

SUMMARY OF AUDITORS' REPORT ON THE
SCOPE OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE
TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT

NOVEMBER 2015

Recommendation 4 The University should undertake to identify all of its academic programs and ensure that they are included in the calendar of Cyclical Program Review.

Recommendation 5 The QUQAPs should be revised to include the full definition of “new program” from the Quality Assurance Framework.

Recommendation 6 The QUQAPs should be revised to clarify the criteria used to define whether proposals should be treated as ‘new programs’, ‘major modifications’ or ‘minor modifications’.

Recommendation 7

September 14, 2015

Donna M. Woolcott, PhD
Executive Director
Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance
Suite 1100 - 180 Dundas Street West
Toronto, ON M5G 1Z8

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
AND VICE-PRINCIPAL (ACADEMIC)

Richardson Hall, Suite 353
Queen's University
Kingston ON Canada K7L 3N6
Tel 613 5332020
Fax 613 5336441
www. Queensu.ca/Provost

Dear Dr. Woolcott:

In reply to your letter dated June 10, 2015 regarding the Institutional One Year Followup Report to the quality assurance audit at Queen's University I am pleased to provide the following responses to each of the eight recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1: Review Teams should be advised that, in their reports, they are expected to address all the evaluation criteria, for each program under consideration.

Modifications have been made to the Review Team Report Form (found [here](#)) which highlight the requirement that reviewers are to address all evaluation criteria for each program under review. Both the initial instructions and the section on evaluation criteria have been modified to make this expectation clear. I meet with reviewers at the start of each site visit and stress to them that they should cover each program fully in their subsequent report.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The QUQAPs should be revised to include the titles of all officers, including their delegates, who fulfill specified QA roles.

Please see Section 1.1 of the revised QUQAP (Queen's University Quality Assurance Processes) as ratified by the Quality Council on June 19, 2015.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The Senate Committee on Cyclical Program Review should ensure that each program under review is addressed in its reports to the Provost.

New processes have been put in place for the Senate Cyclical Program Review Committee (SCPRC) including assigning a first reader to each cyclical program review. The responsibility of the first reader is to do a thorough review and analysis of the file and then report back to the SCPRC on the highlights and deficiencies of the materials. All materials associated with a cyclical program review (self-

study, review team report, internal responses, etc.) are rigorously vetted by the committee and the reports to the provost are carefully crafted to ensure completeness.

RECOMMENDATION 4: The University should undertake to identify all of its academic programs and ensure that they are included in the calendar of Cyclical Program Review.

To address this recommendation, extensive work has been done in coordination with the Office of the University Registrar and individual Faculties/Schools to ensure that all academic programs are included in Queen's Cyclical Program Review schedule. Appendix 2 of the revised QUQAP lists all the programs currently offered at Queen's and the dates they are due for cyclical review. I am pleased to report that Queen's undergraduate medical program will be undergoing its first ever cyclical program review in 2016-17.

RECOMMENDATION 5: The QUQAPs should be revised to include the full definition of "new

SUGGESTION 1:The University should ensure that documents prepared in compliance with QUQAPs are clearly signed and dated by the relevant parties named in the QUQAPs.

Our attention to detail has improved immensely with the hiring of a Teaching and Learning Coordinator in March 2014 . All QUQAP documents are now signed and dated.

SUGGESTION 2:The QUQAPs and related documents should be revised to clarify what is expected from the academic units in terms of the length and scope of responses to Review Team Reports.

Communications (memos, emails, etc.) to academic units and relevant deans, requesting their internal responses, have been improved to ensure clarity around the length and scope required.

SUGGESTION 3:Program representatives who are invited to appear at SCPRC meetings should be informed in advance about issues of concern and/or provided with some general questions to assist them in preparing for the meeting.

As we gain more experience with cyclical program reviews it has not been necessary to

SUGGESTION 6: The roles of internal reviewers should be clarified, including their responsibilities with respect to the preparation of the Review Team Report Form.

Amendments have been made to the Review Team Report template, the QUQAP Guide and the instructions to reviewers to address the role of the internal reviewer.

SUGGESTION 7: The University should specify the academic unit or units responsible for each program review.

The year-4(y)T2