

~~CABINET OFFICIALITY ASSURANCE~~

SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL FINDINGS OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

SEPTEMBER 2014

Summary of the Principal Findings of the Quality Assurance Audit of Queen's University

First, the University must ensure that all of its academic programs are subject to review. As noted in our list of recommendation and suggestions, this will require some attention to jurisdiction, i.e., identifying which units are responsible for reviews of programs that are not seen readily to 'belong' to particular departments or schools, and ensuring that all the academic units of the University comply with the requirement to review its programs under the terms of the QUQAPs. It will also require some housekeeping to ensure that program listings are up to date.

Second, the audit team noted a considerable amount of delegation of responsibility for functions outlined in the QUQAPs. In some instances, this appears to have resulted in uncertainty about who has the authority to intervene in and/or resolve certain issues. The auditors suggest that the language of the QUQAPs be amended to ensure that the officers to whom responsibility is assigned for various actions are named accurately in the document and that steps be taken to ensure that the named actors are actually performing these responsibilities.

Third, the auditors observed that some decisions about 'new' programs are made outside the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework. In particular, the procedures to be followed in the case of expedited approvals need to be clarified in the QUQAPs and brought in line with the requirements of the Quality Assurance Framework.

The auditors' specific recommendations and suggestions for Queen's University's quality assurance process are listed below:

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.

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

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

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: The QUQAPs should specify the University official(s)