



**ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES**  
COUNCIL on QUALITY ASSURANCE

# Annual Report

July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017





# Message from the Chair of the Quality Council

## Paul Gooch



An annual report gives an opportunity not only to offer an account of the Quality Council's actions and to offer thanks for the remarkable contributions of many people; it also provides occasion to reflect on the fundamental purposes of the activity of quality assurance.

So let me ask two questions: who is being assured?  
And what makes that assurance trustworthy?

The simplest answer to the first question must surely be that quality assurance is, at root, self-assurance. In program development and review, universities engage in analysis, reflection and resolve. They do a lot of assessment, endeavouring to match resources with the needs and opportunities of student learning. Universities want their students to succeed. They invest considerable time and effort in assuring themselves that they have the right programs, and that those programs are kept current in changing circumstances. They open themselves to the scrutiny of colleagues because there is always something to learn, some practice to improve.

From self-assurance flows assurance to others. Primarily, of course, to the students who seek the benefits of a university experience. Those benefits aren't consumable or episodic, and are often realized over a lifetime. So a disappointed student can't try a different vendor next week. That's why reputation is crucial for universities. Since reputation depends on the quality of the institution, it's important to have assessments of quality that enjoy wide confidence.

When students have confidence in the quality of their education, their parents are able to find assurance. And so do all those who support universities, including of course government.

But it all starts with self-assurance. What, then, makes that assurance trustworthy? Here the simple answer is that the assessment of quality is trustworthy when carried out by independent assessors who are knowledgeable about what they are assessing – peers, in a word. The independence and the knowledge are both essential. Knowledge without independence opens itself to charges of bias and cronyism. These defects may

not reach the level of corruption, but they blemish the process and erode confidence. Even the appearance of conflict of interest is a blot: that's why the selection of peer reviewers can't be left to the program being reviewed, and why deans must be seen to approve only arm's length peers.

Independence without knowledge is even worse. Where judgments of quality are made by those who don't have experience of the area, the probability of arriving at conclusions based on extraneous factors is significantly increased. Not just factors expressing the personal preferences of the judges, either: institutional, social, and political power may intrude upon the teaching and research done in the university. Independence without knowledgeable experience often looks to measures and indices as supposedly neutral and unbiased – when in fact any metric of academic value is the expression of a previous judgment of importance that can only properly be made by the experienced. The dangers of conflict of interest and the intrusion of non-academic interests, then, are heightened by the exercise of presumed independence without knowledge.

Though not perfect, peer assessment is the foundation of quality assurance. Assurance gains its trustworthiness from expertise, but also from independence. The Quality Council itself scrutinizes the self-assurance policies and procedures of Ontario universities, approving programs and accepting reviews only where the standards of peer review have been met, and often with conditions that academic judgment has deemed necessary for success. It audits the quality assurance processes of Ontario universities, issuing instructions and offering suggestions for compliance and improvement. The Quality Council must itself enjoy its own independence from the appearance and exercise of inappropriate interests, wherever they may be found. In its deliberations, it strictly follows the rules of conflict of interest. The Quality Council is also committed to the periodic assessment of its work by knowledgeable peers in the area of university quality assurance. We will commence in 2017-18 the task of analysis and reflection in preparation for the independent external scrutiny of the Council and the Framework.

Ontario universities and their students are fortunate to benefit from the expertise and independent judgment of the members of the Quality Council, the Appraisal Committee and the Audit Committee. This is a group of senior faculty, a citizen member, and some recently retired faculty, who contribute many hours of time in the exercise of their responsibilities. I thank them warmly.

Special thanks go to four retiring members. Jeff Berryman (Windsor) has provided exceptional leadership in his role as Chair of the Appraisal Committee, having served as such since the Committee's inception in 2011. Sandy Welsh (Toronto) also completed her second term on the Committee as its Vice-Chair and, like Jeff, has been a member since 2011. She too deserves grateful thanks for her considerable contributions to the

Committee. With regards to the Audit Committee, Christine McKinnon (Trent) has now completed her term on the Committee having also served as its Chair for the past three years. In this capacity, Christine has significantly shaped the work and standards of the Audit Committee, and we owe a debt of gratitude to her. Charles Morrison (Laurier), an experienced and skilled auditor who served on the Committee from its inception, has also now completed his second term.

I thank each of these senior departing members for their important contributions to the integrity of the quality assurance system, and add more special thanks to Cindy Robinson and Shevanthi Dissanayake in the Secretariat, and to Brian Timney for serving as Executive Director for the year.

## Message from the Executive Director

### Brian Timney



The Quality Council and the Quality Assurance Framework has now been in place for seven years, a sufficient length of time for almost every university to have submitted new program proposals and most programs to have gone through a Cyclical Program Review. Most universities have been through the Audit process, and the first cycle will be completed in 2020. From talking to many of those people who have been involved in the process, both staff and faculty, it is apparent to me that there is a growing acceptance of the need for quality assurance, with its emphasis on learning outcomes. Ontario is a leader in this regard.

Overall, the number of new program proposals coming forward for consideration was somewhat lower this year than in previous years, although this may result from the uncertainty among universities as they renegotiate their Strategic Mandate Agreements. However, interest in developing new professional Graduate Diplomas remains strong. A wide range of such programs came forward in 2016-17, reflecting the very high level of student interest in gaining additional skills to assist them as they join the workforce.

Although I was only able to spend one year in this position, it has been a gratifying experience. I had the opportunity to meet so many dedicated people from across the province, all of whom are doing a tremendous job to ensure that the quality of our university programs is the best it can be. I also had a chance to see and appreciate the level of dedication of all the members of the Committees involved in assessing new program proposals and conducting the Audits. The workload of these Committees, and of the Quality Council itself, is considerable, and I would like to express my appreciation, both for myself and on behalf of the whole university community, for their efforts. Finally, I want to thank Cindy Robinson and Shevanthi Dissanayake for their tireless efforts to make the quality assurance process run smoothly. It is hard to imagine how the Quality Council and its committees could function without their support.

## New Programs in Ontario's Universities

---

The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council), now entering its eighth year of operation, is responsible for assuring the quality of all programs leading to degrees and graduate diplomas granted by Ontario's 21 publicly assisted universities. There are nine voting members and one ex-officio (Executive Director) member on the Quality Council.

The detailed work in reviewing new program submissions is undertaken by the Appraisal Committee, which is comprised of eight senior academics with current experience in development, delivery and quality assessment of graduate and undergraduate programs. The approval process involves an in-depth and rigorous examination of the [evaluation criteria](#) for each proposed new program, led initially by two members of the Appraisal Committee. This evaluation of the completeness of the proposal includes close scrutiny of the external reviewers' recommendations and the proposing university's response to these recommendations. The Committee as a whole then discusses the proposal and determines whether a proposed new program is ready for a recommendation, or requires some additional information from the university in order to make a decision. Once the Committee is agreed that it is ready to make a recommendation, the recommendation goes to the Quality Council for substantive discussion, careful scrutiny and ultimately, a decision. Final approvals may include a requirement for a report, typically on some provision or facility not currently in place but planned for later implementation, often two to three years following the launch of the program.


The number of new program submissions dropped in 2016-17, which may have been primarily due to the universities being in a period of renegotiation of Strategic Mandate Agreements with the provincial government. There were 43 new program submissions and 45 new programs approved over the course of the year, a small number of which were continuing business from 2015-16. Of the 45 programs approved, 10 were new undergraduate programs. At the graduate level, 16 new graduate diplomas were approved, as well as 13 new Master's programs, and six new doctoral programs. Only two of the 43 proposals submitted in the past year were still under review as of June 30. Two new program submissions were also withdrawn as part of the appraisal process.

In addition to the new program approvals, five reports on new programs were submitted for review throughout the year, all of which received approval.

Overall, universities continue to be active innovators, as demonstrated by their ongoing development of new programs. **Table 1** reflects an emphasis on new program developments at the graduate level over the six years since the new Quality Council

assumed its roles in program approval. Between 2011 and 2017, a total of 329 new programs have been approved by the Quality Council and its Appraisal Committee.

The Quality Council's website features brief descriptions of all [approved programs](#).



**Table 1: New Program Approvals 2011 – 2017**

	Undergraduate	Master's	Doctoral	Graduate Diplomas (GDip)	Collaborative <sup>1</sup> (Graduate)	Total: New Programs
<b>Total Submitted In:</b>						
2011 – 2012	10	17	4	19	6	<b>56</b>
2012 – 2013	24	21	9	9	3	<b>66</b>
2013 – 2014	13	12	6	12	3	<b>46</b>
2014 – 2015	17	18	9	29	1	<b>74</b>
2015 – 2016	18	30	11	18	1	<b>78</b>
2016 – 2017	9	12	5	17	-	<b>43</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>363</b>
<b>Total Approved<sup>2</sup> in:</b>						
2011 – 2012	8	10	2	11	3	<b>34</b>
2012 – 2013	21	19	8	6	4	<b>58</b>
2013 – 2014	15	17	9	14	2	<b>57</b>
2014 – 2015	19	17	8	23	2	<b>69</b>
2015 – 2016	15	28	9	17	1	<b>70</b>
2016 – 2017	10	13	6	16	-	<b>45</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>333</b>

<sup>1</sup> There was a definitional change from "Collaborative Program" to "Collaborative Specialization", approved in September 2016. Subsequently, Collaborative Specializations are no longer submitted for approval under the Expedited Approval process and are handled internally by the universities.

<sup>2</sup> These numbers can include appraisals that were still active from a prior year.



**Table 2** lists the new programs, by university, approved to commence, or approved to commence with report during 2016-17. Many of the new programs being developed continue to be interdisciplinary and applied in nature, reflecting contemporary student interests and a general response to emerging social, economic and professional developments.

**Table 2: New Program Approvals for 2016-17**

University and Program	Degree
<b>Carleton University</b>	
• Curatorial Studies	GDip (Type 2)
• Curatorial Studies	GDip (Type 3)
• Health Sciences	MA
• Health Sciences	PhD
• Media Production and Design	BMPD
<b>Lakehead University</b>	
• Graduate Diploma in Accounting	GDip (Type 3)
<b>Laurentian University</b>	
• Master of Architecture	MArch
• Science Communication	MScom
<b>McMaster University</b>	
• Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization	BHSc
• Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization	MBDC
• Master of Financial Mathematics	MFM
<b>Queen's University</b>	
• Arts Leadership	MA
• Arts Management	GDip (Type 1)
• Arts Management	GDip (Type 3)
• Bachelor of Music Theatre	BMT
• Biomedical Informatics	GDip (Type 1)
• Biomedical Informatics	GDip (Type 3)
• Gender Studies	PhD
• Liberal Studies	BA (General)
• Major in Languages, Literatures and Cultures	BA (Honours)
• Medical Sciences	GDip (Type 1)

<b>University and Program</b>	<b>Degree</b>
• Medical Sciences	GDip (Type 3)
• Pain Care	GDip (Type 3)
• Professional Masters of Biomedical Informatics	MBI
• Rehabilitation and Health Leadership	DSc
• Specialization in Politics, Philosophy and Economics	BA (Honours)
<b>Ryerson University</b>	
• Accounting	GDip (Type 3)
• Criminology and Social Justice	MA
• Management of Technology and Innovation	GDip (Type 3)
<b>Trent University</b>	
• Environmental Geoscience	BSc (Honours)
<b>University of Guelph</b>	
• Neuroscience	BSc
<b>University of Ontario Institute of Technology</b>	
• Criminology and Social Justice	PhD
• Work Disability Prevention	GDip (Type 3)
<b>University of Ottawa – Saint Paul University</b>	
• Social Organizations Development	GDip (Type 3)
<b>University of Toronto</b>	
• Master of Forensic Accounting	MFAcc
• Master of Management Analytics	MMA
• Theological Studies (Conjoint)	MA
<b>University of Waterloo</b>	
• Data Analytics	GDip (Type 2)
<b>Western University</b>	
• Master of Data Analytics	MDA
• Mining Law, Finance and Sustainability	GDip (Type 3)
<b>Wilfrid Laurier University</b>	
• Human Relationships	PhD
• User Experience Design	BDes (Honours)

University and Program	Degree
<b>York University/EM LYON</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International Studies (Dual credential)</li> </ul>	iBA/BBA

*“When designing new credentials, Queen’s considers student demand, societal need, and emerging fields of study. We integrate new modes of delivery, innovative pedagogies, and experiential learning opportunities to adapt to changing student demographics and learning styles. We are proud of our academic strengths in health and biomedical sciences, the creative arts and arts leadership, as well as transdisciplinary fields, and we have designed our programs to ensure outstanding learning and career outcomes for our students.”* Benoit-Antoine Bacon, Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic), Queen’s University

## Timelines for Program Approvals

---

The Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) indicates that a university will normally receive a decision on a proposed new program within 45 days of submission provided that the submission is complete and the Appraisal Committee does not require more information from the University in order to assess the proposal. When the Appraisal Committee requires additional information, the university should receive a decision within a further 30 days of the Committee receiving a satisfactory response to its request.

It is a priority of the Quality Council and Appraisal Committee to meet frequently (each met 11 times in 2016-17) in order to allow timely introduction of new programs by the universities.

The Quality Council met the target turnaround time of approval for all proposals submitted that did not require any clarification. In total, 26 of the 43 approvals made in 2016-17 were approved within 45 days of submission to the Quality Council. Decisions were made for 14 of the complete proposals within 35 days and for those proposals that involved some interaction with the university, ten also were approved within 45 days. For the remaining 17 proposals that took longer than 45 days, additional information from and interaction with the submitting university was required before approval. However, all 13 received a decision within 30 days of the Committee receiving a satisfactory response.

## Changing, Improving and Closing University Programs

---

The QAF stipulates that each university will report to the Quality Council on an annual basis the major modifications made to its programs. In addition to the vibrant new program activities underway in the universities, strong evidence is seen in **Table 3** that universities are active in strengthening their existing programs. These changes are made in response to new developments that are taking place in the field; improvements in teaching and learning strategies; response to student feedback; response from employers; improvements in technology.

Members of the Quality Council carefully review each reported modification to ensure that the distinction between a major modification and a new program is being appropriately observed. The Quality Council will therefore seek answers to any questions and concerns it may have from the reporting university.

**Table 3** (below) summarizes the 443 programs that underwent 527 major modifications, as reported in the Annual Reports on Major Modifications submitted by 19 of the 21 member universities in 2016-2017.

**Table 3: Reported Major Modifications by Program Level and Type 2012-13 to 2016-17**

Type of Modification	Total 2012/13	Total 2013/14	Total 2014/15	Total 2015/16	Total 2016/17
<b>Undergraduate</b>					
Add specialization/honours/option/concentration/stream	40	51	38	104	76
Change course/program requirements	31	55	94	76	63
Change program learning outcomes	5	8	37	18	31
Closure of a program	28	17	23	131	30
Add new freestanding minor	9	0	24	22	24
Add new / change pathway for college/university students	12	7	13	37	24
Close specialization/honours/option/concentration/stream	16	16	15	23	23
Change program/specialization name	13	17	13	10	14
Change faculty/other essential resources	3	0	11	7	9
Merge two or more programs	-	-	7	3	8
Add/change mode of delivery	-	-	-	-	7
Add co-op option	4	7	11	7	6
Significant changes to admission requirements	-	-	1	8	5
Other	58	6	6	4	4
Close co-op option/diploma/combined degree	-	-	-	-	3
Add a new undergraduate/postgraduate certificate/diploma	-	-	-	5	2
Closure of a minor	2	5	2	2	2

Type of Modification	Total 2012/13	Total 2013/14	Total 2014/15	Total 2015/16	Total 2016/17
Add existing program offering at another new campus	-	-	-	4	-
Add new capstone course	-	-	-	3	-
Change degree designation	-	-	-	2	-
Creation of a program based on an existing program	-	-	-	2	-
Add new major/double majors	-	-	-	2	-
<b>Undergraduate Total</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>Graduate</b>					
Change course/exam requirements	5	12	41	47	31
Add new field, concentration, stream, specialization	18	25	9	37	29
Closure of a program	12	9	11	11	19
Change admission requirements	6	15	12	26	18
Close/change a field/option/co-op option	7	14	19	24	14
Other	32	1	9	4	10
Add part-time/full-time/course based option	2	1	12	14	9
Change program name	6	2	5	11	9
Add co-op, internship, practicum	2	3	4	18	7
Change program learning outcomes	3	3	9	3	7
Add course based option	-	-	-	-	6
Add new dual degree program	-	-	-	-	5
Add/remove domestic/international partner/locale to existing program	3	0	2	3	5

Type of Modification	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
Add/change mode of delivery	2	2	0	9	5
Clarify program requirements	-	-	-	-	4
Add/change collaborative program/specialization	-	-	-	-	3
Add new unit to collaborative program/specialization	2	4	7	9	3
Change field name/requirements	5	7	6	7	4
Add new combined program	2	1	7	11	2
Create new collaborative specialization	-	-	-	-	2
Change faculty/other essential resources	-	-	-	-	2
Combine two or more programs	-	-	-	-	2
Add new completion option	-	-	-	6	-
Add new capstone course	-	-	-	5	-
Change completion option name	-	-	-	3	-
Change degree/credential designation	-	-	-	3	-
Change course title	-	-	-	2	-
Addition of degree designation/option	-	-	-	2	-
Add/close courses/credits	-	-	-	2	-
<b>Graduate Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>196</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>527</b>

## Quality Assurance Audits

---

Consistent with “best practice” quality assurance in place internationally, the Quality Assurance Framework calls for the audit of each Ontario publicly assisted university every eight years. The Audit Committee therefore verifies that each university’s internal quality assurance practices to develop new programs, modify existing programs, and review all programs with arm’s-length external reviewers at least every eight years, is done in compliance with its Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) and the QAF.

Now in the fifth year of the first eight-year cycle, there was significant audit-related activity in 2016-17. Three more universities underwent site visits: Lakehead University, Trent University and the University of Toronto. The [Summary Report of Principal Findings](#) of all audits are available on the Quality Council website.

Recommendations in Audit Reports result when a university is not acting in conformity with its IQAP so it is important to have timely follow-up. In some cases the university revises its policies to make them clearer; in other cases, the university develops better monitoring of its processes or clearer oversight of its quality assurance activities to address the issues. This year, such follow-up, in the form of an institutional One-Year Follow-Up Response, was received from Nipissing University, York University and Ryerson University. The auditors’ One-year Response Reports include the university’s response to the recommendations that were made by the Quality Council auditors. These reports detail the sufficiency of the university’s response to the issues raised in the audit. All One-year Responses and the auditors’ reports can be seen on the [Quality Council’s website](#).

Overall, the audit process continues to provide evidence that great progress can be seen in the implementation of the new quality assurance policies. Each university has had its own unique challenges in implementing the QAF, but all demonstrate a strong commitment to ensuring the maintenance of the highest standards of quality. The greatest challenge everywhere continues to be the shift to a strong focus on program learning outcomes. But it is also in this area that the audits are finding the universities rising to the challenge of clearly identifying program learning outcomes and assessing the extent to which students are achieving them.

*“The Audit process provided an important opportunity for the University of Toronto community to engage on the issue of quality assurance. The preparation for the audit, the site visit and the report brought heightened awareness of quality assurance across the institution, and fostered the collective self-examination that is the hallmark of a commitment to quality.”* Sioban Nelson, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life



## Outreach

---

### 2017 Meeting of Quality Assurance Key Contacts

---

Representing 20 universities, 56 delegates attended the fourth meeting for Key Contacts in Quality Assurance held at the COU offices in April 2017. The day was organized by the Quality Council with a continued focus on the day being highly interactive and engaging for all participants. As with past years, sessions were facilitated by key contacts, members of the Quality Council and its Committees. Topics included:

- QA Past, Present and Future
- Getting the Most out of our Quality Assurance Processes
  - Program reviews and institutional academic planning
  - Getting the most impact from a Cyclical Program Review – keeping the recommendations and Implementation Plans front of mind for the next eight years
  - Leveraging audit results to make meaningful changes to program quality
- Making Quality Assurance Work
  - Before, During and After – Preparation, Practices, and Post-Audit Change Management: The Triple Ps of a Positive Audit Experience
  - Demystifying Program Modifications: Minor Mods, Major Mods, New Programs, and more!
  - Stakeholder Management 101: Effective EXTERNAL Stakeholder Management in a Cyclical Program Review
  - Stakeholder Management 102: Effective INTERNAL Stakeholder Management in a Cyclical Program Review
  - From Rivalry to Collaboration: Making Accreditation and CPR Work Together
  - Structure of QA Leadership and Support
  - Best Practices
  - Brainstorming the QAF/Upcoming Review

A fifth meeting of the key contacts in quality assurance will take place in 2018.

*“Once again, the organizing committee designed a strong program that offered something for everyone in attendance. I particularly enjoyed the opportunity to share what we had learned going through our first institutional audit with others preparing for theirs. An additional bonus was the time built into the program for connecting with colleagues at other institutions. There really is no substitute for being together and talking through the important nuances of operationalizing quality assurance.”* Nancy Luckai, Deputy Provost, Lakehead University

## 2016 Symposium – Learning Outcomes: Evolution of Assessment

---

There have now been four highly successful conferences, with the first being held in 2012 ([Learning Outcomes Assessment: a Practical Guide](#)). The second ([Learning Outcomes Assessment: Practically Speaking](#)) was held in 2013, and the third in 2014 ([Learning Outcomes: A Toolkit for Assessment](#)). The Quality Council was once more a co-sponsor and key organizer of the 2016 event, [Learning Outcomes: Evolution of Assessment](#), which took place in Toronto on October 17 and 18 and had 254 delegates and speakers in attendance.



Peter Ewell, Keynote Speaker

The focus this year was on the achievements, challenges and emerging questions in relation to the development of the assessment of learning outcomes as these contribute to a shared commitment to producing and documenting quality in post-secondary education. There were over 40 different workshops, two engaging plenary sessions with eight invited speakers, and keynote speakers [Peter Ewell](#), [Charles Blaich](#) and [Kathy Wise](#).

*“This year’s symposium extended and deepened ongoing conversations and sparked new ones as we shared trends, tools, research and our evolving practices in the development and assessment of learning outcomes.”* Alice Pitt, Chair of the Symposium Program Planning Committee and Vice-Provost, York University

### Other Initiatives

---

The Quality Council’s [website](#), which provides a window into the Quality Council’s role, and features two key documents – the [Quality Assurance Framework](#) and the [Guide to the Quality Assurance Framework](#), is a helpful resource for those responsible for quality assurance at Ontario universities. In 2015-16, the Quality Council developed a new [Frequently Asked Questions](#) section to the website, intended to assist universities as they continue to develop and implement quality assurance practices at the universities

in Ontario. There have been 447 visits to this page between the launch of this resource in April 2016 and the end of this reporting period (June 30, 2017).

Overall, the number of users of the site is down by 14% from the previous year thus returning it to the 2014-15 level and the number of sessions has decreased by 5%. The Quality Assurance Framework is the most frequently visited page with 5,169 page views. This is followed by the Learning Outcomes Symposium (5,117 page views), the Guide to the Quality Assurance Framework (3,792 page views), the Degree Level Expectations (1,435 page views) and the program approvals (1,235 page views). The average time spent on any given page is one minute, 25 seconds<sup>3</sup>, which indicates that people are actually reading the content of the page visited, and the average number of pages viewed during each session is 2.5.

The Executive Director of the Quality Council provides quality assurance briefings and updates to the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS), MAESD (previously MTCU), other national post-secondary education quality assurance agencies, and others upon request throughout the year.

---

<sup>3</sup> According to [Time.com](http://Time.com), 55% of internet users spend less than 15 seconds actively on a webpage. Another [source](#) says that a dwell time of over two minutes is considered outstanding.

## Membership of the Quality Council in 2016-17

---

### **Dr. Paul Gooch, Chair**

Paul W Gooch holds a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Toronto, where he has taught for four decades. He has held a number of administrative posts throughout his career, including Vice-Provost dealing with faculty issues, academic integrity, and academic policy including reviews at the University of Toronto. From 2001 until June 2015, Dr. Gooch was President of Victoria University, federated with the University of Toronto. His research and publications are in ancient philosophy, philosophical theology, philosophy of religion, and ethics.

Dr. Gooch has broad knowledge of Canadian universities, and extensive experience in conducting, commissioning and appraising academic and institutional reviews. He has reviewed academic programs in several provinces, and has been a member of the Campus Alberta Quality Council since 2012.

### **Dr. Brenda Brouwer, Member / Graduate Dean Representative**

Brenda Brouwer is Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) at Queen's University. She has responsibility for the administrative oversight of over 120 graduate programs and has a mandate to support student achievement, program development, and uphold the highest standards in graduate degree programs.

Dr. Brouwer serves as a Board member of the Canadian Association of Graduate Studies and was Chair of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

### **Professor Erika Chamberlain, Academic Colleague Representative**

Erika Chamberlain is Associate Dean of Law, Western University. Prior to her faculty appointment, Professor Chamberlain graduated as Gold Medalist from Western Law in 2001, served as law clerk to Mr. Justice Major at the Supreme Court of Canada, and was called to the Bar of Ontario in 2002. She received her doctorate from the University of Cambridge, where she was a Commonwealth Scholar, SSHRC Doctoral Fellow, and recipient of the WM Tapp Studentship in Law at Gonville and Caius College.

Professor Chamberlain has won several teaching awards at the Faculty of Law and at Western University. She has been active in Western's Institutional Quality Assurance Process at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and oversees Western Law's professional accreditation processes.

### **Ms. Beverly Harris, Citizen Member**

Beverly Harris earned a BA in Political Science from the University of Waterloo prior to obtaining a Bachelor of Laws from the University of Ottawa. From 1982 to 1990, she practiced law at Cassels, Brock in Toronto, where she specialized in administrative law.

In April 2008 she completed a ten-year term as Chair of the Health Services Appeal and Review Board and the Ontario Hepatitis C Review Committee, two provincial adjudicative tribunals. She is currently an adjudicator and mediator for the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal.

Ms. Harris served as a member of the Board of Governors at Wilfrid Laurier University for sixteen years beginning in 1995. During her tenure, she chaired the Board of Governors for four years and also was Chair the Council of Chairs of Ontario Universities and the corresponding council for Board Chairs at the former Association for Universities and Colleges of Canada (now Universities Canada).

### **Dr. Denis Hurtubise, Member / Out-of-Province Quality Assurance Expert**

Dr. Hurtubise served as Associate Professor (1993-2000) and later Vice-President, Academic and Research at Saint-Paul University in Ottawa from 2000 to 2007, where he was principally responsible for research services, marketing, international and library services. As Dean of Studies at Université du Québec en Outaouais from 2007 to the end of 2011, he was responsible for the development and evaluation of numerous undergraduate and graduate programs. During his tenure as Dean of Studies, he was a member of the task force that prepared the current version of the Province of Quebec's *Program Proposal Evaluation Process and Procedures*. Between January 2012 and June 2014, he worked as a higher education consultant including for the network of Université du Québec on the intake and academic integration of international students at the undergraduate level in Quebec universities. Dr. Hurtubise is now a professor at Laurentian University.

### **Dr. Sioban Nelson, Member / OCAV Representative**

Professor Sioban Nelson serves as both Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life at the University Toronto. As Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, Professor Nelson leads the University's Quality Assurance Process for undergraduate and graduate programs, working closely with all its faculties and schools and with other post-secondary institutions. Professor Nelson is the senior assessor to the University's Committee on Academic Policy and Programs of Academic Board, and a member of the Academic Board. In her role as Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life, Professor Nelson has responsibility for the development and oversight of a wide variety of policies and programs to support the institutional goal of appointing, promoting and retaining outstanding faculty.

Professor Nelson is the co-editor of the Culture and Politics of Healthcare Work series for Cornell University Press. Her current research interests include labour mobility and the global health workforce, and health professional regulation and transnational history.

### **Dr. John Shepherd, Member / OCAV Representative**

John Shepherd is Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic) at Carleton University. He has had responsibility for quality assurance since the inception of the new Quality Assurance Framework in 2010, and is also currently responsible for operational academic planning and implementation. Dr. Shepherd was Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs before stepping down in 2012 to assume the newly established position of Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Academic).

Dr. Shepherd holds a BA in French and a BMus from Carleton University, an Associateship of the Royal College of Music in the flute, and a DPhil in Musicology from the University of York (UK). In 2000 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in recognition of his role 'as a leading architect of a post-War critical musicology,' and in 2002 was named Chancellor's Professor of Music and Sociology at Carleton.

### **Dr. Jeff Smith, Member / Academic Colleague Representative**

Jeffrey Smith has been a faculty member at Carleton University in 2008 and is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Chemistry and Institute of Biochemistry and he is also the Director of the Carleton Mass Spectrometry Centre (CMSC). His collaborative research program includes the use of mass spectrometry and microfluidics to develop novel quantitative proteomic and lipidomic strategies and apply these to monitor the dynamics of proteins and lipids from a systems biology point of view. Dr. Smith has won awards for his teaching of analytical chemistry and currently serves as the Academic Colleague for Carleton University.

### **Dr. Colleen Willard-Holt, Undergraduate Dean Representative**

Colleen Willard-Holt was the inaugural dean of Laurier's Faculty of Education and has held that role since 2008. Previously, she coordinated the Elementary Education Program and served as the director of Initial Teacher Certification Programs at Penn State Harrisburg. She received her Ph. D. in Educational Psychology from Purdue University.


At Laurier, Dr. Willard-Holt is active at all levels of university governance, including serving on committees responsible for academic planning, strategic enrolment management, multi-campus governance, institutional priorities and resource management team, and resource-centred management. She was also a member of the committee responsible for developing Laurier's Institutional Quality Assurance Procedures (IQAP), and has served as an external reviewer for an Ontario Master of Education program. Within the provincial context she has chaired the Ontario Association of Deans of Education group and now serves on the Accepting Schools Expert Panel for the Ministry of Education.

In her role as Dean of the Faculty of Education, Dr. Willard-Holt is well-versed in the university's quality assurance processes. She oversaw the development of the Master of Education and Minor in Education programs, led the first cyclical review of the Bachelor of Education and led both the undergraduate and graduate education programs through provincial accreditation processes. Prior to coming to Ontario she co- led her institution's initial accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), participated in two statewide accreditation processes, and served on multiple teams accrediting other institutions.

**Dr. Brian Timney, Executive Director (ex-officio)**

Brian Timney was born in England, completing his undergraduate degree in Psychology at the University of Edinburgh and his Ph.D. at Brandeis University, in Massachusetts. After post-doctoral work at Queen's University and Dalhousie, he joined the University of Western Ontario, where he was a member of faculty in the Psychology Department from 1978. He is also a member of Western's Brain and Mind Institute. Dr. Timney's primary area of research is in Visual Neuroscience, where he has worked on visual development, and on the visual capacities of non-primate mammals, including cats, horses and camels. More recently he has been investigating the effects of alcohol on the human visual system.

In 1992, Dr. Timney was appointed as an Associate Dean in the Faculty of Social Science at Western, serving both as Associate Dean (Student Affairs) and Associate Dean (Budget and Operations) at different times. He served as Dean of Social Science from 2002 until 2015. Dr. Timney has had a long-standing interest in student education and curriculum. During his time at Western he was for many years a member and Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Awards, which was responsible for administrating academic policy at Western, and for approving new and modified programs. He was also instrumental in developing a new curriculum structure for all undergraduate programs in 2004.



The Quality Council  
operates at  
arm's-length from  
government and  
Ontario's universities

## The Quality Council's Appraisal and Audit Committees

---

The Quality Council's Appraisal Committee reviews proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs from Ontario's publicly assisted universities, and makes recommendations regarding their approval to the quality council.

### MEMBERS OF THE APPRAISAL COMMITTEE, 2016-2017

- Dr. Phil Bates, Faculty of Engineering, Royal Military College of Canada
- Dr. Jeff Berryman (Chair), Faculty of Law, University of Windsor
- Dr. Gregory Finn, Department of Earth Sciences, Brock University
- Dr. Sofie Lachapelle, Department of History, University of Guelph
- Dr. André Loiselle, Department of Film Studies, Carleton University
- Dr. Jan Polgar, School of Occupational Therapy, Western University
- Dr. Barry Warner, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Waterloo
- Dr. Sandy Welsh (Vice-Chair), Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto
- Dr. Brian Timney (*ex-officio*), Executive Director

The Quality Council's Audit Committee reviews audit reports prepared by the Quality Council Auditors and makes recommendations to the Quality Council. The audit report describes whether the university has, since its last review, acted in compliance with the provisions of its Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP).

### MEMBERS OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE, 2016-2017

- Dr. Carolyn Andrew, Professor Emeritus, University of Ottawa
- Dr. Suzanne Crosta, Professor, McMaster University
- Prof. Katherine Graham, Professor, Carleton University
- Dr. Wayne Loucks, Associate Professor Emeritus, University of Waterloo
- Dr. Anne-Marie Mawhiney, Professor, Laurentian University
- Dr. Douglas McDougall, Professor, University of Toronto
- Dr. Christine McKinnon (Chair), Professor, Trent University
- Dr. Sarah McKinnon, OCAD University
- Dr. Charles Morrison, Professor, Wilfrid Laurier University
- Dr. John Pierce, Professor, Queen's University
- Dr. Peter Sutherland, Professor Emeritus, McMaster University



## The Quality Assurance Secretariat

---

The Quality Assurance Secretariat supports the ongoing business of the Quality Council and its Committees by providing timely information, advice and support. Among other responsibilities, the Secretariat prepares agendas and materials for all meetings and appraisals, takes minutes of meetings, and communicates decisions of the Appraisal Committee and the Quality Council to the appropriate institutions. The Secretariat also supports the Audit process, and provides general quality assurance and appraisal-related advice to Ontario universities.

### **MEMBERS OF THE SECRETARIAT, 2016-2017**

- Shevanthi Dissanayake, Coordinator
- Cindy Robinson, Manager
- Brian Timney, Executive Director

## Mission

---

The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance is the provincial body responsible for assuring the quality of all programs, leading to degrees and graduate diplomas that are granted by Ontario's publicly assisted universities, and the integrity of the universities' quality assurance processes. Through these practices, the Quality Council also assists institutions to improve and enhance their programs. In fulfilling its mission, the Quality Council operates in a fair, accountable and transparent manner with clear and openly accessible guidelines and decision-making processes, and through reasoned results and evidenced-based decisions.

## Mandate

---

The roles and responsibilities of the Quality Council, while respecting the autonomy and diversity of the individual institutions, are the following:

- to guide Ontario's publicly assisted universities in the ongoing quality assurance of their academic programs
- to review and approve proposals for new graduate and undergraduate programs
- to ensure through regular audits that Ontario's publicly assisted universities comply with quality assurance guidelines, policies and regulations for graduate and undergraduate programs
- to communicate final decisions to the Ministry of Advanced Education Skills and Development (formerly the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities)
- to review and revise, from time to time for future application, the Council of Ontario University's quality assurance protocols in light of its own experiences and developments in the field of quality assurance
- to liaise with other quality assurance agencies, both provincially and elsewhere
- to undergo regular independent review and audit at intervals of no longer than eight years

**Ontario Universities Council on Quality  
Assurance**

**180 Dundas Street West, Suite 1800**

**Toronto, Ontario M5G 1Z8**

**Tel: 416-979-2165 Extension 235**

**Fax: 416-979-8635**

**Email: [info@oucqa.ca](mailto:info@oucqa.ca)**