

Review of the Quality Council (QC) of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) by an Independent Review Panel, May 2018

Section 1: Context

1. Background

On its inception in 2010, it was agreed that the system of external quality assurance for publicly-assisted universities in Ontario, established by the COU, would be independently reviewed after eight years (to coincide broadly with the conclusion of a first cycle of audits for all institutions). Consequently, in 2018 an independent panel of assessors was formed. It considered particularly the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) and the body implementing the new quality assurance system, the Quality Council (QC). This panel was comprised of Professor Roger King (University of Bath, UK), chair, Professor Anna Kindler (University of British Columbia), and Professor Greg Moran (Professor Emeritus and Provost Emeritus, Western University).

The Review Panel (RP), convening at the QC's offices in Toronto, interviewed and held discussions with key stakeholders between 29 April 2018 and 2 May 2018 (please see the attached schedule, Appendix 1). Immediately thereafter, the Panel provided initial feedback of its conclusions to the review's steering committee with this, the full and written report, to follow by 31 May 2018.

2. A Few Broad Reflections on the Current system

It is clear that the system of quality assurance for Ontario's universities has attracted considerable support from the university sector. Its self-regulatory governance and ownership continues to be highly valued, and there is no sign from government that it wishes significant change to these arrangements. The QC is credited by all stakeholders in considerably improving the commitment to best practice quality assurance throughout the university system and the ability to design and implement processes to support it. This provides an excellent basis for the next stage (cycle two) in the evolution of the external quality assurance framework and the role of the QC.

Nonetheless, and not unexpectedly, there are criticisms from the sector (the universities) that require addressing. In particular, the bureaucratic emphasis of cycle one needs to give way, in an increasingly mature system, to a sharper and more principles-based focus for the QAF and its application in cycle two. Moreover, there is need to allow a greater degree of 'earned autonomy' for institutions with demonstrably excellent quality assurance track records. The longer term aim should be for all universities to have more responsibility for their own quality assurance and improvement with less direct involvement by the QC, not least in the capacity for introducing new programs. Such a change need not wait until the end of a further cycle and could be introduced gradually following successful audits. (We note that an original aim of the external quality assurance system at inception was to maximize levels of institutional autonomy as the system matured, although this has yet to be fully realized).

Similarly, information requirements laid on institutions by the QC, for both audit and course planning approval, should be lightened. Perhaps greater consideration, too, should be given to a more formal and comprehensive utilization of the findings of professional bodies' reviews where this is available.

Although the QC has final authority for decisions concerning recommendations of approval for new programs and compliance with audit guidelines, in other respects the QC is responsible to COU through the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), an affiliate group of COU. In order to dispel any possible public perceptions of 'club governance' by self-interested insiders, the QC should be seen more clearly to possess an independence of action and decision, with only broader accountability to the COU through OCAV, perhaps by way of an annual report or when it specifically seeks COU advice on particular matters. The Chair of the QC and its Executive Director should be key contact points in OVAC/COU communications. Members of the Secretariat, though employees of COU, should report directly to the QC through the Chair and Executive Director. It is clear, however, that the QC has full responsibility for the quality assurance process, with the Executive Director accountable to the Chair of the QC.

Section 2: Purposes and international norms

1. The external assurance of university quality processes has become a standard feature in many higher education institutions. Global regulatory principles of transparency and accountability, alongside notions of consumer protection, have influenced these developments, as they have in other public service sectors. International policy imitation and related processes have helped underscore normative convergence among national and local jurisdictions on these matters.
2. More recently, however, external quality agencies in a number of OECD-countries (Australia, UK, Europe, and the USA) and elsewhere have refocused their approaches. There is a pronounced move to greater autonomy for universities and colleges, including an emphasis on institutional accreditation, although generally buttressed by cyclical external review, and with the reinforcement of the notion that institutions themselves are the primary agents for quality assurance. External quality assurance therefore has moved away from more detailed interventions towards a system of monitoring and assessing internal quality assurance processes – it regulates the regulators, often by turning ‘inside-out’ for external investigation institutions’ own procedures.
3. This shift towards greater institutional autonomy coincides with an increased expectation by governments that universities in their jurisdiction contribute to innovation and economic competitiveness by being societally responsive and entrepreneurial. This requires,

particularly in an age of declining budgets for both institutions and quality agencies, methodologies that are not burdensome for either universities or those that assure them.

Moreover, although new entrants to a sector may require closer and more continuous monitoring, trusted universities should expect, and receive, more autonomy in the exercise of their affairs. Thus, a more differentiated approach is called for, moving away from treating universities as though they have demonstrated broadly similar levels of maturity and capacity for quality assurance. Rather, risk analysis is increasingly used in quality regulation to assess which universities pose the greatest or least risk to standards, students, and the broader public interest, and to then tailor assurance methods accordingly. That is, while institutions are governed within the same overall framework, variations in the intensity of approach by agencies reflect levels of successful track records in quality compliance and enhancement.

This approach is consistent with the desire to expand the focus of QA beyond that of the institutions demonstrating compliance with the established standards of quality to that of encouraging investments in quality improvement.

Section 3: Findings and Recommendations

1. Governance

The system of self-regulation for Ontario's external quality assurance of its universities is working well and is generally supported by all stakeholders. It has the advantage of expertise, formal and tacit knowledge, and broad sector confidence. There is a danger in such self-governing systems, however, that they may come to be regarded as rather 'insider-protecting' and opaque to outsiders, and that mutual self-interest may become a predominant driver.

More often this is a matter of perception rather than actuality. But perceptions matter, and the QC rightly includes a citizens' representative in its governing ranks. The QC may wish to consider if its commitment to broad public objectives may be more explicitly stated, perhaps in a 'Quality Code', where access and social mobility expectations and practices may be contained.

It is important that the Executive Director particularly maintains regular interaction with the political realm and exercises a relatively high profile in the media as well as towards a range of stakeholders. The QC may also wish to consider whether it would gain by having a wider international or public presence on its main committee.

As referred to above, we believe too that the QC should more clearly demonstrate its independence in decision-making from the COU (through OCAV), although a broader reporting and advisory relationship remains desirable. One example of where OCAV may be too directly involved in the QA process is in the recruitment and selection of auditors. Although

OCAV might usefully be involved in the nomination of auditors and audit committee members, final decisions on appointment are the responsibility of the QC. A further consideration is whether incorporation of the QC would allow additional strengthening of its independence.

A further danger for self-governing systems (which in essence are always ‘licensed’ as such by governments in allowing and relying on such governance arrangements) is that they seek to do too much to convince others that public trust in the system is not misplaced. The result can be bureaucratic overload in order to cover all eventualities. Moreover, insufficiency of resources can also be a problem as such agencies are often reluctant to impose further financial costs on their members, particularly when resources generally are becoming tighter. Yet, self-governance has to be adequately resourced in order to remain sustainable and that often difficult message to members has to be conveyed clearly.

2. Quality Assurance Framework

The QAF is well-detailed and operates as a touchstone for institutional quality systems. It has received an exceptional level of institutional buy-in and has been instrumental in guiding the development of institutional QA approaches. Each of Ontario’s universities has now developed its own Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the requirements for which are set out in the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). However, it became clear during our review that the Framework appears too detailed to adequately embrace varied institutional profiles and practices. The QAF

would benefit if more specific procedural details were contained in a separate section or annex and perhaps presented as illustrative of good practice without requiring that they be followed religiously by every university – thus, impeding appropriate adaptations to local conditions and cultures. Currently, there are too many resources being consumed by all parties in assessing the textual matching of IQAPs to the QAF, with not enough allowance being made for understandable variances in institutional approaches, programs and cultures.

A more principles-based approach would allow wider scope for interpretation and application. It would also provide recognition of the wider diversity in institutional strategies and student populations that is being encouraged by governments, institutions, and others. The QAF principles would be separated from procedures and comprise the main section and focus of the QAF. An accompanying ‘narrative’ explaining the purposes of the QAF principles would also be advantageous to both users and to other stakeholders (such as the aspiration to move towards greater institutional autonomy against clearly articulated criteria around maturity and track record; or, for institutional practice to move beyond just demonstrating quality to continuous quality improvement.). In a nutshell, it is the ends or objectives that are crucial quality assurance, not the means by which they are achieved.

Among the principles that the QC could consider, *inter alia*, could be proportionality, risk, institutional maturity and track records, standards, and institutional responsiveness to the QC. A key focus for the QC and the QAF would be on educational guidance and the transposing of good quality practices

throughout its sector, with sanctions as a last resort. However, the QC needs to have the authority to impose concrete measures when there are persistent and egregious examples of institutional evasion; relying only on reputational damage or media attention provide insufficient leverage to the regulator to do the job. Without such an instrument other institutions will wonder whether non-compliance is advantageous if others are perceived as getting away with such a stance and possibly taking competitive benefit. Even more importantly, the public and government are left without an answer to the questions regarding the consequences of deliberate institutional non-compliance. Having said this, the overriding approach of the QC should be on persuasion and negotiation. Speaking softly while having recourse to substantive sanctions would help to demonstrate to government and the wider public the robustness of the self-governing system and its ability to take hard decisions.

Principles-based approaches should be clear and succinct, focusing on the quality expectations of institutions, particularly at minimum or 'threshold' levels (the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment, 'Quality Code' 2018, provides a useful example). As codified, these fundamental principles would apply and be seen to apply to higher education quality across all of Ontario's universities, irrespective of varied local contexts and detailed practices. These principles would include, for example, emphasizing the role of providers in assuring the quality of the experience they offer to students, student engagement, and ensuring external referencing is used to ensure the integrity of awards and the

quality of provision. A core idea is the setting and measuring of explicit learning outcomes. The Structure of the Quality Code for UK higher education (2018), for example, is based on three elements that together provide a reference point for effective quality assurance:

- a) *Expectations* which clearly and succinctly express the outcomes providers should achieve in setting and maintain the standards of their awards, and for managing the quality of their provision
- b) *Practices* representing effective ways of working that underpin the delivery of expectations, and which deliver positive outcome for students; these include, (i) core practices (such as having a reliable, fair and inclusive admissions system) that must be demonstrated by all institutions as part of assuring their standards and quality; and (ii) common practices (such as the provider regularly reviewing its core practices for quality and using the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement) that will be applied by providers in line with their missions, their regulatory context, and the needs of their students
- c) *Advice and guidance* which will help providers to develop and maintain effective quality assurance practices.

A meeting with the OCAV Executive included a discussion of quality assurance principles, which in turn prompted two members of the Executive to provide a short and excellent paper on the topic. It noted the following:

- The QAF and process must define what it means by quality and have performance criteria that are valid indicators of quality

- The QA process must not obstruct and must facilitate university responsiveness to societal need
- The QAF should seek a differentiated approach to the assurance of quality and standards in universities based on ‘earned autonomy’ as measured against transparent and robust criteria

3. Audit

The density of procedures and detail involved in cyclical audit is burdensome and in need of considerable pruning. A principles-based approach should allow assessment of IQAPs, and the measuring of institutional quality processes against IQAPs, to take place at the time of cyclical audit, rather than the current system of continuous and detailed assessment of often relatively small changes in IQAPs against the specificities of the current QAF. There should be a move towards formal recognition of further institutional quality assurance self-determination to identify universities that can be assigned the authority and responsibility for their own program changes and approval (and perhaps other aspects of the QA process), and the QC will need to consider the indicators against which ‘earned autonomy’ of this kind is assessed.

Discussions should take place with the Ministry for Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD) with regard to its priorities and processes for the authorization of new programs (resources, labor markets) in the case of those with more institutional QA self-determination and whether a QC ‘stamp’ is still necessary (as it would continue to be for those

institutions still on the route to formal self-determining status). More frequent cyclical audits, perhaps occurring every five or six years as QC detailed program approval processes decline, should be considered. Provision for the withdrawal of recognized institutional quality assurance self-determination should also be included in the evolved quality system and tied to the outcomes of cyclical audit.

Currently the Auditors are overloaded, undertaking both the functions of Audit Committee members and the carrying out of the institutional audits. There is danger in such circumstances of not achieving succession planning and of a shortfall in suitable recruits. The two functions should be more clearly separated. An Audit Committee (of five or six members, rather than the current nine) should be established. A further Audit Pool of around 15-20 auditors with diverse expertise available to work in small teams should be established to undertake the audits, with an institutional audit team normally also containing one member of the Audit Committee. Planned recruitment and succession, alongside training, should be instigated to allow a regular but planned cycle of recruitment and retirement of both Audit Committee and institutional auditors. This arrangement should also provide scope for monitoring whether institutions are following up in a timely manner the recommendations contained in Final Audit Reports (through a simple annual reporting pro-forma), although cyclical audits will also consider such matters more fully at the time of institutional visits.

4. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO)

This government agency undertakes research and policy analysis, rather than quality assurance. There is scope for more collaboration between the QC and HEQCO, particularly as the educational and guidance role of the QC is intended to grow under these proposals and as the student outcomes/learning gain agenda is likely to be a shared interest of both organizations.

It is noted, too, that HEQCO is also undertaking development work on experiential learning, which should also prove valuable to the QC. Both developments could eventually inform the preparation and induction arrangements for QC's quality assessors.

5. QC Secretariat and Executive Director

The Secretariat requires a further staff member in quality assurance to prevent overload and to allow proper succession planning.

The Executive Director needs to be a full-time, or full-time equivalent, position to pick up the increased communicative function required both internally to the universities and externally to government and the wider public, as well as being available to manage the Secretariat in a continuous manner. Although requesting the extra resources needed from members to enable continuing with a full-time position may be a challenge, the case is strong, particularly when linked to the retention of a well-run self-governing system. The

extensive administrative tasks demanded of the Executive Director within the current system may currently be an impediment to attracting candidates of the right caliber. This matter can be addressed by adding an additional administrative staff member to the secretariat. With these changes, the role of Executive Director should be attractive to a range of suitably qualified individuals.

6. The QA Key Contacts

The Key Contacts at institutions appears a very valuable source of feedback and consultation for the QC but may not be fully utilized at present. There may be benefit for the Key Contacts Group to be more formally established as a structured forum that gives advice to the QC, in much the same way as COU has affiliate groups.

7. Student engagement

Student engagement is a key theme internationally in quality assurance and student contributions should be encouraged in cyclical audits. QC may wish to pilot such an approach in cycle two.

Summary of Recommendations

1. The rather bureaucratic emphasis of cycle one needs to give way, in an increasingly mature system, to a sharper and more principles-based focus for the QAF and its application in cycle 2

2. A more differentiated approach to institutions should allow a greater degree of ‘earned autonomy’ for those with demonstrably very good or excellent quality assurance track records
3. The longer-term aim for all universities is for them to become formally recognized as capable of more independent self-regulation in quality assurance and improvement, not least in the capacity for new program development as they respond to societal needs, but this need not wait until the end of the second cycle and could be introduced gradually, including following successful audits
4. Current very extensive information requirements laid on institutions, notably for audits, should be reduced to only those directly relevant and essential to consideration of the IQAPs. Greater use should be made of institutions’ own data reports and, where available and appropriate, the findings of professional accreditation bodies. Open-ended invitations to provide “relevant” data and material for new program proposals, cyclical reviews and audits should be avoided
5. The QC should demonstrate its independence of action and decision, with only broad accountability to the COU through OCAV, perhaps by way of an annual report or when it specifically seeks COU advice on particular matters. The Chair and Executive Director are key contacts in such communications. The issue of QC incorporation could be considered.

6. The QC and the QAF should reflect international trends in higher education quality assurance in moving away from program to institutional accreditation, buttressed by cyclical audits. The focus would be on institutions' own internal quality processes (as the primary agents for assuring quality) and on the confidence to be placed in their operation
7. In addition to quality assurance itself, an overriding objective must be to reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens on both universities and the QC in order to allow more scope for the nimbleness, entrepreneurialism and societal responsiveness that government and the public expects of its universities, and in contributing to well-being and national economic competitiveness
8. As a self-governing system, the QC may wish to consider whether its commitment to wider public norms may be more explicitly stated, in its Framework (access and social mobility, for example), in the composition of its main committee, and in an increased emphasis in the role of the Executive Director on external communication
9. An additional quality assurance administrative staff member is needed in the Secretariat and the position of Executive Director should remain full-time or full time equivalent. The difficulties in asking members for additional resources need to be redressed around the need to regularly demonstrate the robustness of a self-governing system

10. IQAPS should reflect the principles-based approach of the QAF and allow for institutional diversity; its applications should be considered at the time of cyclical audit and this, along with monitoring progress on matters identified in previous Final Audit Reports, would be a primary objective of such audits, which could operate on a five or six-year cycle
11. The QAF narrative and principles should be captured in a formal 'Quality Statement' which could be structured against Expectations, Practices and Purposes
12. The Key Contacts could become a more formal group affiliated group of the QC, similar to the affiliates of the COU
13. To be effective and authoritative, and to enjoy public support, the enforcement strategies of the QC should be persuasion, negotiation, education and guidance, while carrying a 'big stick,' i.e., have clear recourse to substantial sanctions for use where necessary
14. The Audit function should comprise a (smaller) Audit Committee and a separate and larger or Pool of Auditors available to serve on institutional audit Panels
15. Increased collaboration with HEQCO is desirable

Conclusion

If most or all of the above recommendations are accepted there will be need for the Executive Director (perhaps advised by a small task group) to make detailed procedural/technical recommendations regarding a number of issues. These include:

1. Identifying the underlying principles in the current QAF and separating these from the procedural details
2. Critically reviewing and editing the list of required data and information to simplify documentation for new program proposals, cyclical reviews and audits
3. Establishing an operational way to identify universities that would be recognized so as to enjoy greater autonomy – and establishing what the greater autonomy might entail
4. Defining the circumstances and nature of sanctions to be available to the QC
5. Reviewing and refocusing/reducing the complexity of audits

These are not simple tasks and their detail is beyond the brief of the RP. It will need one or more people with the experience and time to do this job.

Professor Roger King
Professor Anna Kindler
Professor Greg Moran

May 2018

Review of the Quality Assurance Framework and Quality Council

Schedule of Meetings with External Reviewers

April 30 – May 2, 2018

COU Boardroom 1

180 Dundas Street West, Suite 1800

Teleconference: 1-877-882-2208, participant code 175-6848#, leader PIN *490-4678#

Review Team: **Dr. Anna Kindler**, (Professor & Senior Advisor International, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia)

Dr. Roger King, (Visiting Professor, School of Management, University of Bath; Adjunct Professor, Teaching and Education Development Institute, University of Queensland; Research Associate, Centre for the Analysis of Risk and Regulation, London School of Economics)

Dr. Greg Moran, (Executive Director, Academics Without Borders & Professor Emeritus and Provost Emeritus at Western University)

Sunday, April 29

Time	Participants	Location
6:30 pm	Review Team and Steering Committee members: Anna Kindler, Roger King, Greg Moran, Jeff Berryman, Janice Deakin, Paul Gooch, Alan Harrison, Cheryl Regehr, Cindy Robinson	Bodega Restaurant 30 Baldwin Street, Toronto

Monday, April 30

Time	Participants	Location
09:00 - 10:00 am	Review Team prep meeting	Boardroom 1
10:00 -10:45 am	Audit Committee members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katherine Graham • Christine McKinnon, Past Chair of the Audit Committee (until 10:30 only) • John Pierce, Chair of the Audit Committee 	Boardroom 1
10:45 – 11:30 am	QA Key Contacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sally Heath, Wilfrid Laurier University • Amanda McKenzie, University of Waterloo • Patricia Tersigni, University of Guelph 	Boardroom 1

Time	Participants	Location
11:30 – 12:00 pm	Lakehead University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nancy Luckai, Deputy Provost, Office of the Provost and Vice President (Academic) (Teleconference) 	Boardroom 1
12:00 - 1:00 pm	Lunch	Boardroom 1 (food set up in Boardroom 4)
1:00 – 1:30 pm	David Lindsay, President & CEO, Council of Ontario Universities	Boardroom 1
1:30 – 2:15 pm	Carleton University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adrian Chan, Assistant Vice-President (Academic) (Teleconference) Lorraine Dyke, Vice-Provost & Associate Vice-President (Academic) (Teleconference) 	Boardroom 1
2:15 – 2:30 pm	Break	
2:30 – 3:30 pm	Donna Woolcott, Past Executive Director, Quality Council	Boardroom 1
3:30 - 4:15 pm	Queen's University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brenda Brouwer, Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies John Pierce, Professor (English) Jill Scott, Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning) 	Boardroom 1
4:15 – 4:30 pm	Break	
4:30 – 5:30 pm	Review Team discussion	Boardroom 1

Tuesday, May 1

Time	Participants	Location
9:30 – 10:00 am	Sandy Welsh, Past Vice Chair, Quality Council Appraisal Committee	Boardroom 1
10:00 – 10:45 am	Sam Scully, Past Chair, Quality Council	Boardroom 1
10:45 – 11:00 am	Break	
11:00 - 12:00 pm	Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paddy Buckley, Director, Postsecondary Accountability Branch (Teleconference) Seetha Kumares, Manager, Universities Unit (Teleconference) Kelly Shields, Assistant Deputy Minister, Postsecondary Education Division (Teleconference) 	Boardroom 1

Time	Participants	Location
12:00 - 1:00 pm	Lunch with Paul Gooch, Chair of the Quality Council	Boardroom 1 (food set up in Boardroom 4)
1:00 - 1:45 pm	OCAV Executive Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janice Deakin, Provost & Vice-President Academic, Western University (Teleconference) • Jacqueline Muldoon, Provost and Vice-President, Academic, Trent University (Teleconference) • Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and Provost, University of Toronto • Charlotte Yates, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), University of Guelph (Teleconference) 	Boardroom 1
1:45 - 2:45 pm	University of Windsor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patti Weir, Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies 	Boardroom 1
2:45 – 3:00 pm	Break	
3:00 – 3:45 pm	Ontario Council on Graduate Studies members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brenda Brouwer, Vice-Provost and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, Queen’s University • Craig Brunetti, Vice-Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies, Trent University (Teleconference) • David Lesbarrères, Director, School of Graduate Studies, Laurentian University (Teleconference) • Jennifer Mactavish, Dean, School of Graduate Studies, Ryerson University • Linda Miller, Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, Western University • Matthias Neufang, Dean, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs, Carleton University (Teleconference) • Patricia Weir, Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of Windsor & Chair, OCGS • Doug Welch, Vice Provost and Dean, Graduate Studies, McMaster University (Teleconference) • Michael Zyrd, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, York University (Teleconference) 	Boardroom 1
3:45 - 4:15 pm	Western University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Doerksen, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs & Students • Linda Miller, Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies 	Boardroom 1
4:15 – 5:15 pm	Alan Harrison, Interim Executive Director, Quality Assurance Secretariat	Boardroom 1

Time	Participants	Location
5:15 – 6:00 pm	Review Team discussion	Boardroom 1

Wednesday, May 2

Time	Participants	Location
08:45 - 09:00 am	Peter Gooch, Senior Director, Policy & Analysis, COU	Boardroom 1
09:00 -10:00 am	Cindy Robinson, Manager, Quality Assurance, Quality Assurance Secretariat	Boardroom 1
10:00 – 11:00 am	Quality Council Representatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bev Harris (Citizen Member) • Denis Hurtubise (Member with Out-of-Province QA Experience) (Teleconference) • John Shepherd (Past OCAV Member), Carleton University • Colleen Willard-Holt (Undergraduate Dean Member), Dean of Education, Wilfrid Laurier University (Teleconference) 	Boardroom 1
11:00 – 11:15 am	Break	
11:15 – 11:30 am	Shevanthi Dissanayake, Coordinator, Quality Assurance Secretariat	Boardroom 1
11:30 - 12:15 pm	Nipissing University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arja Vainio-Mattila, Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research (Teleconference) 	Boardroom 1
12:15 - 1:00 pm	Lunch	Boardroom 1 (food set up in Boardroom 4)
1:00 – 2:00 pm	OCADU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cary DiPietro, Educational Developer (Curriculum) • Natalie Nanton, Coordinator, Academic Governance & Quality Assurance • Gillian Siddall, Vice-President, Academic and Provost 	Boardroom 1
2:00 – 4:00 pm	Review Team wrap-up meeting	Boardroom 1

4:00 - 5:00 pm	<p>Review Team exit meeting with Steering Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janice Deakin, Provost & Vice-President Academic, Western University (Teleconference) • Paul Gooch, Chair, Quality Council • Peter Gooch, Senior Director, Policy & Analysis, COU • Alan Harrison, Interim Executive Director, Quality Assurance Secretariat • Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and Provost, University of Toronto (Teleconference) • Cindy Robinson, Manager, Quality Assurance Secretariat 	Boardroom 1
----------------	--	-------------