ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
COUNCIL on QUALITY ASSURANCE

REPORT ON THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

SEPTEMBER 2023

Contents

Introduction to the Phase One Cyclical Audit for the University of Ottawa

The University of Ottawa was established in 1848 by the Catholic church and was originally named the College of Bytown before becoming the College of Ottawa in 1861, and receiving a university charter in 1866. In 1889 it was granted a pontifical charter by Pope Leo XIII that enabled it to grant ecclesiastical degrees. In 1965 the ecclesiastic functions of the University were assumed by St Paul University, and the University of Ottawa became a corporation independent of any religious organization. As with other Ontario universities having a similar history, the two institutions maintain a federated relationship.

The University of Ottawa operates as a bilingual institution, with the vast majority of its programs offered in both English and French. With just under 40,000 undergraduate students and just over 8,000 graduate students, it identifies itself as the largest English-French bilingual university in the world. Over 20% of the University's enrolment is international students. Its programs are offered through the Faculties of Arts, Science and Social Science, as well as in Faculties offering professional programming in the areas of Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, Civil Law, Common Law, Medicine, and Management. The University of Ottawa is also a member of the U15 group of Canadian research-intensive universities and reported an annual research income of $432M in 2022.

The audit of the University of Ottawa described in this report was conducted using the provisions of the 2010 version of the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) that is overseen by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council). The QAF describes procedures for the academic review of proposed new degree programs and the periodic review of existing degree programs in Ontario's university sector. The Framework draws on the long experience of Ontario universities in undertaking quality assurance and brings together best practice at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All Ontario universities have agreed to abide by this Framework, and each university has developed an Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) that complies with the QAF and provides each university with an internal policy for the conduct of quality assurance. In 2018 the QAF and the Quality Council underwent an external review. This led to a revised Quality Assurance Framework being approved in 2021, and the Ontario universities have been revising their IQAPs accordingly.

The QAF provides Ontario universities with autonomy over their quality assurance processes. Notwithstanding this, the universities have ceded to the Quality Council the authority to audit their quality assurance activities periodically. The purpose of the audit is to determine whether each university's quality assurance practices are in compliance with its IQAP and the QAF, and to guide the university on needed remediation in any areas that are out of compliance. The audit process is part of the universities' accountability to stakeholders (prospective students, students, graduates, parents, employers, the provincial government, taxpayers, and public at large) to provide evidence that each university's degree programs not only meet national and international academic standards, but also strive continuously to improve quality.

The first cycle of audits under the 2010 QAF commenced in 2012, and was completed in 2020, with two to three universities being audited in each year. The University of Ottawa was one of the first group of universities undergoing audit in 2012-13. The second cycle of audits commenced in 2022, and the University of Ottawa is again one of the first group being audited in 2022-23. Because Ontario universities are all updating their IQAPs to comply with the 2021 QAF, universities undergoing audit in the first two years of the second cycle (the University of Ottawa among them) will be audited in two phases. In phase 1 the audit will focus on quality assurance activities undertaken under the 2010 QAF and relevant university IQAPs. In phase 2, the audit will be based on activities undertaken under the 2021 QAF and the universities' subsequently revised IQAPs.

The following comprised the Phase One Audit Team for the University of Ottawa audit (see brief biographical information for the auditors in Appendix B).

    Dr. Johanne Bénard
    Dr. Serge Desmarais
    Dr. Alan Weedon
    Dr. Christopher Evans, Quality Council Secretariat support
    Ms. Cindy Robinson, Quality Council Secretariat support
    Dr. Jennifer Bethune, Quality Council Secretariat support

In the spring of 2022 the University of Ottawa was asked to supply advance materials that included a list of the degree programs being offered. The Audit Team selected for audit a sample of six quality assurance activities conducted under the IQAP's New Program Approval Protocol and the Cyclical Program Review Protocol. One of these was a new undergraduate program, one was a new graduate program, one was a combined Cyclical Program Review of an undergraduate and a graduate program, one was a Cyclical Program Review of a graduate program offered jointly with Carleton University, and two were Cyclical Program Reviews of undergraduate programs that also undergo accreditation.

In the fall of 2022 the University of Ottawa submitted copies of records documenting the quality assurance activities for the six programs selected along with the Institutional Self-study. The auditors then conducted a desk audit using the University's Institutional Self-study and the records of the sampled programs, together with associated documents.

The Audit Team conducted an on-site visit with the University of Ottawa from March 7-9, 2023. The site visit schedule is included in Appendix C. During the site visit, the Audit Team met with the University's senior leadership, including the President, those with important roles in supporting the quality assurance processes, and representatives from those programs selected for audit. A meeting with students was also scheduled. Unfortunately, only one student participated in this meeting with the Audit Team, despite the Audit Team's urging the University to arrange for more students to attend (the Director of the Student Rights Centre also attended this meeting). The site visit meetings served to answer questions arising from the auditors' review of the University's documentation; all individuals and groups the Audit Team met with appeared well briefed on the purpose of the visit, and appeared to have prepared in order to

answer questions. The Audit Team particularly appreciated the candour and positive approach with which everybody answered the Team's questions, even when the Audit Team ventured into difficult areas where some could have felt defensive. The Audit Team also offers its thanks to those responsible for organizing the meetings and for the hospitality and assistance received throughout the Site Visit.

Following the audit, the Audit Team prepared this report, with recommendations, subject to a multi-stage review process and final approval by the Quality Council. For a more detailed account of the Audit Process, please refer to Appendix A.

The Quality Assurance Context at the University of Ottawa

The University of Ottawa's first IQAP was ratified by the Quality Council in 2011. The IQAP was revised in 2015 and then again in 2019. The 2019 IQAP responded to changes in the arrangements for oversight of graduate education at the University of Ottawa that created the role of Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in 2017. Under this IQAP, administrative responsibility for Cyclical Program Review of both undergraduate and graduate programs was placed under a Director of Quality Assurance (later re-titled Director of Program Evaluation) reporting to the Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs. Administrative responsibility for oversight of the development and approval of new undergraduate and new graduate programs (or major modifications of existing programs) was placed in the roles of the Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs and the Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, respectively. Collegial governance of these processes is provided by a group of Senate Committees. A Senate Committee on Undergraduate Program Evaluation and a Senate Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation, both chaired by the Director of Program Evaluation, review and approve Self-study briefs prepared by programs undergoing Cyclical Program Review. The Committees also receive External Reviewer reports, and the program and decanal responses to them, and then generate Final Assessment Reports that summarise Cyclical Program Reviews and provide recommendations for quality improvement. The Committees also receive for review the draft Action Plan generated by the program in collaboration with the Dean that describes the actions and timelines for implementation of the recommendations during the period leading to the next review. For new programs, or major modifications of existing programs, analogous collegial governance is provided by two Senate Committees: the Council on Undergraduate Studies and the Council on Graduate Studies. These are chaired by the Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs and the Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, respectively.

At the time of the Audit Team's Site Visit, the University of Ottawa was in the process of revising its 2019 IQAP to reflect changes made to the 2021 version of the Quality Assurance Framework.

The 2013 Audit

As part of the current Audit, the Audit Team examined the University's actions undertaken in relation to Recommendations 2 and 3 of the four recommendations made in the 2013 Audit

---

Report (Recommendations 1 and 4 had been dealt with by the time of the University's one-year response to the 2013 Audit Report). The results of this examination are as follows:

1. The 2013 Audit Report recommended that the general BAs and BSc's be subject to Cyclical Program Review (including external review) and that the IQAP statement that general degrees are not externally reviewed be removed. This issue is now moot for the Arts and Social Science general degrees because they have been transformed (by Major Modification) into interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary degrees that will in future undergo normal Cyclical Program Review. The University continues to grant general BSc degrees, and the case was made, and accepted by the auditors, that the general science BSc is not a program *per se* and so should not have to undergo Cyclical Program Review; rather it is an exit degree that does not admit students, and is granted to students who have completed courses from programs that do undergo Cyclical Program Review. This process is analogous to Graduate Diplomas, Type I, that the Quality Assurance Framework excludes from the requirement for Cyclical Program Review. This would also apply to any future general degrees that are "exit" in nature and do not admit students.

2. The 2013 Audit Report required the University to ensure all of its programs are reviewed and that they be reviewed on an 8-year (or less) cycle. The 2013 auditors specifically mentioned that the MD program was not on the schedule and that this should be rectified.

    The 2023 Audit Team finds that the University is still not compliant in this area. A significant number of programs are not on the Cyclical Program Review schedule, and a significant number of programs are being reviewed at intervals exceeding 8 years. See Cause for Concern 1 for further details.

Findings Arising from the Quality Assurance Audit of the University of Ottawa

The findings of this Audit are based on the following:

- the report of the 2013 Audit and the University's responses;
- advice from the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council on areas where it has observed a pattern of difficulties in applying the University's IQAP during the development of New Program proposals;
- the University's 2022 Institutional Self-study;
- a scan of quality assurance-related pages on the University's website;
- the desk audit of documentation provided by the University for six programs that have either undergone Cyclical Program Review or were new programs that have undergone appraisal for approval; and,
- information gathered at meetings with groups and individuals during a site visit at the University of Ottawa.

The findings of this Audit lead to a series of Commendations and Best Practices, Causes for Concern, Recommendations and Suggestions. Further details on these findings can be found in the subsequent sections of this Report.

Implications of the Institutional Self-study

The 2021 Quality Assurance Framework requires that, in advance of an audit site visit, the university provide the Audit Team with an Institutional Self-study that presents a reflection on the quality assurance processes at the university. The University of Ottawa's Institutional Self-study provided the Audit Team with much food for thought and generated a significant number of questions that were asked of those met with during the site visit. Matters arising from the Institutional Self-study are addressed throughout this Report. However, within the document, the University also asked that the Audit Team pay particular attention to and offer advice on the following aspects of its quality assurance related work:

1. Resourcing and structuring the University's staffing and supports for its quality assurance activities.

Responsibility for quality assurance is currently split between three academic leadership roles: Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs (who is responsible for new undergraduate programs, and major modifications of existing undergraduate programs), Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (who is responsible for new graduate programs, and major modifications of existing graduate programs), and the Director Program Evaluation (who is responsible for Cyclical Program Reviews of both undergraduate and graduate programs). These three roles are relatively new and reflect changes that were made in the University's leadership structure around 2017. Prior to that time, there was an Associate Vice-President Academic whose responsibilities included quality assurance review of new undergraduate programs, major changes to existing undergraduate programs, and Cyclical Program Review of undergraduate programs. The current Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs has been in the role since 2018 and her term ends in June 2023.

The role of Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies was also created in 2017. Prior to that time, the University of Ottawa had a Dean and a Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies that had responsibility for quality assurance review of new graduate programs, major changes to existing graduate programs, and Cyclical Program Review of graduate programs. The current incumbent in the Vice-Provost's role is serving in an interim capacity until October 2023 while a search is conducted to fill the position.

The role of Director of Program Evaluation (initially titled Director of Quality Assurance) was also created in 2017. The incumbent is a faculty member who serves for a three-year term. The current incumbent's term also ends in June 2023.

The Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs, and the Director of Program Evaluation do not have a budget, nor do they have staff reporting directly to them. All staff supporting quality assurance activities in their areas report to a Chief of Staff, who is also responsible for the budget in the Provost's office, including for all quality assurance related activities. Given this structure, the

Audit Team has concerns that the academic leadership has little role, if any, in recruitment, job description development, or assignment of work tasks for the staff they need to support quality assurance activities. The Audit Team was provided with an organizational chart that showed two staff persons with Cyclical Program Review responsibilities reporting to the Chief of Staff; one of these was described as being 100% dedicated to Cyclical Program Review, and the other 50% to Cyclical Program Review and 50% to teaching evaluations. The Audit Team did not meet these staff, nor the Chief of Staff. In the site visit meetings, the Audit Team was told that absences due to illness or leaves, plus turnover of incumbents, has meant that the Director of Program Evaluation has had limited staff to support his role. The dispersion of the responsibility for different aspects of quality assurance across the offices of the two Vice-Provosts and the Office of Program evaluation, the approaching turnover in leadership positions, and the staffing and budget are discussed further below.

The University's Institutional Self-study raises the question of whether all quality assurance processes (New Programs, Expedited Approvals, Major and Minor Modifications of existing programs, Cyclical Program Review) should be administered from a single office of quality assurance, rather than (as now) administered through three separate offices (i.e., Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs (new undergraduate programs, major modification of existing undergraduate programs), Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (new graduate programs, major modifications of existing graduate programs), and Director of Program Evaluation (Cyclical Program Reviews)). The University's Institutional Self-study suggests that, while there is no consensus on this idea, a central office would ensure a comprehensive overview and understanding of every step of its IQAP, from creation to the cyclical evaluation of a program. An integrated office could also improve efficiency and encourage a culture of continuous improvement of programs by ensuring the continuum in implementing recommendations of program reviews.

The University's Institutional Self-study also makes the case that the current level of staff support in the Office of the Director of Program Evaluation is insufficient. The view of the Audit Team, both following the Desk Audit and the Site Visit, was that distributing administration of quality assurance activities across three offices inevitably means that the staff support of quality assurance is also spread more thinly than it would be if the activities were concentrated in a single office; the Audit Team is also of the view that such a concentration would allow more depth and continuity of knowledge of the University's quality assurance processes and offer insurance against prolonged absences or resignation. In addition, placing some quality assurance responsibilities in the roles of each of the Vice-Provosts means that those matters arrive on their desks in competition with all of their other responsibilities and have to be prioritised accordingly. The University is fortunate that the current incumbents in the three offices share a common commitment to quality assurance and continuous quality improvement, work well together, and communicate frequently and effectively with each other. Such is not always guaranteed to be the case, and the Audit Team agreed with the view expressed to them that the successes achieved in the administration of quality assurance at the University of Ottawa are "fragile" since they depend on the individuals who happen to be in the three

leadership roles, rather than upon a structure. Accordingly, the Audit Team was concerned to learn that the terms of the three incumbents all end in June 2023.

Such simultaneous turnover is dangerous for continuity of good quality assurance practices at the University of Ottawa (see Suggestion 1). Comments made in the University's Institutional Self-study and during the site visit suggest that the issues of budget and staffing could be contributing to turnover in the senior leadership positions responsible for quality assurance.

Further to the comments above, the Audit Team learned from their various meetings during the site visit of the numerous initiatives and good practices that have been introduced by the current (and also former) Director of Program Evaluation to aid programs in their Cyclical Program Reviews. Many of these initiatives and practices are not documented and require the personal intervention of the Director. In addition, the Audit Team heard that the volume of initiatives and practices may not be sustainable given that the Director is also an academic with a 40% workload commitment to teaching and research activities. If the University decides to review its quality assurance structures and staffing levels (see Suggestion 1), it may also wish to consider how the continuity and volume of the activities of the Director's role can be sustained.

2. Given the bilingual mandate of the institution, are there any efficiencies that might be introduced, while still ensuring the quality of the University's bilingual programs?

The University's Institutional Self-study states that Final Assessment Reports (FARs) and Action Plans (referred to as Implementation Plans in the QAF) are published on the University's website, as required by the Quality Assurance Framework. The relevant section of the University's website was reviewed as part of the Desk Audit, and only a small fraction of the programs scheduled for Cyclical Program Review over the last five years have any material posted. The Quality Council itself has, in recent years, written to the University in response to its annual report on program review, noting that the number of FARs reported appears to be far fewer than would be expected for an institution the size of the University of Ottawa. At the site visit, the Audit Team was told that official documents posted on the University's website must, as a matter of policy, be presented in both English and French, and that the time and cost of translation was a barrier to getting the FARs and Action Plans posted. The University could reduce the time and cost of translation by taking advantage of the QAF provision allowing the FAR to be posted in the form of an Executive Summary rather than as the full document (See Suggestion 7). The Audit Team was concerned that the structure of multiple offices responsible for Ottawa's quality assurance activities, and lack of staffing in support of quality assurance combined with the lack of a tracking and document management system may also contribute significantly to the under-reporting of FARs and Action Plans (see Recommendation 1 and Suggestions 1 and 2).

3. Combining the two Senate program evaluation committees (undergraduate and graduate) into a single committee to improve the process and introduce some efficiencies, particularly in the case where undergraduate and graduate programs in the same department are reviewed together.

The Audit Team raised this issue in its meeting with representatives of the two committees during the site visit. Their response was thoughtful and not strongly polarized between the two possibilities. However, they did make the point that a combined committee might have less disciplinary depth, and also that the existence of two committees mean more faculty are exposed to the quality assurance process and can interpret it back to their colleagues in their home units. This extended knowledge would increase understanding across the University of the benefits of program review and the idea of continuous quality improvement the Quality Assurance Framework and the University's IQAP promote. For its part, the Audit Team noted that one of the graduate program Cyclical Program Reviews it had looked at in detail was part of a pilot in which the review of the graduate program was combined with the Cyclical Program Review of the undergraduate program; the sub-Committee of the two Senate Program Review Committees struck to deal with this appeared to function well, and the pilot has informed subsequent refinement of the process, including the template used to prepare the combined Self-study. In addition, the use of such a sub-committee has the advantage that members from each of the parent Committees have an interest in ensuring the Review is balanced and does not overly focus on either the graduate or the undergraduate program.

Commendations and Best Practices (QAF 6.2.7)

Commendations

The Audit Team observed that the University of Ottawa's office for Teaching and Learning Support Services (TLSS) is currently doing commendable work in support of Cyclical Program Review. The TLSS has two staff members dedicated to helping programs with Degree Level Expectations (DLEs), Program Learning Outcomes and curriculum analysis and mapping, etc., and the Director of Program Evaluation meets weekly with them. Also, the Director of TLSS meets weekly with the Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs. The Audit Team deemed these practices to be commendable.

The TLSS has developed video modules that are posted on the web to help programs, a practice which is also to be commended, although it should be noted that the Audit Team did not review the content of these videos.

The University of Ottawa's Senate committees on Undergraduate and Graduate Program Evaluation are doing excellent work in support of Cyclical Program Review. Both Committees are chaired by the Director of Program Evaluation, and they have a major role in Cyclical Program Review. The Committees review a program's draft Self-study and provide detailed feedback. They also review the final Self-study, the external reviewers' report, and the program and decanal responses, and write the FAR. Further, the Committees review and finalise the Action Plan drafted by the program in collaboration with the Dean. When the English undergraduate and graduate programs underwent Cyclical Program Review together, the two committees form a joint sub-committee to do the Committees' work. During the site visit, the Audit Team heard consistently from those familiar with the two Committees that they have a heavy workload and undertake it diligently and effectively. The Audit Team noted that the two

Committees kept excellent minutes. At the site visit, the Audit Team met with a group of faculty drawn from the two Committees' membership; the Committee members acknowledged the contribution of their chair, the Director of Program Evaluation (both the current and former incumbent) not only in guiding their work, but also in ensuring that they understood their function of supporting the development of a culture of continuous quality improvement through the Cyclical Program Review process. The Committee members also mentioned that the Committees plan their membership to ensure steady turnover and a continuing balance of new and experienced members, and that experienced members take on a mentorship role for the new members. The Audit Team views these Committees, their roles, and the manner in which they undertake their roles to be a strength of the University of Ottawa's quality assurance process.

Degree programs leading to a professional designation commonly have to undergo an accreditation process designed to demonstrate they meet a minimum quality standard. The QAF is written to enable the combination of accreditation reviews with the Cyclical Program Review process in order to reduce the workload involved in conducting two separate reviews. The QAF envisions a gap analysis being undertaken so that accreditation review materials can be supplemented to enable assessment of a program's actions to achieve the culture of continuous quality improvement that is fundamental to the Cyclical Program Review process. Two of the University's programs whose quality assurance processes the Audit Team looked at in detail undergo accreditation. For one of these the Cyclical Program Review was undertaken independently of the accreditation review. In the other the two reviews were partially combined; i.e., there was a single site visit and the external reviewers prepared an accreditation report and a report for the Cyclical Program Review. However, a full Self-study was prepared for the Cyclical Program Review, rather than supplementary materials being added to the accreditation package. The Audit Team learned that based upon these and other experiences, the current Director of Program Evaluation has taken steps to align the timing of Cyclical Program Reviews with that of accreditation reviews; the Director also works with program representatives two years in advance of a review to examine the requirements of the accreditation process relative to those for Cyclical Program Review and thereby assess the feasibility of combining the two reviews. The Audit Team deemed this practice of advanced planning and gap analysis to be commendable.

Best Practice

The University of Ottawa's Faculty of Social Science offers undergraduate students the opportunity to be engaged in the preparation of a program's Self-study as a course credit. Not only does this help the program cope with the workload of Self-study preparation but it also aids in bringing the student perspective into the Self-study and increases knowledge of quality assurance among students. The Audit Team considered this to be a best practice that could be adopted across the University and/or in other Institutions to help encourage student participation in quality assurance work.

Causes for Concern (QAF 6.3)

Causes for Concern are potential structural and/or systemic weaknesses in quality assurance practices (for example, inadequate follow-up monitoring, as required per QAF 5.4.1d) or a failure to make the relevant implementation reports to the appropriate statutory authorities (as required per QAF 5.4.2). Causes for Concern require the university to take the steps specified in the report and/or by the Quality Council to remedy the situation.

CAUSE FOR CONCERN 1: The University of Ottawa must ensure that all programs undergo Cyclical Program Review, and within the eight-year window required by the 2010 Quality Assurance Framework (section 4.2.6 (b)) and the University's IQAP.

The 2013 Audit Report required the University to ensure all of its programs are reviewed and that they be reviewed on an eight-year (or less) cycle. The 2013 Auditors specifically mentioned that the MD program was not on the schedule and that this should be rectified. During the site visit the 2023 Audit Team learned that the MD program is currently undergoing Cyclical Program Review, but that this is the first since the QAF was established in 2010 meaning that it is at least 13 years since the program underwent academic review other than accreditation. The Audit Team also noted that one of the new programs whose approval process it audited does not yet appear on the schedule of Cyclical Program Reviews even though the first students were admitted into the program in 2020.[1]

A detailed review of the University's schedule of Cyclical Program Reviews conducted prior to the site visit revealed that a number of other new programs either do not appear on the schedule or are scheduled for review more than eight years following the initial enrolment. In addition, the reviews of a significant number of programs have been deferred to the ninth year; the Audit Team was told by the Director of Program Evaluation that the University is now bringing programs up for Cyclical Program Review every seven years in order to provide a contingency for a year's deferral in cases where a key leader of the process is on leave, on sabbatical, etc. However, this revised review cycle does not appear on any of the schedules of reviews provided to the Audit Team.

During the Desk Audit the auditors noted that some graduate programs offered jointly with Carleton University stalled at the Self-study preparation stage of Cyclical Program Review, in some instances for several years, effectively moving the Review well beyond eight years from the previous one. The extreme cases identified were delayed by 4 years and 5 years, such that the FAR and Action Plans were eventually developed on the eve of the next Cyclical Program Review with no meaningful time left for implementation of the Action Plans. These observations suggest that the joint programs require more oversight by the University's offices responsible for quality assurance. During the site visit the Audit Team was told that this oversight has now been

---

[1] The 2023 Audit Team was initially also concerned by the statement in the University's IQAP that only "civil" degree programs at Saint Paul's undergo Cyclical Program Review, implying that some programs at Saint Paul's are not reviewed. However, at the site visit the University advised the Audit Team that the non-"civil" programs are not University of Ottawa degrees but are ecclesiastic programs offered under the pontifical charter granted by the Vatican.

provided through the creation of a Joint Procedural Document with Carleton University. During the site visit, the Audit Team was also given verbal assurances that the circumstances leading to these multi-year delays have been identified and resolved. However, no documented evidence was provided.

The University of Ottawa has yet to establish a track record demonstrating that all of its degree programs are undergoing Cyclical Program Review and are doing so on an eight-year (or less) cycle. Notwithstanding verbal assurances provided to the Audit Team during the site visit that appropriate remediation steps are being taken, the Audit Team is not convinced that progress being made will be sustained until the root causes of the Concern expressed here have been addressed. These root causes are described in the section of this report titled Implications of the University's Institutional Self-study and are discussed further in Suggestions 1 and 2.

CAUSE FOR CONCERN 2: The University of Ottawa must ensure that progress (monitoring) reports are produced, as required by the IQAP's process for monitoring new programs.

As required by the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF 2.9.2), the IQAP (2019) appropriately makes it very clear that new programs should be monitored (section 2.6). The Desk Audit of the two New Programs selected for audit did not provide evidence that the monitoring met the requirements of the IQAP (2019). A number of representatives from the University of Ottawa acknowledged throughout the course of the site visit that new programs are not currently being monitored, as required.

Recommendations to the Institution

Recommendations, which are recorded in the Audit Team's report when they have identified failures to comply with the IQAP and/or there is misalignment between the IQAP and the required elements of the Quality Assurance Framework. The university must address these recommendations, including in its response to the Audit Team's report when required.

The University of Ottawa must:

RECOMMENDATION 1: Ensure that all Final Assessment Reports and Action Plans are posted on the University's website and distributed to the University's Senate and Board of Governors, and submitted or reported to the Quality Council in accordance with QAF 4.2.6 a and b.

The University of Ottawa must comply with its IQAP (Section 5.2.7.2) and section 4.2.6 (a) and (b) of the 2010 QAF to ensure that all FARs (or their summaries, as appropriate) and Action Plans for Cyclical Program Reviews are reported to Senate and that the FAR's Executive Summary (or entire FAR, at the University's choosing) and Action Plan are reported to the University's Board of Governors and posted on the University's website as soon as they have been approved. These requirements must be met on a go-forward basis. The requirement to post Executive Summaries and Action Plans on the website should also be met for Cyclical

Program Reviews appearing on the schedule of reviews in the last eight years (see also Implications of the Institutional Self-study (item 2. on page 7) and Suggestion 7).

The University must also comply with QAF protocols for reporting the outcome of Cyclical Program Reviews to the Quality Council (see Implications of the Institutional Self-study, item 2. on page 7).

RECOMMENDATION 2: Ensure that staff and students are consulted during the development of the Self-study.

The Audit Team found that one of the programs selected for audit of the Cyclical Program Review process did not appear to undertake proper consultation with staff and//or students during the development of the Self-study. In addition to consulting faculty when preparing Self-studies for Cyclical Program Reviews, the University must ensure that the views of a program's staff (when applicable) and students are also obtained and described in the Self-study, as per the requirement of Section 4.2.3 b) 9. of the QAF.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Ensure that variants to the usual process for External Review are approved by the appropriate decision maker.

In the case of one of the new programs whose approval processes were audited by the Audit Team the External Review was conducted by a Desk Audit rather than by a site visit or virtual site visit. The University's relevant IQAP required that such a variance from the normal practice must be approved by the Vice-Provost Academic Affairs. The documentation provided to the Audit Team contained no evidence that this occurred.

Suggestions to the Institution

Suggestions, which are forward-looking, are made by the Audit Team when they identify opportunities for the university to strengthen its quality assurance practices. Suggestions do not convey any mandatory obligations and sometimes are the means for conveying the Audit Team's province-wide experience in identifying good, and even on occasion, best, practices. Universities are under no obligation to implement or otherwise respond to the Audit Team's suggestions, though they are encouraged to do so.

The University of Ottawa should:

SUGGESTION 1: Consider undertaking a review of the academic administrative structure overseeing quality assurance, and the distribution and depth of staffing that supports quality assurance.

The section of this report titled "Implications of the Institutional Self-study" discusses in detail the University's current dispersed arrangements for administrative oversight of the IQAP and the staffing levels that support this oversight. It is the Audit Team's view that the current academic administrative structure and staffing arrangements supporting quality assurance at the

_____

University, combined with the lack of a comprehensive tracking and document storage system (see Suggestion 2), is likely the root cause of issues of non-compliance with the University's IQAP identified in this report. Accordingly, the Audit Team strongly suggests that the University conduct a review – potentially drawing on the experiences and expertise of other universities in the province – to inform how best to structure its quality assurance supports. If undertaken, such a review would ideally seek to identify an administrative structure and staffing levels that would better support the University's implementation of its IQAP by ensuring continuity of knowledge and practice.

SUGGESTION 2: **Consider developing a comprehensive monitoring and reporting system to track each step in the cyclical reviews of its undergraduate and graduate programs in order to ensure timely completion of these reviews.**

There is no central tracking system for quality assurance reviews (other than a spreadsheet file establishing the schedule of Cyclical Periodic Reviews) and no document management system for the University's quality assurance activities. An important consequence of the absence of such systems is that the University has no reliable way of tracking whether reviews are proceeding on schedule and whether all requirements of the IQAP and the Quality Assurance Framework are being met. This is a contributing factor to the Audit Team's findings that some Cyclical Program Reviews at Ottawa are taking longer than they should, that some are starting late and thereby exceeding the eight-year window between reviews, that Final Assessment Report summaries and Action Plans are not being properly reported on the University's website or to the Quality Council, and that new programs are not being monitored following approval (see Causes for Concern 1 and 2, Recommendation 1).

A tracking system would allow accountability measures to be built in so that issues could be caught and rectified.

Another consequence of the lack of a central system for the administration of the quality assurance processes at the University of Ottawa is that the documentation supplied for Audit was incomplete. For example, documents passing between central offices and programs initiating steps in the quality assurance processes were not always supplied, making it difficult for the Audit Team to determine whether IQAP provisions were being followed and on schedule. The Audit Team also observes that tracking and document management systems used at other universities help generate institutional and faculty buy-in to the quality assurance process, and also provide an important source of information for leaders and decision makers.

SUGGESTION 3: **Consider establishing timelines for all steps of the Cyclical Program Review process so that the reviews can be completed expeditiously.**

The University's IQAPs contain timelines and deadlines for various processes, and in general the Audit Team found these have been adhered to in an exemplary manner. However, at a number of points in the IQAP's Cyclical Program Review process, there were no deadlines specified, or there were no expectations articulated about how long a particular activity should take. The desk audit of specific programs revealed that this appears to have led to some

activities taking what seems like an unnecessarily long time. Program reviews that encounter even small pauses or interruptions at several stages of the process can then experience serious delay that can make the Action Plan developed at the end of the process obsolete before its implementation even commences.

If additional timelines for the Cyclical Program Review process are developed, the Audit Team would suggest that these might helpfully specify expectations for the following: when the first draft of the program Self-study should be submitted to the relevant Senate Program Evaluation Committee following initiation of the Cyclical Program Review; the turn-around time for that Committee to provide feedback to the program; the turn-around time for the program to produce a final draft ready for submission to the External Reviewers; the subsequent timing of the External Reviewers' site visit following receipt of the final version of the Self-study; the timeline for receipt of the External Review Report and the internal responses to that Report by the program and the Dean; the timeline for the relevant Senate Program Evaluation Committee to then prepare the Final Assessment Report; the timeline for the program and Dean to prepare the Implementation Plan; and the timeline for the University's approval of the Implementation Plan so that it can be returned to the unit for implementation. Further, the University of Ottawa should consider putting in place a process of tracking and remediation to ensure any significant failure to achieve the timelines in the Cyclical Program Review process is both detected and addressed in a timely manner (see also Suggestion 2).

SUGGESTION 4: **In Faculties where some quality assurance responsibilities are delegated to Vice-Deans, consider seeking ways to ensure that a Dean's responsibility for the fiscal and academic health of the Faculty's programs is supported by appropriate briefings on quality assurance activities**

The Audit Team noted that detailed administration and oversight of the quality assurance at the University of Ottawa operates mainly through the interaction of the Vice-Provost Academic Affairs, the Vice-Provost Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, and the Director of the Office of Program Evaluation with the Vice-Deans of the Faculties and the Department Chairs and Program Directors. The Audit Team found that the Deans are supportive of the quality assurance process but the fact that their Vice-Deans may attend to the details of each Faculty's part in the quality assurance process puts many of them at a distance from it. For example, the Audit Team heard that Deans found themselves seeing program Self-studies for the first time when the External Reviewers came to visit, or were being asked to approve an Action Plan that had been created without their input. This appeared to be especially true of those Deans in Faculties that are divided into Departments or Schools

In Faculties where quality assurance processes are coordinated by a Vice-Dean, the Deans might wish to seek further ways to ensure they are appropriately briefed on quality assurance matters.

SUGGESTION 5: **Consider ways in which to encourage more of those developing New Program Proposals to utilize the expert advice of the Teaching and Learning Support Services staff.**

Prior to the site visit, the Appraisal Committee of the Quality Council had advised the Audit Committee that, for around a third of new program proposals coming from the University of Ottawa, the Appraisal Committee asked for more information about Learning Outcomes for the proposed new programs. While this was not raised with the Teaching and Learning Support Services group during the Site Visit, the Audit Team noted that, in addition to continuing their exemplary work supporting programs undergoing Cyclical Program Review, the Teaching and Learning Support Services group could perhaps be of greater assistance to academic units developing new programs. If not there already, adding prompts to the template for the New Program Proposal would be one way to ensure those using it are fully aware of the support they can receive as they develop the program-level learning outcomes they must describe in their proposal.

SUGGESTION 6: Consider offering faculty members the option of attending quality assurance-based information sessions.

The Institutional Self-study prepared for this Audit described the results of discussions at workshops attended by faculty and Vice-Deans who have been involved in Cyclical Program Reviews in the last seven years. A significant number of faculty participants expressed the view that Cyclical Program Review is an administrative, bureaucratic process that has little academic value. In the Audit Team's meetings with program representatives during the site visit, this view was offered as an explanation for why, in some Cyclical Program Reviews, attending to the process in a timely manner is a low priority.

The Director of Program Evaluation told the Audit Team during the site visit that this feedback was a surprise and that it may reflect the view of those who have not been involved in Cyclical Program Reviews recently. He explained that, as part of the current orientation to the Cyclical Program Review process, care is taken to stress the academic value of developing a culture of continuous improvement of program quality as articulated in the University's IQAP. The concept is understood and supported by the Provost, the Vice-Provosts, Deans and Vice-Deans, and by some faculty in programs that have recently been through a Cyclical Program Review, but for many faculty the quality assurance process remains a low priority administrative task that is not seen as an opportunity for program improvement.

Among other things, offering information sessions could cover the goals and benefits of quality assurance, the structure of responsibilities for quality assurance in the University and the supports available in the University for those undergoing a Cyclical Program Review or developing a new program.

SUGGESTION 7: Consider translating and posting on its website only the Action Plan and the FAR Executive summary rather than the complete FAR document.

As noted in the section of this report titled "Implications of the Institutional Self-study", very few FARs and Action Plans have been posted on the University's website. At the site-visit it was suggested to the Audit Team that the cost and time needed for translation was a contributing factor to timely posting. To ease the burden the Audit Team suggests the University consider

posting only the Executive Summary of the FAR (as is required by the 2010 QAF SECTION 4.2.6. b)), rather than the full document.

SUGGESTION 8: Consider modifying its IQAP to identify who confirms that the External Reviewers chosen for a New Program review or for a Cyclical Periodic Review are indeed arm's length.

During the desk audit, the Audit Team noticed that, while Ottawa's IQAP is fully compliant with the Quality Assurance Framework with respect to the requirement that External Reviewers be at arm's length, there was no indication in the IQAP, or in the documentation describing the processes followed, of who verified the arm's length status. During the site-visit, the Audit Team learned that the relevant Senate Committee on Program Evaluation does this as part of its review of the program Self-study prepared for Cyclical Program Review by inspecting the CVs of prospective External Reviewers before ranking them in order of suitability. Embedding the process for assessing arm's length status in the IQAP would help to ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities, as well as continuity of practice over time.

SUGGESTION 9: Consider developing a Conflict of Interest policy for the University's committees responsible for quality assurance.

During the desk audit, the auditors noticed that a member of one of the Senate Evaluation Committees remained active on the Committee at a time when matters relating to the Cyclical Program Review of a program from their home-department were being considered. The Audit Team had some discussion about whether this constituted a conflict of interest, and the question was put to the Senate Committees during the site-visit. Their view was that the individual might have insights that would be helpful to the Committee, but had seen situations where a program director, or department chair on the Committee was asked to recuse themselves.

To ensure there is no actual or perceived conflict of interest in the decisions of these groups, the University is encouraged to consider requiring members of its Senate Evaluation Committees to withdraw when their home programs are being discussed.

SUGGESTION 10: Clarify in its IQAP that it is the relevant Senate Committee on Program Evaluation that approves the final draft of a program's Self-study before it goes to the External Reviewers.

Based upon the Desk Audit, the Audit Team understood that the relevant Senate Committee on Program Evaluation reviews draft program Self-study briefs prepared for Cyclical Program Review and provides detailed suggestions for change back to the program. The Audit Team was, however, unclear who then approves the final draft of the Self-study so that it can be sent to the External Reviewers. At the site visit, the Audit Team learned that it is the Senate Committee of Program Evaluation who gives this final approval (2010 QAF 4.2.3 c)).

SUGGESTION 11: Review the process for cyclically reviewing joint programs and, where appropriate, revise the governance structure to enable the creation of a stand-alone

_____

program, and undertake an appropriate quality assurance process to confirm viability of the stand-alone program.

The University of Ottawa has 14 institutes that are home to masters and doctoral students admitted into joint programs offered in partnership with Carleton University. These joint programs were conceived as single programs operating at two sites and drawing faculty members from both sites to provide sufficient resources. Students in the programs have access to courses and faculty at both universities. The joint programs are in disciplines in the Faculty of Science, the Faculty of Engineering, and in Economics in the Faculty of Social Science. The desk audit revealed that at least one of these programs is effectively operating as a standalone program, although no quality assurance process was ever undertaken (e.g., a New Program or Major Modification consideration) to verify that the resources (e.g., faculty, staff, laboratories, instrumentation, etc.) and academic supports and arrangements (e.g., Degree Level Expectations, Program Learning Outcomes, curriculum, etc.) solely at the University of Ottawa were sufficient to enable the program to operate independently. At the site visit the Audit Team learned that a number of other joint programs may have evolved to standalone operation. All of these programs continue to recruit students while representing that they operate jointly with Carleton University.

The Audit Team suggests that for joint programs that are *de facto* operating as standalone programs, and that have undergone Cyclical Program Review independently (and with an outcome demonstrating that they are viable independently of Carleton University), the University should revise the governance arrangements and make clear in recruitment that the program is not a joint program as defined under the protocols through which it was established. For any programs that are still operating jointly but wish to evolve to standalone status, the University should consult with the Quality Council to identify an appropriate quality assurance process that would verify the program is viable independently of Carleton University.

Conclusion and Next Steps for the University of Ottawa

The University of Ottawa has a mature quality assurance process involving strong collegial governance through Senate Committees, and implemented by individuals who are supportive of quality assurance and serve in academic leadership positions at all levels, from Department and program chairs, through Vice-Deans, Deans, and Vice-Provosts to the Provost and President. That said, there is something amiss at the University of Ottawa that has resulted in some provisions of its IQAP not being fully implemented and some not being implemented in a timely manner. As detailed in this report, the Audit has revealed evidence that the University has not fully complied with the Recommendation of the 2013 Audit that it ensure all degree programs undergo Cyclical Periodic Review, and that the reviews occur every eight years or less. The desk audit and site visit also revealed that the University has not been consistently implementing the provisions of its IQAP relating to the monitoring of new programs. In addition, the University has not been reporting the outcome of most Cyclical Program Reviews, both publicly on its website, and to the Quality Council, thereby not providing evidence that its degree programs are undergoing academic review. The University has also allowed some of its

programs offered jointly with Carleton University to evolve into *de facto* standalone programs without a quality assurance process that would have confirmed their viability outside of the joint arrangement. These are significant shortfalls: the integrity and purpose of the quality assurance process is undermined if all the requirements of the IQAP are not implemented or are not applied in a timely manner. The Audit Team also noted numerous smaller instances where the IQAP had not been followed consistently. While not as serious as the above issues, they do point to a need for closer oversight by the senior offices responsible for quality assurance at the University.

As already discussed elsewhere in this Report, the Audit Team believes the likely root causes of these issues (both serious and minor) are the dispersion of administrative responsibility for quality assurance across three senior offices (two Vice-Provosts and a Director of Program Evaluation), the level and nature of staff support in each of these areas, and turnover in leadership and staffing with resulting loss of continuity of knowledge and process. The lack of a comprehensive tracking and document management system is likely also a significant factor (see Suggestion 2). Accordingly, the Audit Team strongly suggests that the University seriously consider this Report's suggestion (Suggestion 1) that a review be undertaken of the academic administrative structures responsible for quality assurance and of the staffing arrangements that support them, and changes made to ensure the University's IQAP is implemented fully and in a timely manner. Further, the Audit Team strongly suggests the University of Ottawa seriously consider this Report's suggestion (Suggestion 2) to develop a robust tracking and document storage system so that central offices overseeing quality assurance can be aware of when and where steps in the IQAP have not been completed and take remediation steps accordingly. For both of these Suggestions there are structures, practices and systems at other Ontario institutions that the University of Ottawa would find helpful to consider.

Given the seriousness of some of the issues leading to the Causes for Concern, Recommendations and Suggestions in this Report, the Audit Team recommends that the University be asked to provide an account of actions taken to remediate the Causes for Concern and to address the Recommendations one year from the date of approval of this Report by the Quality Council. The Team further recommends that progress on addressing the Causes for Concern and the Recommendations be examined as part of the Phase 2 Audit.

Appendix A: Overview of the Quality Assurance Audit Process for the University of Ottawa

Every publicly assisted university in Ontario will be audited at least once every eight years (QAF 6.1).

Purpose

Quality assurance is a shared responsibility between the Quality Council and the University of Ottawa. Its aim is to ensure a culture of continuous improvement and support for a vision of a student-centered education based on clearly articulated program learning outcomes.

Quality assurance processes result in an educational system that is open, accountable, and transparent. The Cyclical Audit process allows the University to evaluate its quality assurance policies and practices, together with an assessment of performance by the Quality Council.

Objectives

The objectives of the Cyclical Audit are to ensure transparency and accountability in the development and review of academic programs, to assure students, citizens, and the government of the international standards of quality assurance processes, and to monitor the degree to which the university has:

a) Improved/enhanced its quality assurance processes and practices;

b) Created a culture of continuous improvement; and

c) Developed processes that support program-level learning outcomes and student-centered learning.

Scope

The Cyclical Audit:

a) Reviews institutional changes made in policy, process, and practice in response to the recommendations from the previous audit;

b) Confirms the University's practice is compliant with its IQAP as ratified by the Quality Council and notes any misalignment of its IQAP with the QAF; and

c) Reviews institutional quality assurance practices that contribute to continuous improvement of programs, especially the processes for New Program Approvals and Cyclical Program Reviews.

AUDIT PROCESS (QAF 6.2)

A. Pre-orientation and briefing

To initiate the audit process, a briefing occurred on March 7 and 10, 2022. The Quality Assurance Secretariat and two members of the Audit Team provided an orientation on what to expect from the Cyclical Audit to the Key Contact and other relevant stakeholders.

B. Assignment of auditors

Normally three auditors, selected from the Audit Committee's membership by the Quality Assurance Secretariat, are assigned to conduct the Cyclical Audit. The auditors are senior academics with experience in the development, delivery and quality assessment of graduate and undergraduate programs, and are at arm's length from the university. They are accompanied on the audit visit by member(s) of the Quality Assurance Secretariat.

C. Institutional Self-study

The University prepared a written Self-study report that presented and assessed its institutional quality assurance processes, including challenges and opportunities, and with particular attention to any issues flagged in the previous audit. The report was submitted to the Quality Assurance Secretariat in advance of the desk audit and formed the foundation of the Cyclical Audit.

D. Selection of the sample of quality assurance activities for audit

The audit team independently selected a sample of quality assurance activities for audit, normally two programs developed under the New Program Approval Protocol and three or four programs that have undergone a Cyclical Program Review. Programs that have undergone the Expedited Protocol and/or the Protocol for Major Modifications are not normally subject to audit.

Specific areas of focus may also be added to the audit when an immediately previous audit has documented causes for concern, or when the Quality Council so requests. The University may also request specific programs and/or quality assurance elements be included in the audit. The Audit team may consider, in addition to the required documentation, any additional elements and related documentation stipulated by the university in its IQAP.

The Audit Team selected the following University of Ottawa programs for audit:

New Programs
- Acting, BFA, approved by the Quality Council in 2018, Faculty of Arts
- Anthropology, PhD, approved by the Quality Council in 2020, Faculty of Social Sciences

Cyclical Program Reviews (CPR)**:**
- Biology, MSc/PhD, joint program with Carleton University, 2017/18, Faculty of Science

- Biomedical Mechanical Engineering, BASc, and Computing Technology, BSc, 2018/19, Faculty of Engineering
- English Literature, MA/PhD, 2017/18, Faculty of Arts
- Food and Nutrition Sciences, BA (Hons), 2018/19, Faculty of Health Sciences

E. Findings in Areas of focus Requested by the University (if Applicable):

The university requested review of the following areas about which it has particular concerns:

Not Applicable

F. Desk audit of the university's quality assurance practices

In preparation for the site visit, the auditors undertook a desk audit of the University's quality assurance practices. Using the university's Self-study and records of the sampled programs, together with associated documents, this audit tests whether the university's practice is compliant with its IQAP[2], as ratified by the Quality Council, as well as any misalignments of the IQAP with the QAF.

It is essential that auditors have access to all relevant documents and information to ensure a clear understanding of the university's practices. The desk audit serves to raise specific issues and questions to be pursued during the on-site visit and to facilitate an effective and efficient audit. The documentation submitted for audit includes:

a) Relevant documents and other information related to the programs selected for audit, as requested by the Audit Team;

b) The record of any revisions of the university's IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council; and

c) The annual report of any minor revisions of the university's IQAP that did not require Quality Council re-ratification.

Universities may provide additional documents at their discretion (QAF 6.2.5).

The auditors undertook to preserve the confidentiality required for all documentation and communications and to meet all applicable requirements of the Freedom of Information and Protection Privacy Act (FIPPA).

G. Site visit

The principal purpose of the site visit is for the auditors to get a sufficiently complete and accurate understanding of the University's application of its IQAP in its pursuit of continuous

---

[2] Changes to the institution's process and practices within the eight-year cycle are to be expected. The test of the conformity of practice with process will always be made against the ratified Institutional Quality Assurance Process applying at the time of the conduct of the review.

improvement of its programs. Further, the site visit serves to answer questions and address information gaps that arose during the desk audit and assess the degree to which the institution's quality assurance practices contribute to continuous improvement of its programs.

During the site visit, auditors spoke with the University's senior academic leadership including those who the IQAP identifies as having important roles in the QA process, as well as representatives from those programs selected for audit, students, and representatives of units that play an important role in ensuring program quality and success. (QAF 6.2.6)

H. Audit Report

Following the conduct of the audit, the Audit Team prepared a report that is considered "draft" until it is approved by the Quality Council. The report, which is to be suitable for subsequent publication, comments on the institution's commitment to the culture of engagement with quality assurance and continuous improvement, and:

a) Describes the audit methodology and the verification steps used;

b) Comments on the institutional Self-study submitted for audit;

c) Describes whether the university's practice is in compliance with its IQAP as ratified by the Quality Council, on the basis of the programs selected for audit;

d) Notes any misalignment of its IQAP with the QAF;

e) Responds to any areas the auditors were asked to pay particular attention to;

f) Identifies and records any notably effective policies or practices revealed in the course of the audit of the sampled programs; and

g) Comments on the approach that the University has taken to ensuring continuous improvement in quality assurance through the implementation of the outcomes of cyclical program reviews and the monitoring of new programs.

The report shall not contain any confidential information. A separate addendum, not subject to publication, provides the University with detailed findings related to the audited programs.

Where appropriate, the report may include:

● **Recommendations**, which are recorded in the Audit Team report when they have identified failures to comply with the IQAP and/or there is misalignment between the IQAP and the required elements of the Quality Assurance Framework. The university must address these recommendations in its response to the auditors' report.

● **Suggestions**, which are forward-looking, are made by the Audit Team when they identify opportunities for the university to strengthen its quality assurance practices. Suggestions do not convey any mandatory obligations and sometimes are the means for conveying the Audit Team's province-wide experience in identifying good, and even on occasion, best,

practices. Universities are under no obligation to implement or otherwise respond to the Audit Team's suggestions, though they are encouraged to do so.

● **Causes for concern**, which are potential structural and/or systemic weaknesses in quality assurance practices (for example, inadequate follow-up monitoring, as required per QAF 5.4.1d) or a failure to make the relevant implementation reports to the appropriate statutory authorities (as required per QAF 5.4.2). Causes for concern require the university to take the steps specified in the report and/or by the Quality Council to remedy the situation.

The Audit Report includes recommendations that the Quality Council take one or more of the following steps, as appropriate:

   i. Direct specific attention by the Audit Team to the issue(s) within the subsequent audit, as provided for in QAF 6.2.4;

   ii. Schedule a larger selection of programs for the university's next audit;

   iii. Require a Focused Audit;

   iv. Adjust the degree of oversight and any associated requirements for more or less oversight;

   v. Require a Follow-up Response Report, with a recommended timeframe for submission; and/or

   vi. Any other action that is deemed appropriate.

I. Disposition of the Audit Report

The Quality Assurance Secretariat submits the Audit Report to the Audit Committee for consideration. Once the Audit Committee is satisfied with the Report, it makes a conditional recommendation to the Quality Council for approval of the Report, subject only to minor revisions resulting from the fact checking stage described below:

● The Quality Assurance Secretariat provides a copy to the University's "authoritative contact" (QAF 1.3) for fact checking to ensure that the report does not contain errors or omissions of fact but not to discuss the substance or findings of the report.

● That authority submits its report on the factual accuracy of the draft report within 30 days. If needed, the authority can request an extension of this deadline by contacting the Quality Assurance Secretariat and providing a rationale for the request. This response becomes part of the official record, and the audit team may use it to revise their report. The University's fact checking response will not be published on the Quality Council's website. When substantive changes are required, the draft report will be taken back to the Audit Committee.

The Chair of the Audit Committee takes the Audit Committee's recommendation for approval of the report to the Quality Council. The Council either accepts the report or refers it back to the Audit Committee for modification.

J. Transmittal of the Audit Report

Upon approval by the Quality Council, the Quality Assurance Secretariat sends the approved report to the University with an indication of the timing for any required follow-up.

K. Publication of main audit findings

The Quality Assurance Secretariat publishes the approved report of the overall findings, absent the addendum that details the findings related to the audited programs, together with a record of the recommendations on the Quality Council's website. The University will also publish the report (absent the previously specified addendum) on its website.

L. Institutional Follow-up Response Report

When a Follow-up Response Report is required (QAF 6.2.7v), the University will submit the report within the specified timeframe, detailing the steps it has taken to address the recommendations and/or Cause(s) for Concern. If the Audit Team is satisfied with the University's Follow-up Response Report, it drafts a report on the sufficiency of the response. The Audit Team report, suitable for publication, is then submitted to the Audit Committee for consideration. If the Audit Team is not satisfied with the institutional response, the Audit Team will consult with the institution, through the Quality Assurance Secretariat, to ensure the follow-up response is modified to satisfy the requirements of the Audit Report. The Institution will be asked to make any necessary changes to the follow-up response within a specified timeframe. The Audit Committee submits a recommendation to the Quality Council to accept the University's follow-up response and associated Audit Team report.

M. Web publication of Follow-up Report

When a Follow-up Report is required, the Quality Assurance Secretariat publishes this Report and the Audit Team's report on the scope and adequacy of the University's response on the Quality Council website and sends a copy to the University for publication on its website.

N. Additional reporting requirements

A report on all audit-related activity is provided to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents, the Council of Ontario Universities and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities through the Quality Council's Annual Report.

Appendix B: Auditor Bios

Dr. Johanne Bénard, *Professor, French Studies, Queen's University*

Dr. Bénard is a bilingual Professor in Queen's University's Department of French Studies and has also held the position of Associate Dean (Studies) in the Faculty of Arts and Science. As a member of the senior leadership team, she was responsible for academic consideration and accommodation, academic integrity, advising and appeals. Dr. Bénard worked on the New Protocol on Academic Consideration (2016-2018). As Undergraduate Chair and Head of the French Studies Department, Dr. Bénard played a significant role in many curriculum changes and reviews of the French Studies Department over a period of 20 years. Additionally, she has held Chair positions on the Academic Orientation Committee, Board of Studies, Curriculum Committee, Promotion, Renewal and Tenure Committee, and Appointments Committee. She will hold the position of Acting Head in the Department of French Studies in 2022-2023. Johanne has been on the Quality Council's Audit Committee since 2019.

Dr. Serge Desmarais, *University Professor Emeritus, University of Guelph*

Serge Desmarais is a University Professor Emeritus in the Department of Psychology at the University of Guelph. He joined the University of Guelph in 1995 after holding faculty positions at Saint Mary's University and Wilfrid Laurier University. During his academic career, he held positions as Chair of the Psychology department, Associate Dean and Acting Dean in the College of Social and Human Applied Sciences. He also completed a ten-year term as Associate Vice-President (Academic) and served as the University's Interim Provost in 2014-2015. He is a former recipient of a Canada Research Chair in Applied Social Psychology. His research expertise includes the changes and impact of gender norms on perceptions of justice, close relationship, sexuality, and the use of social media. He has also researched and published several articles on matters related to teaching and learning. Serge has been on the Quality Council's Audit Committee since 2019.

Dr. Alan Weedon, *Professor Emeritus, Department of Chemistry, Western University*

Alan Weedon received his undergraduate BSc and PhD degrees from Imperial College in London, and was appointed as an assistant professor in the chemistry department at Western in 1980, becoming an associate professor in 1986 and full professor in 1991. He retired from Western in 2018. From 1992 until 2016, he was variously an elected and ex-officio member of Western's Senate and served on its sub-committees responsible for academic program planning, approval and monitoring. Alan served as Western's Dean of Graduate Studies from 1996 until 2002, and was thereby a member of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (including a term as its chair) at a time when it was still responsible for quality assurance of graduate programs in Ontario. From 2002 until 2016, he was Vice-Provost (Academic Planning, Policy and Faculty) at Western. In this role, he was responsible for all matters relating to faculty, including working with the Provost, Deans and Department chairs on their faculty complement planning. Throughout his time as Vice-Provost, he met with all of the external reviewers of Western's programs and academic units and received their reports, which were then reviewed

with the Deans as part of the annual budget planning process. Alan has been a member of the Quality Council's Audit Committee since 2018.

Appendix C: Site Visit Schedule

Site Visit Schedule
Quality Council Audit
University of Ottawa

March 7-9, 2023

March 7

	Meetings	Participants	Room
9h-10h	Audit Team Planning Meeting	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune	Vanier Hall, room 1026
10h-12h	Audit Team meets with senior QA team	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Aline Germain-Rutherford, Vice-provost aux affaires académiques / Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs - André Beauchemin, Vice-provost aux études supérieures et postdoctorales / Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies - Marcel Turcotte, Directeur, Bureau de l'évaluation périodique des programmes / Director, Program Evaluation Office - Sophie St-Denis, Directrice, Cabinet du vice-provost aux études supérieures et postdoctorales / Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies	Vanier Hall, room 1026

	Meetings	Participants	Room
		- Élise Detellier, Conseillère principale aux politiques académiques / Senior Academic Policy Advisor	
12h-12h30	Lunch	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune	Vanier Hall, room 1026
12h30-13h30	Audit Team meets with representatives of program BFA Acting	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personne rencontrée : - Sylvain Schryburt, Directeur, Département de théâtre au moment de la création du programme / Chair, Department of Theatre at the time of the program's creation	Vanier Hall, room 1026
13h30-14h30	Audit team meets with representative of Program PhD Anthropology	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Vincent Mirza, Professeur, École d'études sociologiques et anthropologiques / Professor, School of Sociological and Anthropological Studies	Vanier Hall, room 1026
14h30-15h	Pause	Comité de l'audit - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune	Vanier Hall, room 1026

	Meetings	Participants	Room
15h-16h	Audit Team meets with Director of TLSS and Library Representative	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Alain Erdmer, Directeur général, Service d'appui à l'enseignement et à l'apprentissage (SAEA) / Director General, Teaching and Learning Support Service (TLSS) - Edmond Zahedi, Spécialiste de curriculum et de résultats d'apprentissage / Senior Curriculum and Learning Outcomes Analyst (online) - Tyson Gofton, Spécialiste en développement du curriculum / Curriculum Development Specialist - Hélène Carrier, Bibliothécaire associée, Apprentissage et service aux usagers / Associate University Librarian, Learning and User Services Manon DesGroseilliers, Gestionnaire, Recherche institutionnelle et planification (RIP) / Manager, Research and Planning, Institutional Research and Planning (IRP)	Vanier Hall, room 1026

March 8, 2023

	Meetings	Participants	Response
9h-10h	Audit Team meets with representative of Program Biology MSc, PhD (Joint program with Carleton)	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Jeremy Kerr, Directeur, Département de biologie / Chair, Department of Biology - Vance Trudeau, Professeur au Département de biologie et ancien directeur du programme / Professor, Department of Biology and and former program director - Jessica Forrest, Professeure, Département de biologie et co-directrice du programme / Professor, Department of Biology and actual program co-director - Howard Rundle, Professeur, Département de biologie et co-directrice du programme / Professor, Department of Biology and actual program co-director - Deryn Fogg, Vice-doyenne aux études supérieures, Faculté des sciences / Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Science - Charles-Antoine Darveau, Professeur, Département de biologie / Professor, Department of Biology	Vanier Hall, room 1026
10h-11h	Audit Team meets with representatives from the Senate QA Committee	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Lauchlan Thomas Munro, Professeur, École de développement international et	Vanier Hall, room 1026

	Meetings	Participants	Response
		mondialisation et membre du Comité d'évaluation des programmes de premier cycle (CÉPPC) / Professor, School of International Development and Global Studies and Member of the Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs (SCEUP) - Julie Paquette, Professeure à l'Université Saint-Paul et membre du CÉPPC et du Sénat / Professor at Saint-Paul University and member of SCEUP and Senate - Claire Isabelle, Professeure à la Faculté d'éducation et membre du CÉPPC / Professor, Faculty of Education, and member of SCEUP - Nadine Wiper Bergeron, Professeure, Département de médecine cellulaire et moléculaire, et membre du Comité d'évaluation des programmes d'études supérieures (CÉPÉS) / Professor, Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, and Member of the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee (GPEC) - Isabelle Giroux, Directrice, École des sciences de la nutrition et membre du CÉPÉS / Director, School of Nutrition Sciences and Member of the GPEC - Marc-André Daoust, Directeur associé, Programmes Coop, et membre du Conseil des études de premier cycle (CEPC) / Associate Director, Coop Programs, and Member of the Council on Undergraduate Studies (CUS) - David Delcorde, Professeur à l'École de gestion Telfer et membre du CEPC / Professor at the Telfer School of Management and membre of CUS - Sophie Thériault, Vice-doyenne, Faculté de droit – section Droit civil et membre du CEPC / Vice-Dean, Faculty of Law – Civil Law Section and Member of CUS - Christine Dallaire, Vice-doyenne, Faculté des sciences de la santé et membre du	

	Meetings	Participants	Response
		CEPC et du Conseil des études supérieures (CÉS) / Vice-Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences and Member of CUS and of the Council on Graduate Studies (CGS) - Marc Charron, Vice-doyen à la Faculté des arts et membre du CEPC et du CÉS / Vice-Dean at the Faculty of Arts and member of CUS and CGS - Deryn Fogg, Professeure au Département de chimie et sciences biomoléculaires et membres du CÉS / Professor at the Department of Chemistry and Biomolecular Sciences and member of CGS	
11h-12h	Audit Team meets with representatives of Program Mechanical Engineering and Biomedical Mechanical Engineering – BASc Mechanical Engineering and Computing Technology - BSc	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Marianne Fenech, Professeure, Département de génie mécanique / Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering - Davide Spinello, Professeur, Département de génie mécanique / Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering	Vanier Hall, room 1026
12h15-13h	Lunch with students	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées :	Vanier Hall, room 1026

_____

	Meetings	Participants	Response
		- Nafissatou Sall, Directrice, Centre des droits étudiants/Director, Students Rights Centre	
13h-13h30	Pause	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune	Vanier Hall, room 1026
13h30-14h30	Audit Team meets with Deans	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Lucie Thibault, Doyenne, Faculté des sciences de la santé / Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences - Vicky Barham, Doyenne, Faculté des sciences sociales / Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences - Jacques Beauvais, Doyen, Faculté de génie / Dean, Faculty of Engineering - Gregory Richards, Vice-doyen / Vice-Dean, for Stéphane Brutus, Doyen, École de gestion Telfer / Dean, Telfer School of Management - Kathryn Prince, Doyenne, Faculté des arts / Dean, Faculty of Arts - Sophie Thériault, Vice-doyenne/Vice-Dean for Marie-Ève Sylvestre, Doyenne, Faculté de droit – section Droit civil / Dean, Faculty of Law, Civil Law Section - Kristen Boon, Doyenne, Faculté de droit, section Common Law / Dean, Faculty of Law, Common Law Section	Vanier Hall, room 1026

	Meetings	Participants	Response
		- Richard Barwell, Doyen, Faculté d'éducation / Dean, Faculty of Education - Alain Stintzi, Vice-doyen /Vice-Dean for Bernard Jasmin, Doyen, Faculté de médecine / Dean, Faculty of Medicine - Louis Barriault, Doyen, Faculté des sciences / Dean, Faculty of Science	
14h30-15h30	Audit Team meets with representatives of Program English – (BA), MA, PhD	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personne rencontrée : - Robert Stacey, Directeur, Département d'anglais / Chair, Department of English	Vanier Hall, room 1026
15h30-16h30	Audit Team meets with representatives of Program Food and Nutrition – BA	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Isabelle Giroux, Directrice, École des sciences de la nutrition / Director, School of Nutrition Sciences - Susan Tosh, Professeure, École des sciences de la nutrition / Professor, School of Nutrition Sciences	Vanier Hall, room 1026

March 9, 2023

	Meetings	Participants	Response
9h30-10h15	Audit Team Meeting	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune	Vanier Hall, room 1026
10h15-10h30	Pause	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune	Vanier Hall, room 1026
10h30-12h	Audit Team meets with senior QA team	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Aline Germain-Rutherford, Vice-provost aux affaires académiques / Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs - André Beauchemin, Vice-provost aux études supérieures et postdoctorales / Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies - Marcel Turcotte, Directeur, Bureau de l'évaluation périodique des programmes / Director, Program Evaluation Office - Sophie St-Denis, Directrice, Cabinet du vice-provost aux études supérieures et postdoctorales / Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies - Élise Detellier, Conseillère principale aux politiques académiques / Senior Academic Policy Advisor	Vanier Hall, room 1026

12h-13h	Lunch with President	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personne rencontrée : - Jacques Frémont, Recteur / President	Tabaret Hall, room 210
13h-14h	Audit Team wrap-up meeting	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune	Tabaret Hall, room 210
14h-15h	Audit Team de-brief with Provost/QA leader	Comité de l'audit : - Johanne Bénard - Serge Desmarais - Alan Weedon - Chris Evans - Cindy Robinson - Jennifer Bethune Personnes rencontrées : - Jill Scott, Provost et vice-rectrice aux affaires académiques / Provost and Vice-President, Academic Affairs - Aline Germain-Rutherford, Vice-provost aux affaires académiques / Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs	Tabaret Hall, room 217

Appendix D: Acronyms

CEAB – Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board's

CPR – Cyclical Program Reviews

DLEs – Degree Level Expectations

FAR – Final Assessment Report

FIPPA – Freedom of Information and Protection Privacy Act

IQAP – Institutional Quality Assurance Processes

OCGS – Ontario Council on Graduate Studies

PFPN – Partnership for Nutrition Education and Practice

QA – Quality assurance

QAF – Quality Assurance Framework

Quality Council – Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance

SCEUP – Senate Committee on the Evaluation of Undergraduate Program

TLSS – Teaching and Learning Support Services