



ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
COUNCIL on QUALITY ASSURANCE

**REPORT ON THE
QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT OF
NIPISSING UNIVERSITY**

FEBRUARY 2016

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION -----	1
<i>AUDIT PROCESS</i> -----	1
<i>CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS</i> -----	6
1. Social Welfare and Social Development: BA -----	6
2. Native Studies: BA -----	10
3. History: BA, MA -----	14
<i>CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE</i> -----	17
<i>NEW PROGRAMS</i> -----	17
1. Social Work: BSW -----	17
2. Kinesiology: MSc -----	20
<i>MAJOR MODIFICATIONS</i> -----	23
1. Teacher Education: BEd -----	23
2. Master of Education: MEd -----	24
<i>CONCLUSION</i> -----	25
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS</i> -----	26
<i>SUGGESTIONS</i> -----	27
Appendix A: Members of the Audit Team -----	28
Appendix B: List of Documents Reviewed by Auditors -----	30
Appendix C: Schedule of Auditors' Site Visit -----	35

INTRODUCTION

Nipissing University, located in North Bay, received its charter as an independent University in 1992 following a period from 1967 when it was affiliated with Laurentian University and known as Nipissing University College. The earliest roots of today's university were established with the North Bay Normal School. The University has a focus primarily on undergraduate education including programs in arts, science, professional programs including for example, teacher education, social work, business and nursing. Graduate programs are offered in Education (including Master's and a PhD program) and in History, Environmental Sciences/Studies and Mathematics.

Nipissing University offers programs through three faculties: Arts and Science; Education; and Applied and Professional Studies. Some of its programs are also available at off-site locations in Muskoka and Brantford. Total student enrolment as reported in fall 2103 was just over 4000 students, with 3387 in undergraduate programs, 81 in Master's level programs and 20 in the PhD program in Education.

Nipissing University is one of three universities to be audited in the third year of this first cycle of quality assurance audits under the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). The University was audited under the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) in 1999; with its second UPRAC audit taking place in 2006. The timetable for audits under the QAF was based on the timetable in place for UPRAC.

The auditors recognize and very much appreciated the enormous institutional commitment of time and human resources to ensure the preparation of all the documents required for the audit and also the willingness of those involved in the audit process in providing the audit team with additional information during the course of the audit. The audit team was impressed by the willingness of the Senior Administrative Team to discuss both the opportunities and the challenges of moving to the new Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). We would particularly like to thank Anne Bolger and Jamie Graham for their kindness and attention to details that made our site visit both pleasant and effective.

AUDIT PROCESS

The QAF specifies that each university in Ontario will be audited once every eight years with the objective of determining whether or not the institution, since the last audit, has complied with the provisions of its Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) for Cyclical Program Reviews as ratified by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council).

The Quality Council establishes a panel of auditors in collaboration with the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) (QAF 5.1).

A. Assignment of no fewer than three auditors

The first step in the audit process is the assignment of no fewer than three auditors, by the Executive Director of the Quality Council, to conduct the institutional audit (QAF 5.2.1). The auditors selected are at arm's-length from the institution that is undergoing the audit. They are accompanied on the audit visit by member(s) of the Quality Assurance Secretariat. The following comprised the audit team for the Nipissing University audit (see brief biographical information in [Appendix A](#)).

- Dr. Caroline Andrew
- Dr. Paul Axelrod
- Dr. Anne-Marie Mawhiney
- Dr. Donna Woolcott, Quality Council Secretariat support
- Ms. Hillary Barron, Quality Council Secretariat support

B. Auditors' independent selection of programs for audit

The next step in the audit process (QAF 5.2.2) involves the auditors independently selecting programs for audit, typically four undergraduate and four graduate cyclical program reviews. At least one of the undergraduate programs and one of the graduate programs will be a New Program or Major Modifications to an Existing Program approved within the period since the previous audit.

The Executive Director of the Quality Council authorizes the proposed selection, assuring, for example, a reasonable program mix. Specific programs may be added to the sample when an immediately previous audit has documented causes for concern, and when so directed in accordance with QAF 5.2.5 b. When the institution itself so requests, specific programs may also be audited. The auditors may consider, in addition to the required documentation, any other elements and related documentation stipulated by the institution in its IQAP.

The auditors selected the following Nipissing University programs for audit:

Cyclical Program Reviews:

- Social Welfare and Social Development: BA
- Native Studies: BA
- History: BA; MA

New Programs:

- Social Work: BSW

- Kinesiology: MSc

Major Modifications:

- Teacher Education: BEd
- Master of Education: MEd
- Geography and Environmental Geography¹: BA; BSc

C. Desk audit of institutional practices

Step 3 involves a desk audit of the institutional quality assurance practices (QAF 5.2.3). Using the institution's records of the sampled cyclical program reviews and associated documents, this audit tests whether the institution's practice conforms to its own IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council.² It is essential that the auditors have access to all relevant documents and information to ensure a clear understanding of the institution's practices. The desk audit serves to raise specific issues and questions to be pursued during the on-site visit and to facilitate the conduct of an effective and efficient on-site visit. The documentation to be submitted for the programs selected for audit includes all documents and other information associated with each step of the institution's IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council and the record of any revisions of the institution's IQAP, as ratified by the Quality Council. Institutions may provide any additional documents at their discretion.

During the desk audit, the auditors will also determine whether or not the institution's web-based publication of the executive summaries of the Final Assessment Reports, and subsequent reports on the implementation of the review recommendations for the programs included in the current audit, meet the requirements of QAF 4.2.6. The auditors undertake to preserve the confidentiality required for all documentation and communications and meet all applicable requirements of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA)*. A list of the documents reviewed by the audit team is included in Appendix B.

¹ The auditors selected this major modification for audit but have not included an analysis in the Audit Report because the program changes were undertaken prior to IQAP ratification.

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 that applies at the time the review is conducted.

D. On-site visit at institution

The auditors conducted an on-site visit at Nipissing University in North Bay from March 25 to 27, 2015. The site visit schedule is included in Appendix C. The purpose of the on-site visit is for the university to answer the auditors' questions and to address information gaps that may have arisen during the desk audit. The visit allows the auditors to get "a sufficiently complete and accurate understanding of the institution's application of its IQAP so that they can meet their audit responsibilities" (QAF 5.2.4).

E. Preparation of audit report

The audit report is produced following the site visit. As per QAF 5.2.5, the audit report provides a status report on the programs selected for audit. The status report will note the degree of compliance with the institution's IQAP as well as any notably effective policies or practices revealed in the course of the audit. Where appropriate, the report will make suggestions and recommendations and identify any causes for concern, as defined in QAF 5.2.5:

- **Suggestions** will be forward-looking, and are made by auditors when they identify opportunities for the institution to strengthen its quality assurance practices. Suggestions do not convey any mandatory obligations and sometimes are the means for conveying the auditors' province-wide experience in identifying good and, even on occasion, best practices. Institutions are under no obligation to implement or otherwise respond to the auditors' suggestions, though they are encouraged to do so.
- **Recommendations** are recorded in the auditors' report when they have identified failures to comply with the IQAP and/or there is misalignment between the IQAP and the Quality Assurance Framework. The institution must address these recommendations.
- **Causes for concern** are potential structural weaknesses in quality assurance practices that auditors may identify (for example, when, in two or more instances, the auditors identify inadequate follow-up monitoring; a failure to make the relevant implementation reports to the appropriate statutory authorities; or the absence of the Manual).

The auditors prepare a draft report and a summary of the principal findings suitable for publication. The Quality Council Secretariat forwards a copy of both to the institution for comment. This consultation is intended to ensure that the report and associated summary do not contain errors or omissions of fact. The institution submits a response to the draft report and associated summary within 60 days. The auditors may use this response to revise their report and/or associated summary before submitting them to the Executive Director of the Quality Council who presents them to the Audit Committee. The Audit Committee reviews the report and associated summary and recommends approval to the Quality Council (QAF 5.2.6).

The approved report and associated summary are forwarded by the Quality Council Secretariat to the institution, and to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) for information (QAF 5.2.7). The approved summary of the overall findings, together with a record of the recommendations, are posted on the website of the Quality Council. These are also forwarded to the institution for them to post on their website (QAF 5.2.8).

Within a year of the publication of the final audit report, the institution will inform the auditors, through the Secretariat, of the steps it has taken to address the recommendations. The auditors will draft a response commenting on the scope and adequacy of the institution's response, together with a draft summary of their commentary, suitable for publication. The auditors' response and summary are then submitted to the Audit Committee, which considers them and makes a recommendation to the Quality Council regarding the acceptability of the institutional one-year follow-up response (QAF 5.2.9). The auditors' summary of the scope and adequacy of the institution's response is posted on the Quality Council website and a copy is sent to the institution for publication on its website; copies are also sent to OCAV, COU and MTCU for information (QAF 5.2.10).

STATUS REPORT ON PROGRAMS AUDITED

This section of the report provides details of the audit results for each of the sampled programs audited. In each case, the report identifies any gaps in compliance with Nipissing University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (NU-IQAP) as well as examples of notably effective policies and practices. The report on each review contains suggestions and recommendations, as appropriate. Nipissing University's IQAP came into effect when it was ratified by the Quality Council in June 2011. Following some changes by the University, the IQAP was re-ratified in June 2013. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research (hereafter cited as VPAR) is the administrative authority responsible for the University's quality assurance policy and procedures for new and existing programs and is Nipissing University's authoritative contact for the Quality Council.

CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

1. Social Welfare and Social Development: BA

Introduction:

Social Welfare and Social Development, known simply as “Social Welfare” until 2008, was created as a 3-year degree in 1986. A 4-year double major was added in 2008, and in 2012-13, a 4-year Honours Specialization was added (a “Single Major,” under former nomenclature). An enormous amount of program planning and development has occurred since 2012, and has been done in a way that complements the proposed creation of a Bachelor of Social Work program.

Initial Notification:

NU-IQAP v1 was in effect at the time of this cyclical program review. Page 7 states that, “The Office of the VPAR will notify the academic units responsible for review one year in advance of the commencement of the review. This follows consultation by the VPAR with the Deans and the Senate Committee on Policy and Planning (hereafter referred to as PPC).” According to the program coordinator, notice of the review was provided by the Dean. This was confirmed in an email dated January 26, 2012.

Self-Study:

NU-IQAP v1, p. 9 stipulates that, “The Dean of the relevant Faculty will review and approve the self-study to ensure that it meets the above (criteria).” Documentation received by the auditors includes approval by PPC of the self-study on November 23, 2012. PPC resolved at that meeting to send the report to external reviewers. According to the program coordinator, the Dean did approve the self-study, although there is no specific documentation indicating this. It is recommended that this process be recorded in written documents.

SUGGESTION 1: Nipissing University should consider requiring that the responsible authority sign and date the self-study as confirmation that it has been approved.

Apart from the review and approval of the self-study by the PPC, there is no additional written documentation indicating that the Dean provided feedback to the Unit, although the program coordinator told the auditors that the report would have gone to the Dean for approval before being sent to PPC. It is suggested that this process be formally documented.

Similarly, the auditors did not receive documentation that the self-study was sent to or approved by the VPAR as is stipulated on page 7 of the NU-IQAP v1, although oral testimony indicates that it was. It is recommended that this process be recorded in written documents.

See SUGGESTION 1

The self-study is a very long and detailed document. It includes a comprehensive account of the history of the program. It was written by the program coordinator, with input from the other program faculty, and took some five months to complete. The self-study contained extensive reference to student input including results of surveys of current students and alumni, two focus group sessions with current students, and student evaluation feedback on courses. The external reviewers did meet with students at their site visit. The program is to be commended for its extensive efforts to incorporate student feedback into its program review.

The auditors heard contradictory responses to the question of whether there is a template for a self-study available to programs that are undertaking cyclical program reviews. The NU-IQAP v1, p. 8-9 contains a comprehensive set of instructions to programs on the information to be provided in the self-study.

SUGGESTION 2: Nipissing University should consider developing a template for self-studies for cyclical program reviews.

External Evaluation (Peer Review):

Selection of the Review Team

NU-IQAP v1, p. 10 describes the process whereby the external review committee is selected. Typically the review committee consists of four members, two external to the university and two members of the university but external to the program under review. The PPC will identify a ranked list of the most appropriate external reviewers and internal members after it reviews the self-study for the program, including a list of the proposed external reviewers. The auditors saw e-mail correspondence from the program to the Dean and then to the VPAR with four names (ranked by the program) for the two internal members and six names for the two external members. The cover memo from the program indicated that their top ranked person as an external nominee was a reviewer at the time of the last program review. The auditors note that it would not represent best practice to appoint a reviewer who had completed the previous review. In this case the university did not appoint that nominee.

It is not clear who made the selection of the reviewers but in their meeting with PPC at the site visit, the auditors were told that the VPAR ranks reviewers to be selected for Review Committees and that PPC does not play a role. It appears that there is a discrepancy between practice and the NU-IQAP on this step.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Nipissing University must comply with its IQAP to follow the processes for appointment of internal and external reviewers for cyclical program reviews or change the IQAP.

The auditors noted that the number of internal review members is larger than observed at some other universities and exceeds the requirements of the QAF which specifies at least one internal member. This might be a consideration if the university is finding it difficult to locate internal review members for each program review.

NU-IQAP stipulates that the Office of the VPAR will contact proposed external reviewers directly, confirm those willing to serve, and oversee the arrangements for a campus site visit. The auditors confirmed that these processes were adhered to and that the VPAR spoke to each of the reviewers in advance of the site visit to the campus. This presented an opportunity to provide clear instructions to the external reviewers on their roles and to respond to any questions. The auditors commend the VPAR for this exemplary practice.

Review Committee Instructions

The Office of the VPAR provided to each member of the Review Committee a copy of standard instructions with respect to the review and the preparation of the committee's report, which will direct the reviewers, for each program under review. As stated above the VPAR also spoke by telephone with the reviewers in advance of the site visit.

Review Materials

In compliance with NU-IQAP v1, p. 11, the Dean of the Faculty, in cooperation with the Chair/Director of the unit ensured that the external reviewers received all required information and documents. The Office of the VPAR included in e-mail correspondence dated November 28 and 29, 2012 with the reviewers a list of documents they would receive for review. The Reviewers' Report documents the information that was received for review.

Site Visit

The Office of the VPAR finalized the site visit schedule in consultation with the academic unit as described in NU-IQAP v1, p. 12. The site visit took place February 7-8, 2013.

Reviewers' Report

According to NU-IQAP v1, p. 13, the findings and recommendations of the review team should be presented in the form of a brief, concisely written report (with an executive summary) that will be received by the Vice-President, Academic and Research³ on behalf of PPC. A report (some 8 pages) was submitted by the external review committee on March 1, 2013, meeting the timeframe of 4 weeks following the site visit as specified in the NU-IQAP. The report did not include an executive summary. The Reviewers received a template for their report which was based on the evaluation criteria in the NU-IQAP. This is an example of best practice.

Program's Response to External Review Committee's Report:

The Department completed its response to the reviewers' report on April 20, 2013; the Dean completed his response on April 22, 2013. Both reports were submitted to the PPC and discussed at its September 20, 2013 meeting (NU-IQAP v1, p. 13).

Internal Response to External Review Committee's Report:

The University indicated that at this stage in the review process, NU-IQAP v2 came into effect. Page 15 of the IQAP indicates that following a full review of all reports, including the self-study, the VPAR (or his/her designate) shall prepare for PPC a report (excluding all personal information) that summarizes the findings and conclusions of the undergraduate and graduate quality review for the programs of the unit. There was no separate report from the VPAR to PPC as required by the IQAP, although the VPAR appeared to have had input into the Final Assessment Report through his participation on the PPC.

Final Assessment Report (FAR), including Executive Summary and Implementation Plan:

A Final Assessment Report was approved by the PPC on November 22, 2013. However, there is no documentation in the file indicating Senate approval of the Final Assessment Report (NU-IQAP v2, p. 16).

SUGGESTION 3: Nipissing University should clarify the role of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research in the preparation of Final Assessment Reports to the PPC, and ensure that written documentation of Senate approval is included in the files.

Approval, Posting and Distribution of FAR and Implementation Plan:

³ This position title has been changed to Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research

Although the NU-IQAP identifies that it is the role of the Office of VPAR to ensure the distribution of the Final Assessment Report (excluding all confidential information) and the associated Implementation Plan for the Unit, Senate and the Quality Council, it is not clear from the written documentation if this was done.

It is recommended that the completion of this process be documented in writing. Furthermore, the Institutional Executive Summary of the outcomes of this review and the associated Implementation Plan have not yet been posted on the website (NU-IQAP v2, p. 15). Nor has the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan been submitted to the Quality Council as is required in NU-IQAP v2, p. 15.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Nipissing University must prepare and post on its website the Institutional Executive Summary and Associated Implementation Plan for each cyclical program review. This is a Cause for Concern.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Nipissing University must prepare and send the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan for each cyclical program review to Senate and to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. This is a Cause for Concern.

Provisions for Tracking of Implementation Plan:

NU-IQAP v2, p. 16 identifies that it is the Dean's office that will provide for the timely monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations, and the appropriate distribution, including web postings, or the scheduled monitoring reports. Although the Final Assessment Report indicates which recommendations will be implemented and which will not, there is no indication of a follow-up monitoring process.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Nipissing University must comply with its IQAP and implement the follow-up monitoring process identified in the IQAP for each program review. This is a Cause for Concern.

2. Native Studies: BA

Introduction:

According to the Nipissing University website, the BA (Native Studies) uses "a traditional, holistic framework for knowledge, insight and a guide to living life." The program provides an Aboriginal worldview through a number of specialized courses that are intended to provide students with a comprehensive understanding of the history and issues related to Aboriginal peoples from the perspective of Aboriginal worldviews. The University offers a major in Native Studies, comprising 36 credits, including three required courses: Introduction to Native Studies, Native Philosophy, and Native

Spirituality and Religions, and 18 upper year Native courses, some which may be from cross listed courses offered by other departments. The University also offers a minor in Native Studies, comprising 18 courses in Native Studies; cross listed courses are not approved as part of this minor.

Initial Notification:

Nipissing University has established mechanisms (NU-IQAP v2, p. 7) that ensure that proper notification to programs is made from the Office of the VPAR to initiate the cyclical program review. In the meeting with auditors, the department chair confirmed that notification had occurred as described in the IQAP. Documentation shows that the cyclical review was triggered by the Office of the VPAR on January 23, 2103, with a follow up written reminder on April 9, 2013.

Self-Study:

The auditors confirmed in their meeting with the Dean that she did review and approve the self-study. The documentation shows there was a meeting with the VPAR on August 15, 2013. A draft self-study went to the PPC and the minutes of the PPC meeting record that the department chair stated that the self-study was incomplete and would be ready January 2014. (NU-IQAP v2, p. 10)

See SUGGESTION 1

The auditors noted that the self-study was a very lengthy document (over 300 pages) consisting of several sections including text prepared by the program coordinator, photocopied sections of the university calendar, and other documents such as course outlines, and data on enrolments, alumni, etc. Creating a concise yet comprehensive self-study might be easier if a template was provided by the University for the self-studies for cyclical program reviews. The faculty member responsible for the self-study in this case indicated that it would have been helpful to have a template.

See SUGGESTION 2

External Evaluation (Peer Review):

Selection of the Review Team

The program coordinator confirmed that he provided a ranked list of external reviewers and internal members who could review the Native Studies program. Included in the list for external reviewers was someone who reviewed the program at the time of the previous cyclical review in 2008. On the list of the possible internal reviewers was someone described as “a regular collaborator and influential colleague for Native Studies faculty since his earliest arrival”. The auditors observe that the use of a previous reviewer and the close relationship of an internal reviewer are practices at

odds with the stated requirement that reviewers should be “at arm’s-length”. The documentation shows the selection of reviewers was initiated on September 12, 2013 and the selection process was completed by October 24, 2013 (NU-IQAP v2, p. 11).

RECOMMENDATION 5: Nipissing University must ensure that the external and internal reviewers appointed are at “arm’s-length” from the program to be reviewed.

Review Committee Instructions

The Office of the VPAR sent out packages to all review committee members on January 22, 2014. The VPAR confirmed that he contacted proposed external reviewers directly, selected the external and internal review members, and followed the required steps leading to the campus site visit. An external member visited via Skype. The VPAR confirmed at the auditors’ site visit that he had contacted the review committee members by telephone to provide standard instructions and orientation on requirements and expectations. Documentation supports this, showing that the VPAR spoke to external reviewers prior to the site visit on February 7, 2014 (NU-IQAP v2, p. 11).

Review Materials

The Review Committee received the self-study and related documents from the Office of the VPAR in conformity with NU-IQAP v2, p. 11, on January 22, 2014.

Site Visit

The site visit schedule was finalized and provided to the review team by the Office of the VPAR in conformity with NU-IQAP v2, p. 13. The site visit took place February 13-14, 2014.

Reviewers’ Report

The Reviewers’ Report was received by the University on June 9, 2014, several weeks beyond the four week period specified in NU-IQAP v2, p. 14. The report was written using the template provided by the University and addressed the evaluation criteria in the IQAP.

Program’s Response to External Review Committee’s Report:

The program chair confirmed with the auditors that he had seen the Review Committee’s report (NU-IQAP v2, p. 15) and prepared a response. The program response was sent to the VPAR on October 19, 2014. The IQAP indicates that the program should prepare its response in close partnership with the Dean. It is not clear to the auditors if this consultation with the Dean occurred. From the chronology

specified in the documents audited it appears that the Dean's response was prepared prior to the program response.

Internal Response to External Review Committee's Report:

The Interim Dean provided a written response to the Reviewers' Report dated, June 26, 2014. In her cover memo to the VPAR, she indicated that she had shared her response with the program coordinator.

The PPC received the Reviewers' Report and the two internal responses at a meeting on October 24, 2014. The Minutes of the meeting refer briefly to the Reviewers' Report and the Dean's response report.

Final Assessment Report (FAR), including Executive Summary and Implementation Plan:

The auditors found no evidence that there was a Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan for this program review. The Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research confirmed that he had not yet prepared any Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans for any reviews undertaken since he assumed the position in 2012.

The auditors note that there appeared to have been limited or no follow-up on the previous cyclical review of this program. It is of some concern that when there are serious issues that come to the attention of the University in the course of a review of an existing program, a plan to address these concerns should be implemented to protect the integrity of the program for students.

See RECOMMENDATIONS 3 and 4 These are Causes for Concern.

The NU-IQAP states that the Institutional Executive Summary of the outcomes of the review and the associated Implementation Plan shall be posted on the website and provided to the Senate of the University, with a copy provided to the Quality Council. This had not occurred at the timing of the auditors' site visit. (NU-IQAP, v2, p. 15)

See RECOMMENDATIONS 2 and 3 These are Causes for Concern.

Preparation and Adoption of Plans to Implement the Recommendations:

The auditors received no evidence that this step (Nu-IQAP v2, p.16) had occurred at the time of their site visit. The absence of a Final Assessment Report and implementation plan does not allow this important step to take place.

See RECOMMENDATIONS 2, 3 and 4 These are **Causes for Concern**.

Provisions for Tracking of Implementation Plan:

No implementation plans as required in NU-IQAP v2, p. 16 were in place at the time of the site visit by the auditors. The IQAP indicates that such follow-up should begin 15-18 months following PPC receipt of responses.

3. History: BA, MA

Introduction:

The History BA and MA programs are located in the Department of History and Classical Studies, one of the largest Departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science at Nipissing University. The MA program in History started in 2008 and was the first graduate program offered in the Faculty of Arts and Science. This is the first program review for the MA program since it was initiated. The last review of the 3 and 4 year BA – single and combined Major-History, 3 year single and combined Major- Classical Studies and MA – History was in 2006 before the new QAF came into effect. This combined review of the BA and MA programs was scheduled for Fall 2013 (NU-IQAP v2).

Initial Notification:

The NU-IQAP indicates that the office of the VPAR will notify the academic units responsible for programs scheduled for review one year in advance of the commencement of the review. On June 10, 2013, the Office of the VPAR notified the Department of History and Classical Studies that there would be separate IQAP program reviews for the History and Classical Studies programs (NU-IQAP v2, p. 7).

Self-Study:

NU-IQAP v2, p. 10 indicates that the Dean of the relevant Faculty will review and provide feedback to the Unit regarding the self-study to ensure that it meets the criteria in the IQAP. The auditors did not find any evidence of this step having occurred.

The NU-IQAP v 2 p. 10 also stipulates that, with or without revisions, the self-study will then be submitted to the VPAR who will also review, make changes as appropriate, and approve the self-study report. There was no written documentation of this step, but in the meeting with auditors the faculty indicated that they recall being asked by the VPAR to submit a missing chart for the self-study.

See SUGGESTION 1

The NU-IQAP v2 p. 10 indicates that if the unit does not agree with the VPAR's decision, the matter will be submitted to PPC for resolution.

The auditors learned that the PPC discussed the self-study but it was not clear whether the PPC was approving the self-study or resolving a disagreement between the Unit and the VPAR.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Nipissing University must ensure that the relevant officials (e.g. Dean; Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research) review and provide feedback to the program on self-studies created for cyclical program reviews to ensure that the self-study contains the information required in the IQAP.

SUGGESTION 4: Nipissing University should clarify the role of the Planning and Priorities Committee in reviewing the self-study for cyclical program reviews.

External Evaluation (Peer Review):

Selection of the Review Team is described in NU-IQAP v2, p. 11. The auditors did not see evidence that the PPC identified a ranked list of the most appropriate external reviewers and internal members. From documentation available to the auditors, it is not clear who selected the reviewers. However, it is clear that the reviewers were chosen from the list proposed by the History Department, in a document dated June 25, 2013.

In the auditors' meeting with the PPC at the site visit, they were told that the VPAR ranks reviewers to be selected for Review Committees and that PPC does not play a role.

See **RECOMMENDATION 1**

The Office of the VPAR contacted the proposed external reviewers directly, confirmed those willing to serve, and oversaw the arrangements for a campus site visit. These steps were completed in conformity with the NU-IQAP v 2.

Review Committee Instructions

The Office of the VPAR provided to each member of the review Committee a copy of standard instructions with respect to the review and the preparation of the committee's report as stipulated in NU-IQAP v2, p. 11. The reviewers did receive a template for their report as well. The VPAR scheduled a teleconference with the Review Committee a few weeks prior to the site visit. As in previous cases audited, the VPAR manages this part of the review very commendably.

Review Materials

The NU-IQAP v2, p. 11 indicates that the Office of the VPAR, in cooperation with the Dean and the Chair/Director of the unit whose program(s) is (are) under review, will ensure that the external reviewers receive all required information and documents identified in the NU-IQAP, including any additional materials that the VPAR and the Dean may deem helpful to the assessment process. In this program review, there was no written evidence that the Dean or Director of the Unit was involved but the faculty interviewed by the auditors indicated that they would have sent the self-study to the Dean.

The IQAP names three levels of review of the self-study (Dean/Director; VPAR; PPC) for each program reviewed before it is sent to the Review Committee. If the University is looking for ways to streamline its processes, this step might be handled with more efficiency.

SUGGESTION 5: Nipissing University should consider clarifying in the IQAP who the final authority is to sign off on the documentation to be sent to the Reviewers for a cyclical program review.

External Review Committee Visit

The NU-IQAP v2, p. 13 states that the office of the VPAR finalizes the visit schedule in consultation with the academic units being reviewed which shall work jointly to provide a draft schedule listing the individuals to be interviewed and further details respecting availability. There was no documentation provided to the auditors that the Director played a role. The site visit for this review took place in February 2014.

Reviewers' Report

The Reviewers' Report was sent to the VPAR on March 25, 2014, within the one month timeframe specified in the NU-IQAP v2, p. 14. It appeared to the auditors to be quite comprehensive and included feedback as was required on both the BA and MA programs in History. One observation from the auditors was that there was very little reference in the Report to student outcomes for the programs being reviewed. This focus is an important feature of the new QAF.

Internal Response to External Review Committee's Report:

The NU-IQAP v2, p. 15 states that on receipt of the Reviewers' report, the members of the unit will meet in committee for discussion. The Dean and the unit head will then meet with PPC to review the report. The Dean will submit an independent response to PPC as described in NU-IQAP. Both the Program and the Dean prepared responses to the Reviewers' Reports as required in the IQAP. The Reviewers' Report and the Program's and Dean's responses to the Review were on the agenda of PPC meeting dated October 24, 2014. Minutes of that meeting include a very brief statement about the review.

The NU-IQAP also details the role of the PPC's Response (NU-IQAP v2, p. 14) but the auditors saw no evidence that this step has occurred yet.

Final Assessment Report (FAR), including Executive Summary and Implementation Plan:

At the time of this report, the approval, posting and distribution of the program's FAR and Implementation Plans as well as the provisions for tracking the Implementation Plan have not been done.

See RECOMMENDATIONS 3 and 4 These are Causes for Concern.

CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE

The auditors compared the list provided by Nipissing University of the undergraduate and graduate programs it offers against its cyclical program review schedule. The auditors found a few examples of programs, some of the newer ones, had not yet been included on the schedule. For example, the auditors could not find the BA program in Anthropology or the PhD program in Education on the schedule. These gaps should be remedied. Given that some programs are offered both in North Bay and at other locations (Bracebridge and Brantford), the location(s) of delivery should be identified on the review schedule.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Nipissing University must review its list of programs offered against its cyclical program review schedule to ensure the review schedule is up-to-date and that every program is scheduled for review at least once every eight years.

NEW PROGRAMS

1. Social Work: BSW

Introduction:

For a number of years, once Nipissing became a stand-alone university, faculty members at Nipissing University have proposed the development of an honours bachelor of social work degree. Prior to independence Nipissing University College, an affiliate of Laurentian University, provided the first two years and some upper year electives of Laurentian University's BSW and students completed the final two years of required courses at Laurentian University.

Stage I - Letter of Intent:

Based on the documentation presented for audit, a proposal was submitted for Stage 1 approval on December 11, 2009 which pre-dates the ratification of the NU-IQAP. The auditors are auditing the University's practices since the ratification of its IQAP in June 2011 and therefore will not comment on the steps taken in Stage I.

Stage II - Presentation of the Proposal Following the Completion of Stage I:

Stage II of program development took place under the NU-IQAP v1 and v2 beginning in early 2012 and ending with final approval in 2014 by the Quality Council.

The NU-IQAP v1, p. 17 indicates "the New Program Proposal will focus on the aspects outlined as the required information for PPC..." which is described in a section titled, Resource and Planning Information. This section includes reference to Appendix E of the NU-IQAP v1, which contains evaluation criteria to be addressed in a new program proposal and Appendix F includes Senate Criteria for Program Development.

The auditors noted that the initial proposal that went to PPC on February 23, 2012 was for two BSW programs- one to be offered on the North Bay campus as a four year program; the other to be offered in Muskoka as a one year program. The level of detail in the proposal did not appear to always be in conformity with the requirements in the NU-IQAP v1.

Prior to the proposal going for external review, the NU- IQAP (v1, p. 18) specifies that PPC should give conditional approval to the New Program Proposal. The auditors saw evidence of this approval in the March 2, 2012 agenda and minutes of PPC.

Administration and Coordination of External Review of New Programs

NU-IQAP v1, p. 18 specifies that at least one arm's-length external reviewer is required for new undergraduate programs and that a site visit is required. The NU-IQAP v1 requires that the proposing unit provide 4-6 nominees for the external member(s) to the VPAR with a brief description of each nominee. The auditors did not see evidence of this nomination process but did see email communications (March and April 2012) from the Interim VPAR to two external reviewers who both agreed to serve as reviewers for the BSW proposal.

During the site visit the auditors learned from the lead proponent of the program, the Dean and the VPAR that all steps in the nomination process had taken place (though written records of all of them were not available). For future audits it is recommended that records be kept of all stages required in the IQAP.

Site Visit

The Office of the VPAR confirmed the review and site visit with the external reviewers by e-mail on April 20, 2012. On April 27 the Office of VPAR confirmed with the reviewers the dates and schedule for the site visit (North Bay campus on May 14, 2012 and the Muskoka campus on May 15, 2012). The schedule of meetings was set up by the program proponents and the Office of the VPAR as described in NU-IQAP v1, p.19.

Reviewers' Report

NU-IQAP v1, p. 19 indicates that the reviewers should prepare a joint report that appraises the standards and quality of the proposed program against the criteria in Appendix E and Appendix F. The auditors did not receive documentation about what instructions were given to the reviewers about the review and the Reviewers' Report other than what was contained in an e-mail dated April 20, 2012 from the VPAR to the reviewers (which included the proposal as an attachment and a link to the university website where the IQAP could be found and a note that these documents would also be couriered to the reviewers).

The Reviewers' Report was received by the Dean of the Faculty of Applied and Professional Studies (and not the VPAR) on August 28, 2012, later than the four weeks stipulated in the IQAP (NU-IQAP v1. p. 19). The Reviewers' Report identified a number of issues and made a number of recommendations.

SUGGESTION 6: Nipissing University should ask external reviewers to send their Reviewers' Report to the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research.

Internal Response

NU-IQAP v1, p. 19 indicates that the VPAR will invite the unit proposing the program and the relevant Dean and, others as appropriate, to respond to the Reviewers' Report. The documentation presented for audit indicates that the Dean of the Faculty of Applied and Professional Studies asked the Office of VPAR to set up a meeting "of our committee" to draft a response, shift the proposal and finalize a submission to the Ministry. The auditors were provided with documentation including the Response to the External Review prepared by the Interim Director of Social Work (undated) and the response prepared by the Dean and dated October 22, 2012.

Final Approval:

The BSW proposal, Reviewers' Report and the responses to the Reviewers' Report by the program and the Dean were on the agenda for the October 26, 2012 meeting of PPC. PPC sought clarification on a number of identified issues. The response to this request was reviewed at the November 23, 2012 meeting of PPC (NU-IQAP v1, p. 19).

At this meeting, PPC recommended to Senate Stage II approval "after suggested minor revisions have been made". Senate approved the proposal on December 14, 2012 and the Board of Governors approved financing and ancillary fees in January 2013. The University submitted the proposal for approval to the Quality Council on May 1, 2013. Each of these steps was undertaken in conformity with the NU-IQAP v 1. The Quality Council approved the program to be offered in the four year format on the North Bay campus in March 2014. The approval process included several interactions between the Appraisal Committee and the University and some changes to the proposal.

The University plans to admit the first students to the BSW program in fall of 2015 so the process of monitoring as a new program as described in the NU-IQAP has yet to begin.

2. Kinesiology: MSc

Introduction:

Nipissing University has had a Bachelor of Physical and Health Education program for several years with an enrolment of some 300 students. Student interest in a Master of Science program in Kinesiology has been strong, and the Department contends that faculty research interests would support such an initiative. The program would be located in the School of Physical and Health Education. The new program was approved by the Quality Council on December 18, 2014.

Stage I - Letter of Intent:

This step in the approval process took place under the first ratified version of NU-IQAP v1, p. 16 and 17. The University provided the auditors with a timeline document that indicated that this step was undertaken with the revised IQAP v2 but the auditors do not see how this would have been possible given that Stage I took place in 2012 and the re-ratification by the Quality Council did not occur until June 28, 2013. The IQAP (both versions) calls for approval by the sponsoring Faculty Council. If this step occurred, it was not documented for the auditors. In the NU-IQAP version under which this Stage I step was taken there was not a requirement for Graduate Studies Council approval of the letter of intent (that was added to the NU-IQAP v2 ratified in 2013). A proposal for a Master of Science in Kinesiology was received and approved by the Graduate Studies Council on October 15, 2012. The documentation included a letter of intent, as well as a description of the ways in which the program would fit with the Faculty's plan and priorities, and with the University's vision statement. Pertinent details of the program's plan were included in the report. At its meeting of October 26, 2012, PPC recommended to Senate Stage 1 approval of the Master of Science in Kinesiology. The auditors received documentation indicating Senate's approval of the Stage I

program proposal in an extract of the minutes of the Senate meeting of November 16, 2012.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Nipissing University must ensure that there is formal documentation of the approval of relevant governance bodies including Faculty Council, Senate Committees and Senate for quality assurance processes that require these approvals.

Stage II - Presentation of the Proposal Following the Completion of Stage I:

Resource and Planning Information

The University indicated that this stage took place under NU-IQAP v2 but as noted above, this stage began during the period in which NU-IQAP v1 was in effect. PPC received the revised Stage II Kinesiology Proposal on April 29, 2013 for consideration, which, once approved, would then be forwarded to Senate. There was to be a vote on the motion at the May 10, 2013 meeting of PPC. However there was no quorum. An electronic vote was subsequently held on May 15 and passed unanimously, and evidently sent to Senate, though there is no documentation of this in the file. It turns out that Stage II support should not have been sought from Senate until after the external review had been completed. This was subsequently corrected, and the report was re-submitted to Senate following the completion of the external review. (NU-IQAP v1. p. 19)

Administration and Coordination of External Review of New Programs

This step occurred after the re-ratification of the IQAP by the Quality Council and thus it was audited under NU-IQAP v2. The IQAP specifies that the proposing unit will provide the names of four to six nominees including a description of their qualifications and a rationale for their participation in the review to accompany the submission. The auditors received documentation that the School Director supplied to the Office of VPAR the names and contact information and general research interests of twelve potential reviewers by memo dated September 12, 2013. According to the NU-IQAP v2, the VPAR will consult with the Dean to select the reviewers. There is no documentation that this step occurred. Two reviewers from the list of nominees were invited by the VPAR in September 2013. They were sent a template for their Reviewers' Report on October 17, 2013 and the program proposal on October 23, 2013.

Site Visit

The schedule of interviews during the visit was developed by the proposing unit with input from the office of the VPAR (NU-IQAP v2, p. 21). The site visit took place November 7-8, 2013.

Reviewers' Report

All the steps regarding the Reviewers' Report were followed. The Reviewers used the template to complete their report and submitted it to the University on December 4, 2013, in conformity with the timelines in NU-IQAP v2, p. 21.

Internal Response

The Department's response to the report was submitted to the VPAR on February 4, 2014. There were no other written responses to the Reviewers' Report included in the documentation for audit. It is not clear whether the Dean and other units and/or post-secondary institutions, etc. were invited to respond and chose not to or if their responses were conveyed in a different form, for which there is no record. No letters of invitation are in the files. If the institution believes that any of these IQAP required invitations are extraneous⁴, it might consider modifying the IQAP requirements (NU-IQAP v2, p. 22).

Final Approval:

PPC discussed the proposal at its meeting on March 21, 2014. A motion to submit the program to the Senate for Stage II approval was approved. The auditors were provided an extract from the minutes of the Senate meeting of April 11, 2014 that a motion to approve the Stage II proposal was passed. The auditors did not see documentation of the program proposal being submitted or approved by the Audit and Finance Committee of the Board. (NU-IQAP v2, p. 22)

See **RECOMMENDATION 8**

The program proposal was submitted to the Quality Council Appraisal Committee on October 3, 2014. The Appraisal Committee sought clarification on November 4, 2014, which was provided on November 27, 2014 along with a revised program proposal. There was one additional request for information before the Quality Council issued its approval of the program on December 18, 2014 (NU-IQAP v2, p. 22).

⁴ The QAF does require a relevant Dean's (or delegate's) response to the External Reviewers' report.

MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

1. Teacher Education: BEd

Introduction:

The Bachelor of Education program is a signature program at Nipissing University and it has played a significant role in teacher education in Northeastern Ontario.

Stage I - Letter of Intent:

The program modifications were initiated as a result of a Provincial government policy that required teacher education programs to increase in length from one to two years. In consultation with sister education programs and the Quality Council, the University determined that the changes in teacher education program requirements could appropriately be made through the protocol for major modifications rather than as a new program development.

The modifications were made under NU-IQAP v2, p. 25. The auditors noted that the processes used at Stage I conform to the IQAP. The Letter of Intent was approved by the Faculty Council on October 29, 2013 and then by PPC on November 22, 2013. PPC forwarded a motion to Senate recommending approval to progress to Stage II. An extract of minutes of the Senate meeting of December 13, 2013 indicates approval of this motion.

Stage II – Proposal:

A comprehensive proposal was prepared using the relevant evaluation criteria in Appendix C and Appendix I (NUQAP v2, p. 25). The proposal was considered by the Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC) on November 20, 2013 and December 3, 2013. On December 9, 2013 the proposal was sent from USC to PPC which approved it on December 13, 2013. Extracts from the minutes of the Senate meeting of January 17, 2014 indicate that Senate approved the major modifications to the BEd Concurrent and Consecutive programs.

Annual Report to the Quality Council:

The Office of the VPAR provided a report on this major modification in the 2013-14 Annual Report of Major Modifications at Nipissing University to the Quality Council (NUQAP v2, p. 26).

Summary:

From both the documentation that was provided in advance of the site visit and from meetings with the Dean and Registrar and Institutional Planning, the auditors have concluded that this major modification followed the University's IQAP process at all stages with the possible exception of having moved to Stage II before it appears Senate had approved this action.

2. Master of Education: MEd

Introduction:

Curricular changes were made in the requirements for the MEd program in response to the expectations and needs of a more diverse student constituency. The modification changed the number of required and elective courses in the program (now two mandatory and eight elective courses vs three mandatory and seven elective courses). The change was implemented in Fall 2012. The auditors examined the process for this major modification for conformity with NU-IQAP, v1.

Stage I - Letter of Intent: (NU-IQAP, v1, p. 23)

There was no letter of intent from the program because the program officials were not aware that the proposed change was a major modification. The Graduate Studies Council approved the curriculum change at its May 10, 2012 meeting and forwarded its recommendation to the Senate. There is no indication from the file that PPC received the proposal or issued its approval. According to the Graduate Program Director, the proposal was viewed as a minor modification and was approved on this basis.

Stage II – Proposal: (NU-IQAP, v1, p. 23)

The file contains no evidence of a Stage II proposal being prepared or filed. However, the Graduate Program Director said that she was not aware that the change was filed as a major modification.

Governance: (NU-IQAP, v1, p. 23)

There is no documentation of PPC's approval of the changes in the file. Documentation is provided that Senate approved the change to the program on June 1, 2012. But it is not clear when and in what way the decision was made to forward this as a major modification. The changes to the program were reported as major modifications in the University's Annual Report on Major Modifications to the Quality Council on July 31, 2013.

Summary:

The changes made to this program signals a need for Nipissing to clarify and refine the distinctions between minor modifications, major modifications, and program changes. The University might consider the appointment of an arbiter to determine these distinctions. The respective roles of the Graduate Studies Council and the PPC in assessing and approving program changes also requires clarification. Academic reasons for changes such as those made to the Master of Education Program should be included in the documentation.

SUGGESTION 7: Nipissing University should consider naming an arbiter to assist in identifying when a program change is a major or minor modification or a new program.

CONCLUSION

In general, the auditors found that Nipissing University has been working diligently in following many of its processes in its IQAP. The auditors commend the University for engaging students throughout the review processes. They also commend the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research for briefing external reviewers in advanced of campus visits. The auditors were impressed by the willingness and candor of the Senior Academic Team to discuss both the opportunities and challenges in implementing a new Quality Assurance Program and IQAP. The notable problem that emerged across all cyclical program reviews audited was the absence of final assessment reports and implementation plans. The creation, approval, posting and distribution of the program's FAR and Implementation Plans as well as the provisions for tracking the Implementation Plan had not been done at the time of the auditors' visit for any programs reviewed. These are "Causes for Concern" as defined in the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF 2.5.2). The absence of decisions and action on recommendations to improve a program or remedy serious program deficiencies may be affecting the quality of student learning and, as observed by the auditors, is having an effect on the morale of faculty in these programs.

The audit report makes eight recommendations in areas where the auditors found that the University was not undertaking its quality assurance practices in conformity with the IQAP. Three of these recommendations are flagged as "Causes of Concern." The shortcomings identified in these recommendations require immediate action." The Report includes seven suggestions about how quality assurance practices might be improved.

The following are the auditors' recommendations and suggestions for Nipissing University's quality assurance process:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Nipissing University must:

1. comply with its IQAP to follow the processes for appointment of internal and external reviewers for cyclical program reviews or change the IQAP;

2. prepare and post on its website the Institutional Executive Summary and Associated Implementation Plan for each cyclical program review;
3. prepare and send the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan for each cyclical program review to Senate and to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance;
4. comply with its IQAP and implement the follow-up monitoring process identified in the IQAP for each program review;

CAUSES FOR CONCERN

5. ensure that the external and internal reviewers appointed are at "arm's-length" from the program to be reviewed;
6. ensure that the relevant officials (e.g. Dean; Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research) review and provide feedback to the program on self-studies created for cyclical program reviews to ensure that the self-study contains the information required in the IQAP;
7. review its list of programs offered against its cyclical program review schedule to ensure the review schedule is up-to-date and that every program is scheduled for review at least once every eight years; and
8. ensure that there is formal documentation of the approval of relevant governance bodies including Faculty Council, Senate Committees and Senate for quality assurance processes that require these approvals.

SUGGESTIONS

Nipissing University should:

1. consider requiring that the responsible authority sign and date the self-study as confirmation that it has been approved;
2. consider developing a template for self-studies for cyclical program reviews;
3. clarify the role of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research in the preparation of Final Assessment Reports to the PPC, and ensure that written documentation of Senate approval is included in the files;
4. clarify the role of the Planning and Priorities Committee in reviewing the self-study for cyclical program reviews;
5. consider clarifying in the IQAP who the final authority is to sign off on the documentation to be sent to the Reviewers for a cyclical program review;
6. ask external reviewers to send their Reviewers' Report to the Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research; and
7. consider naming an arbiter to assist in identifying when a program change is a major or minor modification or a new program.

Appendix A: Auditors

Dr. Caroline Andrew

For over 30 years, Dr. Andrew has led an academic and professional career at the University of Ottawa. She is currently a full professor at the School of Political Studies as well as the Director of the Centre on Governance. Dr. Andrew was also Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences from 1997-2005 and she was appointed a Distinguished University Professor for 2006-2007. As Dean, Dr. Andrew oversaw the cyclical review of several undergraduate programs in the Faculty of Social Sciences, including Psychology, Women's Studies and Sociology. Over the course of the reviews, her responsibilities included working in collaboration with the program directors to submit the auto-evaluations, meeting with the external evaluators and ensuring all program recommendations were met.

Dr. Andrew played a key role in the creation of the University of Ottawa's Women's Studies program. In addition, Dr. Andrew is part of an evaluation team for *Youth Futures*, a program she established that offers summer employment, leadership training and exposure to post-secondary education to high school students from families with little to no experience with post-secondary education. Dr. Andrew received the Ontario Francophonie Award (Francophile) in 2011 for her significant contribution to the advancement of the French language and culture in Ontario.

Dr. Paul Axelrod

Dr. Axelrod is a Professor and former Dean (2001-2008) in the Faculty of Education at York University. He is the author of numerous publications on higher educational history and policy development. His books include *Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980*; *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English-Canada during the Thirties*; *The Promise of Schooling: Education in Canada, 1800-1914*; *Values in Conflict: The University, The Marketplace, and the Trials of Liberal Education*, and (co-editor) *Making Policy in Turbulent Times: Challenges and Prospects for Higher Education*. He is the recipient of a number of academic honours, including the 2007 Smith Award for contributions to research and public policy on higher education awarded by the Council of Ontario Universities. His extensive administrative and service work includes, most recently, the chairing of York's Academic Planning, Priorities and Research Committee.

Dr. Anne-Marie Mawhiney

Dr. Mawhiney is currently on leave from Laurentian University, having completed a six month term as acting Vice President Research from July 2014 to January 2015 and a four year term as Special Advisor to the President. In this role she was responsible for projects delegated by the President, including leading work on the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan, and on "Have your Say: Striving for Organizational Excellence 2011," the first survey on Laurentian faculty and staff engagement.

From October 2012 to October 2013 she was Acting University Secretary and Legal Affairs in addition to her role as Special Advisor. From 2002 to 2009, Dr. Mawhiney was Dean of the Faculty of Professional Schools, and previously led the Institute of Northern Ontario Research and Development as Director, initiating and coordinating numerous social scientific research projects.

With a background in social policy and a special interest in Indigenous policy, Dr. Mawhiney was instrumental in the development of the Honours Bachelor of Social Work (Native Human Services) program at Laurentian. She has edited, authored or co-authored three books and a number of book chapters and peer reviewed articles.

Appendix B: List of Documents Reviewed by Auditors

All documents were provided in electronic format, or links were provided to the appropriate web address:

- Quality Assurance Framework
- Nipissing University's IQAP (ratified June 2011 and re-ratified June 2013)

General Documents Reviewed

- Nipissing University's Schedule of Cyclical Academic Program Reviews
- List of undergraduate and graduate degree programs as of September 29, 2014
- Status Report of 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (for PPC)
- Status Report of 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 (for PPC)
- Annual Report on Major Modifications – 2011-2012
- Annual Report on Major Modifications – 2012-2013
- Annual Report on Major Modifications – 2013-2014
- Minutes of the meeting of the Nipissing University Audit Team – October 28, 2014 and February 24, 2015
- Nipissing University's Membership List and Terms of Reference for its committees: Planning and Priorities Committee (PPC); Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC); and Graduate Studies Committee (GSC)
- Nipissing University Senate Bylaws

Program Documents for Social Welfare and Social Development

- Unit reminder regarding review – email from January 26, 2012
- PPC Agenda and Minutes from November 23, 2012
- Self-Study Brief November 8, 2012
- Unit's suggested list of internal and external reviewers – emails from April 27, 2012
- Invitations/responses: internal and external reviewers – emails from June 16, June 26, July 19, July 31, 2012
- Confirmation of review dates – email from July 12, 2012
- Sample Report Template provided to the review team – email from February 1, 2013
- Sample Report Template
- Self-Study sent to external reviewers – email from November 28, 2012
- Self-Study sent to internal reviewers – email from November 29, 2012
- Site Visit Agenda sent to review team – email from January 18, 2013
- Site Visit Agenda
- External reviewers' Report and Email – March 1, 2013
- Unit Response and Email - May 9, 2013
- Dean's Response and Email - May 9, 2013
- PPC Agenda and Minutes from September 20, 2013
- PPC Agenda from November 22, 2013

- PPC Recommendation of Final Assessment Report to Senate (Draft Report to Senate, November 22, 2013)

Program Documents for Native Studies

- Unit reminder regarding review – emails from January 23, April 9, and June 10, 2013
- Unit/Dean meeting with the VPAR to review self-study document – email from July 30, 2013
- PPC Agenda and Minutes from December 13, 2013
- Self-Study Brief December 13, 2013
- Units suggested list of internal and external reviewers – emails from September 13, October 18, October 29, and October 31, 2013
- Confirmation of review dates – email from October 24, 2013
- Sample Report Template provided to review team – email from February 4, 2014
- Teleconference with the VPAR – email from February 5, 2014
- Self-Study sent to review team – emails from January 22, 2014
- Site Visit Agenda
- External reviewers' Report and Email – June 9, 2014
- Unit Response and Email – October 19, 2014
- Dean's Response from June 26, 2014
- Dean's Email from July 2, 2014
- PPC agenda and minutes from October 24, 2014

Program Documents for History

- Unit reminders regarding review – emails from January 23, 2013 and April 9, 2013
- Meeting to discuss review procedures – email from February 13, 2013
- History and Classical Studies to be reviewed separately – email from June 10, 2013
- Unit/Dean meet with VPAR to review self-study document – email from July 9, 2013
- PPC agenda and minutes from November 22, 2013
- Self-Study Brief November 1, 2013
- Unit's suggested list of internal and external reviewers – emails from July 9, 2013
- Invitation to internal and external reviewers – emails from July 12, August 2, September 18, and September 19, 2013
- Confirmation of review dates – email from August 13, 2013
- Reviewers' Report Template sent to review team – email from February 25, 2014
- Self-Study sent to review team – emails from December 5, 2013 and February 5, 2015
- External reviewers' Report and Email – March 25, 2014
- Unit Response and Email – April 11, 2014
- Dean's Response from October 19, 2014
- Dean's Email from October 17, 2014
- PPC agenda and minutes from October 24, 2014

Program Documents for Social Work

- Stage 1 New Program Proposal (under UPRAC, 2008)
- Academic Planning Committee (APC) Meeting Agenda and Minutes – December 11, 2009
- APC Report to Senate – December 11, 2009
- Senate Minutes – December 18, 2009
- Stage II New Program Proposal – February 23, 2012
- PPC Meeting Agenda and Minutes – March 2, 2012
- Email Notifying Unit of External Reviewers' Selection – April 19, 2012
- Email Invitation to External Reviewers – March 28, 2012 and April 16, 2012
- Email Confirmation of Review Dates – April 27, 2012
- Email of Program Proposal and Site Visit Agenda to External Reviewers – April 20, 2012
- Site Visit Agenda – May 14 and 15, 2012
- External reviewers' Report and Email – August 28, 2012
- Unit Response to the External Reviewers' Report – undated
- Deans' Response to the External Reviewers' Report – October 22, 2012
- PPC Agenda and Minutes – October 26, 2012 and November 23, 2012
- Senate Minutes – December 12, 2012
- Audit & Finance Committee Minutes – January 14, 2013
- Appraisal Committee Letter to University – June 20, 2013
- University Response to Appraisal Committee (Letter and Email) – January 27, 2014
- Appraisal Committee Letter to University – January 15, 2014
- University Response to Appraisal Committee (Letter and Email) – February 19, 2014
- Quality Council Email and Letter to University – March 13, 2014

Program Documents for Kinesiology

- Stage I Letter of Intent – September 2012
- GSC Minutes – October 15, 2012
- PPC Agenda and Minutes – October 26, 2012
- PPC Report to Senate – October 26, 2012
- Senate Minutes – November 16, 2012
- GSC Minutes- April 29, 2013
- GSC Motion for PPC Email – April 30, 2013
- PPC Agenda – May 10, 2013
- PPC Memo to GSC – May 23, 2013
- Stage II Program Proposal – May 2013
- Unit Email and List of External Reviewers – September 12, 2013
- Email Invitation to External Reviewers – September 17, 2013
- Email Confirmation of Review Dates – September 19, 2013
- Email of Sample External Reviewer Report Template – October 24, 2013

- Site Visit Agenda – November 7 and 8, 2013
- Email of Program Proposal to External Reviewers – October 23, 2013
- Email of Site Visit Agenda to External Reviewers – November 1, 2013
- External reviewers' Report and Email – December 4, 2013
- Unit Response Report – February 4, 2014
- PPC agenda and minutes from March 21, 2014
- PPC Report to Senate – March 21, 2014
- Senate Minutes – April 11, 2014
- Email of Program Proposal Brief to Appraisal Committee – October 3, 2014
- Appraisal Committee Letter to University – November 4, 2014
- University Response Letter to Appraisal Committee – November 27, 2014
- Revised Program Proposal Brief – November 27, 2015
- Email from Appraisal Committee to University – December 8, 2014
- Email from University to Appraisal Committee – December 9, 2014
- Quality Council Email to University – December 18, 2014
- Quality Council Letter to University – December 18, 2014

Program Documents for Teacher Education

- ARCC minutes – October 4, 2013
- ARCC report to the Education Faculty Council – October 4, 2013
- Letter of Intent – September 4, 2013
- Faculty Council Minutes - October 29, 2013
- PPC Agenda and Minutes - November 22, 2013
- PPC Report to Senate - November 22, 2013
- Senate minutes - December 13, 2013
- USC minutes - November 20, 2013 and December 3, 2013
- PPC agenda and minutes - December 13, 2013
- PPC Report to Senate - December 13, 2013
- Program Proposal Brief – December 13, 2013
- Senate Minutes - January 17, 2014)
- 2013-14 Major Modifications Report July 31, 2014
- Quality Council Letter from September 22, 2014)
- PVPAR response email from September 29, 2014)
- NU Letter to Quality Council - September 29, 2014)
- List of approved courses)
- List of courses by division
- Year 1 and Year 2 courses

Program Documents for Master of Education

- MEd Program Degree Requirements Proposal 2012

- GSC Minutes - May 10, 2012
- GSC Report to Senate - May 10, 2012
- Senate Minutes - June 1, 2012

Program Documents for Geography and Environmental Geography

- Report of the Academic Planning Committee - December 10, 2010
- Senate agenda and minutes – December 10, 2010
- Academic Regulations and Curriculum Committee (ARCC) minutes – November 10, 2011
- USC Minutes and report – December 15, 2011
- Senate minutes – February 2, 2012
- 2011-12 Major Modifications Report to the Quality Council

Appendix C: Schedule of Auditors' Site Visit

Auditors: Caroline Andrew
Paul Axelrod
Anne-Marie Mawhiney

Quality Assurance Secretariat:
Donna Woolcott
Hillary Barron

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Time	Participants	Location
9:00 am	Audit Team Planning Meeting	F307
10:00 am	Harley D'Entremont, Provost and Vice-President, Academic & Research Jamie Graham, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Planning and Quality Assurance	F303
11:00 am	Bachelor of Social Work Program Anne Wagner, Chair	F303
12:00 pm	Audit Team Meeting	F303
1:00 pm	Bachelor of Education Program (Teacher Education) Carole Richardson, Interim Dean Jamie Graham, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Planning and Quality Assurance	F303
2:00 pm	Graduate Studies Council Murat Tuncali, Interim Dean of Arts and Science Carole Richardson, Interim Dean of Education Hilary Earl- Graduate Coordinator MA Michelann Parr- Graduate Coordinator MEd Jeff Dech- Graduate Faculty in Social Science Jennifer Barnett- Graduate Faculty in Education Nancy Black, Library Jamie Graham, Registrar	F303

Thursday, March 26, 2015

Time	Participants	Location
9:00 am	MSc Program in Kinesiology Jim McAuliffe, Director, Physical & Health Ed Carole Richardson, Dean of Education	F303
10:00 am	Meeting with Student Senators Jordan Andrews (BSc Psychology – 4 th year) Kerri Sawyer (BA Marketing – 3 rd year) Ian Hall (BA Criminal Justice – 4 th year)	F303
11:00 am	Meeting with Deans Carole Richardson- Education Murat Tuncali- Arts and Science	F303
12:00 pm	Audit Team meeting	F303
1:00 pm	Graduate program in History Katrina Srigley, Chair Françoise Noël	F303
2:00pm	Senate Planning and Priorities Committee Murat Tuncali Roxana Vernescu Greg Brown Glenn Brophey Matti Saari Uldis Kundrats Aroha Page Elizabeth Ashworth Jamie Graham Nancy Black	F303
3:00 pm	BA/BSc Geography/Environmental Geography Sean O'Hagan, Chair Dan Walters	F303
4:00 pm	BA Social Welfare and Social Development Larry Patriquin, Chair	F303

Friday, March 27, 2015

Time	Participants	Location
9:00 am	Program in Native Studies Terry Dokis, Program Coordinator	F303
9:45 am	MEd program Michelann Parr, Graduate Studies Chair	F303
10:30 am	Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee Jamie Graham Matti Saari Murat Tuncali Astrid Steele James Abbot Anne Wagner Tara-Lynn Scheffel	
11:30 am	Meeting with President and Vice Chancellor: Dr. Mike DeGagné	F303
12:30 pm	Audit Team wrap up meeting	F303
1:30 pm	Audit Team de-brief with Provost and Vice-President, Academic and Research and Assistant Vice-President, Institutional Planning and Quality Assurance	F303