ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES
COUNCIL on QUALITY ASSURANCE

SUMMARY OF AUDITORS' REPORT ON THE SCOPE OF YORK UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT

SEPTEMBER 2017

REPORT CONTENTS:

1. **SUMMARY:** SUMMARY OF THE AUDITORS' REPORT ON THE INSTITUTIONAL ONE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT OF YORK UNIVERSITY

2. **APPENDIX 1:** YORK UNIVERSITY'S ONE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE TO THE QUALITY COUNCIL AUDIT

SUMMARY OF THE ONE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE ON THE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT OF YORK UNIVERSITY

The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) undertook an Audit of Quality Assurance at York University in 2015-16. As with all such audits, the purpose was to assess the extent to which York complies with its own Institutional Quality Assurance Processes (outlined in the York YUQAP) and to affirm that the institution's IQAP is consistent with the Quality Assurance Framework that governs quality assurance activities at publicly assisted Ontario Universities.

A team of three Quality Council auditors was assigned to conduct the audit. They prepared a report based on a desk audit of documents submitted by York and a two-day site visit to the institution in November 2015. The Report on the Quality Assurance Audit of York (Audit Report) was approved by the Quality Council and sent to the University in May 2016.

The Quality Assurance Framework requires that each institution submit a One-Year Follow-Up Response to the Quality Council in which it describes the steps it has taken to address the Recommendations in the Audit Report. This Response is reviewed by the auditors, who then prepare a Report to the One-Year Follow-Up Response as well as a Summary of that Report, for consideration by the Audit Committee and, ultimately, by the Quality Council. Upon approval of the Institutional One-Year Follow-Up Response by the Quality Council, the Institutional One-Year Follow-Up Response and the Summary of the Auditor's Report are published on the Quality Council website.

In May 2017, York submitted its One-Year Follow-Up Response, which included explanations of how it had addressed each of the Recommendations. While not required to do so by the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF), York had also addressed each of the Suggestions. The auditors reviewed the documentation and conferred in the drafting of their Report and Summary.

The 2016 Audit Report for York contained 11 Recommendations (listed below) and 12 Suggestions. Recommendations are made when auditors have identified practices that are not in compliance with an institution's IQAP or when they have noted instances where an institution's IQAP is not consistent with the Quality Assurance Framework. Institutions are obliged to respond to the Recommendations in their One-Year Follow-Up Response. Suggestions are made when auditors think there are ways in which the quality assurance practices at an institution could be improved. As noted above, institutions are not obliged to respond to Suggestions in their One-Year Follow-Up Response.

_____

RECOMMENDATION 1: Retain complete and accurate documentation for each stage of all quality assurance processes.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Ensure that every program is reviewed at least once every eight years.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Provide comprehensive information in the self-study or new program proposal to ensure that all of the evaluation criteria are addressed.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Ensure that identified authorities who approve the self-study check that the content of the document includes all the relevant information required by the YUQAP.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Document how external reviewers are chosen to participate in quality assurance processes.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Enhance the methods of briefing the external reviewers on the requirement to address all the evaluation criteria set out in the YUQAP.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Amend the YUQAP to establish a clear process for the selection of the internal reviewer in the CPR processes.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Ensure that responsibility for contacting, selecting and vetting potential external reviewers is formally assigned to the Office of the Vice Provost Academic in conformity with the YUQAP.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Ensure that the "senior academic lead" from the academic unit arranges and manages the site visit of the reviewers (as set out in 7.8.4) or revise the YUQAP to indicate that the Office of the Vice Provost Academic oversees these aspects of the CPR process.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Ensure that the final approved documents posted on the Vice-President Academic and Provost's Website on Quality Assurance conform to the description set out in "Reporting requirements and Access" (YUQAP 7.9.4).

RECOMMENDATION 11: Include on the Periodic Review Schedule all programs offered.

_____