

The University of British Columbia
Okanagan Campus

Institutional Report

Quality Assurance Process Audit (2021)

Prepared for the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills & Training



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Okanagan Campus

May 6, 2021

1 of 30

1.	Institution Profile	3
	<i>Student Enrolment</i>	3
	<i>Campus Locations</i>	3
	<i>Program Offerings</i>	3
	<i>International partnerships</i>	4
	<i>Institution Mandate</i>	4
2.	Quality Assurance Policy and Practice	5
	<i>Introduction</i>	5
	<i>Senate Policy for External Reviews of Academic Units</i>	6
	<i>Accreditation</i>	6
	<i>Learning Outcomes and Assessment</i>	7
	<i>Student Progression and Academic Success</i>	8
	<i>Excellence Funds</i>	8
	<i>Academic Appointments and Terms of Appointment</i>	9
	<i>President's Academic Excellence Initiative</i>	11
	<i>Recruitment</i>	11
	<i>Faculty Professional Development</i>	12
3.	Self-Evaluation Approach	12
	<i>Development of the Institution Report</i>	12
4.	Quality Assurance Process Audit (QAPA) Self Study	14
	<i>Overall Process</i>	14
	<i>Scope of the process</i>	15
	<i>Self-study template</i>	16
	<i>External Reviewers</i>	17
	<i>Response to External Review Report</i>	17
	<i>New program approvals</i>	18
	<i>Program Concept and Viability</i>	18
	<i>Faculty Approval (1 – 2 months)</i>	19
	<i>Senate Approval (1 – 2 months)</i>	19
	<i>Board of Governors Approval (3 months minimum)</i>	20
	<i>Ministry Approval (6 – 8 months minimum)</i>	20
	<i>Guidelines for new programs</i>	20
	<i>Quality Improvement</i>	21
	<i>Institution Assessment</i>	23
	<i>4.2 Review Findings</i>	26
	<i>Institution Assessment—Review Findings</i>	27
5.	Other Institution Commitments	29
6.	Program Samples	29
7.	Appendix	29

1. Institution Profile

Student Enrolment

The below data are based on enrolment as of March 1, 2021.

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Degree Programs	Non-Degree Programs
Full-time equivalent (FTE)	9,213	960	10,128	45

For a full report of enrolment at UBC, please refer to the [2019/20 Annual Report on Enrolment](#) in Appendix 1.

Campus Locations

We respectfully acknowledge the Syilx Okanagan Nation and their peoples, in whose traditional, ancestral, unceded territory UBC Okanagan is situated. Since our inception in 2005, UBC Okanagan has worked together with the Syilx Okanagan Nation to enhance education and support Syilx Okanagan Indigenous culture, history, language, philosophy and knowledge. UBC Okanagan is grateful for this partnership and is dedicated to continuing to strengthen and grow this relationship.

UBC Okanagan is located in the city of Kelowna, British Columbia and is home to nine faculties and schools, some of which are shared with UBC's Vancouver campus, the first UBC campus to be established.

The Okanagan campus continues to grow rapidly, both in terms of student enrolment and physical campus size. A testament to this growth is the recently approved UBC presence in downtown Kelowna, established to better serve local communities and support future regional needs. Construction for this new project is expected to begin in 2022.

Program Offerings

Total number of credential programs offered by credential level.

Credential Type	# of Programs
Bachelor Degrees	11
Masters Degrees	10
Doctoral Degrees	1
Certificate	3
Diploma	2

International partnerships

List international partnerships involved in the delivery of programs which results in the conferring of a credential.

UBC Okanagan does not currently have any international partnerships that lead to the conferring of a credential. Students may participate in UBC's Go Global study abroad program, which allows students to complete up to one year of courses eligible for transfer credit at an approved UBC partner institution.

Institution Mandate

Describe how the institution's Mandate impacts or influences the quality assurance mechanisms employed by the institution (300 words maximum)

The [Mandate Letter to UBC](#) (2020) indicates two priorities for UBC Okanagan: reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples and taking action towards a low-carbon economy. The letter outlines that UBC Okanagan commits to:

1. Support lasting reconciliation with Indigenous peoples through initiatives that increase the participation and success of Indigenous learners and implementation of the education-related Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action.
2. Contribute to an accessible and relevant post-secondary system.
3. Develop and recognize flexible learning pathways for students to access post-secondary education and skills training.
4. Strengthen workforce connections for student and worker transitions.

These priorities and commitments are also articulated in UBC Okanagan's strategic planning documents: [Shaping UBC's Next Century](#) and [UBC Okanagan 2040 Outlook](#). Several initiatives are underway to support these commitments and enhance the quality of academic programming across the institution for all. For example, UBC Okanagan has a supportive admissions process for Indigenous undergraduate applicants. Indigenous applicants who are not admissible to a degree program through standard admissions pathways can be invited to enroll in Aboriginal Access Studies through a personalized offer letter. Through this process, our campus has increased the access, participation and success of Indigenous learners.

UBC Okanagan's processes for academic reviews and program proposals (described in detail throughout this report) reflect a priority to ensure academic programs are accessible and effectively prepare

students for post-graduate employment. Newly developed and revised programs have adopted increased work-integrated learning, seizing the advantages of a centralized campus co-op program.

Initiatives are also underway to support the development of both credit and non-credit opportunities to help students develop skills-based competencies and increase accessible and flexible learning pathways for the broader community.

Finally, units across UBC Okanagan participate in discipline-specific, annual provincial articulation meetings to support and increase student mobility through the BC Council's Transfer and Articulation program (BCCAT).

2. Quality Assurance Policy and Practice

This report introduces the QAPA team to the internal processes currently in use at the institution and other materials needed during the site visit. Describe how the internal policies and program review processes are reflective of the institution's mission and whether the internal process gauges such things: how faculty scholarship and professional development inform teaching and continue to be a foundation for ensuring that programming is up to date, how learning outcomes are being achieved, and how student progress is assessed and measured. This report introduces the QAPA team to UBC Okanagan's internal processes and other materials needed during the site visit.

Introduction

UBC Okanagan has numerous policies and practices that support and enhance the quality of teaching and learning, many of which are shared with the Vancouver campus. Although the Okanagan campus has its own Senate, the Board of Governors oversees both campuses, bearing responsibility for the management, administration and control of the property, revenue, business and affairs of the University, as conferred by the *BC University Act*. The Board of Governors' policies on academic appointments, renewal and tenure and promotion are shared across campuses (for example: [AP3 on Board of Governors Appointments](#); [AP4 on Faculty Term Appointments](#); [AP9 on Academic Heads](#); [AP10 on Postdoctoral Fellows](#); [SC6 on Scholarly Integrity](#); [LR2 on Research](#); and [SC3 on Conflict of Interest](#) — see Appendix 2).

Since the Okanagan campus' inception in 2005, the campus has experienced rapid growth, not only in student enrolment—from 3,500 to over 11,000 students— but also in academic program offerings—from 16 to 26— along with services available to students, faculty and staff, as well as substantial infrastructure growth. This has led to continuous and ongoing changes and development of strategic goals and priorities.

The Senate is currently deliberating enhancing and updating policies and practices that contribute to quality teaching and learning, an exercise informed by the recent QAPA audit of UBC's Vancouver campus. Specifically, this effort is considering policies, guidelines and practices related to academic

reviews. Such efforts are also informed by the current campus strategic vision document, [2040 Outlook](#) (see Appendix 3) and [Shaping UBC's Next Century](#), UBC's current strategic planning document (see Appendix 4). This work is also supported by the newly created position of Associate Provost, Academic Programs, Teaching and Learning role in the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic Okanagan (Provost's Office).

Senate Policy for External Reviews of Academic Units

At UBC Okanagan, programs are reviewed within the context of their academic units. A unit is defined as a faculty, school, institute, centre, department or other administrative unit within the University. This process is guided by the [Senate policy on Reviews of Administrative Units](#) (see Appendix 5), Board of Governors policy on the [Extension of Deans](#) (see Appendix 6) and a set of [Principles, Procedures and Guidelines](#) (PPG) (see Appendix 7), which were formalized by the Provost's Office in 2014 and mirror UBC Vancouver's approach. Additionally, the Provost's Office has developed web-based accompanying resource packages and information to support units. The Okanagan Planning and Institutional Research Office (OPAIR) also plays a key role in supporting units preparing for external reviews.

The Terms of Reference (TOR) provided by the Provost's Office offer flexibility for the unit under review to ensure relevance to their context and discipline. The TOR may also be adapted to a unit's specific areas of concern or focus for peer review.

Additionally, the Senate approves any further academic review guidelines for a particular Faculty. For example, the campus' two largest Faculties— the Irving K. Barber Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Irving K. Barber Faculty of Science— have used this mechanism to develop procedures for academic reviews that best serve their specific context and disciplines.

UBC Okanagan recognizes that policies and practices should be reviewed periodically for continuous improvement. Thus, the Senate-approved template for academic policies includes a section for cyclical renewal of the policy. The current Senate policies on [Reviews of Administrative Units](#) and PPG have not been updated in many years. This, combined with the learning taken from UBC Vancouver's QAPA audit, has led to a current review of both the Policies and the PPG by the Okanagan Senate. It is important to note that the Okanagan campus has immensely benefitted from the earlier review of the Vancouver campus to identify areas for growth and future direction.

Accreditation

UBC, as an institution, is not accredited by any external organization. However, many of our programs are accredited by one or more external agencies. As such, processes are in place to ensure academic programming is relevant and continuously updated to ensure it is of the highest quality and that it meets accreditation requirements.

Accredited UBC Okanagan programs		
Faculty	Degree or Program	Accrediting Body
Faculty of Health and Social Development	Master of Social Work (MSW)	Canadian Association for Social Work Education Association Canadienne Pour La Formation en Travail Social (CASWE-ACFTS)
	Bachelor of Science in Nursing	British Columbia College of Nurses and Midwives (BCCNM), and Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing/Association canadienne des écoles de sciences infirmières (CASN-ACESI)
Irving K. Barber Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	Clinical Psychology PhD	Canadian Psychological Association
School of Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science	Bachelor of Applied Science in: Civil Engineering Electrical Engineering Mechanical Engineering	Engineers Canada
Irving K. Barber Faculty of Science	Master of Science in Medical Physics	Commission on Accreditation of Medical Physics Education Programs (CAMPEP)
	B.Sc. in Chemistry	Chemical Institute of Canada
Okanagan School of Education, Faculty of Education	Bachelor of Education	BC Teachers' Council, BC Ministry of Education

Learning Outcomes and Assessment

UBC Okanagan is committed to identifying learning outcomes at the course and program levels, as reflected in our current institutional [Strategic Plan](#). Specifically, through [Strategy 12](#), UBC aims to reframe the design of undergraduate academic programs in terms of learning outcomes and competencies. For example, the recently revised Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Human Kinetics programs are structured around competency-based and program learning outcomes.

UBC Okanagan's Senate Curriculum Committee is guided by its Curriculum Guidelines, which are reviewed by the committee at the end of every academic year. The Guidelines require new courses and programs to clearly articulate their intended learning outcomes. The Senate Curriculum Committee's approval is also necessary for current courses to significantly change their learning outcomes, which ensures they are also updated in the Academic Calendar. The syllabus template in the Guidelines ensures this process is followed for all courses at UBC Okanagan, which is key for students' learning and academic success.

The Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offers support and resources to help instructors identify course or program learning outcomes, through guidance from an educational consultant and/or instructional designer. Further support is currently underway through a UBC-designed web application—the [Curriculum Mapping Tool](#)— that will soon allow instructors to engage in curriculum mapping from a backward-design perspective by focusing on learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, as well as assessment methods. This same tool will allow program coordinators to visualize their academic programs, in turn helping them gather pedagogical evidence to re-design programs towards an enhanced student learning experience and higher relevancy to the workforce after graduation via career-related competencies and alignment to high-demand occupations in the province.

The Senate recognizes the importance of having units and faculty members increasingly align assessment activities and course learning outcomes. Although it is recognized that types of assessments within a particular course are influenced by a number of factors, including the learning outcomes, the level of the course, the discipline and the instructor, academic units across UBC Okanagan have developed curriculum committees to provide a coordinated effort and oversight to ensure assessment methods remain appropriate and assess the course learning outcomes. In addition, there is work underway to understand how the integration of different learning technologies can support more creative assessments (e.g. peer and group-based assessment activities), as well as overall course design and delivery.

Some units have Indigenous engagement committees and community advisory committees who work with the unit's curriculum committees towards ongoing development and updating of curricula. Further, units with a strong experiential learning component, such as the Bachelor of Human Kinetics, Bachelor of Management, Bachelor of Science in Nursing and Masters of Social Work, among others, have dedicated staff to support both students and key relationships with employers/industry partners to inform academic programming.

Student Progression and Academic Success

Student progression and academic success is a priority at UBC Okanagan. A number of committees, services and supports have been put in place to help students succeed academically. The Student Academic Success Committee (SASC) was formed in 2017. The committee membership includes associate deans or associate directors of both undergraduate and graduate programming, as well as those in leadership positions within student services. The committee's mandate is to discuss and promote best practices across the campus related to student success and to bring forward challenges arising from policies, procedures, support services and/or initiatives that affect students from more than one degree program, in an effort to promote solutions. In addition, the academic and student services portfolios have successfully brought together a number of student learning services that comprise the Student Learning Hub (SLH), where students from any discipline can access a wide-range of resources to help them succeed academically.

Excellence Funds

Since 2016, the Provost's Office has allocated a portion of the campus' annual revenue to advance and strengthen academic excellence through [the Excellence Fund](#). The Excellence Fund supports ambitious

research initiatives that provide significant transformative learning opportunities and contribute to the campus' Outlook 2040 goals.

Academic Appointments and Terms of Appointment

At UBC Okanagan, approximately 450 faculty members are represented by the UBC Faculty Association. The [Collective Agreement](#) (Appendix 8), [Board Policy AP3](#) and [Board Policy AP9](#) govern the rigorous academic review processes to ensure that the award of a UBC academic appointment remains consistently high. That said, the framework of the Collective Agreement and Board Policy AP9 provide individual academic units flexibility and autonomy to also meet requirements of individual disciplines.

The process for selecting candidates for tenure-track or tenured appointments within an academic unit (e.g. faculty, department, school) may vary but, in most cases, begins with the establishment of a search committee that reviews applications to assess and rank the applicants. Search committees typically include professors and students from the unit but may also include faculty from other units and/or industry or community partners. Search committees receive support from other UBC departments, such as Faculty Relations and Human Resources. To address diversity commitments, in accordance with the [Federal Contractors Program](#), the Equity and Inclusion Office provides training and guidelines to mitigate selection bias.

Shortlisted applicants are usually approved by the dean and visit the campus, meet with multiple campus stakeholders and give a public presentation on their research and/or teaching (e.g. a 'mock class' on a prescribed topic).

Once the committee decides on a successful candidate, the appointment process moves into an academic review of the candidate's file, in accordance with the provisions of the [Collective Agreement](#). Beginning at the unit level, a committee of tenured and tenure-track faculty will deliberate and make its recommendation to the dean. It is important to note that the constitution of the committee will vary depending on the rank under consideration for appointment. The head or director has a separate vote independent of the committee.

The dean ensures that the department's review was procedurally sound and that the committee's recommendation aligns with the supporting evidence. Should the appointment also be considered for tenure, the dean will further consult with a Faculty committee. The dean makes a recommendation to the president and, in the case of a tenured appointment, or appointments above the rank of assistant professor or associate professor of teaching, the president will seek the recommendation of a Senior Appointments Committee, which is comprised of 20 full professors from across the institution. While the Board of Governors retains the authority to make appointment or tenure decisions, the president is empowered to provide the final decision.

A streamlined appointment process is outlined in the most recent [Guide to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures at UBC](#) (updated September 2020). The streamlined process is intended for use in extraordinary circumstances only and is designed to facilitate exceptional new senior appointments to UBC where the candidate is being considered for a senior administrative position. Senior appointments include associate professors with tenure, professors of teaching with tenure or professors with tenure.

UBC'S comprehensive hiring process provides various checks and balances to ensure that UBC follows transparent and objective processes to recruit the highest quality applicants.

Tenure-Track Appointments

UBC has two tenure-track streams for faculty members: the research and teaching stream (RT) and the educational leadership (EL) stream. Members of both streams are evaluated on their teaching and service contributions. Those in the RT stream are also evaluated on the quality and significance of their scholarly activity, while those in the EL stream are evaluated on the quality and significance of their contributions to educational leadership.

For appointment as an assistant professor, members within the RT stream require demonstrated scholarly activity and achievement and must show actual or potential ability to instruct in their discipline. For appointment as an assistant professor of teaching, members within the EL stream require completion of academic or professional qualifications, commitment to teaching and potential of educational leadership.

Promotion for Tenure-Track Academic Appointments

The initial appointment for an assistant professor within the RT stream is made for a four-year term, followed by a reappointment for a second four-year term. The seventh year includes a mandatory review for promotion and tenure. The criteria for promotion to associate professor (RT stream) requires successful teaching, sustained and productive scholarly activity, the ability to direct graduate students and participation in the affairs of the academic unit and the university. For promotion to professor (RT stream), candidates must have made outstanding contributions to teaching and service while achieving distinction in their field of scholarship.

Initial appointment for an assistant professor of teaching within the EL stream is made for a three-year term, followed by reappointment for a second three-year term. The fifth year includes a mandatory review for promotion and tenure. The criteria for promotion to associate professor of teaching (EL stream) requires excellence in teaching, innovation in curriculum and demonstrated educational leadership. Promotion to professor of teaching is based on outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership, along with innovative and sustained contributions to curriculum development and design initiatives that contribute to excellence in teaching and learning.

As with the initial appointment process, promotion and tenure processes proceed in accordance with the [Collective Agreement](#). The heads, directors and deans consult with advisory committees that review and deliberate on the candidate's file and make their recommendations to the president, who consults with the Senior Appointments Committee. Within the academic unit, these advisory committees typically include only tenured members of the same rank or higher. The committee will select external academic referees to provide feedback, following which it will deliberate on all of the evidence and then, ultimately, make its recommendation of appointment to the dean. It's important to note that there is only one opportunity to be reviewed for tenure. If unsuccessful, the candidate is given notice of a terminal year before their UBC employment ends.

To support faculty success through the pre-tenure period, faculty members are required to meet annually with their unit/department head to review their progress in meeting the criteria for

reappointment, promotion and tenure. Together, they will review the faculty member's progress as informed by the candidate's evolving dossier, including evidence of their research record (RT stream) or educational leadership activities (EL stream), peer review and student evaluations of teaching, service contributions and other relevant material. The head will clarify expectations and processes, recognize the member's successes and identify and provide support to ameliorate deficiencies. The head will document the process and send a copy of the record to the candidate to ensure that an accurate record of the discussions is available for future reference.

Other Academic Appointments—Lecturers & Sessionals

Lecturers are faculty members hired on contracts for up to five years with a right of re-appointment subject to demonstration of excellence in teaching and service contributions.

Sessional lecturers are contract faculty who are predominantly hired on four-month contracts to teach specific courses. The university is making a concerted effort to reduce the need to hire sessional lecturers. The Okanagan campus has seen success with the establishment of the Academic Excellence Initiative (see details below). The Collective Agreement governs the provisions for performance evaluation and renewal of appointments for lecturers and sessional faculty.

There are a number of [policies and expectations](#) outlined for all faculty and staff that highlight both principles and rules that are expected to be upheld and/or followed as members of a public institution.

President's Academic Excellence Initiative

In March 2020, President Santa Ono launched the [Academic Excellence Initiative \(PAEI\)](#), otherwise referred to as the Academic Renewal Plan. This ambitious initiative is intended to extend UBC's research impact as a major university through the strategic recruitment of research-based faculty members without sacrificing existing teaching excellence at all program levels. At UBC Okanagan, the PAEI seamlessly links to the campus' Outlook 2040 strategic plan in supporting research excellence and transformative learning experiences for students.

Recruitment

Since July 1, 2020, UBC Okanagan Faculties have recruited approximately 22 research-based faculty members inclusive of two deans and the deputy vice-chancellor and principal. This recruitment trend is likely to continue in the upcoming academic year. Since its inception in 2005, UBC Okanagan has continued to experience an accelerated growth trajectory and recruitment efforts are balanced to ensure that new faculty are appropriately resourced and provided with access to labs, classrooms and professional and personal support.

Commitment to Indigenous Engagement and Diversity

The university is deeply committed to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Call to Action through ongoing reconciliation efforts and Indigenous engagement. It is further committed to reflecting a workplace and academic climate that is diverse and dynamic. To support these commitments, last year the Provost's Office provided Okanagan Faculties with term bridge funding to support eight new positions to be filled by Indigenous, Black or People of Colour (IBPOC) faculty. During the upcoming

academic year, the Provost's Office will again provide Faculties with bridge funding to support eight additional IBPOC faculty positions.

Faculty Professional Development

UBC Okanagan has also established a number of resources and funding opportunities to support professional development. The two main supporting units are the Office of Research Services (ORS) and the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL). ORS has a number of research development officers who offer workshops and one-on-one support to faculty members as they develop their research programs. There are also a number of internal funding opportunities and awards to recognize the research accomplishments of faculty. Similarly, the CTL has educational consultants who organize workshops, communities of practice and one-on-one support to help faculty enhance their pedagogical practice and educational leadership activities. Finally, the Provost's Office has established funding opportunities such as the [Aspire-2040 Learning Transformations Fund](#) and [Open Educational Resources Grant Program](#) to support curriculum development and pedagogical innovation. Additional [financial support](#) is provided to staff and faculty to support participation in external professional development opportunities, such as attending conferences and/or workshops, membership fees for professional organizations and fees and subscriptions for journals and books.

3. Self-Evaluation Approach

Provide a general overview of the approach used by the institution to complete its internal evaluation process (self-study) for the QAPA. This section should outline the following: the main issues of the self-evaluation; the membership of the institution's quality assurance team/committee members and their respective roles; the distribution of duties and responsibilities; data/ evidence collection procedures; data/ evidence analysis procedures used to critically assess the effectiveness of quality assurance mechanisms; and any consultations carried out.

The development of this report was a notable way to reflect on UBC Okanagan's accomplishments over the past 15 years, as well as areas for further opportunity and growth. Fruitful conversations and actions have stemmed from preparing this document, some of which are noted in the below sections, as relevant.

Development of the Institution Report

The Provost's Office supported the writing of this report through a working group comprised of:

- Interim Academic Lead, Centre for Teaching and Learning (chair)
- Chief Institutional Research Officer, Planning and Institutional Research
- Associate Dean, Teaching, Learning and Curriculum, Irving K. Barber Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
- Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Creative and Critical Studies
- Associate Director, School of Nursing
- Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Development and member of the Senate Academic Policy committee

- Academic Initiatives Manager, Provost and Vice-President Academic Office

The working group members provided guidance to answer all sections of this report using knowledge from their disciplines and units as well as the UBC Vancouver campus' QAPA report as a guide.

The Chief Institutional Research Officer played an integral role, ensuring the most up-to-date data and evidence was woven throughout this document. Data used for this report stemmed from published institutional reports, many of which are used for annual reporting to the Senate, Board of Governors and Ministry.

Additionally, campus stakeholders were consulted throughout the preparation of this report to ensure accuracy of information and to strike balance between the depth and breadth offered herein. Campus stakeholders included deans, members of the Student Academic Success Committee, the Director of Faculty Affairs, and the Senior Advisor to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor on Indigenous Affairs.

This report was reviewed by the Senate Academic Policy and Curriculum committees before being reviewed by the UBC Okanagan Senate in May 2021. Throughout this process, feedback and advice was gathered by the working group to inform the report in an iterative manner. Not surprisingly, working on this document was difficult within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. In-person conversations and reflections were missed.

This report served as a primer for the establishment of the first Associate Provost, Academic Programs, Teaching and Learning position, which was filled in May 2021. Together with this report, this new role will be a catalyst for further initiatives and work around quality assurance and enhancement on our campus.

4. Quality Assurance Process Audit (QAPA) Self Study

Overall Process

Does the process reflect the institution's mandate, mission, and values? The institution should be able to demonstrate that it has an established institutional and program review planning cycle and process to assess the effectiveness of its educational programs and services, their responsiveness to student, labour market, and social needs. The process should contribute to the continuous improvement of the institution. Describe how the institution meets this criterion. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

The cyclical reviews of units at UBC Okanagan are governed by the [Senate policy on Reviews of Administrative Units](#) (see appendix 5) the [Board of Governors policy on Extension of a Dean's Appointment](#) (see Appendix 6), and [the Principles, Procedures, and Guidelines \(PPG\) for External Academic Unit Reviews](#) (see Appendix 7). The latter was formalized by the Provost's Office in 2014 to complement the Senate policy which pre-dates the creation of the Okanagan Senate in 2005.

“Units”, as noted above, refers to departments, institutes, centres, schools, faculties, or other administrative units within the university. Academic programs offered by the unit, including undergraduate, graduate and professional programs, are collectively examined as part of that unit's academic review. In the case of undergraduate units offering graduate-level programs, the unit works with the College of Graduate Studies to address them.

The Senate policy states that Faculties are authorized and encouraged to design additional Senate-approved processes to guide their cyclical academic reviews. The Irving K. Barber Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Irving K. Barber Faculty of Science, the campus' two largest Faculties, formalized their Statement of Principles, Procedures and Guidelines (PPG) for External Reviews of Units in 2016 (see Appendix 9).

While the timing of the reviews is not strictly enforced by the current Senate policy, the PPG stipulates that “reviews are normally conducted every five years and the time interval between reviews must not exceed ten years.” In addition, an external review may also be initiated by the head, dean, provost, senate or, by other circumstances, such as accreditation requirements, revision of curriculum, joint initiatives with other units and/or a re-deployment of resources. The Board of Governors policy (see Appendix 6) calls for a review of Faculties when the dean's appointment is approaching expiration and there is consideration of extending the appointment for more than one year. Similarly, the appointment and extension of department heads is also informed by the most recently completed review of their academic unit (see Appendix 5), as per Board of Governors policy AP9.

An external review begins with a conversation among the leadership of the academic unit, including the Office of the Dean and senior administration of the university, as applicable. This allows for the selection and refinement of the terms of reference that will guide the purpose and focus of the academic review. A memo is sent to all unit members to inform them of the upcoming review, reviewers and site-visit dates.

Once a review is complete, units are asked to respond to the reviewers' report through an action plan that consolidates the strengths and weaknesses of the unit and its programs. Two years later, a report on the implementation of such actions must be filed with the dean or president, as appropriate, and the Senate Secretariat. On an annual basis, the Provost's Office reports to the Senate on the previous year's academic reviews via a summary of the reviewers' reports and the unit's responses.

The Provost's Office supports the reviews of units by making data available, offering templates and sharing resources, such as ways to provide the provincial context to those reviewers coming from outside British Columbia. The Provost Office makes resources available through its [website](#).

Scope of the process

There should be evidence of a formal, institutionally approved policy and procedure for the periodic review of programs against published standards that includes the following characteristics:

A self-study undertaken by faculty members and administrators of the program based on evidence relating to program performance, including strengths and weaknesses, desired improvements, and future directions. A self-study takes into account:

- *the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, admissions requirements, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and standards;*
- *the adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial, and human);*
- *faculty performance including the quality of teaching and supervision and demonstrable currency in the field of specialization;*
- *that the learning outcomes achieved by students/graduates meet the program's stated goals, the credential level standard, and where appropriate, the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting, or professional association;*
- *the continuing adequacy of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement to ensure that the program's stated goals have been achieved;*
- *the graduate satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduation rate; and*
- *where appropriate, the graduate employment rates, employer satisfaction level, and advisory board satisfaction level.*

An assessment conducted by a panel that includes independent experts external to the institution. The assessment should normally include a site visit, a written report that assesses program quality and may recommend quality improvements; and an institution response to the report. A summary of the conclusions of the evaluation that is made appropriately available.

Describe how the institution meets this criterion, including an overview of the policy and processes, a description of how the policy was developed, the formal approval process, and when the policy was last reviewed. The policy and processes for ongoing program and institutional assessment and other relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

Self-study template

The self-study of units under review is guided by the terms of reference chosen by the unit's leadership. A template for the self-study is included in the PPG in a modular manner so it can adapt to the needs of the unit.

Self-study outline:

1. Executive summary
2. Overview of the unit
3. Undergraduate instruction and learning module
 - a. Overview
 - b. Enrolment and recruitment
 - c. Curriculum review
 - d. Instructional models, assessment of learning
 - e. Teaching and learning evaluation and effectiveness
 - f. Student advising and development
4. Graduate and postdoctoral studies module
 - a. Graduate programs
 - i. Overview
 - ii. Recruitment, enrolment and completion
 - iii. Structure, curriculum/pedagogy and assessment
 - iv. Research mentoring (for programs with significant research component)
 - v. Environment resources
 - vi. Student finances
 - vii. Graduate student research productivity
 - viii. Post-graduation outcomes
 - ix. Graduate student report
 - b. Post-doctoral fellows
5. Research, scholarly and professional activity module
 - a. Faculty awards and distinctions
 - b. Research intensiveness and dissemination
6. Service and community partnerships
7. Aboriginal engagement
8. People and outstanding work environment
9. Resources, administration, and governance module
10. Response/follow-up on previous review
 - a. Head's summary

OPAIR supports the collection of relevant data for the self-study. The PPG outlines the below metrics to be included:

- Enrolment and recruitment statistics
- Teaching and learning evaluation and effectiveness
- Research intensiveness and dissemination
- Resources, administration and governance metrics

- Recruitment, enrolment and completion

The list of available metrics from OPAIR is continuously updated and made available to units via the Provost's Office's website to [support unit reviews](#) as appropriate for the most up-to-date list.

External Reviewers

The PPG requires at least two external reviewers. In practice, departments often select two external reviewers, while Faculty reviews often have three external reviewers. Similarly, required site-visits tend to take place over two days for departments and over three days for faculties. A list of suggested reviewers is provided to the Provost, who makes the final selection of reviewers in conversation with the unit's leadership.

The resources developed by the Provost's Office suggest that units invite their membership to recommend reviewers and produce a list considering the following:

- Academic leadership from peer institutions
- Relevant administration experience
- Understanding of the BC post-secondary education context (if not possible, plan to support them with this contextual information)
- Conflict of interest
- Gender balance
- Equity considerations
- For professional programs/faculties, consider including a member from the relevant professional community

In the case of Faculty reviews, once the Provost approves the reviewers, a memo is sent out to unit members, including the dates of the site-visit and an invitation to submit anonymous feedback via the Provost's Office. The Provost's Office will then redact the feedback, as needed, to ensure anonymity and append it to the self-study in advance of the site-visit (normally, at least one month ahead of the site-visit).

Response to External Review Report

A response to the reviewers' report by the unit must outline an action plan consolidating the strengths and weaknesses of the unit. This is the responsibility of the leadership of the unit under review, the unit's dean, the graduate studies dean and the senior administration of the University.

Additionally, the Provost's Office presents an annual report to Senate on all reviews completed the previous academic year. Such a report includes a summary of the reviewers' recommendations and the unit's response. When the unit under review is a Faculty or an administrative unit, the Provost's Office also makes the documentation publicly available via the office's website.

A report reviewing the implementation of recommendations is done within two years of the review and is forwarded to the appropriate executive lead as well as to the Senate Secretariat.

New program approvals

Describe how the institution meets this criterion, including an overview of the policy and processes, a description of how the policy was developed, the formal approval process, and when the policy was last reviewed. The policy and processes for the approval of new programs and other relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

The process for new program approval was created when the Okanagan Senate was formed in 2005 and was based on the existing Vancouver campus practices. The development of new programs is guided by the Senate-approved [Guide to Curriculum Submissions](#) (GCS) (see Appendix 10) for UBC Okanagan, which is reviewed and updated at the end of every academic year by the Senate Curriculum Committee. This document stipulates the formal processes and procedures to make any curricular changes in the institution before they can be implemented.

In 2017, the Provost's Office developed a complementary process to propose new programs preceding the Senate-required steps delineated by the GCS. This process was created in consultation with academic units and the Senate Secretariat to ensure clarity and streamlining, and most importantly, to support program proponents from the outset in developing a strong and successful application to Degree Quality Assessment Board when required. In this instance, the Provost's Office works with the program proponent to ensure early and meaningful consultation with peers in the province, potential employers, students and community members.

These two processes have proven to work well for the approval of one new program and the re-design of one existing program to date. Faculty members currently working on new academic program proposals have also provided feedback on its usefulness. Thus, the Senate Curriculum Committee formalized the Provost's Office's suggested steps in the GCS in April 2021. As a result, all proposals are now required, by Senate, to meaningfully engage with peers and community members prior to submitting the complete proposal to Senate for their review and approval. These changes also require proponents to identify jobs in BC for which program graduates would qualify for upon successfully completing the program.

Over time, the required Concept Paper for a new program (or re-design of an existing program), which triggers the entire process of approval, will be adapted to emphasize key areas identified by UBC's strategic plans and/or mandated by the Ministry.

The process for new program approval, including both the Provost's Office process and the GCS process, is as follows ([see accompanying checklist](#)) for the process in (Appendix 11):

Program Concept and Viability

1. An academic unit starts to develop a new degree program or a major change to an existing program.
2. The champions of the emerging new program are the proponents. The proponents advise their department's head (or director as appropriate) and dean's office that work is starting on the

development of an idea for a new program. The proponents should provide preliminary materials ([concept paper](#) (see Appendix 12) and preliminary Viability of Program Assessment) to the dean.

3. Following the dean's support, the proponents advise both the Senate Secretariat and the Provost's Office that a proposal for a new program is under development.
4. In preparation for ministerial approval (if applicable), the Provost's Office will work with the proponents to provide further strategic direction and start completing the Stage 1 Application Form (or other Ministry required forms). Submission to Ministry is done by the Provost's Office once the Senate and the Board of Governors have approved the new program or changes to an existing program.
5. Proponents continue to work with their Faculty financial manager to revise the Viability of Program Assessment Tool and the Concept Paper.
6. If the program is already offered at the Vancouver campus, Ministry approval may not be required. Instead, a learning outcomes map that compares and contrasts the two programs will be required. A template and support for this comparison is available through the Provost's Office.

Faculty Approval (1 – 2 months)

7. The proponents work closely with their Faculty to follow internal processes towards department and formal Faculty approval, considering feedback received thus far. Proponents are strongly encouraged to seek support from the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) in the development of curriculum and Enrolment Services/College of Graduate Studies (as appropriate) to plan for loan eligibility, admissions and scholarship details.
8. The proponents then complete required formal consultations with departments and Faculties across campus offering related programs and with any units or individuals expected to contribute to, support, or be impacted by the new program. If the proposed program is a graduate-level program, this includes the [Graduate Program and Curriculum Committee](#).
9. A final Viability of Program Assessment is completed by considering all consultations. The assessment is reviewed and approved by the dean and further supported by the Provost's Office.

Senate Approval (1 – 2 months)

Following Faculty approval, the proposal can move through the required Senate committees.

10. The Senate Secretariat can assist with ensuring the proposal is reviewed by the relevant committees (including the Senate Admissions Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee). Refer to [Senate Curriculum Guidelines](#) for further details and resources.

Simultaneously, proponents:

11. Start working with [AVP Students](#) to begin the student tuition consultation (as required by [Policy No. 71](#)). The consultation must be open for at least one month and the Faculty must respond, in writing, to any significant issues raised in the resulting Student Consultation. This entire process may take up to three months. Thus, it is important to start planning for student consultation as

soon as Faculty Council has approved the proposal. It is also encouraged that proponents start working with the recruitment and marketing teams to plan for program promotion.

Board of Governors Approval (3 months minimum)

12. Following Senate approval, the Senate will forward the proposal for Board of Governors for approval. The student consultation and Faculty response (if needed) must be added to the Board documents. Certificates or diplomas do not require Ministry approval. Thus, these may be implemented upon Board of Governors approval.

Ministry Approval (6 – 8 months minimum)

13. Upon the Board of Governors approval, the Provost's Office makes final edits to the Stage 1 Form (or any other required form) and forwards the proposal to the Ministry of Advanced Education for approval. The Provost's Office will advise proponents of ministerial approval once it has been granted.

Guidelines for new programs

Are the guidelines differentiated and adaptable to respond to the needs and contexts of different units, e.g., faculties or departments or credential level?

1. *The guidelines are adaptable to the range of programs and offerings within the institution.*
2. *The guidelines provide measurable, consistent means and direction to undertake diversified program review.*
3. *The guidelines are consistent with institutional Mandate, mission, vision and associated strategic goals.*

Describe how the institution meets these criteria. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

- 1) As noted above, a key feature of UBC's governance framework and the PPG for External Academic Unit Reviews is creating a set of consistent high-level expectations and criteria that are flexible enough to meet the needs of diverse academic units. This feature is evident in the modular template in the PPG for the self-study document, as well as the process of beginning an external review with conversations amongst the leadership of the academic unit, the Office of the Dean and senior administration to refine the scope and terms of reference of the review to meet the needs of the unit. In addition, it is noted in the PPG that units may incorporate elements from their accreditation processes towards fulfilling the UBC external review of their units, as relevant, keeping in mind that that different audiences may be looking at different indicators.
- 2) The external review process provides measurable, consistent means and direction. The PPG outlines the involvement from the Provost's Office with each review to ensure consistency of

process and direction and the use of a template for the self-study that allows for consistency of information (with flexibility to allow for some diversity based on the unit undergoing the review). In addition, OPAIR provides a set of data to all units in developing the self-study. Finally, the PPG outlines that the external review report and the unit's response must be shared back to the Provost's Office, which again helps ensure consistency in quality assurance processes across the institution.

- 3) The *Self-Study* component of the PPGs explicitly outlines a number of elements that allow the reviewers to assess performance and alignment with the unit/Faculty/University's strategic plans including: (a) undergraduate instruction and learning; (b) graduate and post-doctoral studies; (c) research, scholarly and professional activity; (d) service and community partnerships; (e) Indigenous engagement; and (f) resources, administration, and governance. In addition, within the *Structure and Selection of Review Committees*, the membership of the review team shall reflect a commitment to equity and balance in representation, which further reflects the mission of UBC Okanagan.

Overall, the PPG emphasizes the importance of academic reviews that serve the commitment in [UBC's Strategic Priority on Educational Renewal](#) to provide greater support to instructors and students and to provide excellent transformative learning opportunities to all.

Quality Improvement

- 1) *The institution should be able to demonstrate that it has appropriate accountability mechanisms functioning for vocational, professional, and academic programs.*
- 2) *The institution should be able to demonstrate how faculty scholarship and professional development inform teaching (including graduate teaching) and continue to be a foundation for ensuring that programming is up to date.*
- 3) *The institution should be able to demonstrate how learning outcomes are being achieved and how student progress is assessed and measured.*

Describe how the institution meets these criteria. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

- 1) The university has an appropriate accountability mechanism in place for reviewing units and their academic programs grounded in the Senate policy on Reviews of Administrative Units (see Appendix 5), the Board of Governors policy on Extension of a Dean's Appointment (see Appendix 6), and the Principles, Procedures and Guidelines (PPG) for External Academic Unit Reviews (see Appendix 7). Specifically, the PPG provides explicit guidelines, metrics and assessment criteria to be used in the review of academic units and their respective academic programs. In addition to meeting the criteria established by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Training, all credit-bearing programs must be approved by Senate and the Board of Governors.

The Senate Curriculum Committee and Admissions Committee have responsibility for approving non-credit-bearing programs, as per [Senate policy O-129](#) (see Appendix 13). Such policy requires the provost to submit information on non-credit program enrolment to Senate on an annual basis. The policy governing non-credit programs was developed and approved in 2018. Since then, two programs have been approved. It is expected that these programs are also reviewed when their units are reviewed. The Provost's Office is currently leading a working group to support non-credit initiatives using a quality assurance framework to develop high quality programs that are responsive to the community needs and British Columbia's labour market.

2) UBC is committed to scholarship and professional development that informs teaching and initiatives to foster innovative academic programs responsive to the changing needs of our students and communities. The tenure-track Educational Leadership stream is a concrete example of this commitment. There are also specific structures designed to support high-quality scholarship and teaching for all faculty, including the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the Office of Research Services (ORS), and the Provost's Office. The CTL provides technical and pedagogical support through one-on-one consultations, workshops and the establishment of communities of practice. Educational consultants also support curriculum development and revision as well as Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities and curriculum development. ORS offers a number of services and initiatives to support faculty members in obtaining both internal and external grants to support research and scholarship. It recognizes faculty who make significant scholarly contributions and encourages bringing this work into the classroom and/or mentoring students on research through a variety of undergraduate research awards or work-integrated learning opportunities. In addition, a number of initiatives and funding opportunities are available through the Provost's Office. For example, each year the Provost's Office funds numerous projects to support innovation in teaching and learning through [Aspire grants](#), the [Excellence fund](#), the [Program for Undergraduate Research](#), and the [Open Educational Resources Grant Program](#). The Provost's Office also recognizes outstanding and Innovative teaching through a number of [teaching awards](#). Finally, the Provost works closely with the UBC Executive, deans of the campus' eight Faculties and schools and supporting portfolios in the Provost's Office to deliver [strategic initiatives](#) that create an exceptional teaching and learning environment and foster academic excellence.

Student evaluation of teaching has been in place since UBC Okanagan's establishment. In 2009, a consistent set of university-wide questions were mandated for every course, with various units able to add questions at their discretion. In addition, units were encouraged to engage in both formative and summative peer-review of teaching to further support the development and implementation of high-quality pedagogical practices. In 2019, a cross-campus working group was formed to further review and make recommendations for improving evaluation of teaching within the institution, which led to the Senates on both campuses adopting a set of recommendations in May of 2020 that are currently in the process of being implemented. The main recommendations include: a change to the university-wide questions to have an increased focus on the student-learning process; instituting steps that would lead to a better understanding of bias in teaching evaluations; and working towards a more holistic approach to the evaluation of teaching, as opposed to a focus on the student and peer evaluations.

- 3) There has been a significant shift in recognizing the importance of curriculum mapping, whereby the course-level learning outcomes required by Senate when proposing new courses or making changes to current courses should align and/or link with broader program-level learning outcomes. Despite the identification of learning outcomes being relatively new to the Canadian post-secondary culture, particularly at the program level, UBC Okanagan is committed to the development of explicit program-level learning outcomes. Significant work has recently been completed or is actively underway in a number of academic units. For example, learning outcomes structured the redesigns of the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Media Studies and Bachelor of Human Kinetics programs, as well as new programs such as the Bachelor of Nsyilxcn Language Fluency and the Bachelor of Sustainability.

In addition, the Provost's Office is leading the development of a web application to support the design and evaluation of courses and programs so that alignment between learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and assessment methods, is articulated and strengthened. The tool will allow users to visualize this alignment towards supporting program design and re-design decisions. A group of staff members from the Provost's Office, Centre for Teaching and Learning, and the Library will support the use of this tool across campus once launched.

Institution Assessment

Based on the preceding responses in section 4.1, provide a critical assessment of strengths and areas for improvement in the quality assurance mechanisms described. Include how the institution will implement measures to address areas for improvement. This should include an evaluation of their impact on continuous quality improvement.

Considering the rapid growth and resulting competing priorities of our campus since its inception in 2005, the campus has done its best to ensure units and programs undergo external reviews according to the Reviews of Administrative Units Policy and the PPG. However, these efforts have had varying degrees of success. Discussions at Senate to date have identified areas for improvement and strengths that the revised policy on academic reviews (currently under review) will reflect. A similar policy is being considered by the UBC Vancouver Senate, creating the potential for a system-wide updated policy in fall 2021.

The updates under discussion include combining the integration of the guidelines offered through the PPG, the best practices offered by the Provost's Office and the strengths of the current policy into one cohesive policy document with attached procedures. This document will inform all academic reviews and minimize gaps around the required follow-up reporting, including the reporting required after the response from reviewers has been received and the report on progress, which is submitted two years later. These follow-up reports have been acknowledged to be missing in some of the completed reviews. The proposed new reporting format will be action-oriented which we believe will directly contribute to continuous quality improvement.

It is important to note that in completing this report, units provided great examples of multiple actions taken as a result of their reviews and recommendations, even if a formal response was not submitted. These actions included the design of a new program, re-design of existing programs and/or identification of strategic directions for a program or department. Therefore, in most cases, failing to provide a formal response to a review and/or report on progress within two years of a review has been a matter of capacity or resources rather than a lack of meaningful action based on the recommendations from the review.

The new policy for academic reviews will clarify the expectation of a five-to-seven-year cycle, including follow-up reports with consideration of how to best align the review of units who are accredited by external bodies in order to mitigate the increased workload involved in the review process. For example, processes that would allow externally accredited units that meet both our policy's terms of reference and the accrediting body's scope to be combined within one review process. This will ensure that reviews are done on a cyclical manner across all units without creating extra work.

Current strengths and best practices for academic reviews will continue to be part of the updated policy and its procedures. For example, the Provost's annual report to Senate on the previous year's academic reviews on campus, as well as flexible terms of reference to guide the reviews and provide adaptability to units to ensure relevancy. Another example is the work and support provided by OPAIR, including up-to-date evidence on the effectiveness of a unit and its programs.

Our current engagement with UBC Okanagan students is also a strength and has proven to be a successful driver for campus growth and ongoing quality improvement. OPAIR continuously supports program reviews, redesign initiatives and policy evaluations. OPAIR creates, deploys and analyzes student surveys and focus groups to gather evidence of interest for a new program, provide feedback on a current program, or determine impact of a new or current academic or non-academic policy. Most recently, this was paramount for the proposal of the Bachelor of Sustainability and the redesign of both the Media Studies and Human Kinetics degrees. OPAIR also continues to engage with students to evaluate the impact of changes proposed by Senate for the Student Experience of Instruction questionnaire. OPAIR recently launched a new website to make data more accessible to all UBC Okanagan community members via interactive dashboards.

It has been recognized that our formal engagement with external communities can be strengthened, in particular with our alumni. Our campus does not currently have a systematic and centralized way to support this engagement, although some units make efforts to engage with them through their own channels, such as email lists, blogs, periodic events or social media. However, this is an area that can be improved as we move towards meeting the vision of UBC Okanagan Outlook 2040, whereby the campus looks to serve the region by also offering education pathways outside of traditional 4-year degrees. To this end, the campus has started to explore options and strengthen this aspect of formalized community engagement to ensure quality improvement. Further, a working group focused on Career and Personal Education (CPE) pathways is exploring ways to prioritize community members, labour market demands and alumni in the design, review and implementation of academic programming.

In keeping with comments above related to academic policies changes, another strength has been the willingness of the Senate Curriculum Committee to discuss and recognize the value of making changes to the process by which a new program (or redesign of a current program) is proposed. The recently approved changes to the Senate Curriculum Guidelines (SCG) formalize practices adopted by units in

recent years, as per guidelines from the Provost's Office, such as early engagement with peers and community and consideration of the labour market in BC for program graduates. The updated SCG now also includes expectations when proposing to decommission a program so to ensure current students and alumni are informed and prioritized in such decisions.

The Senate Curriculum Committee has also recognized the need for improved processes to ensure that future iterations of courses conform to those initially approved by Senate on an ongoing basis. For example, this would ensure assessment practices continue to align with learning outcomes. Early discussions have begun to identify ways to accomplish this in manners consistent across academic units.

4.2 Review Findings

Q: Were the responses to the sample program review findings adequate?

The institution has a follow-up process for internal program reviews and acts in accordance with it. Describe how the institution meets this criterion. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

The PPG and the resources provided by the Provost's Office require the unit to respond to the recommendations outlined in the external review in a timely manner. The Senate policy on Academic Reviews of Unit mandates a report be submitted within two years outlining progress made on the recommendations. Specifically, Faculties are required to respond to the reviewers' recommendations in a timely manner and these responses are made publicly available via the Provost's Office website. Among departments, however, responses to reviews vary.

In the Irving K. Barber Faculty of Science and the Irving K. Barber Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, for example, responses from departments are in most cases completed, especially since they are mandated by faculty-specific policies and procedures. To ensure full compliance with its own policies, the Faculties require further administrative support to ensure these responses are submitted as outlined in their respective policies and guidelines. The Provost's Office provides an annual report to the Senate on the reviews completed and Faculty response, as mandated by the PPG.

Q: Does the process inform future decision making?

The program review ensures that the program remains consistent with the institution's current mission, goals, and long-range plan. Describe how the institution meets this criterion. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

Program reviews, in the context of their unit reviews, inform the extension of a dean or head, as per Board of Governors policies. Thus, they become a key component of the direction of a unit.

The PPG emphasizes the relevancy and importance of unit reviews for reflection, future planning and achievement of delivering the goals outlined in UBC Okanagan's strategic plans. Since the launch of [UBC Okanagan's Outlook 2040](#) (see Appendix 3) in 2019, units have been further encouraged to take a forward-looking perspective. This is supported by the Terms of Reference and the self-study template, which covers the areas of alignment to the institution's mission and goals.

Academic reviews have informed significant changes to academic programs. The Bachelor of Arts, externally reviewed in 2016, was redesigned and will officially launch in the fall of 2021. Similarly, the School of Health and Exercise Sciences has enacted its external reviewers' recommendations outlined in their 2019 review, leading to a redesign of the Bachelor of Human Kinetics. The newly created Bachelor of Arts Major in World Literatures and Intercultural Communications also resulted from the review of

the Departments of English and Cultural Studies and Languages and World Literatures, in the Faculty of Creative and Critical Studies.

It is anticipated that such notable examples will become the norm in the near future when the updated Senate policy for academic reviews is implemented, along with accompanying procedures to support the meaningful engagement and completion of reviews. Additional support and direction will come from the newly established position of Associate Provost, Academic Programs, Teaching and Learning.

Q: Are the review findings appropriately disseminated?

The institution has a well-defined system to disseminate the review findings to the appropriate entities. Describe how the institution meets this criterion. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

The current policy stipulates that “a copy of each review committee’s report as submitted to the members of the unit being reviewed be deposited with the Senate Secretariat and made available for examination by senators” and, “that, within two years of the completion of the review, a report on the implementation of the recommendations of the review be forwarded to the Dean or the President, as appropriate, and a copy lodged with the Secretary of Senate.”

The PPG does not specifically address dissemination of the review findings. However, the resources made available from the Provost's Office do call for the response to the reviewers’ recommendations to be shared with the entire unit, the dean’s office, and appended to the annual report on Faculty reviews to the Provost's Office. Since these resources are yet to be formalized by Senate, the practices across units vary. Additionally, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and Faculty of Science post all documents pertaining to external reviews on their unit internal websites. In the case of Faculty reviews, the Provost's Office makes the response to the review findings available to the community via the Provost Office website.

Institution Assessment—Review Findings

Based on the preceding responses in section 4.2, provide a critical assessment of strengths and areas for improvement in the quality assurance mechanisms described. Include how the institution will implement measures to address areas for improvement. This should include an evaluation of their impact on continuous quality improvement.

As mentioned in the assessment of section 4.1, there are strengths and areas of opportunities around the process of academic reviews at UBC Okanagan, many of which are being currently addressed at the Senate level. However, in this section, we will take the opportunity to elaborate a bit more on some of those areas as it relates to section 4.2 above.

A gap identified in the academic reviews process is the follow-up reporting and dissemination of results. The working group gathered numerous examples of follow-up actions that directly speak to the recommendations gathered from a review, however a formal report is often missing, as is the progress report required at the two-year post-review mark. As a result, dissemination is often a gap as well.

For faculty and school reviews, the Provost's Office has made an effort to disseminate memos, results and responses through its [website](#). Similarly, the Faculty of Science and Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences disseminate review-relevant information through their internal website for faculty and staff. The Schools within the Faculty of Health and Social Development also disseminate review-relevant information through their websites. This practice is not present among all other units and an area where improvement could be made.

5. Other Institution Commitments

UBC Okanagan has experienced rapid growth since its establishment in 2005. During this period of significant growth and change, our campus community has been dedicated to actioning initiatives to enhance the educational experience and academic success of our students. Thus, UBC Okanagan recognizes this Quality Assurance Process Audit as another step in helping improve both practices — and in particular, policies— that will further improve our own quality assurance processes. The quality assurance working group looks forward to receiving feedback about its own efforts, as well as policies and practices implemented at other institutions to continue our commitment to high quality post-secondary education.

6. Program Samples

The three program areas to be included in the review are as follows with the appropriate documentation attached in Appendix 14. UBC policies in place at the time are as current and outlined as part of this report.

- a) School of Engineering
- b) Department of Languages and World Literatures
- c) Department of Computer Science, Mathematics, Physics and Statistics

7. Appendix

Information provided as a separate document covering both the Institutional Report and Ministry Briefing.

- 1 – [UBC Annual Report on Enrolment \(2019/20\)](#)
- 2 – UBC Board of Governors Policies re Faculty – [AP3, AP4, AP9, AP10, SC6, LR2, SC3](#)
- 3 – [UBC Okanagan 2040 Outlook](#)
- 4 – [Shaping UBC's Next Century](#)
- 5 – [Senate policy on Reviews of Administrative Units](#)
- 6 – the [Extension of Deans](#)
- 7 – [Principles, Procedures and Guidelines \(PPG\) for External Academic Unit Reviews](#)
- 8 – [UBC Faculty Collective Agreement](#)
- 9 – IKBSAS Statement of Principles, Procedures and Guidelines (PPG) for External Reviews of Units

- 10 – [Guide to Curriculum Submissions \(GCS\) for UBC Okanagan](#)
- 11 – [New Program Proposal or Revision to Current Program: Checklist](#)
- 12 – [New Program Proposals: Concept Paper](#)
- 13 – [Senate Policy O-129 Non-Credit Credentials](#)
- 14 – Program Samples
 - a) School of Engineering
 - b) Department of Languages and World Literatures
 - c) Department of Computer Science, Mathematics, Physics and Statistics