



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Okanagan Campus

External Reviews of Academic Departments or Schools

Note: This resource package does not apply to reviews of Departmentalized Faculties

Prepared by: Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic
Last updated: August 2024



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Context	3
1. Initiation of review.....	4
2. Self-study report.....	8
3. Site visit	10
4. Response, action plan and summary.....	11
5. Progress update.....	11
Appendix A: Generic high-level timeline for process	13
Appendix B: Considerations for the engagement plan with communities.....	14
Appendix C: Email template to invite reviewers	15
Appendix D: Standard terms of reference.....	16
Appendix E: Self-study report: guiding questions by ToR and accompanying data	19
Appendix F: Example of self-study report outline	24
Appendix G: Example of a curriculum map	26
Appendix H: SOAR analysis template	28
Appendix I: Site Visit Schedule Example	35
Appendix J: Response and action plan template.....	37
Appendix K: Progress update report template.....	38

Introduction

An academic review is a mechanism for quality assurance and improvement and an opportunity for learning, sharing, and creating a collective vision for the unit and the communities it serves. This unique process allows for evaluation, planning, and prioritization of short and long-term goals for the unit and its programs.

These guidelines have been designed to support units in planning and executing a transparent and organized review while using resources available for a successful and meaningful process.

Context

This resource package supports the UBC Okanagan academic community in conducting external reviews of academic units, including reviews of the unit academic programs. External reviews are normally conducted every five years to seven years. The time interval between reviews must not exceed ten years.

Guiding policies and procedures: Academic reviews are common UBC practice under [Senate Policy on Reviews of Administrative Units](#), [Board of Governors AP9 policy on Academic Heads \(section 7\)](#), and the [Principles, Procedures and Guidelines for External Academic Unit Reviews](#) set out by the Provost's Office.

Goal of an academic review: To review the strength and balance of the unit's teaching and research activities, academic programs and service; to evaluate the unit's leadership and administration; and to advise on the future development of the unit and its programs.

An external academic review has five main components:



1. Initiation of Review

It is the responsibility of the Dean's Office to initiate the review as per the central schedule of reviews, published on the [Provost's Office website](#). The Dean's Office is also responsible for the site-visit logistics and expenses.

The initiation of a unit review is normally marked with a conversation among the leadership to plan for the review which can take between 12 to 18 months. Shortly after, a planning meeting between the Dean's Office and leadership of the unit under review should be organized to:

1. Gather and review documentation from the last academic review of the unit:
 - Self-study document
 - Reviewers' report
 - Unit's response and action plan
 - Unit's progress report (2 years after site-visit)
2. Review and discuss this resource package to identify expectations, templates and overall process
3. Identify next steps for immediate action:
 - Identify possible reviewers
 - Review standard Terms of Reference and finalize the ToR for the review
 - Identify key stakeholders and members who need to be invited to be part of the process. For example, faculty members, internal student committees, unit staff members, alumni, employers, members of Indigenous communities, etc.
 - Draft an engagement plan for the identified community members inclusive of surveys, focus groups, meetings, etc.
 - Prior to implementing the engagement plan, ensure the Dean's Office has reviewed it and provided feedback
 - The plan for engaging with Indigenous communities must also be submitted to the Provost's Office for review, feedback and guidance, prior to implementation
4. Identify the project lead(s) for writing the self-study report, organizing the schedule and logistical support for the site visit
 - Include specific dates for drafts and their circulation for feedback from all unit members
 - Consider an internal process for document version control and file sharing
5. Schedule periodic meetings for status updates
6. Additionally, it is key to meet with [OPAIR](#) (Okanagan Planning and Institutional Research) as soon as possible to communicate the review timeline and data needs.

Terms of Reference

The scope and Terms of Reference (ToR) of the review are determined by the Dean's Office and unit's leadership in alignment with the Guiding Policies and Procedures. The ToR should be clear and be adjusted to reflect the unit's needs and priorities. The Provost's Office can support with developing the ToR.

Selection of the External Review Committee (ERC)

Once the review has been initiated, the Dean's Office and the unit under review begin to identify possible reviewers for consideration. Unit members should be invited to submit their suggestions to the Dean's Office. Submissions must include:

- Contact information
- Academic Rank
- Synopsis of academic qualifications and field(s) of expertise

All suggestions should be considered by the Dean's Office to finalize the review committee, in consultation with the leadership of the unit under review. When generating a list of reviewers, consider the following:

- Advanced academic credential related to the subject area under review (normally at the doctoral level in the discipline or terminal level in particular fields)
- Relevant academic experience in areas such as quality assessment (e.g., as appraisers for accrediting bodies or as reviewers of degree programs), curriculum design, teaching and learning, and administration
- Any required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience
- Understanding of the BC post-secondary education context (if not possible, request contextual information from the Provost's Office)
- Conflict of interest
- Gender balance
- Equity considerations
- For professional programs/faculties, consider including a member from the relevant professional community
- Other ideas and input from unit members

Internal Observers/Reviewers: Some units may choose to invite a UBC observer or reviewer to join the review team. A UBC Okanagan observer (external to the unit under review) can contribute to the review by contextualizing conversations and discussions that take place during the site visit and answering questions that may come up during the writing of the reviewers' report.

A UBC reviewer can be invited from the Vancouver campus (external to UBC Okanagan), when the unit under review deems such participation would be valuable for their assessment, planning, and strategic visioning.

Conflict of interest: Reviewers must have a level of separation from the department. Particularly, reviewers should not be research partners with unit members or have had a supervisory role of a unit member. Review UBC's Conflict of Interest and Commitment policies [here](#).

Process Workflow

1. The review is initiated and the meeting to plan the review is held
2. The unit under review drafts and submits lists and plans for engagement with internal, external and Indigenous communities and members, for review and feedback prior to implementation
3. In the meantime, the Dean's Office and the unit's leadership collect names of potential reviewers and identify the preferred external review committee (two to three reviewers depending on the size of the unit)
4. Submit the ranked list to the Provost's Office for information or support if needed (depending on Faculty's procedures, the Provost may need to approve the list of reviewers. If this is the case, approval can take two to three weeks)
5. The Dean and the unit's leadership finalize the Terms of Reference for the review
6. The Dean (or identified lead in the Dean's Office) invites the chosen reviewers to confirm their willingness to participate. Note that this can take up to four weeks.
 - Include compensation details (\$600/day or \$1,200/total per reviewer is suggested) and other logistical support the unit is able to provide before and during the review
 - University's policies that can contribute to their work and/or they are expected to comply with such as the Discrimination, Sexual Violence Prevention, and the Respectful Workplace Policy.
 - A high-level timeline of the review and targeted timing of the site visit
7. As soon as the external review panel is confirmed, the site visit dates must be secured (two to three days) and shared with all unit members and Provost's Office
8. Additional key information must be sent to the reviewers after securing the site visit dates:
 - Scope of the review and ToR when finalized
 - Date by which they can expect the self-study report from the unit (must be at least four weeks in prior to the site visit)
 - A date and time for a virtual/phone orientation meeting prior to the site visit (two or three weeks in advance)
 - o This orientation meeting is between the reviewers and the leadership of the Dean's Office and the unit under review. It serves to contextualize the review, clarify expectations, review the ToR and the site visit schedule. The Provost's Office can attend this meeting if requested by the Dean's Office for support.
 - o It is imperative to have the site visit schedule ready by the time this meeting takes place
9. Find a conducive space on campus for the site visit meetings
10. Begin working on the site visit schedule and reaching out to UBCO executives and unit members to secure their participation in the review
11. Upon receiving feedback on the submitted engagement plans, begin implementation

Timeline

Generally, the selection of reviewers and determination of ToR takes around 4 to 5 weeks. For a February –

March visit, reviewers should be selected and contacted prior to the start of classes in September.

Appendices

Appendix A: Generic high-level timeline for review process

Appendix B: Considerations for engagement plan with external communities

Appendix C: Email template to invite reviewers

Appendix D: Standard Terms of Reference

2. Self-Study Report

The self-study report is at the core of the review process. The document should demonstrate a **balance between quantitative and qualitative data, reflection, and vision**, that is well-organized and less than 50 pages with a maximum of 300 pages in appendices. Most importantly, it should provide the reviewers with **enough relevant information to answer the questions posed to them in the Terms of Reference**. For example, the review committee will be unable to answer questions regarding student learning if no learning outcomes and learning assessment data have been included in the report. Similarly, if reviewers are expected to assess alumni engagement, provide opportunities for alumni to participate or share perspectives.

A self-study report appropriately embeds the feedback received during the unit-led engagement plan and it includes:

- A summary of the last review: The summary should highlight the unit's progress towards previous recommendations, including those not being pursued along with a rationale as to why they are not being pursued
- Summary of operations of academic unit;
- Quality of instruction, research, and service or outreach and to include quality enhancement plans for each area;
- How accessible, equitable and inclusive principles and practices at all levels of University
- governance, teaching, and research are included;
- The embedding of UBC's Indigenous Strategic Plan and incorporation of principles of accessibility, equity, diversity, and inclusion;
- The embedding of Indigenous and globally diverse perspectives at all levels of unit governance, teaching, and research including engagement with community members;
- An assessment of the adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human)
- Value to students' education (undergraduate and graduate) and preparation;
- The adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human);
- Role within UBC and effectiveness in fulfilling that role, including Health and Safety requirements;
- Future objectives and resources or change necessary to achieve them; and
- Any additional unit and program data relevant to the Terms of Reference. This can be done with the support of OPAIR and the Provost's Office
- Credit and non-credit programs offered by the unit
- For each credit-program, include:
 1. Program structure, admissions requirements, and method of delivery
 2. The program's continuous achievement of the [degree level standards](#), and where appropriate, standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association
 3. Program learning outcomes and their assessment: If not already identified, units

should use the review as an opportunity to work with the [Centre for Teaching and Learning](#) to develop sound learning outcomes for programs and courses, and identify ways in which they can be intentionally and appropriately assessed for the purpose of program evaluation.

4. Program curriculum map. A curriculum map is a well-structured way to show how courses and program requirements contribute to program learning outcomes and objectives. A useful tool to do this is [UBC's Curriculum MAP](#).
5. Where appropriate, the graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, employer satisfaction level, advisory board satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduate rate
6. Program's alignment with its unit's current mission, goals and long-range plan
7. SOAR analysis: This analysis provides a concise summary of Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results (SOAR) developed via meetings with faculty, leadership, students, and alumni.

Process Workflow

1. Unit requests data from OPAIR for the self-study and shares the ToR to help compile a meaningful data package
2. Unit collects data from other units (e.g. CoGS) and their records, as appropriate, to integrate in the self-study report
3. Unit continues to implement engagement plans to incorporate feedback and results of engagement into their self-study
 - Identified internal and external partners are invited to provide written feedback for the reviewers and to attend the site visit
4. The self-study report is submitted to the Dean's Office for review and feedback
5. The final self-study report is sent to the reviewers at least four weeks ahead of the site visit and sent to all executives and people invited to the site visit
 - The Dean's Office or unit under review may choose to post their self-study (without the appendices) on their website for enhanced transparency of the process. The Provost's Office can also host reports on their website if preferred

Timeline

Generally, writing the self-study takes around three to four months, inclusive of feedback and collaboration from faculty, students, alumni, external communities and partners. For a February – March visit, the self-study should be formally initiated in September. When planning, consider the time needed for the self-study project lead and leadership to review, make suggestions, or additions to the self-study before sending it to the reviewers.

Appendices

Appendix E: Self-study report: guiding questions and accompanying data by ToR

Appendix F: Example of a self-study report outline

Appendix G: Example of a curriculum map

Appendix H: SOAR analysis: report template

3. Site Visit

The site visit can take up to three days, depending on the size of the unit. A project lead (in the Dean's Office or the unit under review) should be identified to take responsibility for logistics, including the time of the visit, hotel and travel, on-campus meeting rooms, catering, processing expenses and payment of honoraria (see [UBC's reimbursement policy](#)). Securing the reviewers and dates can be challenging due to conflicting schedules.

If the visit is done online due to health-related restrictions, other considerations should be considered, such as platform, privacy, and technical support.

Process Workflow

1. Finalize the site visit schedule, ensuring there is adequate representation of faculty, staff, students, alumni and relevant communities the unit serves
 - Ensure confidentiality for unit members who engage in the review process. No member of the unit's leadership team should be present during the site visit conversations with these groups
2. Communicate with all groups and stakeholders about the schedule so they can attend at the appropriate time.
 - For students: Plan to have them attend over lunch to increase attendance
 - For unit faculty and staff members: Provide the option to request one-on-one time with the review team, time permitting

Additionally, if the site visit must be done online, consider:

1. Finalize schedule for online meetings mindful of the reviewers' time zones and accommodate accordingly
2. For group meetings, consider booking a conference room on campus to allow local participants to meet together
3. Submit a ticket for IT support for the boardroom(s)
4. Decide whether to use new Zoom links or one Zoom link with waiting room feature
 - It is recommended to use separate links for each meeting unless there is an admin/UBC observer to delegate as host, who can monitor the waiting room
 - IMPORTANT: If you do not have a UBC observer/host, make sure participants can join at any time/5 mins prior to the scheduled meeting (i.e. does not require the host to be present for the meeting to start), since external reviewers cannot be pre-added as meeting hosts

Timeline

For a February – March visit, dates and details of the visit should be finalized by October. Reviewers should submit their reviewers' report within one month after the site visit.

Appendices

Appendix I: Site visit schedule example and checklist

4. Response, Action Plan and Summary

The reviewers' report should be received within one month of the site visit. The report is reviewed by the Dean's Office and unit's leadership for factual errors. If any errors are found, the unit lets the reviewers know so to ensure accuracy in a final report.

Once the final report is received, the unit must submit a response within the following three months including:

1. Linkages between the results of the review and the unit and UBC's strategic plans
2. An action plan
3. A 2-page summary of the unit's response and action plan

The response should be informed by the same community and unit members who participated in the self-study (i.e., students, alumni, community partners, employers, etc.).

The response is shared with the entire unit, the Dean's Office, the Provost's Office and the Senate Office.

The summary (maximum of 2 pages) of the response and action plan must be made available publicly via the unit's,

Faculty's website or Provost's website. Additionally, The Provost's Office will include this summary in the annual report of academic reviews to the Okanagan Senate.

Timeline

The unit should take no longer than two weeks to review the report for factual errors. If any are found, the reviewers should submit a final report within two weeks of receiving feedback from the unit's leadership. The response and action plan from the unit should be completed within three months of receiving the reviewers' final report.

Appendices

Appendix J: Response and action plan template

5. Progress Update

A progress update is a short report on progress against the action plan. Planned actions that have not been carried out should be identified with a brief explanation and a target for when they will be completed. The progress update is developed and distributed to all unit members, the Provost's Office and Senate Secretariat.

Timeline

The progress update must be completed and submitted two years after the response to the review report was submitted.

Appendices

Appendix K: Progress Update Template



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Okanagan Campus

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Generic High-Level Timeline for Process

	Lead(s)	Deadline
Initiation of Review: ToR and Selection of Reviewers		
Planning meeting (Dean's Office and Department/School Leadership)		July
Contact OPAIR to request data		August
Generate reviewers + inclusive of suggestions		August
Selection of Terms of Reference		August
Selection of reviewers		August
Invitation and confirmation of reviewers		September
Bookings for site-visit		September
Self-study report		
Formal communication to all unit members		September
Draft engagement plan and submit to Dean's Office/Provost's Office as relevant		September
Gather input from unit		September – November
Implement engagement plan with external communities, per feedback received		October – November
Distribute self-study report among unit members for feedback		December
Send document to reviewers and cc Provost's Office		January
Site visit		
Online orientation meeting with reviewers (2 weeks prior to the site visit)		January
Host site-visit		February
Review reviewers' report for factual errors		February/March
Process honoraria		February/March
Response, action plan and summary		
Review reviewers' report with unit		March
Engage unit and external communities to write a response		March – May
Engage with Dean's Office for a final response and action plan		April
Send final response, action plan and summary to Provost's Office and Senate Office		May
Follow-up and progress update		
Update website with review documents		May/June
Plan for unit's next steps towards action plan		May/June
Final archival review and associated files		June/July
Submit report on progress towards action plan		2 years after submission of the unit's response

Appendix B: Considerations for the Engagement Plan with Communities

A strategy for community engagement (internal and external audiences) must be well-organized within the context of true partnership and reciprocity. A scan of a wide variety of sources revealed that key considerations are: 1) adherence to a definition of community engagement, 2) identification of stakeholders, partners and communities, and 3) agreement on purpose, reasons, and levels of engagement.

- [The Community Engagement Office](#) offers a definition that could be helpful to guide this process. They define community engagement as “The interaction and collaboration between UBC and all parts of the wider community (local, regional, national and global) for the collectively beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.”
- The unit must have a clear understanding of the questions/areas of their educational, research, and/or administrative operations, that they are hoping to share with stakeholders/communities for input. These areas should be identified after reviewing the data already gathered and available through OPAIR and their own units, so to avoid duplication of efforts or engagement fatigue from partners/communities.
- A list of stakeholders, partners, and communities should be developed based on purpose and reason to engage. This list should include Indigenous communities which is to be reviewed by the Provost’s Office, for guidance and support as needed, via the submission on their engagement plan.
- To decide the level of engagement, these may be helpful, depending on the unit and agreed upon reason and purpose:
 - The [IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation](#)
 - [Framework for engagement with industry](#) by Manwaring, R., Holloway, J., & Coffey, B. (2020).
- It is key to include a communications plan throughout the process to ensure expectations and opportunities for engagement are clear, and that the results from the engagement are made available in a timely manner to all involved.

Appendix C: Email Template to Invite Reviewers

[Date]

Dr. XXXX

[Address]

Email: [address]

Dear Dr. XXXX:

RE: INVITATION TO SERVE AS MEMBER OF EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

I am pleased to invite you to serve as an external reviewer for the upcoming review of the Department of XXXXX in the Faculty of XXXXX, scheduled to take place between XXXXX and XXXXX.

External reviews are essential to shaping the growth and development of our university. As an exemplary scholar and leader in this field, you have been highly recommended as a potential external reviewer, and we are confident that this process would benefit greatly from your guidance and insights.

The purposes of the external review include:

- reviewing the strength and balance of the department/school's teaching and research activities, academic programs, and service contributions;
- evaluating its leadership and administration;
- advising on its future development.

External reviewers receive an honorarium of CAN \$1,200.00 upon completion of the final report. As part of the review, a self-study report will be provided to reviewers four weeks in advance of the site visit, followed by a two-day site visit to UBC's Okanagan campus. During the site visit, reviewers will meet with faculty, staff, students, senior UBC administrators, and other groups and individuals as relevant. We will make necessary arrangements for travel and accommodation, and reviewers will be reimbursed for other travel expenses related to the review.

We sincerely appreciate your consideration, and welcome your valuable input to support UBC's Okanagan mission of academic excellence. I would be pleased to provide additional information and answer questions you may have. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

[Dean's Name]

[Title, Faculty]

Appendix D: Standard Terms of Reference

Use the below Terms of Reference to guide the Academic Review exercise. Be sure to edit as relevant by adding areas of focus and deleting references to activities that are not relevant to the unit. For example, if your unit is working through a question or change you would like feedback on, be sure to include it. Such requests should also be reflected in data provided in the self-study report.

Terms of Reference of the External Review

Purpose of the Review

To review the strength and balance of the unit's teaching and research activities, academic programs and service; to evaluate the unit's leadership and administration; and to advise on the future development of the unit and its programs.

Background Materials

- [UBC's Strategic Plan](#)
- [UBC Okanagan Outlook 2040](#)
- [UBC's Indigenous Strategic Plan](#)
- [UBC's StEAR Framework](#)
- The unit's self-study report

Terms of reference

Without limiting its overall mandate, the External Review Committee should consider the following:

1. ***Undergraduate Education and Student Learning:*** Review and evaluate the quality, extent, format, organization, and enrolment of the unit's academic programs, the quality of teaching, and to compare its performance in these areas to that of its national and international peers.
2. ***Graduate Education (and Post-Doctoral Training):*** Review and evaluate the quality, extent, format, organization, and enrolment of the unit's graduate programs, and compare its performance to that of its national and international peers.
3. ***Continuing and Professional Education:*** Review the current and future opportunities for continuing and professional education (CPE) provided by the unit, including non-credit micro credentials and professional programs.
4. ***Student Academic Experience and Support:*** Assess the satisfaction and quality of the students' academic experience from first contact upon admission, through to alumni status. How is the unit supporting the academic success of historically, persistently or systematically marginalized students?
 - a. Are undergraduate students well advised and supported? Consider student morale, strength of student retention, experiential learning opportunities, co-curricular opportunities, and career preparation. Are graduates demonstrating the outcomes set out by the unit?
 - b. Are graduate students well advised and supported by their supervisor(s)? Consider student morale,

strength of student retention, and opportunities for professional and career development, networking, and assistance with publications.

5. **Research, Scholarly, (Creative) and Professional Activity:** Review and evaluate the quality, extent, range, and balance of the scholarly and teaching activities of the unit, with particular attention to the impact of these activities in academic and non-academic venues, including innovation and knowledge translation. Assess the overall leadership of the faculty members within their communities-of-praxis, their granting/funding success, and the quality and impact of their scholarly contributions.
6. **Leadership and administration:** Review and evaluate the governance, organizational structure, leadership, planning, and administration of the unit, including:
 - a. Is the unit's leadership inclusive, responsive, transparent and representative of the diversity of the faculty members?
 - b. Is the unit's governance inclusive, response, and transparent?
 - c. How is the unit supporting succession planning through the development of future leaders?
7. **People, environment and culture:** Consider and assess the working and educational environment, morale, and institutional culture of the unit, as reflected in the experiences and perceptions of faculty members, sessional instructors and staff. The review should take into account support for career advancement, professional development, advising, and balanced workloads and give special attention to the unit's performance relative to the University's employment and equity policies.
8. **Community Engagement:** Assess the nature, scope, and effectiveness of the unit's outreach activities and the communities' levels of satisfaction with them.
 - a. How is the unit engaging with schools, Indigenous communities, professional organizations, alumni, government agencies, other post-secondary institutions, and the overall external and UBC community to inform its educational programming?
 - b. How is the unit engaging with schools, Indigenous communities, professional organizations, alumni, government agencies, other post-secondary institutions, and the overall external and UBC community through its research activities?
9. **Support for the University's and Campus Strategic Plans:** Determine the extent to which the unit reinforces through its programs and activities, the key commitments of UBC and UBC Okanagan strategic plans, notably [UBC's commitments to People and Places, Research Excellence, Transformative Learning, and Local and Global Engagement](#).
10. **Physical Infrastructure:** Assess the range and quality of the teaching and research facilities at the unit's disposal, and to determine whether the Faculty is appropriately housed and equipped to meet its teaching and research goals.
11. **Financial Planning and Resources:** Review and evaluate the financial resources of the unit, including its financial base (i.e., levels of university funding, funding by external agencies, tuition revenue, and donor support), its capacity for

enrolment management, its plans for revenue diversification.

12. **Future development:** Review and comment on the unit's strategic and academic plans for the next five years and identify its challenges and opportunities, including the unit's breadth of programing. To make recommendations about possible directions for its future growth and development.

Appendix E: Self-Study Report: Guiding Questions by ToR and Accompanying Data

The self-study report is at the core of the review process. The report should demonstrate a **balance between quantitative and qualitative data, reflection, and vision**, that is well-organized and less than 50 pages plus no more than 300 pages in appendices. This may mean that some units will need to abridge their syllabi and/or faculty members' CVs.

To abridge CVs, a useful example may be from the guidelines from SSHRC applications: consider the last 6 years and most salient publications during that time as well as key contributions to research and leadership; most significant contributions; interruptions to career; and contributions to training.

Terms of Reference, Guiding Questions and Accompanying Data

OPAIR and CoGS provide the following data to help units answer many of the review's ToR through the self-study. The self-study authors can and should use multiple data points to reflect on a question and provide complete and contextualized answers. For example, when the unit is asked to reflect on their students' experience, they can refer to multiple data points from OPAIR (e.g. class sizes, student-to-Faculty ratio, student experience survey results, etc.) but also their own data, to provide an answer. For example, data collected through conversations with advisors, experiences working with students through the unit's committees, engagement of students in other unit-led initiatives, etc.

1. Undergraduate Education and Student Learning

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What is the average class size by year level (1x, 2x...)?	OPAIR
What is the unit's student-to-faculty ratio?	OPAIR
What is the students' experience?	OPAIR
What is the students' experience of instruction in courses taught by the unit under review?	OPAIR
How many undergraduate students applied, were admitted, and registered?	OPAIR
What are the program time-to-completion rates for undergraduate students?	OPAIR
What are the student retention rates?	OPAIR
How do students perform academically?	OPAIR
What is the total composition and distribution of students across programs' years?	OPAIR
What is the relative distribution of international and domestic students by program and specialization?	OPAIR
What citizenships are held by the international students by program/level?	OPAIR
What is the enrollment of Indigenous students by year compared to the applicable campus?	OPAIR
To what extent has the unit advanced experiential, work-integrated, and extended learning opportunities for students by program?	Unit

To what extent has the unit incorporated sustainability education into the programs?	Unit
To what extent have efforts been made to decolonize and Indigenize the curriculum?	Unit
Have efforts been made to embed equity, inclusion and anti-racism into the curriculum?	Unit
Have efforts been made to sustain program renewal and improvements in teaching effectiveness?	Unit
Are the students achieving the unit's programs' learning outcomes?	Unit
What is the projected long-term risk in terms of international student demand for programs? How about domestic student demand?	Unit

2. *Graduate Education (and Post-Doctoral Training)*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What is the relative distribution of international and domestic students by program and specialization?	OPAIR
What is the number (and %) of faculty who supervise graduate students?	Unit
What is the average number of graduate students per supervisor?	Unit
How is the unit assessing the quality of faculty supervision?	Unit
How many graduate students applied, were admitted, and registered?	COGS
What are the program time-to-completion rates for our graduate students?	OPAIR
How successful are your graduate students in competing for national tri-council funding and university awards?	COGS
How does the student funding level competitive with other institutions?	Unit

3. *Continuing and Professional Education (CPE)*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What is the overall profile of your (non-credit) continuing and education program activity over the past five years? Please identify the credential types, enrolments and audiences served (post-degree professionals, community, youth and high school and current students).	CPE
What has been the feedback received from faculty, staff, and learners about the CPE programs? How has that feedback been used for enhancement and planning?	CPE
In what ways has the programming enhanced your revenue generation, community/employer engagement and/or student recruitment goals?	CPE and Unit
Have you developed a CPE plan for your unit that links CPE activity to your strategic goals and identifies key opportunities for growth?	Unit

4. *Student Academic Experience and Support*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What efforts have been made to strengthen the undergraduate and graduate student experience and communities?	Unit
What are the outcomes for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows?	Unit
What are the outcomes for undergraduate students?	OPAR
To what extent are the students engaged and satisfied with their educational experience?	OPAIR
Do students feel well advised and supported to achieve academic success?	OPAIR
How satisfied are graduates with their educational experience?	OPAIR
What is the unit doing/planning to do to support and accommodate students with diverse abilities?	Unit
What is the unit doing/planning to do to support and accommodate student affordability?	Unit
How is the unit/program adapting to their students' diverse needs?	Unit
How is the unit/program supporting Indigenous students' success?	Unit
How is the unit/program supporting historically, persistently, or systematically marginalized students' success?	Unit
How is the Faculty/program assessing the quality of teaching performance?	OPAIR
What is the students' experience from recruitment through admission and first registration and orientation?	OPAIR

5. *Research, Scholarly, (Creative) and Professional Activity*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
How much research funding does the unit generate?	OPAIR
What is the average research revenue per full-time research faculty member?	Unit
How many CRC appointments does the unit have?	Unit
How many other recognitions have been received by the unit's faculty members? E.g., Royal Society of Canada awards, National Killam Awards, Tri-council awards, Discipline-specific research excellence awards.	Unit
What is the research output of the unit? Consider quantity and impact	Unit
If applicable, for research centres (under Senate policy): How much funding has the centre secured and how sustainable is it? How effective is its leadership? How engaged are faculty, students and staff in the activities of the centre? How does the centre contribute to the research culture of the unit and the university?	Unit

6. *Leadership and administration*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
How transparent, flexible, and accessible is the governance and administration of the unit?	Unit
How satisfied are staff, faculty and students with the leadership of the unit?	Unit
How diverse is the leadership and administration of the unit? What efforts are made to further diversify the team and/or heighten inclusivity in governance and administration?	Unit

7. *People, environment and culture*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What is the composition of the unit's faculty complement? How has the composition changed over time?	OPAIR
What are the hiring trends for faculty (faculty renewal)?	OPAIR
What is the diversity of people within the unit (faculty and staff)? What efforts have been made to address under-representation of Indigenous, and HPSM faculty and staff?	OPAIR and Unit
What is the composition of your staff complement?	OPAIR
What is the ratio of staff to faculty over time?	OPAIR
How is your unit supporting faculty career advancement and professional development?	Unit
How is your unit supporting staff career advancement and professional development?	Unit
How satisfied are the unit's staff and faculty at the workplace?	Unit
How is your unit managing and balancing workload for staff and faculty?	Unit

8. *Community Engagement*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
How is the unit assessing employer satisfaction?	Unit
How satisfied are external communities (including employers, professional organizations, and Indigenous communities) with the engagement activities of the unit?	Unit
How is the unit partnering with other academic units on campus, or with other post-secondary institutions?	Unit
How is the unit engaging with K-12 schools (e.g. outreach, dual credit, or admission pathways)?	Unit
What is the nature, scope, and effectiveness of the unit's engagement with alumni?	Unit

9. *Support for the University's and Campus Strategic Plans*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
To what extent does the unit reinforce, through its programs and activities, the key commitments of the UBC's Strategic Plan, Outlook 2040, and UBC's commitments to People and Places, Research Excellence, Transformative Learning, and Local and Global Engagement?	Unit

10. *Physical Infrastructure*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What is the range and quality of the unit's research, teaching and administrative space?	Unit
How is space utilization being managed within the unit?	Unit
Does the unit have the equipment and physical resources to meet its teaching and research goals?	Unit

11. *Financial Planning and Resources*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What is the financial health of the unit?	Unit
What are the unit's plans for revenue diversification?	Unit
What is the levels of donor support for the unit?	Unit
What is the unit's strategic enrolment management plan?	Unit

12. *Future development*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
What is the unit's strategic plan for the next 3 – 5 years?	Unit
What is the unit's academic plan for the next 3 – 5 years?	Unit
What is the unit's SOAR analysis? (Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results)	Unit

Appendix F: Example of a self-study report outline

1. Executive summary
2. Department overview
 - a. Department and/or Faculty Strategic Plan(s)
3. Summary of the last review and report on progress
4. Summary of operations of academic unit
5. Undergraduate instruction and learning
 - a. Program structure, admissions requirements, and method of delivery
 - b. Achievement of the [degree level standards](#)
 - c. Graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, employer satisfaction level, advisory board satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduate rate
 - d. Programs' learning outcomes and assessment
 - e. Programs' curriculum maps
 - f. Programs' alignment with its unit's current mission, goals and long-range plan
 - g. SOAR analysis: This analysis provides a concise summary of Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results (SOAR) developed via meetings with faculty, unit leadership, students, alumni and other relevant stakeholders.
6. Graduate and postdoctoral studies
 - a. Program structure, admissions requirements, and method of delivery
 - b. Achievement of the [degree level standards](#)
 - c. Graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, employer satisfaction level, advisory board satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduate rate
 - d. Programs' learning outcomes and assessment
 - e. Programs' curriculum maps
 - f. Programs' alignment with its unit's current mission, goals and long-range plan
 - g. SOAR analysis: This analysis provides a concise summary of Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results (SOAR) developed via meetings with faculty, unit leadership, students, alumni and other relevant stakeholders.

7. Continuing and professional education (CPE) offerings
8. Research, scholarly and professional activity
 - a. Internal and external funding
9. Student success, experience and support
 - a. Graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, employer satisfaction level, advisory board satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduate rate
10. Indigenous engagement
11. Alumni engagement
12. Culture of respect, diversity and inclusivity
 - a. How does the program ensure inclusive content, design and teaching practices that include different ways of learning and knowing, intercultural and international perspectives?
 - b. If the program controls its own recruitment and admissions, how does the program contribute to access and pathways for historically underserved student populations?
 - c. How diverse is the faculty complement delivering the program? What plans are in place to maintain or increase the diversity?
13. Service and community partnerships
14. People and outstanding work environment
15. Resources, administration and governance
16. Role within UBCO and effectiveness in fulfilling that role, including health and safety requirements
17. Head/Director's summary
 - a. SOAR analysis and recommendations for improvement
18. Appendices
 - a. External review's terms of reference (ToR)
 - b. Programs' details (admission prerequisites and/or program requirements)
 - c. Student engagement, learning, and retention data
 - d. Course outlines
 - e. Teaching data (SEOTs/SEoIs)
 - f. Peer review procedures
 - g. Scholarship data
 - h. Committees
 - i. Faculty CV's

Appendix G: Example of a curriculum map

Example of a curriculum map UBC's Curriculum MAP website (<https://curriculum.ok.ubc.ca/>)

Program Learning Outcomes										
	Communication and rhetorical literacies	Rhetorical modes and multimodality	Composition and writing conventions	Communication concepts	History and theories of rhetoric	Interdisciplinary	Indigenous ways of knowing and learning	Research methods	Collaborative	Professional Context
CO RH 203	D	D	D	D	I	D	D	D	D	D
CO RH 204	D	I	D	I	N/A	I	N/A	I	I	I
CO RH 205	D	I	A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	I	I
CO RH 206	A	A	D	D	D	D	A	D	D	D
CO RH 210	D	I	I	D	I	I	N/A	I	I	D
CO RH 216	D	D	A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CO RH 304	A	A	A	A	D	A	D	A	A	D
CO RH 321	D	D	A	D	D	D	D	A	A	D
CO RH 331	A	D	A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	D	D
CO RH 400	A / D	A	D / A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CO RH 405	A	A	A	A	N/A	D	N/A	D / N/A / A	N/A / D	D
CO RH 499	A	D	D	D	N/A	D	N/A	D / N/A	D	A

Mapping			
Colour	Scale	Abbreviation	Description
	Introduced	I	Key ideas, concepts or skills related to the learning outcome are demonstrated at an introductory level. Learning activities focus on basic knowledge, skills, and/or competencies and entry-level complexity.
	Developing	D	Learning outcome is reinforced with feedback; students demonstrate the outcome at an increasing level of proficiency. Learning activities concentrate on enhancing and strengthening existing knowledge and skills as well as expanding complexity.
	Advanced	A	Students demonstrate the learning outcomes with a high level of independence, expertise and sophistication expected upon graduation. Learning activities focus on and integrate the use of content or skills in multiple.

Appendix H: SOAR analysis template

Source: Hoare, A., Dishke Hondzel, C., & Wagner, S. (2022). *Program review handbook: A course-based approach to conducting program review* <https://programreviewhandbook.pressbooks.tru.ca/>

SOAR Summary Report

[insert program name]

[insert date]

Summary

This report summarizes the strategic SOAR Analysis Activity that faculty from the [insert program] participated in on [insert date].

Results are framed in discussion of over-arching Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, and Results (SOAR), as well as a summary of the major themes and goals. The SOAR approach was chosen in order to facilitate action planning and to move forward with the cyclical program review process.

SOAR is an information gathering and planning framework with an approach that focuses on strengths and seeks to understand a system and its environment by including the voices of the relevant stakeholders. Focusing on strengths means that the SOAR conversations centre on what is already being done well and the areas or programs that can be enhanced. It can be used to identify initiatives or approaches that are compelling to the various stakeholders.

By engaging many faculty members, we were able to capture a broad picture of a complex system by accessing a variety of different perspectives. This systems approach tries to find patterns within the integration and dynamics of the many relationships and interactions among people, programs, functions, and the broader environment. This helps stakeholders see and understand at a high level how the system works and where their unique contribution makes a difference.

Based on the information collected during the SOAR conversations, the recommended areas to focus the [insert program] goals are concentrated in the following areas:

- Goal #1
- Goal #2
- Goal #3
- Goal #4

The results of this report can be used to help inform the Action Plan component of program review or other program planning activities.

Strengths

Participants were asked to consider the strengths of the program, under headings of four different questions: (1) What have we done well so far? (2) What are we most proud of so far? (3) What positive aspects have students/ faculty/ employers/ others commented on? (4) What makes us unique?

Key strengths are indicated below with a sampling of statements shared by faculty members that supported the main theme. These themes are the foundations for the work to implement the Action Plan. Actions should be grounded in and build upon the strengths and commitments that already exist.

Strength The program offers...	Supporting Statements
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•

Opportunities

Participants were asked to consider the opportunities for the department and programs in relation to four questions: (1) What changes do we expect to see in the next 3 - 5 years? (2) What external forces or trends may impact the programs? (3) What opportunities exist for us? (4) What are students, faculty, and/or the community already asking for?

The exercise brought forward the following areas where there are immediate opportunities to prioritize and create an Action Plan.

Expected Area of Change/Growth	Supporting Statements
	•
	•
	•
	•

Aspirations

Aspirations reflect the values of the faculty members engaged in program development and delivery. Participants were asked to consider the aspirations for the department and programs in relation to four questions: (1) What are we deeply passionate about? (2) What difference do we hope to make for students, faculty, and staff? (3) What does our preferred future look like? (4) What projects, programs, or processes support our aspirations?

Reflecting the statements collected during the SOAR Analysis Activity, the summaries below reflect aspirations the group indicated were important to consider in order to foster continued growth and success. Aspirations at this level can serve as operational goals with targets driven by specific initiatives or desired results.

Goals / Aspirations for the Future	Supporting Statements
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•

Results

Participants were asked to consider the measurable results for the department and programs in relation to four questions: (1) Considering our strengths, opportunities, and aspirations, what meaningful measures will indicate we are on track with achieving our goals? (2) What measurable results do we want to see? (3) What measurements will we be known for? (4) What resources are needed to implement our most vital projects and initiatives?

This is a draft compilation of some of the measures discussed during the SOAR Analysis Activity. I have done my best to align them with the Strengths, Opportunities, and Aspirations identified earlier, many of which overlap and have been collapsed into the areas listed below. These overarching goals and measures are offered as a starting place to begin action planning.

Goal	Potential Measures
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•

Summary and Next Steps

Based on the conversations that occurred during the SOAR Analysis Activity, many similar and overlapping themes came forward. These aspirations and the subsequent goals must be further broken down with specific tasks and actions. Movement toward goals should be recognized and celebrated over time. Pilot projects can be used to test out new initiatives and shape new opportunities.

References

- Mir, R. A., Mir, A., & Upadhyaya, P. (2003). *Toward a postcolonial reading of organizational control*. In *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement* (pp. 47-73). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Srivastava, S., & Cooperrider, D. (1990). *Appreciative management and leadership: The power of positive thought and action in organizations*. Jossey-Bass.
- Stavros, J. & Cole, M. L. (2013). SOARing towards positive transformation and change. *The ABAC ODI Visions.Action.Outcome*, 1(1), 10-34.
- Stavros, J.M., Cooperrider, D L, & Kelley, D.L. (2003). Strategic inquiry appreciative intent: Inspiration to SOAR, a new framework for strategic planning. *AI Practitioner*. November, 10-17.
- Stavros, J.M. & Hinrichs, G. (2009). *The thin book of SOAR: Building strengths- based strategy*. Thin Book Publishing Co.

Appendix I: Site Visit Schedule Example

DAY 1		In Attendance	Location
8:15	Pick up from hotel		
8:45 - 10:15	Meeting with Dept Head/ School Director		
10:15 - 10:30	B R E A K		
10:30 - 11:00	Meeting with the Dean / Assoc. Deans		
11:00 - 12:00	Reviewers meeting		
12:00 - 13:30	Lunch	Undergraduate students	
13:30 - 15:30	Meeting with faculty		
15:30 - 15:45	B R E A K		
15:45 - 16:45	One-on-one meetings*		
DAY 2			
8:00	Pick up from hotel		
8:30 - 9:15	Meeting with staff		
9:15 - 10:15	Meeting with faculty		
10:15 - 10:30	B R E A K		
10:30 - 11:30	Reviewers meeting		
11:30 - 12:00	Meeting with Dean of Graduate Studies		
12:00 - 13:00	Lunch	Graduate students	
13:00 - 14:00	Meeting with staff/faculty		
14:00 - 14:30	Meeting with Provost/Associate Provost Enrolment and Academic Programs		
14:30 - 14:45	B R E A K		
14:45 - 16:00	Reviewers meeting		
16:00 - 16:30	Meeting with the Dean		
DAY 3			
9:00 – 10:30	Pick up and tour of the facilities		
10:30 – 13:00	Time for reviewers to draft preliminary report		

* This time serves to accommodate unit members who wish to meet separately with the review team.

Site visit checklist

Status	Lead	Prior to site visit
		Identify dates that work for all reviewers and executive team (Dean, Associate Dean(s), Head/Director, Provost/Associate Provost)
		Secure meeting times for the review team and executive team
		Choose a main contact person for the review team when on site. This person should be available and on campus during the site visit and willing to provide their cellphone number to reviewers should they need to talk to somebody during the day.
		Book flights and hotel accommodations for review team. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unit member who is picking up and dropping off reviewers every day: Choose hotel location accordingly (e.g. Four Points by the airport vs. hotel downtown) - Payment methods: Booking flights and hotel for the reviewers may save time from processing reimbursements
		Book rooms on campus that are comfortable and conducive for dialogue. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural lighting - Sitting arrangement - Clock in the room - Space for catering - Room privacy
		Finalize site visit schedule ensuring time is set aside for all stakeholders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engagement of students can be difficult to achieve. Thus, scheduling their meeting time over lunch can help. Be sure to let them know food will be served and gather their RSVP for catering plans and to send them reminders the day before. - To ensure integrity of the process, schedule an introductory and concluding meeting/dinner with the unit's executive team. It is strongly advised not to schedule dinners or other meetings with the unit's executive throughout the site visit.
		Share the finalized schedule with all relevant partners and stakeholders including the Office of the Provost
		Make the necessary arrangements for catering on campus and dinner reservations off campus as needed
During the site visit		
		Gather at least one of the reviewer's cellphone number as point of contact during the site visit
		Agree on a pick-up/drop off time and location for the site visit
		Remind reviewers to keep all receipts for reimbursements
		Give the reviewers a hard copy of the schedule and help them stay on track by giving them 5-minute warnings
		Plan to walk with them when location changes are scheduled to ensure they are in the right place at the right time
		Collect all receipts from reviewers after the visit to process reimbursements as appropriate
		Ensure complete privacy for reviewers and unit members throughout the visit (i.e., nobody from the leadership team of the unit under review should be present during the scheduled conversations with members)
After the site visit		
		Email reviewers to thank them
		Process any receipts collected from the site visit
		Upon reception of the reviewers' report, process honorarium. Call reviewers directly to gather their personal information as required by the finance department



Appendix J: Response and action plan template

Overview

- Who was consulted and engaged in writing this action plan?
- How will the unit use this action plan for future planning and decision making?

Linkages to the Unit and UBC’s Strategic Plans

Specify linkages between the results of the review to your unit’s strategic plan, the broader faculty plan, and UBC’s strategic plan(s) as relevant.

Recommendations Identified by the External Review Committee		
Recommendation	Response/Action	Timeline/Responsibility
<p>Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021:</p> <p>The university should embed a requirement in the review process for clear articulation of the linkage of the review outcomes with unit and university strategic plans.</p>	<p>Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise program review policy to explicitly include this expectation. • Develop resources to support academic units to achieve this goal. 	<p>Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021:</p> <p>Senate; Provost Office (with support from CTL)</p> <p>Policy review – November 2022</p> <p>Resource Development – June 2023</p>

Glossary of Acronyms [if relevant]



Appendix K: Progress update report template (2 years after submission of the response report, action plan and summary)

Date of the site visit:

Date of submission of the response report, action plan and summary:

Recommendations Identified by the External Review Committee			
Recommendation	Response/Action	Timeline/Responsibility	Progress update
<p>Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021:</p> <p>The university should embed a requirement in the review process for clear articulation of the linkage of the review outcomes with unit and university strategic plans.</p>	<p>Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise program review policy to explicitly include this expectation. Develop resources to support academic units to achieve this goal. 	<p>Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021:</p> <p>Senate; Provost Office (with support from CTL)</p> <p>Policy review – November 2022</p> <p>Resource Development – June 2023</p>	<p>E.g., The program review policy has been revised and changes have been made based on campus-wide consultations to emphasize this expectation.</p>