External Review Guidelines for Faculties or Colleges Governing Academic Programs

Note: This resource package is for departmentalized Faculties

Contents

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 complement the UBC policy governing academic reviews and have been designed to support units in planning and preparing for their external review to ensure relevance, consistency, transparency and effectiveness.

Context

This resource package supports the UBC Okanagan academic community in conducting external reviews of Faculties, Colleges or Institutes governing academic programs. External reviews are normally conducted every five to seven years and aligned with the appointment or appointment extension of a Dean.

Guiding policies and procedures: Academic reviews are common UBC practice under Senate Policy on External Reviews of Academic Units (J-305) and Board of Governors Policy on Deans Extensions (AP8).

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 academic review has five main components:

1. Initiation of the Review

It is the responsibility of the Provost's Office to initiate the review. The initiation is normally marked with a conversation between the Provost and the Dean of the unit, and a memo to all members of the unit. The entire review can take between 12 to 18 months and is normally planned to inform the appointment or re-appointment of a Dean. The Provost's Office is also responsible for the site-visit logistics and expenses.

An initial meeting is organized by the Provost's Office between members of the office, OPAIR (Okanagan Planning and Institutional Research) and the unit's leadership to:

1. Review expectations of an academic review per Ministry, UBC policies, and Provost's Office

2. Ensure access to relevant documentation from the previous unit's academic review:
   o Self-study report
   o Review committee's report
   o Unit's response and action plan
   o Unit's progress report (2 years after site-visit)

3. Review and discuss this resource package and identify next steps for immediate action:
   o Identify review committee
   o Engagement plan for internal and external community members inclusive of surveys, focus groups, meetings, etc.
   o Plan for writing self-study

4. Review draft of Terms of Reference and standard data package (Appendix C and D) and identify other data needs and sources
   o OPAIR provides support with survey administration and data collection

Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (ToR) or scope of the review are determined by the Provost with input from the Dean. The ToR should clarify the expectations of the review and be adjusted to reflect the unit's needs and priorities. The ToR should inform the composition of the review panel.

Selection of External Review Committee (ERC)

Once the review has been initiated by the Provost, both the Provost's Office and the unit's leadership begin to identify possible reviewers to suggest to the Provost. Unit members should be invited to submit their suggestions directly to the Provost's Office. Submissions must include:
   - Contact information
   - Academic rank
   - Synopsis of academic qualifications and fields(s) of expertise

All suggestions will be considered by the Provost to finalize the review committee, in consultation with the Dean.

When generating a list of reviewers, the following will be considered:

- 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 wish 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 unit under review. 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.](here)

Process Workflow

1. The Provost's Office sends a memo to all unit members to initiate the review and inform them of the process, including the opportunity to suggest reviewers according to the above considerations
2. The Provost and the unit's leadership finalize the review's Terms of Reference
3. The unit produces a final list of potential reviewers and submits the ranked list to the Provost's Office
4. The Provost invites the chosen reviewers to confirm their willingness to participate and secure the site visit dates
5. Once the site visit dates are identified, the unit must submit their self-study report to the Provost's Office **at least six weeks prior to the site visit**. That way the Provost's Office has time to review the report and provide feedback for a final submission to the ERC, at least 4 weeks prior to the visit.
6. In parallel, the unit's leadership team holds an internal meeting to:

   a. Identify the project lead(s) to write the self-study report

   b. Draft the unit's plan for meaningful engagement with internal and external communities

- This includes specific ways in which students, faculty, staff, alumni, and relevant external communities (including Indigenous and other historically, persistently, or systematically marginalized communities) will have the opportunity to engage throughout the process; the goal of the engagement is to inform the self-study, be part of the site visit (as relevant) and to engage in the process to respond to the review committee's report
- Units are encouraged to work with the Senior Advisor to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor on Indigenous Affairs to plan and implement engagement with Indigenous communities

c. Determine a timeline for writing the self-study report, usually a minimum of three months
- Include specific dates for report drafts to be circulated for feedback within the unit and other stakeholders, as appropriate

d. Consider internal process for document version management and file sharing

e. Schedule periodic meetings for status updates within the leadership team and relevant leads
- Maintain the Provost's Office updated on this progress

7. The unit submits draft plan for internal and external engagement to Provost's Office for review and feedback as soon as possible, prior to implementation. Implement once Provost's Office has reviewed.

Timeline
Generally, the selection of the review committee and determination of ToR takes around six weeks.

Appendices

Appendix A: High-level timeline for review process
Appendix B: Considerations for engagement plan with communities
Appendix C: 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 no more than 50 pages with a maximum of 300 pages in appendices. Most importantly, it should provide the review committee with **enough <u>relevant </u>information to answer the questions posed to them in the Terms of Reference**. For example, the review committee will be unable to answer questions around student satisfaction with their academic experience if no relevant data have been included in the report. Similarly, if reviewers are expected to assess alumni engagement, be sure to provide opportunities for alumni to participate or share perspectives to include in the self-study report.

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

- A summary of the previous 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;
- Embedding of the Indigenous Strategic Plan and incorporating 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

Process Workflow

1. Upon initial meeting with the Provost's Office and OPAIR, the unit continues to work with OPAIR to ensure all relevant data is obtained, per final ToR for the review. There are items in the ToR that require data from outside of OPAIR, for which the units is responsible to collect.
2. The unit begins implementing engagement plan per review and feedback from the Provost's Office which may include advice for the Senior Advisor of Indigenous Affairs as well.
3. The unit completes the report informed by the community engagement and the expectations outlined in this document
4. The self-study report is submitted to the Provost's Office by the deadline (at least 6 weeks prior to the site-

visit) and upon review and approval, the Provost shares the report with the review committee. This must be done 4 weeks prior to the site visit.
5. The self-study report (without appendices) and the review's ToR will also be posted on the Provost's Office website.

Timeline

Generally, writing the self-study takes a minimum of three months, inclusive of feedback and collaboration from faculty, students, alumni, external communities and partners. 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 review committee.

Appendices

Appendix D: Self-Study: Guiding questions by ToR and accompanying data sources

Appendix E: Example of a curriculum map

Appendix F: SOAR analysis for programs: report template

3. Site Visit and Review Committee Report

The in-person site visit normally takes three days. Prior to the visit, the Provost's Office notifies the unit and campus community of the dates and options for engagement, including anonymous written submissions in advance to the visit.

An online site visit will be considered if special health and safety regulations are in place.

Timeline
The ERC is asked to submit their report within 4 weeks of the site visit.

Appendices
Appendix G: Groups and people engaged during the site visit

4. Response, Action Plan and Summary

Upon receiving the report from the External Review Committee, the Provost's Office and the unit's leadership reviews the report for factual errors. If any errors are found, the Provost's Office lets the reviewers know so to ensure accuracy in a final report. Once the final report is received, the Provost's Office submits the reviewers' report to the Dean's Office, and if applicable, to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The unit must submit a response that includes:

1. Linkages between the results of the review, the unit, and UBC's strategic plans
2. An 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 and action plan should not be longer than 10 pages and it is shared with the entire unit, the Provost's Office, the Senate Office, and if applicable, the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies.

Summary
The unit must also submit a 2-page summary of the key findings, key recommendations of the ERC, and the unit's response. This summary must be submitted to the Provost's Office for the annual report to Senate on External Reviews.

Normally, the full reviewers' report, as well as the unit's response and action plan, should be made available publicly through the Provost's office website. At a minimum, the summary of the reviewers' recommendations and unit response must be made public on the Provost's office website.

Timeline
The Provost's Office and unit's leadership 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.

The response, action plan, and summary from the unit should be completed within three months of receiving the reviewers' final report and submitted to the Provost's Office.

Appendix H: 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 Office.

Timeline
The progress update must be completed and submitted two years after the submission of the unit's response to the review, action plan, and summary to the Provost's Office.

Appendices
Appendix I: Progress Update Template

Appendix A: High-Level Review Timeline

Milestone	Estimated Time
Initiation of Review, ToR and Selection of Reviewers	February – mid April
Plan for writing self-study inclusive of engagement plan for Provost's Office review	March
Provost's Office reviews engagement plan and provides feedback	March
Faculty implements engagement plan and completes self-study	March – June/July
Faculty submits self-study to Provost's Office	June/July
Provost submits self-study to reviewers at least a month ahead of the site-visit	July/August
Provost holds orientation meeting with review panel prior to site-visit	August
Provost organizes and hosts site-visit	September/October
Reviewers submit final report	October
Faculty submits response, action plan, and summary of the review to Provost	January
Provost uses Faculty summary for annual report to Senate	Fall term
Faculty submits progress update report to Provost's Office	2 years after original response submission

Note: If applicable, the search for a new Dean or extension of a new Dean will begin in tandem with the review process so to ensure the results of the review inform the committee's advice.

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:

    o The IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation
    o 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.

NAME OF UNIT

Goal of the Review
To review the strength and balance of the unit's teaching and research activities, academic programs and service; to evaluate the Faculty'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 address 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,

10. *Physical Infrastructure:* Assess the range and quality of the teaching and research facilities at the unit's disposal, and to determine whether the unit 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 D: Self-Study Report: Guiding Questions by ToR and Accompanying Data Sources

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 plus no more than 300 pages in appendices. This may mean that some Faculties 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 provides 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?	Faculty
To what extent has the unit incorporated sustainability education into the programs?	Faculty

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

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?	Faculty
What is the average number of graduate students per supervisor?	Faculty
How is the unit assessing the quality of faculty supervision?	Faculty
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?	Faculty

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 Faculty
Have you developed a CPE plan for your unit that links CPE activity to your strategic goals and identifies key opportunities for growth?	Faculty

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?	Faculty
What are the outcomes for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows?	Faculty
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?	Faculty
What is the unit doing/planning to do to support and accommodate student affordability?	Faculty
How is the unit/program adapting to their students' diverse needs?	Faculty
How is the unit/program supporting Indigenous students' success?	Faculty
How is the unit/program supporting historically, persistently, or systematically marginalized students' success?	Faculty
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?	Faculty
How many CRC appointments does the unit have?	Faculty
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.	Faculty
What is the research output of the unit? Consider quantity and impact	Faculty
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?	Faculty

6. *Leadership and administration*

Guiding Questions	Data Source
How transparent, flexible, and accessible is the governance and administration of the unit?	Faculty
How satisfied are staff, faculty and students with the leadership of the unit?	Faculty
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?	Faculty

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 Faculty
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?	Faculty
How is your unit supporting staff career advancement and professional development?	Faculty
How satisfied are the unit's staff and faculty at the workplace?	Faculty
How is your unit managing and balancing workload for staff and faculty?	Faculty

8. *Community Engagement*

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

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?	Faculty

10. *Physical Infrastructure*

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

11. *Financial Planning and Resources*

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

12. *Future development*

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

Appendix E: Example of a Curriculum Map

Example of a curriculum map using 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
CORH 203	D	D	D	D	I	D	D	D	D	D
CORH 204	D	I	D	I	N/A	I	N/A	I	I	I
CORH 205	D	I	A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	I	I
CORH 206	A	A	D	D	D	D	A	D	D	D
CORH 210	D	I	I	D	I	I	N/A	I	I	D
CORH 216	D	D	A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CORH 304	A	A	A	A	D	A	D	A	A	D
CORH 321	D	D	A	D	D	D	D	A	A	D
CORH 331	A	D	A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	D	D
CORH 400	A / D	A	D / A	D	N/A	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CORH 405	A	A	A	A	N/A	D	N/A	D / N/A / A	N/A / D	D
CORH 499	A	D	D	D	N/A	D	N/A	D / N/A	D	A

Mapping Scale:

Colour	Mapping 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 F: 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/

Program Name: [Insert Here]

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:

- Goal 5:

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 G: Groups and People Engaged During the Site-Visit

1. Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Principal

2. Provost and Vice-President Academic & Associate Provosts

3. VP Research and Innovation, AVP Finance and Operations, AVP Students, AVP University Relations

4. Senior Advisor to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor on Indigenous Affairs

5. Executive Director, Development and Alumni Engagement

6. Dean of the Faculty

7. Associate Deans of the Faculty (where applicable)

8. Deans/Associate Deans of other Faculties/Schools

9. Department heads, program/centre directors, etc. within the Faculty (where applicable)

10. Key administrative (M&P) and support staff of the Faculty (Student Academic Services, Admissions, Awards, Student Affairs, Finance, Development, IT, etc.)

11. Chairs of Faculty Standing Committees and Special Programs

12. Group Meetings with faculty members (professors, instructors, lecturers, etc.)

13. Group Meetings with adjunct faculty members (where applicable)

14. Members of the Faculty's External/Internal Advisory Committees (where applicable)

15. Representatives of the Faculty's Professional Associations and Practitioners (where applicable)

16. Graduate and undergraduate students including representatives of student groups/associations

17. Group meetings with alumni

18. Other individuals/groups identified by the Faculty or the Provost

19. Members of UBC who wish to engage in the review of the Faculty and choose to attend the open sessions

Appendix H: Template: Response and Action Plan

External Review Panel & Site Visit Dates:

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 and UBC's strategic plan(s) as relevant].

Recommendations Identified by the Review Panel		
Recommendation	Response/Action	Timeline/Responsibility
Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021: The university should embed a requirement in the review process for clear articulation of the linkage of the review outcomes with and university strategic plans.	Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021: • Revise program review policy to explicitly include this expectation. • Develop resources to support academic units to achieve this goal.	Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021: Senate; Provost Office (with support from CTL) Policy review – November 2022 Resource Development – June 2023

Glossary of Acronyms [if relevant]

Appendix I: Template: Progress Update (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 Review Panel			
Recommendation	Response/Action	Timeline/Responsibility	Progress update
Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021: 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.	Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021: • Revise program review policy to explicitly include this expectation. • Develop resources to support academic units to achieve this goal.	Example from the audit of UBC Okanagan in 2021: Senate; Provost Office (with support from CTL) Policy review – November 2022 Resource Development – June 2023	E.g., The program review policy has been revised and changes have been made based on campus-wide consultations to emphasize this expectation.

Glossary of Acronyms [if relevant]