Guidelines for External Academic Reviews

Appendix to Senate policy J-305 on External Reviews of Academic Units
Applicable to:
- Academic departments
- Schools
- Faculties
- The College of Graduate Studies
- Academic programs

Prepared by: Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic
Last updated: January, 2026

Contents

Introduction

An external review is a mechanism for quality assurance and enhancement, and an opportunity for learning, sharing and creating a collective vision for the unit, its programs and the communities it serves. This process allows for evaluation, planning and prioritization of short and long-term goals every five to seven years.

These guidelines support academic departments, schools, faculties, the College of Graduate Studies, and individual programs (graduate or undergraduate), in planning and executing a transparent and organized review while using resources available for a successful and meaningful process.

Guiding policies and procedures: Academic reviews are governed by Senate Policy on External Reviews of Academic Units (J-305) and aligned with Board of Governors AP9 policy on Academic Heads (section 7) and AP8 policy on Deans Extension (section 2 and 6).

In addition, these guidelines support UBC's mandate from the Ministry of Post-Secondary Education and Future Skills to "review all existing programs and initiatives to ensure programs remain relevant, efficient, sustainable, grow the economy, and help keep costs low for British Columbians."

Goal of an academic review: To evaluate program quality and academic operations of units at UBC, highlighting the strengths and challenges of educational and research programs as well as the adequacy of resources to support institution and unit goals. Refer to the policy J-305 for further details.

Components of an external review
- Self-study report
- External review committee (ERC) site visit
- External review committee report
- Unit's response, action plan, and summary for Senate
- Progress report, 2 years after the site visit

Review of individual programs: Per J-305 policy section 5, "all cross-Faculty degree programs, programs offered by more than one academic unit, and any interdisciplinary programs shall be reviewed, independently, every 5 to 7 years". Though these reviews tend to be shorter, almost all sections of the standard Terms of Reference are applicable, and all components of an external review (as listed above) must be included. The Provost's Office offers support and guidance in adapting these guidelines to an individual program review.

Review of Faculties and the College of Graduate Studies: Per J-305 policy, "in the case of a Faculty or College, [the responsible executive for the academic reviews is] the Academic Vice-

President(s) for the campus(es) in which the Faculty of College is organized." As such, these guidelines are adaptable and applicable to those reviews, whereby the Provost and VP Academic takes the place of the Dean, and the Dean takes the place of the unit's leadership throughout the document, for the purpose of completing such reviews.

Process

Initiation of the review

It is the responsibility of the Dean's Office to initiate unit reviews within their Faculty in accordance with 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 typically begins with a conversation among leadership of the Faculty and the unit under review to plan for the upcoming review, which can take between 12 to 18 months. Shortly after the initiation, a separate meeting should be organized to:

1. Gather and review documentation from the last academic review of the unit:
   - Self-study report
   - External Review Committee report
   - Unit's response and action plan
   - Unit's progress report (two years after site visit)

2. Review and discuss these guidelines to identify expectations, process and templates

3. Identify next steps for immediate action:
   - Identify possible reviewers
   - Review standard Terms of Reference (ToR) and discuss edits or additions with the Dean required for the upcoming 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, industry partners, members of Indigenous communities, etc.
   - Draft an engagement plan for the identified community members, which may include surveys, focus groups, meetings, etc.
     - Consider providing a wide range of options to engage with the review, including anonymous and confidential feedback
   - Review the engagement plan with the Deans' Office 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. Importantly, plan to meet with PAIR (Planning and Institutional Research) and CoGS (if graduate programs are involved) as soon as possible to communicate the review timeline and data needs. PAIR and CoGS will then begin preparing the standard data package (further details in appendix E) to support reviews inclusive of the standard financial reporting from the unit's Finance Manager. PAIR and CoGS may also provide data for any unique needs identified by the unit in the ToR.

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 these guidelines. The ToR should be clear and be adjusted to reflect the unit's needs and priorities. The Provost's Office can support with editing the ToR if needed.

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 potential 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 for potential reviewers should be considered by the Dean's Office, in consultation with the leadership of the unit under review. When generating a list of reviewers, consider the following:
- Academic leadership from peer institutions;
- Relevant academic experience in quality assessment and enhancement, research, curriculum design, teaching and learning and administration;
- Any required or desired professional credentials and/or related work experience;
- Understanding of the BC post-secondary educational context;
- Potential conflicts of interest;
- Members of Indigenous communities;
- Equity representation of diverse lived experiences and perspective across historically, persistently and systematically marginalized groups;
- Understanding of competency-based education or expertise in the development and delivery of undergraduate/graduate curricula within the disciplinary context.

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 unit under review. Particularly, reviewers should not be research partners with unit members or have had a supervisory role of a unit member. Further details can be found in UBC's Conflict of Interest and Commitment policies.

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 from the Dean prior to implementation

3. Concurrently, 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). Depending on Faculty's policies, the Provost may need to approve the list of potential reviewers. Approval may take two to three weeks.

4. The Dean and the unit's leadership finalize the Terms of Reference for the review

5. The Dean (or identified lead in the Dean's Office) invites the selected reviewers to confirm their participation. Note that this is often a challenging task and could take up to five 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
   - Include relevant university's policies that can contribute to their work and/or they are expected to comply with UBC policies, such as the Discrimination, Sexual Violence Prevention, Respectful Workplace policies, etc.
   - Include a high-level timeline of the review and targeted timing of the site visit.

6. Once the external review committee (ERC) is confirmed, the site visit dates must be secured. Site visits are typically held over two to three days, depending on the size of the unit.

7. The Dean shares the list of ERC members along with a summary of their biography and any other relevant information with the Provost.

8. The Dean shares ERC members and site visit dates with all unit members, Provost's Office, and other key executives expected to engage with the review (e.g., DVC, VPs, AVPs). See Appendix E.

9. Additional key information must be sent to the reviewers after securing the site visit dates:
   - Scope of the review and ToR
   - 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)
     - 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.
     - The site visit schedule must be ready ahead of this meeting

10. Find a conducive space on campus for the site visit meetings

11. Begin developing the site visit schedule and securing participation of UBC Okanagan executives and unit members as required

12. Upon review and approval by the Dean, begin implementation of the engagement plan

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 to support this part of the process

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
Appendix E: Groups and People Engaged During the Site-Visit

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 reviewers 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 should appropriately embed the feedback received during the unit-led engagement plan and, at minimum, all sections required by the Senate policy (find further details in appendix I).

Process Workflow

1. Unit requests data from PAIR for the self-study report and shares the ToR (if different from the standard template), to help compile a meaningful data package

2. Unit collects data from other units (e.g., CoGS), 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 individuals invited to the site visit
   - The Dean's Office or unit under review may choose to post their self-study (with or 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 unit leadership to review, make suggestions or additions to the self-study before sending it to the reviewers.

Appendices to support this part of the process

Appendix F: Self-study report: guiding questions and accompanying data by ToR
Appendix G: Example of a self-study report outline
Appendix H: Example of a curriculum map
Appendix I: SOAR analysis: report template
Appendix J: Checklist: Minimum required content by Senate policy

Site visit and External Review Committee (ERC) report

The site visits are typically held over two to three days, depending on the size of the unit. The report from the committee should be submitted to the unit within 4 weeks of the visit.

A project lead (in the Dean's Office or the unit under review) should be identified to take responsibility for logistics, including the timing/schedule, accommodations, travel, on-campus meeting rooms, catering, processing expenses and payment of honoraria (review 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. Ensure the final schedule appropriately accommodates the reviewers' time zones.

2. For group meetings, consider booking a conference room on campus to allow local participants to meet together.

3. Submit an IT support ticket for the meeting room(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 meeting hosts.

Timeline

For a February – March visit, dates and details of the visit should be finalized by October. Reviewers should submit their report within four weeks of the site visit.

Appendices to support this part of the process

Appendix K: Site visit schedule example and checklist

Unit 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 informs the reviewers to ensure accuracy of the final report.

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

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, Faculty 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 L: Response and action plan template

Progress update

A progress update is a short report on progress made toward 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. Upon completion, the progress update is to be 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 submission of the unit's response and action plan.

Appendices to support this part of the process

Appendix M: Progress update template

Appendix A: Generic high-level timeline for process

Activity	Lead(s)	Deadline
Initiation of review: ToR and selection of reviewers		
Planning meeting (Dean's Office and unit leadership)		July
Contact PAIR (and CoGs if required) to request data		August
Request suggestions for reviewers		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 draft external review report for factual errors		February/March
Process honoraria		February/March
Response, action plan and summary		
Review external review 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

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
3. Agreement on purpose, reasons and levels of engagement.

Further considerations for the engagement plan include:

- 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 or areas of their educational, research and/or administrative operations that they would like to share with stakeholders and communities for input. These areas should be identified after reviewing the data collected from PAIR, CoGs and their own units to avoid duplication of efforts or engagement fatigue.

- A list of stakeholders, partners, and communities should be developed based on purpose and reason to engage. For engagement with Indigenous communities, contact Adrienne Vedan for guidance.

- 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.

- For more guidelines and best practices co-developed by the members of the UBC Okanagan Community Partnerships Table, contact the Provost's Office.

Appendix C: Email template to invite external reviewers

Dr. XXXXX
[Address]
Email: [address]

Re: Invitation to serve as member of external review team

Dear Dr. XXXX:

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:
- Evaluate program quality and academic operations of the unit highlight the strengths and challenges of educational and research programs of the unit;
- Advise on the unit's future development.

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. External reviewers will be expected to submit a final report of their findings within four weeks of the site visit.

External reviewers will receive an honorarium of CAD $1,200.00 upon completion of the final report. 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 template to guide the academic review of a department, school or individual program. Units may edit as needed to add specific areas of focus or remove references to activities that are not relevant to the unit or program. For example, if your unit is working through a question or change you would like feedback on, ensure it is included. Such requests should also be reflected in data provided in the self-study report.

External Review Terms of Reference

Purpose of the review
Academic unit reviews are required to evaluate program quality and academic operations of units at UBC, highlighting the strengths and challenges of educational and research programs as well as the adequacy of resources to support institution and unit goals.

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 undergraduate programs, assess the quality of teaching, and compare its performance 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 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 institutional 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 Strategic Directions](#), [Outlook 2040](#), [Indigenous Strategic Plan](#), [Declaration of Truth and Reconciliation Commitments](#), [Strategic Equity and Anti-Racism (StEAR) Framework](#), [Climate Emergency Task Force Report](#) and [Student Strategic Plan](#).

10. ***Physical infrastructure:*** Assess the range and quality of the teaching and research facilities at the unit's disposal, and 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 and 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: Groups and People Engaged During the Site-Visit

1. Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Principal (in the case of the review of a Faculty or the College)

2. Provost and Vice-President Academic & Associate Provosts

3. VP Research and Innovation, AVP Finance and Operations, AVP Students, AVP University Relations (in the case of the review of a Faculty or the College)

4. Senior Advisor to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor on Indigenous Affairs (in the case of the review of a Faculty or the College)

5. Executive Director, Development and Alumni Engagement (in the case of the review of a Faculty or the College)

6. Dean of the unit

7. Associate Deans of the Faculty (where applicable)

8. Deans/Associate Deans of other Faculties/Schools, as appropriate

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

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

11. Chairs of unit committees and special programs or initiatives

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

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

14. Members of the unit'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 unit or the responsible executive (the Dean or the Provost, in the case of a Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies)

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

Appendix F: 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, with 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, SSHRC application guidelines provide a useful example, recommending consideration of 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.

Data

As a standard to support external reviews, PAIR and CoGS provide data packages to help units answer many of the review's ToR through the self-study. The PAIR data package includes financial reports for units, including last three years actuals, current year and next year forecasts, as approved. Additionally, the Development and Alumni Engagement Office (DAE) provides alumni engagement reports upon request by the unit (contact ok.alumni@ubc.ca).

Terms of Reference, Guiding Questions and Accompanying Data

The self-study authors should use multiple data points to reflect on the self-study report sections and provide complete and contextualized answers. For example, when the unit is asked to reflect on their students' experiences, they can refer to multiple data points from PAIR (e.g., class sizes, student-to-faculty ratio, student experience survey results, etc.) but also their own data, to provide an answer which might be 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...)?	PAIR
What is the unit's student-to-faculty ratio?	PAIR
What is the overall student experience and level of satisfaction with the unit?	PAIR and Unit
How do students perceive the quality of instruction in the courses delivered by the unit?	PAIR
How many undergraduate students applied, were admitted and registered?	PAIR

What are the program time-to-completion rates for undergraduate students?	PAIR
What are the student retention rates?	PAIR
How do students perform academically?	PAIR
What is the total composition and distribution of students across programs' years?	PAIR
What is the relative distribution of international and domestic students by program and specialization?	PAIR
What citizenships are held by the international students by program/level?	PAIR
What is the enrollment of Indigenous students by year compared to the applicable campus?	PAIR
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? 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?	PAIR
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 does the student funding level compare with other institutions?	Unit
How many graduate students applied, were admitted and registered?	COGS
What is the overall student experience and level of satisfaction with the unit?	COGS
What are the program time-to-outcome rates for the unit's graduate students?	COGS
How successful are the unit's graduate students in competing for national tri-agency funding and university awards?	COGS

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, high school youth 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?	Provost's Office and Unit
What are the outcomes for undergraduate students?	Provost's Office
To what extent are the students engaged and satisfied with their educational experience?	PAIR
Do students feel well advised and supported to achieve academic success?	PAIR
How satisfied are graduates with their educational experience?	PAIR
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 Faculty/program assessing the quality of teaching performance?	PAIR
What is the students' experience from recruitment through admission and first registration and orientation?	PAIR

Guiding questions	Data source
How diverse is the unit's student body and how is the unit and its program adapting to their diverse needs? Specifically Indigenous students and historically, persistently, or systemically marginalized (HPSM) groups	Unit ([Student Diversity Census](#))

5. *Research, scholarly, creative and professional activity*

Guiding questions	Data source
How much research funding does the unit generate?	PAIR
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?	PAIR
What are the hiring trends for faculty (faculty renewal)?	PAIR

Guiding questions	Data source
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?	PAIR and Unit
What is the composition of your staff complement?	PAIR
What is the ratio of staff to faculty over time?	PAIR
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 and [DAE](#)

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?	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 G: Example of a self-study report outline

The following items should generally be included in the self-study report outline.

1. Executive summary

2. Unit overview
   a. Unit 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 that includes 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 that includes 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. Student success, experience and support

9. Research, scholarly, creative and professional activity
   a. Internal and external funding

10. Leadership and administration

11. People, environment and culture

12. Engagement with Indigenous ways of knowing, histories, worldviews and/or progress advancing goals of the [Indigenous Strategic Plan](#)

13. Engagement with alumni

14. Service and community partnership

15. Role within UBCO and effectiveness in fulfilling that role, including health and safety requirements

16. Physical infrastructure

17. Financial planning and resources

18. Future development

19. Head/Director's summary
    a. Recommendations for improvement

20. Appendices
    a. External Review 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 (Student Experience of Teaching [SEQTs]/Student Experience of Instructions [SEoIs])
    f. Peer review procedures
    g. Scholarship data
    h. Committees
    i. Faculty CV's

Appendix H: Example of a curriculum map

Find an example below of a curriculum map developed using UBC's Curriculum MAP website.

Table Legend			
Colour	**Mapping Scale**	**Abbreviation**	**Description**
Light Blue	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.
Medium Blue	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.
Dark Blue	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 settings.

Program Learning Outcomes Example	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

Appendix I: SOAR analysis template

Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, and Results (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.

Strengths 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.

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

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 J: Checklist — Minimum required content for the self-study report by Senate policy

The self-study report must include:

- ☐ Summary of previous review recommendations and actions taken by the unit;
- ☐ Summary of operations of academic unit;
- ☐ Assessment of quality of instruction, research and service or outreach with quality enhancement plans for each area;
- ☐ Assessment of the integration of the Indigenous Strategic Plan and the incorporation of principles of accessibility, equity, diversity and inclusion.
- ☐ Assessment of the value to students' education (undergraduate and graduate) and preparation;
- ☐ Evaluation of the adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human);
- ☐ Evaluation of strengths and challenges across all administrative and student services within the unit;
- ☐ Role within UBC and effectiveness in fulfilling that role, including health and safety requirements; and
- ☐ Future objectives and resources or change necessary to achieve them.

Program information (both undergraduate and graduate):

- ☐ Assessment of the continuing appropriateness of the program(s) structure, admissions requirements, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and standards;
- ☐ Evaluation of the embedding of Indigenous and globally diverse perspectives at all levels, including engagement with community members;
- ☐ Summary of how accessible, equitable and inclusive principles and practices are included at all levels of teaching;
- ☐ Evaluation of faculty performance including the quality of teaching and supervision and demonstrable current knowledge and expertise in the field of specialization;
- ☐ Assessment of the learning outcomes achieved by students/graduates and how they meet the program's stated goals, the degree level standard, and the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association;
- ☐ Evaluation of the continuing adequacy of methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement to ensure the degree level standards are met; and,
- ☐ Summary of the graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, employer satisfaction level, advisory board satisfaction level, student satisfaction level and graduate rate where appropriate.

Appendix K: Site visit schedule example and checklist

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	Break		
10:30 - 11:00	Meeting with the Dean / Associate 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	Break		
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	Break		
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, Teaching and Learning		
14:30 - 14:45	Break		
14:45 - 16:00	Reviewers meeting		
16:00 - 16:30	Meeting with the Dean		
DAY 3			
9:00 – 10:30	Pick up from hotel and tour of 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 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 support during the day.
		Book flights and accommodations for review team. Consider: • 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) • Booking flights and hotel for the reviewers may save time processing reimbursements
		Book rooms on campus that are comfortable and conducive for dialogue. Consider: • 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. Student engagement can be difficult to achieve. Thus, scheduling their meeting time over lunch can help. Be sure to let them know food will be served, gather RSVPs for catering, and to send reminders the day before.
		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 to ensure integrity of the process.
		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
Status	**Lead**	**During the site visit**
		Request at least one reviewer's cellphone number as point of contact during the site visit
		Agree on pick up/drop off times and locations

Status	Lead	
		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., Members of the leadership team of the unit under review should be present during the scheduled conversations with faculty members)
Status	**Lead**	**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 L: Response and action plan template

External Review Committee members and site visit dates:

Date when the unit's response and action plan was submitted to the Provost's Office, Office of the Senate, and if the unit offers a graduate program, the College of Graduate Studies' Dean:

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 institutional 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.

Note: Well-defined action items with clear timelines and responsibilities will help support the unit in completing the two-year progress report.

Recommendations Identified by the External Review Committee		
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 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

Glossary of Acronyms [if relevant]

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

External Review Committee members and date of the site visit:

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

Summary of major accomplishments, changes to original action plan and challenges since submission of the unit's response:

Recommendations Identified by the External Review Committee			
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.