THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Okanagan Campus

External Reviews of Academic Units

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

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

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

Context

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

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

Definition of academic unit: Academic units include, but are not limited to Faculties, Schools, Departments, Colleges, Institutes, Centres and Research Units. However, this resource package does not apply to the review of a departmentalized Faculty or a College that governs an academic program.

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; to assess the department's standing nationally and internationally; and to advise on the future development of the unit and its programs.

An Academic Review has five main components:

Getting Started

An academic review is a year-long process. To get started, organize a unit leadership meeting to:

- Gather and review documentation from previous unit's academic review:
    - Self-study document
    - Reviewers' report
    - Unit's response and action plan
    - Unit's progress report (2 years after site-visit)

- Review and discuss this resource package

- Identify the project lead(s) for self-study process, site visit process and logistical support
    - Note that the Dean's Office is responsible for the review's expenses

- Determine a project timeline
    - Include plan for engaging UBC internal and external communities for Dean's Office review
        - Engagement plan for engaging with Indigenous communities should be submitted to the Provost's Office for review, feedback and guidance
    - Include specific dates for drafts and their circulation for feedback from the unit
    - Consider internal process for document management and file sharing

- Schedule periodic meetings for status updates

- Identify key stakeholders and members who need to be invited to be part of the process. For example, faculty members, internal student committees, unit staff members, alumni, employers, members of Indigenous communities, etc.

Additionally, it is key to meet with OPAIR (Okanagan Planning and Institutional Research) as soon as possible to communicate the review timeline and data needs.

Appendices

Appendix A: Generic high-level timeline for review process
Appendix B: Considerations for engagement plan with communities

1. Initiation of Review: Terms of Reference and Selection of Reviewers

Selection of Reviewers

It is the responsibility of the Dean's Office to initiate the review as per the central schedule of reviews, published on the Provost's Office website.

The initiation of a unit review is normally marked with a conversation among the unit's leadership to plan for the review and begin identifying possible reviewers. When generating a list of reviewers, consider the following:

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

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

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

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

Scope and Terms of Reference

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

Process Workflow

1. Rank the potential reviewers and identify the preferred reviewer team (two—three depending on the size of the unit).
2. Submit the ranked list to the Provost's Office for information or support if needed (depending on Faculty's procedures, the Provost may need to approve the list of reviewers. If this is the case, approval can take two—three weeks).
3. The Dean (or identified lead in the Dean's office) invites the chosen reviewers to confirm their willingness to participate.

4. Once the reviewers have been secured, send a follow-up email with the following information:
    - Scope of the review and ToR
    - Site visit dates (detailed schedule can be distributed closer to the site visit)
    - Date by which they can expect the self-study report from the unit (one month in advance is the standard)
    - University's policies that can contribute to their work and/or they are expected to comply with such as the Discrimination, Sexual Violence Prevention, and the Respectful Workplace Policy.
    - Compensation ($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
    - A time for a phone/virtual meeting before the self-study is shared with the reviewers. This meeting is between the reviewers and the unit's executive team to clarify expectations and establish document-sharing protocols.
5. Find a conducive space on campus for the site visit meetings.

Timeline

Generally, the selection of reviewers and determination of ToR takes around 4 weeks. For a February – March visit, reviewers should be selected and contacted prior to the start of classes in September.

Appendices

Appendix C: Terms of Reference

Appendix D: Email template to invite reviewers

2. Self-Study

The self-study report is at the core of the review process. The document should demonstrate a balance between data, reflection and vision that is well-organized and less than 40 pages plus appendices. Most importantly, it should provide the reviewers with enough relevant information to answer the questions posed to them in the ToR. For example, the reviewers will be unable to answer questions around 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 includes:

- A summary of the last review: The summary should highlight the unit's progress towards previous recommendations, including those not being pursued.
- Unit and program data relevant to the ToR
- Student and community voices: Self-study authors should create meaningful opportunities for students, alumni, and community partners (as relevant) to take part in the process of writing and reflecting on their experiences when completing the self-study report. Data from OPAIR can be used to contextualize/guide this engagement via focus groups, surveys, or gatherings on or off campus.
- Program information: The review of a unit includes the review of its programs. This includes:
    - Program structure, admissions requirements, and method of delivery
    - The program's continuous achievement of the degree level standards, and where appropriate, standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association
    - Program learning outcomes and their assessment: If not already identified, units should use the review as an opportunity to work with the Centre for Teaching and Learning to develop sound learning outcomes for a program and courses, and identify ways in which they can be intentionally and appropriately assessed for the purpose of program evaluation.
    - Program curriculum maps: A curriculum map is a well-structured way to show how courses and program requirements contribute to program learning outcomes and objectives. A useful tool to do this is UBC's Curriculum MAP.
    - Where appropriate, the graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, employer satisfaction level, advisory board satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduate rate
    - Program's alignment with its unit's current mission, goals and long-range plan
    - SOAR analysis: This analysis provides a concise summary of Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results (SOAR) developed via meetings with faculty, unit leadership, students, and alumni.

Process Workflow

1. Unit requests data from OPAIR for the self-study and shares the ToR to help compile a meaningful data package.
2. Unit identifies ways in which students, faculty, staff, alumni, and relevant external 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 (if relevant) and to respond to the reviewer's report.
3. Unit formally notifies stakeholders about the review, including all faculty, students, staff, alumni and communities. Such notification identifies the specific opportunities for them to provide input.
4. The self-study project lead completes the report informed by community engagement.
5. The self-study report is provided to the reviewers one month ahead of the site visit.

Timeline

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

Appendices

Appendix E: Example of a self-study outline and suggested items for appendices

Appendix F: Example of a curriculum map

Appendix G: SOAR analysis: report template

Appendix H: Summary of data available from OPAIR

3. Site Visit

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

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

Process Workflow

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

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

1. Finalize schedule for online meetings mindful of the reviewers' time zones and accommodate accordingly.
2. For group meetings, consider booking a conference room on campus to allow local participants to meet together.
3. Submit a ticket for IT support for the boardroom(s).
4. Decide whether to use new Zoom links or one Zoom link with waiting room feature
    - It is recommended to use separate links for each meeting unless there is an admin/UBC observer to delegate as host, who can monitor the waiting room.

- IMPORTANT: If you do not have a UBC observer/host, make sure participants can join at any time/5 mins prior to the scheduled meeting (I.e. does not require the host to be present for the meeting to start), since external reviewers cannot be pre-added as meeting hosts.

Timeline

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

Appendices

Appendix I: Site visit schedule example and checklist

4. Response, Action Plan and Summary

Upon receiving the reviewers' report, the unit's leadership reviews the report for factual errors. If any errors are found, the unit lets the reviewers know so to ensure accuracy in a final report. Once the final report is received, the unit must submit a response that includes:

1. Linkages between the results of the review and 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.).

This report is shared with the entire unit, the Dean's Office, the Provost's Office and the Senate Office.

A summary (maximum of 2 pages) of the response and action plan should be made available publicly via the unit's or Faculty's website. The Provost's Office will include this summary in the annual report of academic reviews to Senate.

Timeline

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

Appendices

Appendix J: Response and action plan template

5. Progress Update

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

Timeline

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

Appendices

Appendix K: Progress Update Template

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Template: Generic High-Level Timeline for Process

	Lead(s)	Deadline	Notes
Initiation of Review: ToR and Selection of Reviewers			
Kick-off meeting		July	
Contact OPAIR to request data		August	
Selection of Terms of Reference		August	
Generate reviewers list		August	
Selection of reviewers		August	
Invitation and confirmation of reviewers		September	
Bookings for site-visit		September	
Self-study			
Formal communication to unit		September	
Gather input from unit		September – November	
Engage with external communities		September – November	
Write document		September – November	
Distribute document for feedback		December	
Send document to reviewers		January	
Site-visit			
Orientation meeting with reviewers		January	
Host site-visit		February	
Review reviewers’ report for factual errors		February/March	
Process honoraria		February/March	
Response, action plan and summary			
Review reviewers’ report with unit		March	
Engage unit and external communities to respond		March – May	
Send final response to reviewers, Provost’s Office and Senate Office		May	
Follow-up			
Update website with review documents		May/June	
Plan for unit’s next steps towards action plan		May/June	
Final archival review and file closure		June/July	

Appendix B

Considerations for the Engagement Plan with Communities

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

- The Community Engagement Office offers a definition that could be helpful to guide this process. They define community engagement as "The interaction and collaboration between UBC and all parts of the wider community (local, regional, national and global) for the collectively beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity."

- The unit must have a clear understanding of the questions/areas of their educational, research, and/or administrative operations, that they are hoping to share with stakeholders/communities for input. These areas should be identified after reviewing the data already gathered and available through OPAIR and their own units, so to avoid duplication of efforts or engagement fatigue from partners/communities.

- A list of stakeholders, partners, and communities should be developed based on purpose and reason to engage. This list should include Indigenous communities which is to be reviewed by the Provost's Office, for guidance and support as needed, via the submission on their engagement plan.

- To decide the level of engagement, these may be helpful, depending on the unit and agreed upon reason and purpose:

    - The IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation
    - Framework for engagement with industry by Manwaring, R., Holloway, J., & Coffey, B. (2020).

- It is key to include a communications plan throughout the process to ensure expectations and opportunities for engagement are clear, and that the results from the engagement are made available in a timely manner to all involved.

Appendix C
Template: Email to invite reviewers

[Date]

Dr. XXXX
[Address]

Email: [address]

Dear Dr. XXXX:

<u>RE: INVITATION TO SERVE AS MEMBER OF EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM</u>

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

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

The purposes of the external review include:

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

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

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

Sincerely,

[Dean's Name]
[Title, Faculty]

Appendix D

Terms of Reference

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

Terms of Reference of External Review Team

Purpose of the Review:

To review the strength and balance of the Unit's teaching and research activities, academic programs, and service; to evaluate the Faculty's leadership and administration; to assess the Unit's standing nationally and internationally; and to advise on the future development of the Unit.

Background Material

- The Faculty's goals and objectives as outlined in its Strategic Plan (here if applicable), the Okanagan 2040 Outlook, and the UBC Strategic Plan (Shaping UBC's Next Century).
- The Unit Self-Study.

Terms of reference

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

1. ***Undergraduate Education and Student Learning:*** To review and evaluate the quality, extent, format, organization, and enrolment of the Faculty'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):*** To review and evaluate the quality, extent, format, organization, and enrolment of the Faculty's graduate programs, and compare its performance to that of its national and international peers.

3. ***Student Academic Experience and Support:*** To assess the satisfaction and quality of the students' academic experience from first contact upon admission, through to alumni status. How is the Faculty 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 Faculty?

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.

4. ***Research, Scholarly, (Creative and Professional Activity:*** To review and evaluate the quality, extent, range, and balance of the scholarly and teaching activities of the Faculty, with particular attention to the achievement and status of scholars, artists and practitioners within the Faculty, their leadership within their communities-of-praxis, their granting/funding success, and the quality and quantity of their performance in relation to the achievements of their counterparts in comparable Faculties nationally and internationally.

5. ***Leadership and administration:*** To review and evaluate the governance, organizational structure, leadership, planning, and administration of the Faculty, including opportunities for diversity in leadership and shared governance, the nimbleness and inclusiveness of planning, as well as the relevant support systems both within the Faculty and available to the Faculty. The reviewers should consider the degrees to which governance is transparent, flexible, and accessible to all members of the Faculty.

6. ***People, environment and culture:*** To consider and assess the working and educational environment, morale, and institutional culture of the Faculty, as reflected in the experiences and perceptions of faculty members (including adjunct professors, lecturers, and 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 Faculty's performance relative to the University's employment and equity policies.

7. ***Community Engagement:*** To assess the nature, scope, and effectiveness of the Faculty's outreach activities and the communities' levels of satisfaction with them.

    a. How is the Faculty 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 Faculty 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?

8. ***Support for the University's and Campus Strategic Plans:*** To determine the extent to which the Faculty reinforces through its programs and activities, the key commitments of UBC and UBC Okanagan strategic plans, notably UBC's commitments to People and Places, Research Excellence, Transformative Learning, and Local and Global Engagement.

9. ***Physical Infrastructure:*** To assess the range and quality of the teaching and research facilities at the Faculty's disposal, and to determine whether the Faculty is appropriately housed and equipped to meet its teaching and research goals.

10. ***Financial Planning and Resources:*** To review and evaluate the financial resources of the Faculty, 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.

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

Appendix E

Example: Self-study Report Outline

1. Executive Summary
2. Department Overview
    a. Department and/or Faculty Strategic Plan
3. Summary of the Last Review and Report on Progress
4. Undergraduate Instruction and Learning
    a. Program structure, admissions requirements, and method of delivery
    b. Achievement of the degree level standards
    c. Program learning outcomes and assessment
    d. Program curriculum maps
    e. Program's alignment with its unit's current mission, goals and long-range plan
    f. SOAR analysis: This analysis provides a concise summary of Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results (SOAR) developed via meetings with faculty, unit leadership, students, and alumni.
5. Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
    a. Program structure, admissions requirements, and method of delivery
    b. Achievement of the degree level standards
    c. Program learning outcomes and assessment
    d. Program curriculum maps
    e. Program's alignment with its unit's current mission, goals and long-range plan
    f. SOAR analysis: This analysis provides a concise summary of Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations and Results (SOAR) developed via meetings with faculty, unit leadership, students, and alumni.
6. Research, Scholarly and Professional Activity
    a. Internal and External Funding
7. Student Success, Experience and Support
    a. Graduate employment rates, graduate satisfaction level, employer satisfaction level, advisory board satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduate rate
8. Indigenous Engagement
9. Alumni Engagement
10. Culture of Respect, Diversity and Inclusivity
    a. How does the program ensure inclusive content, design and teaching practices that include different

ways of learning and knowing, intercultural and international perspectives?

b. If the program controls its own recruitment and admissions, how does the program contribute to access and pathways for historically underserved student populations?

c. How diverse is the faculty complement delivering the program? What plans are in place to maintain or increase the diversity?

11. Service and Community Partnerships
12. People and Outstanding Work Environment
13. Resources, administration and governance
14. Head's Summary
    a. SOAR analysis
    b. Recommendations for improvement
15. Appendices
    a. External Review's Terms of Reference
    b. Program details (admission prerequisites and/or program requirements)
    c. Student engagement, learning, and retention data
    d. Course outlines
    e. Teaching data (SEOTs/SEoIs)
    f. Peer review procedures
    g. Scholarship data
    h. Committees
    i. Faculty CV's

Appendix F

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

	Program Learning Outcomes									
	Communication and rhetorical literacies	Rhetorical modes and multimodality	Composition and writing conventions	Communication concepts	History and theories of rhetoric	Interdisciplinary	Indigenous ways of knowing and learning	Research methods	Collaborative	Profe Co
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

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 G

SOAR Analysis: Report Template

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

SOAR Summary Report

SOAR FRAMEWORK

A collaborative approach of open dialogue designed to help programs create a shared vision for the future (Srivastava & Cooperrider, 1990).

Positioned as a potential postcolonial approach to organizational development (Mir et al., 2003).

Involves identifying and building on existing strengths and opportunities, rather than dwelling on problems, deficiencies, weaknesses, and threats.

Focuses on determining which actions will bring the greatest benefit to all stakeholders.

[insert program]

[insert date]

Hoare, A., Dishke Hondzel, C., & Wagner, S. (2022). *Program review handbook: A course-based approach to conduc*

https://programreviewhandbook.pressbooks.tru.ca/

Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths

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

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

Strength The program offers…	**Supporting Statements**
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•

Opportunities

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

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

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

Aspirations

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

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

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

Results

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

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

Goal	Potential Measures
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•
	•

Summary and Next Steps

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

References

Mir, R. A., Mir, A., & Upadhyaya, P. (2003). *Toward a postcolonial reading of organizational control. In Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement* (pp. 47-73). Palgrave Macmillan.

Srivastava, S., & Cooperrider, D. (1990). *Appreciative management and leadership: The power of positive thought and action in organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Stavros, J. & Cole, M. L. (2013). SOARing towards positive transformation and change. *The ABAC ODI Visions.Action.Outcome, 1*(1), 10-34.

Stavros, J.M., Cooperrider, D L, & Kelley, D.L. (2003). Strategic inquiry appreciative intent: Inspiration to SOAR, a new framework for strategic planning. *AI Practitioner.* November, 10-17.

Stavros, J.M. & Hinrichs, G. (2009). *The thin book of SOAR: Building strengths- based strategy.*

Thin Book Publishing Co.

Appendix H
Summary of data available from OPAIR

Enrolment and Completion Statistics

Undergraduate and Graduate student enrolments by:

- Degree program, year level, citizenship, specialization, international/domestic, gender, self-identified Indigeneity

Degree conferrals by:

- Degree program, specialization, international/domestic, gender, self-identified Indigeneity

Retention rates by:

- Degree program, international/domestic, gender, self-identified Indigeneity

Graduate student time-to-completion and/or undergraduate graduation rates by:

- Degree program, international/domestic, gender, self-identified Indigeneity

Course Enrolments and Results

Course enrolments and average course percent grades by:

- Subject, course level, in/out of Faculty students

And/or grade distributions (proportion of students receiving A+, A, A-, etc.) by:

- subject, course year level

Faculty Research Funding

- Award amounts and project counts by award category: Tri-Council, Research Infrastructure, Other External, UBC Internal Funding

Faculty and Staff

- Staff headcounts by employee group and job title
- Faculty headcounts by tenure/non-tenure stream and rank
- New hires by tenure/non-tenure stream, rank, and gender

Graduate Student Funding

- Number of students receiving internal and external awards, as well as teaching and research assistantships, including total funding amounts and amount received per student (do not have historical comparisons for detailed metrics)

Student Experience of Instruction (formerly Student Evaluations of Teaching)

- Norms by subject, term

Survey Data

Undergraduate Experience Survey (UES) results

- E.g. If I was starting again, I would choose to attend UBC's Okanagan campus.

Baccalaureate Graduate Survey (BGS) results

- E.g. Proportion of respondents who were in a job related to their program, 2 years after graduation.

Appendix I

Site Visit Schedule Example

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

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

DAY 3: Plan half day for reviewers to work together on report writing before leaving Kelowna.

Site visit checklist

Status	Lead	Prior to site visit
		Identify dates that work for all reviewers and executive team (Dean, Associate Dean(s), Head/Director, Provost/Associate Provost)
		Secure meeting times for the review team and executive team
		Choose a main contact person for the review team when on site. This person should be available and on campus during the site visit and willing to provide their cellphone number to reviewers should they need to talk to somebody during the day.
		Book flights and hotel accommodations for review team. Consider: - Unit member who is picking up and dropping off reviewers every day: Choose hotel location accordingly (e.g. Four Points by the airport vs. hotel downtown) - Payment methods: Booking flights and hotel for the reviewers may save time from processing reimbursements
		Book rooms on campus that are comfortable and conducive for dialogue. Consider: - 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. - Engagement of students can be difficult to achieve. Thus, scheduling their meeting time over lunch can help. Be sure to let them know food will be served and gather their RSVP for catering plans and to send them reminders the day before. - To ensure integrity of the process, schedule an introductory and concluding meeting/dinner with the unit's executive team. It is strongly advised not to schedule dinners or other meetings with the unit's executive throughout the site visit.
		Share the finalized schedule with all relevant partners and stakeholders including the Office of the Provost
		Make the necessary arrangements for catering on campus and dinner reservations off campus as needed
	During the site visit	
		Gather at least one of the reviewer's cellphone number as point of contact during the site visit
		Agree on a pick-up/drop off time and location for the site visit
		Remind reviewers to keep all receipts for reimbursements
		Give the reviewers a hard copy of the schedule and help them stay on track by giving them 5-minute warnings
		Plan to walk with them when location changes are scheduled to ensure they are in the right place at the right time
		Collect all receipts from reviewers after the visit to process reimbursements as appropriate
		Ensure complete privacy for reviewers and unit members throughout the visit (i.e., nobody from the leadership team of the unit under review should be present during the scheduled conversations with members)
	After the site visit	
		Email reviewers to thank them
		Process any receipts collected from the site visit

		Upon reception of the reviewers’ report, process honorarium. Call reviewers directly to gather their personal information as required by the finance department

Appendix J

Template: Response and Action Plan

Overview

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

Linkages to the Unit and UBC's Strategic Plans

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

Recommendations Identified by the 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 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 K

Template: Progress Update (2 years after response to the review report was submitted)

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.