University of British Columbia

Vancouver Campus

Institution Report

Quality Assurance Process Audit (QAPA)

Prepared for Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills & Training

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Filename: Institution Report FINAL.docx

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

The signatures below acknowledge the responsibility for the contents of the report.

Andrew Szeri

Provost and Vice President, Academic

Eric Eich

Vice Provost & Associate Vice President Academic

DATE: 31 AUGUST 2018

Filename Institution Report FINAL.docx

Table of Contents

Tables

Executive Summary

We begin by acknowledging that UBC's two main campuses are located on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territories of the xʷməθ–kʷəy̓əm (Musqueam) and Syilx (Okanagan) peoples, and that UBC's activities take place on Indigenous lands throughout British Columbia and beyond. In recent years, the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and the publication of its Final Report and Calls to Action, and the development of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, have brought attention to the ways in which Canadian educational and other institutions have failed and oppressed Indigenous people. At this historic juncture, UBC renews its commitments, articulated in the 2009 Aboriginal Strategic Plan, to addressing this history and charting a way forward that provides a basis for productive co-existence and a more equitable future.

The University of British Columbia (UBC) is a global centre for research and teaching, consistently ranked among the top 20 public universities in the world.   UBC offers programs ranging from applied science, arts (creative and performing arts, humanities, and social sciences), business, dentistry, education, forestry, land and food systems, law, medicine, pharmacy and science. UBC educates physicians in the province with 3 other institutions through a distributed model, and is the sole provider of training in 6 other health professions.

UBC aspires to be a great institution, and has a culture of excellence and improvement that is reflected in: 1) our development and implementation of strategic plans at all levels of the university; 2) increasingly adopting practices of evidence-informed, active learning; 3) our success with research and innovation, 4) our ability to recruit and retain world leading students and faculty; 5) providing high quality learning and research facilities; and 6) being recognized as one of the province's best employers.

All parts of the institution have the goal of constant improvement. However, the quality assurance and quality improvement mechanisms in place can vary, as is appropriate to accommodate diversity of academic cultures represented at UBC. Each community of practice has its own aims, norms, criteria for defining excellence, and best practices. As a result of this diversity, UBC has adopted a decentralized model of policy and governance. Centrally, UBC's policies are designed to be broadly enabling, allowing for adaptations to fit the practices of various disciplines and fields. UBC's approach to quality assurance and quality improvement is a mixture of policy, principles, prescribed processes, and accountability. Individually, no single one of these approaches would be suitable or sufficient for a university of our size and complexity, but collectively, this mixture results in measurable and verifiable progress in improving all aspects of UBC and its programs.

1. Institution Profile

The Quality Assurance Process Audit (QAPA) 2018 is to review the policies and processes regarding academic reviews for the UBC Vancouver campus only. The UBC Okanagan campus will undergo a QAPA visit in 2021 although the project team has shared access to information and workshops across campuses.   Please note that the following information is based on the UBC Vancouver campus only.

Student Enrolment

Table 1 – Student Enrolment (Vancouver Campus)

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Degree Programs	Non-Degree Programs
Full-time equivalent (FTE)	40,922*	8,108	49392	4927

*Includes residents in Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy

For a full report of enrolment at UBC, please refer to the 2017/18 Annual Report on Enrolment in Appendix 1.

Campus Locations

UBC's two main campuses are situated in Vancouver (UBC Vancouver) and in Kelowna in the Okanagan Valley (UBC Okanagan). UBC Vancouver is home to 12 Faculties, 13 Schools and one College.

UBC Robson Square and UBC Learning Exchange are vibrant educational centres in the heart of downtown Vancouver. In addition, UBC's Centre for Digital Media is based at the Great Northern Way (GNW) Campus in Mount Pleasant. As a partnership of UBC, Simon Fraser University, the BC Institute of Technology and the Emily Carr University of Art and Design, and operating under the GNW Trust, the 18-acre GNW campus is a fusion of top-tier technology, industry, business, the arts and the general community. The ever-evolving campus's prime catalyst is the Centre for Digital Media and its Master's program.

UBC also provides innovative educational and research programs to Faculty of Medicine students through a distributed and integrated, province-wide delivery model that includes 4 university campuses, 11 clinical campuses, 17 affiliated regional centres and 65+ community education facilities located chiefly in British Columbia's more rural and remote areas.

Internationally, UBC's Asia Pacific Regional Office in Hong Kong and Liaison Office in New Delhi facilitate teaching and research partnerships and support alumni engagement.

Program Offerings

Total number of credential programs offered by credential level.

Table 2 – Program offerings by credential including number of specializations

Credential Type	# of Credentials	# of Specializations/Majors
Baccalaureate	21	104
Certificate	11	68
Combined Doctorate /Diploma	3	3
Combined Masters /Diploma	5	5
Diploma	8	8
Doctoral	4	113
Dual Masters	1	1
Dual Masters/Doctoral	1	1
Masters	53	229
Professional Undergraduate /Post-Baccalaureate	10	10
Vantage*	4	4
Dual Professional Undergraduate/Masters	1	1
Dual Professional Undergraduate /Doctoral	1	1
Grand Total	123	548

*UBC's Vantage College is home to the Vantage One program, a specially designed pathway for international students that supports the transition from high school to second-year university. This unique 11-month program combines first-year coursework with academic mentorship and academic English language courses to enhance overall student performance. Students progress, upon successful completion of the Vantage One program, into the second year of their chosen UBC degree, be it in Arts, Engineering, Management, or Science.

International Partners

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

Currently, UBC has over 400 active agreements with international partners. Initiatives include:

- Dual or double degrees
- English language training
- International co-op placements
- Internships and practica
- Joint teaching certification
- International development projects
- Field schools
- Scholarship agreements
- Student exchanges
- Incoming study-abroad agreements
- Faculty research collaborations
- Faculty and staff exchanges

Table 3 - International Collaborative Degrees

International Collaborative Degrees (Dual Degrees, Dual Certificates, and Joint Degrees)		
External Agency/Organization	Program(s)/Course(s) Name(s)	Degree/ Certificate Level
Yale University	Sauder School of Business	MBA/MAM
University of Edinburgh	Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies - Political Science	PhD
Bauhaus-Universitat Weimar	Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies - Political Science - Interdisciplinary Studies	PhD
Universite Libre de Bruxelles	Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies - Political Science - Electrical & Computer Engineering	PhD
Melbourne Law School	Faculty of Law	JD / LLM
University of Hong Kong	Faculty of Law	Joint Legal Education Program

International Collaborative Degrees (Dual Degrees, Dual Certificates, and Joint Degrees)		
External Agency/Organization	Program(s)/Course(s) Name(s)	Degree/ Certificate Level
SciencePo (L'Institut d'études politiques de Paris)	Faculty of Arts, Sauder School of Business	BA
Various Universities	Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies - Cotutelle Program	PhD
Shanghai Jiao Tong University	Sauder School of Business	International MBA (IMBA) program
Tecnologico de Monterrey (Mexico)	Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Land and Food Systems, the Sauder School of Business and the School of Engineering	Certificates
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg (Germany)	Faculty of Forestry	Master of Forestry – (Transfor-M)
Bangor University (Wales, UK)	Faculty of Forestry	Master of Forestry – (Transfor-M)
University of Eastern Finland (Finland)	Faculty of Forestry	Master of Forestry – (Transfor-M)
University of Hawai'i	Faculty of Law	JD
Beijing Normal University Zhuhai Campus	Faculty of Education	Master of Museum Education
Northeast Normal University	Faculty of Education	MEd
Tsinghua University	Faculty of Law	JD/ LLB
Nanjing Forestry University	Faculty of Forestry	BSF
Fujian Agriculture and Forestry University	Faculty of Forestry	BSF; MF
Beijing Forestry University	Faculty of Forestry	BSF

UBC also has more than 300 partnership agreements with universities and research institutions in more than 50 countries. A list of these can be found on the UBC International Engagement website.

Institution Mandate

Impact of the institution Mandate on its quality assurance mechanisms

Describe how the institution's Mandate impacts or influences the quality assurance mechanisms employed by the institution

The mandate letter of the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training (AEST), dated 18 July 2017, outlines three key commitments of the government:

- To make life more affordable.

- To deliver services that people count on, including access to the quality public education they need to succeed.

- To build a strong, sustainable, innovative economy.

The letter is clear about the commitment to true, lasting reconciliation with First Nations in British Columbia, and it places responsibility on the Minister to concretize the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

In addition, the mandate letter specifies priorities for AEST as follows:

1. Provide greater access to Adult Basic Education and English-language learning by eliminating fees.

2. Reduce the financial burden on students by eliminating interest on BC government student loans and establish a $1,000 completion grant program to provide debt relief to BC graduates.

3. Encourage excellence in BC's graduate school programs by introducing a new graduate student scholarship fund.

4. Work with the Minister of Education to support co-op, apprenticeship and work-experience programs for high school and undergraduate students.

5. Work with the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure to implement effective apprenticeship ratios on government-funded infrastructure projects, and increase participation of equity-seeking groups in the skilled workforce.

Our mandate letter refers only in general terms to quality assurance in the second of its three key commitments. Nevertheless, throughout this report and the Ministry Brief we include material from our response to the mandate, and our annual report to the government, because this material illustrates that there are many drivers behind an institution's commitment to quality assurance that are independent of any policies designed specifically for quality assurance.

The Board of Governors approves the University's Institutional Accountability Plan and Report (IAPR, 22 May 2018) (see Appendix 2). This report includes details on how UBC's strategic direction and achievements contributed to the fulfillment of the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills, and Training's Mandate Letter for 2017/18.

2. Quality Assurance Policy and Practice

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

At UBC, a range of academic policies, agreements and approaches are in place to influence, support and enhance the quality of teaching and learning. The following subsections highlight relevant policies and approaches pertaining to faculty appointment, review and promotion, scholarship and professional development, as well as approaches to support student success, through articulation of learning outcomes and assessment practices. As discussed below, our policies and practices with regard to academic appointments, renewal, tenure and promotion follow a common framework, but allow for different disciplines to hire and promote according to the standards of their communities of practice. The key polices outlined throughout section 2 are #22, 42, 61, 85, 87, 97 (see Appendix 3).

Academic Appointments and Terms of Appointment – The Collective Agreement and UBC Policies

At UBC Vancouver, approximately 2700 faculty members are represented by the UBC Faculty Association. Processes for appointment are governed by the Collective Agreement and Board Policy #22, which provide a flexible framework that allows the individual academic units considerable autonomy to develop practices and expectations to ensure the quality of appointments throughout the University is consistently high while meeting the requirements of individual disciplines.[1]

Academic units (e.g., Faculties, Departments, Schools) have search committees for initial tenure-track or tenured appointments that receive applications, assess and rank the applicants based on their curriculum vitae and letters from arms-length referees. Search committees include professors, students from the unit, and may include faculty from other units, or industry or community partners. Shortlisted applicants visit the campus, are interviewed by multiple people,

---

[1] A number of positions, including the Vice-Presidents, Associate Vice-Presidents, Deans, and the University Librarian are exempt and their appointment processes are governed by Board of Governors Policies 17, 18, 21, and 24. However, some of these appointees also hold faculty appointments and would then be subject to a form of review at the academic unit level.

give a public presentation on their research, and usually lead a teaching seminar (e.g., a 'mock class' on a prescribed topic at an appropriate level). Members of the academic unit of the same or higher rank vote on which, if any, of the shortlisted applicants should be recommended to the Dean for appointment. The Dean in turn determines if the applicant meets the requirements of the Faculty and ensures that proper procedures were followed. If so, the Dean recommends appointment of the selected applicant to the President. Initial appointments are made by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the President. Together the hiring process ensures that UBC recruits the highest quality applicants.

Renewal, Tenure and Promotion and other Academic Appointments

Collective Agreement, Board of Governors' Policies #42 and #61
Criteria for re-appointment, tenure and promotion

UBC has two streams for its tenure-track faculty members, the **research and teaching** stream (RT) and the **educational leadership** (EL) stream. Members of either stream are evaluated on their teaching and service contributions, RT stream members are in addition evaluated for their research and scholarship, and EL stream members are evaluated on their educational leadership.

For the RT stream, appointment as Assistant Professor requires the candidate to demonstrate scholarly activity and achievement, and to show actual or potential ability to instruct in his/her discipline. Promotion to Associate Professor requires successful teaching, sustained and productive scholarly activity, ability to direct graduate students, and participation in the affairs of the academic unit and the University. For promotion to Professor, candidates must have made outstanding contributions to teaching, research, and service.

For the EL stream, appointment as an Instructor requires completion of academic or professional qualifications, commitment to teaching, and promise of educational leadership. Promotion to Senior Instructor demands excellence in teaching, demonstrated educational leadership, and innovation in curriculum. Promotion to Professor of Teaching is based on outstanding achievement in teaching and educational leadership, as well as sustained and innovative contributions to curriculum development, course design, and initiatives that advance excellence in teaching and learning.

Process for granting tenure and promotion[2]

Faculty members are initially appointed to a three- (EL) or four-year (RT) term. Tenure-track faculty members meet annually with their Head to review the criteria and expectations and assessment methods for the re-appointment review and tenure review, to identify potential difficulties and to devise plans for how concerns may be addressed, and to gather the information and documents required for the review to proceed.

The review process for re-appointment and mandatory review for tenure is similar to that of the appointment process. RT faculty are reappointed in year 4, and mandatory review for tenure occurs in year 7, whereas EL faculty are reappointed in year 3 and reviewed for tenure in year 6. If reappointment or tenure is denied, employment with UBC will end with at least 12 months' working notice. At each step of the process (Department, Faculty, Senior Appointments Committee), if concerns are raised about a candidate, that individual is provided with an opportunity to provide a response to the concern in writing. The subsequent process is similar to the appointment process (approval by the appropriate Dean, President, Board), except that Deans and the President have advisory committees that review all applications for appointment at a rank above Assistant Professor or Instructor, as well as all tenure and promotion decisions.

Other academic appointments

Lecturers – Collective Agreement

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

Sessional Faculty Members – Collective Agreement

Sessional Lecturers are contract faculty who are primarily hired on four-month contracts to teach specific courses. The University is making a concerted effort to reduce the need to hire Sessional Lecturers and to increase the number of Lecturers with a 37% increase in lecturers over the past 11 years. There will be a further impact made over the next several years through the recent collective bargaining changes implemented in October 2017.

Provisions for performance evaluation and renewal of appointments for Lecturers and Sessional Faculty are governed by the Collective Agreement.

---

[2] This section represents current practice; there were changes, as a result of collective bargaining, to the review process and some faculty members are grandfathered under the previous system.

All ranks of faculty members can be hired into faculty term appointments without review for a maximum of three consecutive years, at full-time, for leave replacement or when a suitable candidate cannot be found for a tenure-track position, as governed by Board Policy #42.

Persons who practice a profession with distinction and have special skills or teaching and learning value to UBC may be appointed as part-time Adjunct Professors. Examples are a practising lawyer or professional musician who teaches a class in their area of expertise.

Research Associates hold a PhD or other qualification equivalent to that held by an Assistant Professor, but whose responsibilities are limited to research.

Post-doctoral fellows are engaged in research at UBC, supervised by a faculty member, may hold teaching appointments, and are appointed for up to 3 years subject to the terms of employment governed by Board Policy #61.

Clinical faculty appointments are held by health professionals who primarily provide teaching in the context of patient care, but may also perform research or administrative duties. The pertinent units have developed policies and procedures for appointment, re-appointment, and promotion of clinical faculty.

Employment Policies for Academic Personnel

UBC Human Resources publishes a Summary of UBC Policies & Expectations for UBC Faculty & Staff that highlights the key principles and rules which UBC personnel are expected to follow, and provides links to relevant policies and procedures.

Faculty Scholarship

Faculty in both RT and EL streams engage in a broad range of scholarship. RT faculty typically teach courses directly related to their research area to communicate both the excitement and contextual relevance of the discipline to students. Such activities frequently extend into community and partnership sites and collaborations, providing community-based and experiential opportunities for students.

EL faculty are innovators in teaching, learning and assessment methods, and they catalyze change within their units in the areas of course and curriculum design, and in the integration of evidence-based approaches to effective teaching. UBC encourages the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) for faculty members in both RT and EL streams. The Centre for Teaching,

Learning and Technology (CTLT) provides competitive, peer-reviewed SoTL research grants and support to faculty members.

Three key Board of Governors' policies govern scholarship for all researchers including faculty:

1. Policy #85 (Scholarly Integrity) sets out the responsibilities and standards for scholarly enquiry; adherence to requirements of the Tri-Agency framework; investigative processes involving possible incidents of scholarly misconduct.

2. Policy #87 (Research Activity) articulates the authority, requisite processes, and requirements surrounding various aspects of Research activity undertaken by UBC persons.

3. Policy #97 (Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment) ensures that scholarly activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the interests and mission of the University and that maintains the community's trust and confidence.

Faculty Professional Development

UBC provides specific support and programming for key academic transition points in a faculty member's career.

All Faculties offer formal or informal mentoring of junior faculty by more experienced colleagues leading up to the award of tenure. New faculty and staff have opportunities to learn about UBC's priorities, culture, and services through workshops available for new faculty/staff members. A research orientation day connects new faculty members with research support units and resources. New researchers meet experienced faculty, research advisors for NSERC, SSHRC, CIHR and CFI, and are introduced to their peers. New faculty may discuss research matters with the Vice-President Research and Innovation, provide feedback for the continuous improvement of UBC's research infrastructure, or join a forum to support the activities of new and junior faculty members.

We have described Departmental support above. To be considered for salary increases, faculty members must submit an annual report summarizing their relevant scholarly, teaching and service activities. Heads consult with colleagues to determine which faculty members should be awarded merit, career progress increments, or both.

Each year, UBC offers the 9-month Academic Leadership Development Program (ALDP) to new Heads, Directors, Associate Deans and other academic leaders to develop leadership capacity and to build connections with peers. The ALDP offers two boot camps, sixteen studios, six half-day workshops on specific topics, and confidential executive coaching and performance feedback.

Learning Outcomes

UBC is committed to developing learning outcomes for all of its academic programs. This goal is one of the key strategies outlined in our new strategic plan "Shaping UBC's next Century" (see Appendix 4), and being further articulated in the current draft Indigenous Strategic Plan, (see Appendix 5), which specifies that resource allocations will follow strategic priorities. Accordingly, we are committed to resourcing the administrative- and cultural-change processes necessary to achieve the goal of having all programs at UBC become competency-based – as many already are. We are contributing to best practices in this area for research-intensive institutions, and learning from our peers. We now need to work toward including assessment of program-level outcomes into regular program reviews and follow-up actions. Examples of work undertaken in this area are outlined in the Ministry Briefing document which accompanies this report.

UBC now requires that intended learning outcomes should be included in the sample syllabus submitted to Senate as part of the curriculum approval process, or for any new course submitted as part of a new program proposal.

UBC faculty members have made major contributions to the development of methods that assess teaching practices and students' abilities to learn and solve problems, although this is easier in some disciplines than others. In particular, the large scale adoption of blended learning at UBC allows students to spend more time in active learning. A recent analysis of more than 200 published studies shows significant improvements in student retention and effective learning as courses are blended in this way so as to enhance active learning in class.[3] UBC is actively incorporating the research findings of its own faculty, and from advances made elsewhere to improve our existing courses and curriculum across the UBC.

Student Progress and Assessment

Assessment activities reflect specified learning outcomes and provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate the achievement of the outcomes. Increasingly, UBC is using assessments as opportunities for learning, rather than simply as measurements of learning, with the goal of teaching students to acquire skills that help ensure achievement of learning outcomes. A significant project to replace our core Learning Management System (which was the first enterprise learning management system in the Canadian cloud) enhances the effective use of learning technology tools, including those to facilitate peer and group based assessment activities. Assessment of students in individual courses varies by discipline (creative arts vs.

---

[3] https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

engineering, for example), learning objectives, and by instructor. Departments and programs often provide additional oversight and coordination for key core and "gateway" courses in the discipline to ensure consistent year-to-year comparisons. Similar oversight is provided for team taught, multi-section courses to ensure consistency across sections.

Senate Policy for External Reviews of Academic Units

The UBC Senate Policy for Reviews of Administrative Units (see Appendix 6) was passed in 1977 and amended in 1983. This brief document sets out principles that have proven robust and flexible for over 40 years; however, some no longer meet current best practices. We assess our current policy in the paragraphs that follow and note that an important goal for the 2018/19 Senate will be to update the policy.

The existing policy does not specify a regular cycle for review, but instead relies on the Head, Dean, President, or Senate to request a review.

The policy is clear about who appoints members to review committees, and to whom the committee reports. The policy requires that (a) committees have external reviewers, (b) there are clear procedures for selection of committees, (c) there are provisions to ensure that review committees have clear terms of reference and that the strength and balance of the unit should be the focus of the review, and (d) instructions for documentation of the review be explicit; and (e) the review be made available to the members of the unit being reviewed.

The policy dictates that Faculty statements of policies and procedures for the conduct of reviews of departments and other administrative units or programs within their responsibility be submitted to Senate for approval, but delegates to the Faculties the role of designing and approving these policies and procedures. Thus, there is considerable specialization in Faculty policies.

The Senate must be advised of reviews being undertaken and a copy of the review is to be deposited with the Senate secretariat and made available to Senators. In addition, the Provost's Office makes an annual report on all external reviews of academic units that provides a summary of the main findings, and of the response by the unit leader and by the Dean. This report is available publicly in the materials for open Senate meetings.

Finally, the policy states that within two years of completion of the review, a report on implementation of the recommendations of the review be sent to the Dean or President, and a copy lodged with Senate. Compliance with this part of the policy remains inconsistent across Faculties, and the Senate itself does not approve the response.

In 2007, the Senate Academic Policy Committee considered the need for revising the Senate Policy of 1977 and 1983. The Committee prepared a draft document, but after deliberation

decided that their proposed changes would be more appropriately framed as a set of administrative guidelines rather than a policy, and opted not to take the draft to Senate for approval.

As will be discussed in Section 4, in 2013 the Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs issued new UBC-wide Principles, Procedures and Guidelines for External Academic Unit Reviews (see Appendix 7). These March 2013 guidelines, revised in 2014, have supplemented the Senate policy.

Accreditation

UBC does not belong to any organizations requiring institutional accreditation. Nevertheless, some programs within 11 Faculties (Applied Science, Arts (Social Work and Counselling Psychology), Dentistry, Land and Food Systems (Dietetics), Education, Forestry, Law, Medicine, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Sauder School of Business, and Science) are externally accredited by one or more external agencies. Our continuing ability to offer professional degrees, and produce graduates that serve the citizens of BC depends on our ability to reform continually our curriculum, pedagogy, facilities and assessment methods. For those professions requiring graduates to pass a further certification exam, the success rates of UBC students provide an important measure of effectiveness.

Table 4 – UBC Accredited Programs

Faculty	Degree or Program	Accrediting Body
Applied Science	Engineering – Undergraduate Programs	Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB)
	School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture Master of Architecture Master of Landscape Architecture	Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB) accredits the M.Arch Canadian Society of Landscape Architects (LAAC) accredits the M.L.A
	School of Community and Regional Planning Master of Community and Regional Planning (MCRP)	American Planning Accreditation Board Canadian Professional Standards Board
	School of Nursing Bachelor of Science in Nursing	College of Registered Nurses of British Columbia (CRNBC) Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing
	Master of Science Nursing – Nurse Practitioner	College of Registered Nurses of British Columbia (CRNBC)
Arts	Department of Psychology Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology	Canadian Psychological Association (CPA)
	School of Library, Archival & Information Studies	American Library Association (ALA)

Faculty	Degree or Program	Accrediting Body
	Master of Library and Information Studies (MLIS)	
	School of Social Work Bachelor of Social Work Master of Social Work	Canadian Association for Social Work Education (CASWE)
Dentistry	Doctor of Dental Medicine (DMD)	Commission on Dental Accreditation of Canada (CDAC)
	Dental Residency/Internship	Commission on Dental Accreditation of Canada (CDAC)
	Clinical Specialty Graduate Program in Endodontics and Dental Hygiene Degree Program	Commission on Dental Accreditation of Canada (CDAC)
	Dental Hygiene Degree Program (Entry-to-Practice Option)	Commission on Dental Accreditation of Canada (CDAC)
Education	Bachelor of Education	BC Teachers' Council (program accreditation) BC Teacher Regulation Branch (teacher certification)
	Master of Counselling Psychology (MA, MEd)	Council for Accreditation of Counsellor Education Programs (CACEP)
	Doctor of Philosophy in Counselling Psychology	Canadian Psychological Association (CPA)
	Doctor of Philosophy in School Psychology	Canadian Psychological Association (CPA)
	School of Kinesiology	Canadian Council of University Physical Education and Kinesiology Administrators (CCUPEKA)
Forestry	Master of Sustainable Forest Management	Canadian Forestry Accreditation Board (CFAB) Society of American Foresters
	Bachelor of Science in Forestry (B.S.F.) Forest Operations Major Forest Resource Management Program	Canadian Forestry Accreditation Board (CFAB)
	Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Conservation – Major in Science and Management	College of Applied Biology
Land and Food Systems	Bachelor of Science in Food, Nutrition and Health- Dietetics Major	Dietitians of Canada - Partnership for Dietetic Education and Practice (PDEP)
	Bachelor of Science in Food, Nutrition and Health - Food Science Major Accreditation	Institute of Food Technologists (IFT)
Law	Juris Doctor, LL.B.	National Committee on Accreditation (NCA)
Medicine	Continuing Professional Development (CPD)	Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Education (CACME)
	MD Undergraduate Program (MD)	The Committee on the Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS)

Faculty	Degree or Program	Accrediting Body
	Bachelor of Midwifery Program	College of Midwives of British Columbia
	Master of Occupational Therapy (MOT)	Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists (CAOT)
	Master of Physical Therapy (MPT)	Physiotherapy Education Accreditation Canada(PEAC)
	Postgraduate Medical Education (FRCPC, FRCSC, CCFP)	Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada (RCPSC) and the College of Family Physicians of Canada (CFPC)
	Master of Science, Audiology and Speech Sciences Program	Council for Accreditation of Canadian University Programs in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology
	Master of Science, Genetic Counselling	Accreditation Council for Genetic Counseling (ACGC)
Pharmaceutical Sciences	Entry-to-Practice BSc in Pharmacy Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences Program	Canadian Council for the Accreditation of Pharmacy Programs (CCAPP)
Sauder School of Business	School accreditation	The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
		European Quality Improvement System (EQUIS)
Science	BSc Chemistry	Canadian Society for Chemistry

3. Self-Evaluation Approach

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

As part of UBC's continuous learning process, the development of this report has served as an opportunity to reflect on our policies and practices and to work toward their enhancement.

Governance of the QAPA Process at UBC

An early commitment to ensuring good governance over the QAPA process was made by the Provost's Office and developed through a project structure. Membership on the project team included the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs, Senate Secretariat, Associate-Provost, Academic Innovation, Senior Advisor on Teaching and Learning and Academic Director CTLT, and Associate Vice-President, Government Relations and Community Engagement. Interactions with stakeholders included Deans, Associate Deans, Academic, Senate committees, including student representation, Senate, and Board of Governors.

An additional time-limited advisory group, the Quality Enhancement Advisory Team, provided feedback to the project team and updates to their respective Senate committees. This group was actively engaged with the report and with planning the next steps in the development of quality assurance processes at UBC. Membership included chairs or members from the Senate committees for Academic Policy, Curriculum, Teaching & Learning, as well from among the Associate Deans, Academic and students. This group will again come together to develop UBC's response to the site visit report, and for subsequent development of improvements of quality assurance processes at UBC.

Institution Report

Development of the Institution Report

Development of this report was managed by the Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs with support from the project team and other units including Government Relations, Planning and Institutional Research , Faculty Relations, and the Faculties.

Throughout the development of this report the project team has focused on surfacing any gaps within the current processes. The Provost's Office and Senate committees have committed to reviewing the current policies and processes for external reviews with a view toward collaborating with Faculties to further enhance quality assurance across UBC. This review will commence in the fall of 2018 and will follow the established Senate process for policy review.

Review of the Draft Institution Report

The draft report was developed and discussed formally with the Quality Enhancement Advisory Team, Government Relations and at the Senate committees for Teaching & Learning, Academic Policy and Curriculum. Comments and suggestions, including gaps in information, were updated prior to the final draft being presented at the last Senate meeting of the academic year on 16 May 2018. The Senate Curriculum Committee approved the final draft on 16 July 2018, before final review and signoff by the Provost and submission to the Ministry.

Sources of Information

Several sources of information were used to ensure this report was accurate and up to date, reflecting the quality assurance processes across UBC. Information and data were gathered from the following reports, in addition to utilizing feedback from the Quality Enhancement Advisory Team, Faculty, and Senate committees.

Project Information Documents

- Strategic Plans - Shaping UBC's Next Century (Appendix 4), the prior strategic plan Place and Promise (Appendix 9), and the draft Indigenous Strategic Plan (Appendix 5)
- UBC Enrolment Report 2017/18 (Appendix 1)
- Institutional Accountability Plan and Report (Appendix 2)
- Policies - External Reviews Policy and Guidelines, New Programs Approval Process (Appendix 6, 7 & 8)
- International partnership, VP strategic plans, co-op information
- Engagement with Office of Planning and Institutional Research for data requirements

Assessor Visit Schedule (6 & 7 December 2018)

All parties requested to join the site visit have been notified with sessions to outline expectations put in place. The President and Provost are scheduled to join the opening and closing meetings.

Next Steps

Following the site visit, governance and oversight of the final report response and action plan will be through the Project Management team in the Provost's office. Agreement and formal review of the action plan will be taken to the Senate and its relevant Committees and will also be provided as information for the Board of Governors.

4. Quality Assurance Process Audit (QAPA) Self-Study

Overall Process

A. Does the process reflect the institution's mandate, mission, and values?

The institution should be able to demonstrate that it has an established institutional and program review planning cycle and process to assess the effectiveness of its educational programs and services, their responsiveness to student, labour market, and social needs. The process should contribute to the continuous improvement of the institution.

Describe how the institution meets this criterion. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

The Senate Policy of 1977 and 1983 (see Appendix 6) has been supplemented by *Principles, Procedures and Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units* issued by the Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs in March 2013 and updated in 2014 (see Appendix 7). This document – **PPG 2013/14** for short – states that "academic units engaged in teaching, professional training and/or scholarly work at the university shall undergo academic review" (p.2) and defines these units as Faculties, Schools, Departments, Colleges, Institutes, Centres, and Research Units. At UBC, it is at the level of units, not programs, that external reviews take place.

PPG 2013/14 continues with the observation that "while there is no rigid periodicity for reviews, reviews are normally conducted every 5 years and the time interval between reviews must not exceed 10 years." (p.2). UBC Heads, Directors, and Deans are typcially appointed for 5 years and these appointments can be renewed only once. In practice, reviews nearly always occur before or after leadership transition, and sometimes after the first term of a leader who is being considered for reappointment. Reviews may also be triggered when issues arise in a unit that would benefit from an external assessment.

To accommodate the variety of norms, practices, and ideals that exist among different disciplinary areas, the review process varies to some extent among academic units. However, each review must adhere to the following requirements: involvement of external assessors, engagement with appropriate members of the academic unit, assembly of comprehensive documentation appropriate to the terms of reference, a site visit, and the opportunity for all interested faculty, students, post-doctoral fellows, and staff to provide confidential feedback to the review team.

The introduction to PPG 2013/14 states that the major goals of an external review are to provide the unit with an opportunity to reflect on its programs and performance, and to obtain outside advice to guide continuing improvement in academic and operational quality. In addition, external reviews contribute to public accountability by communicarting the quality of the unit's academic and professional activities to all interested parties (including responsible administrators and members of Senate).

While the assessment of academic programs is part-and-parcel of every external review, UBC has also reviewed its course offerings to ensure the currency of its Academic Calendar. During the 2015/16 academic year, Senate and Curriculum Services sought to identify courses no longer being offered, and to remove them from the Academic Calendar. Each of the 8,631 courses in the Academic Calendar was cross-referenced against recent scheduling data, and 1,632 courses that had not been scheduled since the 2011/12 academic year were flagged as potentially inactive. Lists of potentially inactive courses were compiled and distributed to the appropriate Faculties, which reviewed the lists and identifed those that were genuinely inactive and could be discontinued. This process led to the removal of 416 defunct courses from the Academic Calendar.

> *B. Is the scope of the process appropriate?*
> *There should be evidence of a formal, institutionally approved policy and procedure for the periodic review of programs against published standards that includes the following characteristics:*

- *A self-study undertaken by faculty members and administrators of the program based on evidence relating to program performance, including strengths and weaknesses, desired improvements, and future directions. A self-study takes into account:*
- *the continuing appropriateness of the program's structure, admissions requirements, method of delivery and curriculum for the program's educational goals and standards;*
- *the adequacy and effective use of resources (physical, technological, financial and human);*
- *faculty performance including the quality of teaching and supervision and demonstrable currency in the field of specialization;*
- *that the learning outcomes achieved by students/graduates meet the program's stated goals, the credential level standard, and where appropriate, the standards of any related regulatory, accrediting or professional association;*
- *the continuing adequacy of the methods used for evaluating student progress and achievement to ensure that the program's stated goals have been achieved;*

- *the graduate satisfaction level, student satisfaction level, and graduation rate; and*

- *where appropriate, the graduate employment rates, employer satisfaction level, and advisory board satisfaction level.*

- *An assessment conducted by a panel that includes independent experts external to the institution. The assessment should normally include a site visit, a written report that assesses program quality and may recommend quality improvements; and an institution response to the report;*

- *A summary of the conclusions of the evaluation that is made appropriately available.*

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

Answers to the questions above are taken from the PPG 2013/14 and assessors are referred to this document (see Appendix 6) for further information.

(A) Self-study documents

Self-study documents are required and their composition varies among units. However, all self-study documents must include an executive summary, an overview of the unit being reviewed, and a response to the previous review. In addition, the unit must provide material that would allow reviewers to comment on the unit's performance, plans, further opportunities, and alignment with the unit's and UBC's strategic plans in areas relevant to research, Aboriginal engagement, undergraduate instruction and learning, graduate and post-doctoral studies, scholarly and professional activity, service and community partnerships, and resources, administration and governance.

The PPG 2013/14 encourages units to concentrate their self-studies on the critical analysis of their strengths, areas for improvement, opportunities and threats, benchmarks used to assess programs and activities, comparison with appropriate peer academic units, reflections on progress achieved since the last review, current priorities, best practices, plans for the future, and ways in which the unit's attainment of their goals and objectives will be assessed. Therefore, the criteria for self-study documents are all included within the UBC guidelines and policies. Below we provide more detail related to the individual points in the guidelines.

The PPG 2013/14 recognizes that units offering externally accredited programs may have existing documentation relating to accreditation (e.g., a separate self-study), and encourages those units to refer to or include this material as appropriate, thus allowing the unit to align UBC and external requirements while minimizing duplication of effort.

For undergraduate instruction, units must provide enrolment and recruitment statistics, along with past trends, and projections to assess continuing demand and relevance. These data are provided by the Planning and Institutional Research unit at UBC. It is expected that curriculum and potential for its reform will be critically evaluated, and that this evaluation will include attributes of graduates, learning outcomes, interdisciplinarity, curriculum integration, benchmarks or outcome indicators, service and work-based learning, and engagement of diverse student populations. Units must also include a review of degree programs and course offerings, justification of relevance, and evidence that they provide suitable depth and breadth for undergraduate education. The document must evaluate program requirements, pre-requisites and electives. Finally, the self-study must discuss how student learning is assessed.

For graduate instruction, the Dean and Vice-Provost, Graduate and Post-Doctoral Studies has included separate guidelines within PPG 2013/14 that are broadly similar to undergraduate guidelines but place more emphasis on supervision, mentoring, and student financial support. The Dean's office provides data to units on all graduate programs to assist in the preparation of their self-studies. There is less focus on assessment and curricula, but more emphasis on student completion rates, time to completion, research output, professional development, and participation in academic meetings and research conferences.

All instructors at every level must be evaluated and follow the Senate guidelines for Student Evaluation of Teaching.[4] Peer evaluation of faculty teaching for both formative and summative review has shown that a high percentage of students (93%) agree with the survey statements that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of their educational experience at UBC.

Our current guidelines do not place particular emphasis on graduate outcomes, including employment. However, many units collect graduate outcomes which include employment and career trajectories. For instance, a report issued in 2017 by the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies tracked the career outcomes of 3,805 graduates of PhD programs from UBC's Vancouver campus between 2005-2013.[5]

---

[4] https://senate.ubc.ca/vancouver/policies/student-evaluation-teaching

[5] http://outcomes.grad.ubc.ca/docs/UBC_PhD_Career_Outcomes_April2017.pdf

(B) External reviewers

PPG 2013/14 stipulates that at least two external reviewers who are leading academics from peer institutions must participate in the external review, although in practice there are usually three. The review team must reflect gender and equity balance. The list of reviewers must be submitted to the Provost's Office for approval prior to inviting the reviewers.

(C) Summary of conclusions

PPG 2013/14 states that the leadership of the unit under review, the appropriate Dean, and senior administration bear responsibility for responding in ways that consolidate strengths and address the weaknesses of the unit and its programs disclosed by the review process. The unit and Dean will normally respond to the review in writing within several weeks after receiving it, and discuss follow-up actions with the Provost. The Provost's Office prepares a summary of all external reviews carried out in a given year. This summary contains key findings of the reviewers, their key recommendations, and responses of the unit and Dean with plans to implement changes arising from the review. A summary report with key findings, recommendations and departmental responses is submitted to Senate and is publicly accessible.

(i)   The institution can demonstrate that it has a policy and process for new program approval that includes peer / external review by appropriate experts.

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

As part of the Senate Curriculum Committee's Guide for Curriculum Submissions (SCCGCS) (see Appendix 8) for the new program approvals process, a summary of any new program proposal is provided to external post-secondary institutions and industry experts for review and comment. The level of support required is aligned to the type of program being developed. Previously, an external review of any new program proposal was not explicitly required within the process outlined in the SCCGCS. However, with the implementation of the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training (AEST) Stage 1 form, the opportunity for external review of all programs within a unit is undertaken as part of the external review process.

The processes for the development of a new program begin at the Faculty level, then flows through multiple stages of review, consultation and approval across UBC Faculties, Senate and

Board of Govenors. This University-wide support continues through to submission of the application to AEST.

The process for approval of curriculum proposals is outlined in the SCCGCS. This guide covers proposals for new programs and majors, new courses, and substantive editorial revisions to any element of UBC curriculum.

New program approval has many steps that must be carefully coordinated between multiple offices, units and authorities at UBC. The steps are as follows:

1. Proponents in an academic unit start to develop a new program (or a major change to an existing program). They advise both their unit's leadership and their Dean's office of this development and provide both parties with preliminary conceptual material.

2. Proponents then advise the Senate Secretariat and the Provost's Office that a proposal for a new program is being developed.

3. Early in the development process, proponents consult with academic units or Faculties offering related programs, with any individuals or units (Departments, Faculties, Libraries) who might contribute to or be affected by the new program, and with student groups in a position to provide a learner's perspective on the proposed program. External consultations with other post-secondary institutions are carried out to understand the extent of any duplication with existing programs.

4. Proponents also seek support from several offices including the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology in curriculum development, Extended Learning for applied graduate programs, and the Provost's Office for assistance in budget development and financial projections. For programs involving international collaboration and partnerships, support is available through the Vice-Provost, International.

5. In preparation for Ministerial assessment, proponents should begin completing the Stage 1 Application for Approval Process which will be submitted to the Ministry along with the program proposal, once approved by Senate and the Board.

6. The proposal is presented to the relevant unit committees (Curriculum, Teaching & Learning, or their equivalents) for review and approval.

7. After making any recommended changes, the proposal is submitted to the relevant Faculty committees for approval. The proposal should include all Senate-required program and course information as well as budget and fee information.

8. A final proposal is prepared, taking into consideration any feedback received. At this point, the executive summary required by the Ministry is added, along with signed consultations/approvals from the groups listed above.

9. The proposal is then presented to Faculty Council for approval.

10. Following Faculty approval, proponents contact the VP Students Office to initiate the process of formal student consultations as required under UBC Policy #71 (see Appendix 9). The Faculty must respond, in writing, to any significant issues raised in the Student Consultation Report.

11. Following Faculty approval, the proposal moves through the required Senate committees and subcommittees.

12. Proponents should begin preparing a Board docket that will later need to be submitted to the Board of Governors, along with the Student Consultation Report and any Faculty response. Deadlines for submitting documents to the Board are generally two months in advance of the Board meeting.

13. Once approved by the relevant Senate committees, the Chairs of the Senate Curriculum and Senate Admissions Committee typically co-present the proposal to Senate.

14. After Senate approval, Senate and Curriculum Services will forward the proposal on for Board approval as Board has joint powers regarding curriculum approval. At this point the student consultation, tuition information and faculty response must be added to the Board documents.

15. Upon Board of Governors approval, the Provost's Office forwards the proposal for approval by the Ministry.

The process is extensive and by the time it concludes, the program proposal and its consitutent parts have been vetted at every level of the University. Furthermore, administrative units and authorities have had their queries addressed as to the program's feasibility, and students have been consulted about the program's proposed tuition.

Program learning outcomes are a required element of any new degree program proposal under the Ministry submission guidelines (which form part of our own required documentation for Senate approval). However, as a result of its QAPA audit, UBC may be able to improve its evolving program-approval process by requiring more extensive information on intended learning outcomes and their connections to program requirements and assessment methods. As noted in the Ministerial Brief, accompanying this report, several Faculties have already made significant

progress in developing program-level learning outcomes. Other Faculties can benefit from what has been learned elsewhere at UBC to build learning outcomes into their own programs.

The Guide for Curriculum Submissions is edited each year over the summer months, with changes being approved by the Senate Curriculum Committee to guide the work in the next academic year.

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

i. The guidelines are adaptable to the range of programs and offerings within the institution.

ii. The guidelines provide measurable, consistent means and direction to undertake diversified program review.

iii. The guidelines are consistent with institutional Mandate, mission, vision and associated strategic goals.

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

As noted throughout this document, a key feature of UBC's governance framework is its effective use of decentralized policies and procedures that set high-level expectations accompanied by review, while being flexible enough to meet the needs of individual academic units. This feature is evident in our approach to periodic external reviews.

It is acknowledged that the detailed elements and organization of review documents and the review itself is specialized to the unit, the Terms of Reference, and the purpose of the review. PPG 2013/14 guidelines are both generic and modular, which allows units to ignore guidelines that do not apply, and to focus on field or domain-specific criteria, data, and metrics. To provide one example, the guidelines are specific about the need to review assessment practices and standards, while acknowledging that very different assessments will be applied in the creative arts (music, art, writing) versus the humanities, social sciences, or law. Similar arguments can be made for other requirements in PPG 2013/14. It is also understood that it can be efficient to combine visits of reviewers for external accreditation reviews with UBC-mandated external reviews, or to use common materials in documents prepared for accreditation or UBC reviews.

D. Does the process promote quality improvement?

Under the current framework, academic programs are reviewed in the context of the units that offer them. As described above, PPG 2013/14 offers explicit guidelines, metrics and assessment criteria to be used by units when reporting on all credit-bearing programs. In addition to meeting the criteria established by the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training, all credit-bearing certificates, diplomas, and degrees must be approved by Senate, with tuition approved by the Board of Governors.

The Senate Curriculum Committee has responsibility for approving non-credit-bearing program certificates and has exercised this responsibility since a committee restructuring exercise in 2009. In addition to this review, the Provost is required to file annually a list of new non-credit-bearing programs with Senate. Although non-credit-bearing programs tend to remain in existence for a relatively short time (in contrast to credit-bearing programs), they continue to be evaluated for quality by the uptake in the market and by reactions of students.

Career and Personal Education is taken seriously at UBC as a key part of the institutional mandate. With its first extension programs in 1917, UBC embraced the concept of lifelong learning. Today, every Faculty at UBC, plus UBC Extended Learning, delivers hundreds of career and personal education programs. The cost of developing new offerings and the quality of competition from other institutions is high, which ensures that the viability of new offerings is assessed rigorously across the University. UBC Extended Learning is currently supporting seven UBC Faculties in developing new programs. UBC does not offer vocational programs.

UBC's drive to be a North American leader in evidence-informed pedagogy stems from a sustained institution-wide focus, together with deliberate actions to create the necessary institutional conditions and support structures, rather than from specific policies. The prior Place and Promise Strategic Plan (see Appendix 10), developed in 2009 under former President Stephen Toope, laid much of the foundation. Around the same time, principles were developed

by which formative and summative peer review of teaching were made part of the regular review and evaluation of faculty members, with Faculties held responsible for local operationalization. Student evaluation of teaching has been carried out for decades, but in 2009 a consistent set of university-wide questions were mandated for every course. Units may add additional questions if they wish. The Educational Leadership stream (described above) increases UBC's emphasis on effective teaching, course and curriculum innovation, and enhancement. Through the Teaching Learning Enhancement Fund program, described in the accompanying Ministerial Brief, substantial institutional resources continue to be devoted to enhancing teaching and learning. Active and blended learning has been adopted widely, and is now the dominant pedagogical model in some Faculties. With the exception of student evaluation of teaching, which is based on Senate policy, these changes were driven by rising expectations, shared by students and faculty members alike, on what high-quality education means in the 21st century, rather than by the introduction of formal rules or regulations.

Our approach to learning outcomes was previously described in Section 2 of this document. UBC has a varied landscape of practice, arising in part from the presence (or lack) of an external driver, such as accreditation, among various disciplines. There is broad acceptance of the need for course-based learning outcomes, and it is a requirement for all new courses that are proposed. The challenge for these new – and indeed for existing – courses is to develop outcomes that are neither so broad as to be impossible to measure, nor so granular as to be overwhelming in number. Development of program-level learning outcomes is actively underway in several direct-entry Faculties offering non-accredited programs.

Institution Assessment – Overall Process

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

The preceding discussion establishes that UBC has an external review process and planning cycle to assess the effectiveness of its educational programs and services. All academic units are accountable annually for reporting on their progress in meeting the objectives of their own plan, their Faculty's plan and UBC's plan. These reports roll up to submissions to the Board of Governors. The combination of multi-level plans and annual accountability is a driver for quality assurance that lies outside "check the box" measures of quality.

The external reviews of units including Faculties provide a crucial outside lens on what units at UBC do, and how well they are doing it, along with an external impetus for quality assurance and quality improvement. The provincial government requires annual reports on institutional

performance in defined areas with defined metrics that promote focus and clarity about what matters, and ways to assess performance. Nevertheless, there are several areas where improvements in quality assurance can be made at UBC.

While UBC's strategic plans are at a high level, they tend not to use prominently enough the language of quality assurance or quality improvement; as a consequence, UBC's commitment in these areas is not as visible, internally or externally, as it might be. Despite the PPG2013/14 guidelines, which are carefully drafted and consistent with extant best practices, the self-studies produced by units vary from excellent (because they are reflective, analytical, thoughtful, and evidence-based), to poor (because they are the opposite). The PPG 2013/14 instructions, together with the provision of institutional data to the units, encourage units to provide data without meaningful, substantive analysis. External reviewers have occasionally remarked on this lack of analysis and the absence of a clear sense of future direction in some self-studies.

One significant weakness in our quality improvement processes stems from the age and functionality of our information systems. We have made recent progress by replacing our core learning platform, and a related project to revitalize the way student evaluations of teaching are conducted is underway. The most significant and challenging transformation project comprises our Student Information System (SIS). Designed and implemented in-house at UBC several decades ago, our SIS has evolved and been extended in an *ad hoc* and piecemeal fashion, reacting to the need for urgent fixes rather than as part of a strategic digital roadmap. In 2014, the Board of Governors prioritized an ambitious program of digital transformation of foundational enterprise systems to support improved functionality across the institution's key business areas (Student Information System, as well as Finance and Human Resources). This Integrated Renewal Program is now well underway and will roll out across functional areas of the institution over the next few years.

Our current state of aged platforms and highly fragmented data across different information systems impacts the quality and utility of the data that are collected. Different units may struggle to access certain data, may collect their own duplicate data and may even use different terms and definitions for the same types of data. This makes it difficult (or even impossible) to compare data across units.

The Integrated Renewal Program has selected the same vendor for UBC's new financial, human resources and student information systems. This will result in an integrated environment with powerful capabilities. In preparation for the roll out of these systems, and to realize the full benefits of their coordinated alignment, significant effort is currently being directed toward articulating standard data definitions, policies and operational procedures for data governance. During the projected implementation window, we can move towards improved ability to access

accurate and valid data, to develop and use common metrics and key performance indicators, and to work towards a truly data-driven approach to quality assurance and enhancement.

UBC's data governance and Integrated Renewal Program, once implemented, will result in more cohesive and robust data sets, which will in turn aid in our responses to external requests, including future QAPA audits.

We propose to alter the PPG 2013/14 this year, as proposed by the PPG itself. An important change will be to require a written report on progress in addressing issues raised in a given review by a specified date, likely two years as suggested by the 1983 revisions of the Senate policy. We will propose that every to-be-reviewed unit recruit one of their faculty members to serve as a liaison, providing assistance and information to external reviewers but not participating in writing or editing the review. We expect better outcomes will be obtained if Heads, Deans and other key personnel reach agreement on what is required, of whom and by when, to avoid diffusion of responsibility.

We have a flexible approach and believe this to be both necessary and effective. However, we could be more coordinated in our quality assurance efforts. UBC does not have a single body to enforce Senate policies toward quality assurance and enhancement across all types and levels of study. Consequently, UBC has yet to establish a central planning forum for the discussion and development of academic quality assurance procedures (whether internally proposed or externally driven). We expect that such a body will be formed to ensure effective implementation of the new strategic plan.

Review Findings

A. Were the responses to the sample program review findings adequate?

The institution has a follow-up process for internal program reviews and acts in accordance with it.

Describe how the institution meets this criterion. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.

As described above, the Senate policy of 1977/1983 states that academic units must propose plans to implement recommendations of the external reviewers to the Dean, Provost and Senate, and requires submission of a report on the implementation to Senate. This requirement was omitted in the PPG 2013/14 guidelines, so in practice, standards vary widely across the UBC. Some faculties (e.g., Medicine) have internal guidelines and external requirements for progress reports on the implementation of findings, but most do not. The response to the previous external review required by the PPG 2013/14 document has limited utility because 5-10 years

may have passed, the previous leadership may have departed, or the direction of the unit changed in the meantime. Reporting to Senate on implementation is not currently included in the annual summary reports. The result is that UBC is not deriving maximum value from its external review process to drive for quality improvement.

The Provost's Office will recommend to Senate that the 1977/1983 policy be revised to strengthen the requirement for follow-up and action on recommendations from external reviews. The objective is to obtain feedback from students, faculty, and senior administrators on <u>every</u> external review. In the meantime, the Vice-Provost, Academic Affairs is reminding Deans to send follow-ups on external reviews conducted in 2014/15. We are tracking the number and quality of responses received as well as data on the number of academic units that send follow-up reports to their Deans, without copying the Provost's Office. These results will inform any suggested revisions to the 1977/1983 Senate policy and to the 2013/14 PPG.

> *B. Does the process inform future decision making?*
>
> *The program review ensures that the program remains consistent with the institution's current mission, goals and long-range plan.*
>
> *Describe how the institution meets this criterion. Relevant institutional policies should be attached as an appendix.*

All UBC units report annually on their progress in meeting the mission and goals of the UBC strategic plan, and these reports roll up to the Board of Governors. These annual assessments provide regular fine-grained analyses of unit progress. Programs are included in this annual process, but, quality improvement in programs is driven by expectations of unit Heads, requirements to demonstrate teaching excellence for promotion and tenure, support from Faculty teaching support units, CTLT, and the Teaching Learning Enhancement Fund. Consequently, while the external reviews provide a very valuable benchmark to ensure that the improvements that are occurring are consistent with best practice elsewhere, they are not the main driver for quality improvement of programs at UBC.

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

All members of the unit under review, as well as the Head, Dean, and the Vice-Provost, receive complete copies of the external review report. Senate receives a summary of the key findings,

recommendations and the response of the unit rather than the full report. These summaries are available for consultation by any member of the University, including students. Neither the Senate policy of 1997/1983 nor PPG 2013/14 require wider dissemination of the full report. We do not have sufficient data on whether our current dissemination practices drive quality improvement. Nor do we know if dissemination would be effective in spreading best practices across the University. When the policy and the PPG are revised, we will consult widely on whether current practice for dissemination should be changed.

Institution Assessment – Review Findings

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

In drafting this institutional report, it has become clear that the time has come for Senate to review its policy on Reviews of Administrative Units and align that policy with current standards and best practices for achieving quality assurance and enhancement. Some of the issues that will be brought to the attention of the Senate Academic Policy Committee as part of this review include the following:

- Disambiguation of the scope of the policy vis-à-vis academic and administrative units.

- Clarity on the roles and responsibilities for the timing of reviews and follow-up activities.

- Review of practices with regard to reviews vis-à-vis reappointments of unit Heads versus reviews for quality assurance and enhancement.

- Clearer expectations as to the review of academic programs within the scope of reviews of academic units, taking into account the processes that are already in place for programmatic accreditation where applicable.

It is anticipated that additional advice on this subject will flow from the QAPA site visit in the Fall 2018; the policy review process will be well underway by that time.

When the policy is reviewed, it will be adapted to the *Senate's Policy V-1: Format, Development and Administration of Senate Policies*, in place since January 2010. Policy V-1 requires that policies be drafted in a template that includes such important considerations as review dates, definitions, scope of applicability, an indication of the responsible Senate Committee, the policy history and a list of all those parties consulted in the policy's development. Where applicable,

procedures related to a policy are also developed, reviewed, and attached to the policy template as a matter of course. Such procedures will be an important aspect of revisions to the policy on Reviews of Academic Units.

Although the adoption of Policy V-1 has led to many improvements in Senate's policy development procedures, the process is much more lengthy and consultative than it had been in previous decades. Development of a new policy or major revisions to an existing policy can take 4 to 8 months from start to finish. The Senate Committee must first determine that a new policy or a review to an existing policy is necessary, and then the Committee discusses the matter at one or two of its meetings. Once consensus has been reached on the necessary revisions and improvements, the Senate Secretariat is tasked with drafting the policy and/or its revisions. Next, the Senate Committee reviews the draft and its subsequent iterations at one or more of its meetings until it is satisfied that the draft is ready for broad consultation. The Community is then given a month or more to respond to the request for consultation. Afterwards, the Committee reviews the responses received and makes any necessary adjustments before proposing the policy to Senate for approval. Broad support for any proposed revisions to the policy is a sine qua non for assent.

5. Other Institution Comments

We wish to acknowledge continuous and expert support from the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training to help UBC prepare for the Quality Assurance Process Audit. This support included the workshop in November 2017 that provided background from other jurisdictions and presentations from institutions and assessors; a site visit in April 2018, from Ministry staff, and ready availability of staff to answer our many questions. This help was invaluable, saved us time, and allowed us to focus our efforts effectively. Any deficiencies in this report are of course our responsibility.

6. Program Samples

The three program areas to be included in the review are as follows with the appropriate documentation attached in Appendix 11. UBC policies in place at the time are as current and outlined as part of this report.

a) Department of Asian Studies
b) Department of Botany
c) Department of Mechanical Engineering

7. Appendix

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

1 – [UBC Annual Report on Enrolment (2017/18)](#)

2 – [Institutional Accountability Plan and Report 2017/18](#)

3 – UBC Policies re Faculty – [#22, 42, 61, 85, 87, 97](#)

4 – [Shaping UBC's Next Century](#)

5 – [(Draft) Indigenous Strategic Plan](#)

6 - [Review of Administrative Units](#)

7 - [Principles, Procedures and Guidelines for External Academic Unit Reviews](#)

8 - [New programs approval process](#) – [Senate Curriculum Committee's Guide for Curriculum Submissions](#)

9 – [Policy #71](#) – Consultation with Students about Tuition and Mandatory Fees

10 - [A UBC Strategic Plan - Place and Promise (prior strategic plan)](#)

11 – Program Samples

    a) Department of Asian Studies
    b) Department of Botany
    c) Department of Mechanical Engineering