The next open meeting of the Senate of the University of Victoria is scheduled for Friday, January 9, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate and Board Chambers, University Centre, Room A180.

AGENDA as reviewed by the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

2. MINUTES
      
      Motion: That the minutes of the open session of the meeting of the Senate held on November 7, 2014 be approved and that the approved minutes be circulated in the usual way.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4. REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR
   a. University rankings
      
      Tony Eder, Director of Institutional Planning and Analysis has been invited to attend.
   
   b. Other matters

5. CORRESPONDENCE
   a. Campus Planning Committee – V. Kuehne and G. Gorrill, Co-Chairs
      
      i. Semi-annual report (SEN-JAN 9/15-2)
6. PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

a. Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer
   – Dr. Leslee Francis Pelton, Acting Chair

i. 2013/2014 Annual Report  
   **SEN-JAN 9/15-3**  
   INFORMATION

ii. Proposed Revision to Admission Requirements for the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts  
   **SEN-JAN 9/15-4**  
   ACTION

Motion: That Senate approve the proposal to create new admission requirements, effective immediately, that would provide secondary students with the opportunity to enter the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts directly in first year, as recommended by the Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer.

Motion: That Senate approves the proposed change to the Academic Calendar admission section of the academic calendar adding the admission requirements to the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts:

Fine Arts

Required Grade 11 Courses for Combined Program in Music and Computer Science
- English 11
- Pre-calculus 11
- Two courses chosen from an approved science 11; an approved language 11; an approved fine arts 11
- Social Studies 11

Required Grade 12 Courses for Combined Program in Music and Computer Science
- English 12 or English 12 First Peoples
- Pre-calculus 12 with at least 65%
- An additional two approved academic 12 courses OR one approved academic 12 course and one approved fine arts 12 course
b. Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance - Prof. Jamie Cassels, Chair

INFORMATION

ii. Revisions to the Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee  
on Learning and Teaching [SEN-JAN 9/15-6]  
ACTION

Motion: That Senate approve the revisions to the terms of reference  
for the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching.

c. Senate Committee on Awards – Dr. Annalee Lepp, Chair

i. New and Revised Awards [SEN-JAN 9/15-7]  
ACTION

Motion: That Senate approve, and recommend to the Board of  
Governors that it also approve, the new and revised awards set out in  
the attached document:

- CIBC Bursary in the Peter B. Gustavson School of Business (new)
- Christine Elworthy Bursary in the School of Nursing (new)*
- David Flaherty Undergraduate Student Library Scholarship (new)*
- Viking Alumni Rugby Award (new)*
- Schulich Leader Scholarship (revised)
- Henry & Mariain Thiel International Business Award (revised)*
- Howlers Rugby Award (new)*
- New Canadian and Immigrant Entrance Scholarship (new)
- CIBC Scholarship in the Peter B. Gustavson School of Business  
  (new)
- Bob Peart Graduate Scholarship in Terrestrial Parks and  
  Protected Areas (new)*
- William Petrie Graduate Student Library Scholarship (new)*
- Hakai Fellowship (new)
- Jessie H. Mantle Fellowship in Nursing (revised)
- John Michael Brownutt Scholarship (revised)*
- Castaway Wanderers Rugby Award (revised)
- Norah and Calvin Banks Aboriginal Leadership Award in  
  Sciences (revised)*
- 25th Olympiad Scholarship (revised)

* Administered by the University of Victoria Foundation
d. Senate Committee on Planning - Dr. Catherine Mateer, Chair

i. Revised Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures

ACTION

(SEN-JAN 9/15-8)

Motion: That Senate approve the revisions to the Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures.

7. PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM FACULTIES

8. PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC AND PROVOST

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Policy on Policies (GV0100) INFORMATION

(SEN-JAN 9/15-9)

b. Report on Convocation Senator Elections INFORMATION

10. ADJOURNMENT
A meeting of the Senate of the University of Victoria was held on November 7, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in the David Strong Building, room C118.

1. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

   **Motion**: (C. Shankman/R. Grant)
   That the agenda be approved as circulated.

   **CARRIED**

2. **MINUTES**
   a. **Minutes of October 3, 2014**

      **Motion**: (B. Smith/G. Sutherland)
      That the minutes of the open session of the meeting of the Senate held on October 3, 2014 be approved and that the approved minutes be circulated in the usual way.

      **CARRIED**

3. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

   There was none.

4. **REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR**
   a. **President’s Report**

      Prof. Cassels provided a report to Senate on the Provincial and Federal environment, followed by a report on general UVic activities.

      Regarding the provincial environment, Prof. Cassels reported that UVic, along with a number of other BC universities, had recently participated in a trade mission to India.

      Prof. Cassels reported that the UVic Board of Governors had endorsed the BC Taxpayer Accountability Principles, as had the Boards of the other research intensive universities in BC. He also reported that UVic had submitted documentation to the Province to demonstrate compliance with the required standards of conduct for the BC public sector. Further, he said, UVic had submitted its report on the BC Jobs Plan.

      Dr. Kuehne confirmed that the BC Jobs Plan tied 25% of post-secondary operating grants to programs that aligned with the skills identified in the Plan as ‘in demand’. She said that UVic
submitted its plan this week and noted that UVic has always been responsive to the demands of students, the labour market and society. She said that most of UVic’s new programs map on to the government’s stated priorities and she expected this would continue.

Prof. Cassels reported that the Research Universities Council of British Columbia (RUCBC) was working on a communication plan linking education to jobs and released its first report, *Putting Degrees to Work*. Prof. Cassels said the report, available on the RUCBC website demonstrated BC Research University’s success in graduating students that go on to positive employment opportunities.

Regarding the Federal environment, Prof. Cassels said he has recently returned from Ottawa where he met with federal officials and attended a meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. He said, in Ottawa, he also met with university officials from Israel and Germany to exchange ideas about university contributions to economic and social development. Prof. Cassels said he had meetings with the Canada Foundation for Innovation to explore long-term options for stable funding for major UVic science initiatives. Finally, he said he met with the Deputy Minister of Environment, UVic’s University Champion, and showcased UVic’s strengths in the environmental sciences and discuss how to coordinate effort.

Regarding general UVic activities, Prof. Cassels reported that the President’s Campus Update was a success and he appreciated the level of attendance and engagement. He said that the launch of the Student Mental Health Strategy was also a great success and expressed thanks to those that put on the series of programs.

Prof. Cassels reported on the announcement of the CARSA corporate naming partnership with Peninsula Co-op.

Prof. Cassels said that he met with Dr. Karlen and other members of the Ariel Project at Triumf to mark the completion of phase one of the project.

Prof. Cassels closed his comments reminding members of Senate that convocation was forthcoming and thanked those who would be participating.

5. **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was none.

6. **PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES**

   a. **Senate Committee on Academic Standards**

      i. **2013/14 Committee Annual Report**

The report was received for information, there were no questions.
b. Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance

Ms. Dewis reported that Mr. Shankman, a student senator, raised a question regarding Senate’s practice of passing motions to approve reports presented for information or discussion. She said the practice is not consistent with procedural best practices. She reported that the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance approved a new practice and from this meeting forward reports would be presented for information and could be discussed in the usual way at Senate meetings. She said reports with specific recommendations attached would include a motion where the motion was based on the recommendation and not the report.

i. Appointments to the 2014/15 Senate Committees

Motion: (A. Lepp/G. Sutherland)
That Senate approve the appointments to the 2014/2015 Senate committees for the terms indicated in the attached document, as recommended by the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance.

CARRIED

c. Senate Committee on Awards

i. New and Revised Awards

Motion: (A. Lepp/M. Purkis)
That Senate approve, and recommend to the Board of Governors that it also approve, the new and revised awards set out in the attached document:

- Simba Technologies Inc. Scholarship* (Revised)
- Victoria Stroke Recovery Association Scholarship (New)
- Lorene Kennedy Graduate Student Field Research Award* (New)
- Le, Noet Graduate Bursary (New)

* Administered by the University of Victoria Foundation

CARRIED

ii. 2013/14 Committee Annual Report

The report was received for information, there were no questions.
d. Senate Committee on Planning

i. Proposal to change the Professional Writing program’s name to “Professional Communication”

Motion: (M. Purkis/J. Archibald)
That Senate approve the request to change the Professional Writing program’s name to ‘Professional Communication’ as described in the memo from the Department of English dated May 10, 2014.

CARRIED

7. PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM FACULTIES

There were none.

8. PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM THE VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC AND PROVOST

a. 2009/10 to 2013/14 Enrolment Report

Dr. Kuehne introduced Mr. Tony Eder who was present to provide an update on UVic enrollment.

Mr. Eder presented a PowerPoint presentation and provided an update on UVic enrollment. He noted this academic year had the highest enrollment numbers to date. In his presentation, Mr. Eder reported that UVic was increasingly relying on direct entry and international students. He also said that retention rates were lowest for students that entered UVic with less than 80% GPA.

During the question and answer period, Mr. Eder responded to questions from members of Senate, commenting that:

- Other institutions were also seeing an increase in the average entering GPA.
- Past demographic declines did not overly impact enrollment at universities and noted perhaps older students helped fill the gap.
- International students continued to support enrollment growth of the university; however, they also required support resources.
- International student retention rates were higher than domestic student retention rates.
- International student growth could not act as a replacement for domestic students as the provincial grant funding only counts domestic students.
- Aboriginal student numbers are expected to continue to grow.
- His office continued to work on graduate student retention and completion timelines.
- Findings from external data indicated that it could be more difficult to engage students in larger classes.

Prof. Cassels thanked Mr. Eder for his report.

There being no other business the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>In Attendance</th>
<th>Regrets</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aragon, Janni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archibald, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Humanities. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baer, Doug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banerjee, Sakata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassi, Nav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convocation Senator. Elected by the convocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean, Sara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Graduate Studies. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengston, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Librarian. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone, Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Associate Vice-President Planning. By Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branzan Albu, Alexandra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brestad, Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder, Gillian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Law. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canessa, Rosaline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassels, Jamie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President and Vice-Chancellor. Chair of Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice-President Research. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caw, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, Alison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton, Lauren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar. By Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippen, Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Education. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocker, Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechev, Nikolai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devor, Aaron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewis, Cassbreea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate University Secretary. By Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicau, Florin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Science. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driessen, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunson, Jim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Vice-President Student Affairs. By Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman, Julia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Secretary. Secretary of Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Kayleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer, Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Pelton, Leslee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Education. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillen, Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Law. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillis, Kathryn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Science. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopalaikrishnan, Karthik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant, Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter B. Gustavson School of Business. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah, Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convocation Senator. Elected by the convocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskett, Tim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanova, Evelina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator, Law. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim, Susan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator, Education. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein, Saul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Peter B. Gustavson School of Business. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostek, Patricia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Fine Arts. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krull, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehne, Valerie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Vice-President Academic and Provost. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanning, Robbyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convocation Senator. Elected by the convocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepp, Annalee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Susan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Fine Arts. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipson, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Science. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukenchuk, Ben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, Maureen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Division of Continuing Studies. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntyre, Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convocation Senator. Elected by the convocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLarty, Lianne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Fine Arts. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellin, Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam, Roy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neiman, Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parisi, Laura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purkle, Mary Ellen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Human and Social Development. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudsari, Abdul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Human and Social Development. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangster-Gormley, Esther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Human and Social Development. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schallié, Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Graduate Studies. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shankman, Cory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Brock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter B. Gustavson School of Business. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Tracie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Librarian. Elected by the Professional Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair, Ralf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Education. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stahl, Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, Gabrielle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szakacs, Kaylee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang, Nick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Engineering. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiedje, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the Continuing Sessionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulysses, Alicia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Luen, Lynne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Dean, Faculty of Fine Arts. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varela, Diana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Science. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Graduate Studies. Elected by the Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Law. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis, Lindsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Senator. Elected by the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Bruce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head, Division of Medical Sciences. Ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyatt, Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Fine Arts. Elected by the faculty members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: November 18, 2014

To: Julia Eastman
University Secretary

From: Valerie Kuehne, Vice-President Academic and Provost
Gayle Gorrill, Vice-President Finance and Operations
Co-Chairs, Campus Planning Committee

RE: SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SENATE ON CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT

Please find attached the semi-annual report to Senate on campus development for its December 5, 2014 meeting.

Valerie Kuehne
Vice-President, Academic and Provost

Gayle Gorrill
Vice-President, Finance and Operations
1.0 Campus Plan Update

The project is underway to update the current Campus Plan completed in 2003. The Campus Planning Committee (CPC) at its April 24th meeting reviewed the process, schedule and scope for the project and established a Terms of Reference and a Steering Committee. The Plan update is intended to be comprehensive in form and includes the key objectives to support the university’s academic mission, provide for full engagement with the campus and external community and to serve as a framework for future decisions on the long range physical development of the campus. The Steering Committee that was established in June is a subgroup of the CPC and includes:

John Archibald  Dean, Faculty of Humanities
Karena Shaw  Director of the School of Environmental Studies
Sheryl Karras  Director of Administration, Undergraduate Programs (BCom)
Kayleigh Erickson  Chairperson, UVSS
Catherine Mateer  Associate Vice President, Academic Planning
Kristi Simpson  Associate Vice President, Financial Planning and Operations
Ron Proulx  Executive Director, Facilities Management
Neil Connelly  Director, Campus Planning & Sustainability

The project schedule provided for the Steering Committee to issue a Request for Proposals for consultant services in August and to retain a consultant team. After a comprehensive review of seven submissions, Dialog BC was selected as the successful proponent in October. The consultants have commenced their work and were on campus Oct. 29 and 30 to interview various faculty, students and staff, along with neighbourhood representatives from the university’s Community Association Liaison Committee. The interviews provided initial input on engagement objectives and techniques to assist the consultants in their preparation of an Engagement Plan for the project. Other work components that are underway involve a physical baseline assessment of the campus and the review of background documents and context information. More information on the program and the range of activities proposed in the Engagement Plan for 2015 will be available in December, once reviewed by the CPC and the executive.

The project schedule provides for the Plan Update engagement activities to launch in January with a draft campus plan completed for August. Following campus and external community review and feedback on the draft campus plan in the fall, approval of a final Campus Plan is targeted for early 2016.

2.0 Continuing Studies Building Addition

Construction was initiated in September for the addition to the Continuing Studies Building. It will provide expanded space for the English Language Centre and the Pathway Program for international students, along with renovations and improvements for continuing studies programming. Project completion and occupancy is scheduled for January 2016.
3.0 Transit Exchange Expansion project

Construction of the ten bus bay project started in the middle of June and was completed at the end of August with an opening ceremony held on September 4th. The project, developed in conjunction with BC Transit, next to Finnerty Road and adjacent to the Student Union Building and the Halpern Centre for Graduate Studies, brings the total exchange capacity on campus to twenty-one bus bays. An extension of this project is a review and improvement of current pathways from the new exchange into the centre of campus. This portion of the project is anticipated to be undertaken in 2015.

4.0 Centre for Athletics, Recreation and Special Abilities (CARSA) and Parkade Buildings

Construction is proceeding satisfactorily on both buildings, with current attention being given to interior and exterior finishing. The project is scheduled to be ready for occupancy by May 2015, to allow for the opening as planned at that time. Tenders for the McKinnon Building renovation and the associated seismic upgrades are expected to be issued by February 2015. This work will support the needs of the School of Exercise Science, Physical and Health Education and will commence upon completion of CARSA, once Athletics and Recreation has vacated the space.

5.0 Sustainability Action Plan: Campus Operations for 2014 - 2019

The Sustainability Action Plan: Campus Operations 2009 – 2014 was prepared in late 2008 to guide the university’s path toward greater sustainability in its operations. Work to renew the Action Plan for the next five year period began in January and was completed in May. Its preparation involved open house sessions, an online survey, workshops and meetings with students, faculty and staff to assist in obtaining input on sustainability and ways to make UVic more sustainable in its operations. Members of the Sustainability Advisory Committee made valuable contributions throughout the plan renewal process and in the preparation of the content for the final Action Plan. The Campus Planning Committee, at its May 27th meeting, recommended to the President that the 2014 – 2019 Plan be received.

The renewed Plan outlines new and updated goals on strategic topics for sustainability in campus operations. Topics include the standard operational ones such as buildings, energy, transportation, grounds, purchasing, waste and water management. In addition, new sections on Planning, Coordination and Administration and Engagement reflect the attention to be given to the ongoing efforts to work collaboratively with the campus community in advancing the sustainability agenda. Sections on Dining Services and Computing are also included in the Plan given the profile and importance that they have in overall campus functioning. Lastly, the Plan provides for the monitoring of activities and outcomes relative to its 32 goals as part of the regular reporting to be undertaken on Plan progress by the Office of Campus Planning and Sustainability.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ADMISSION, RE-REGISTRATION AND TRANSFER

ANNUAL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 1, 2013 - AUGUST 31, 2014

The Senate Committee on Admission, Re-Registration and Transfer consisted of:

Dr. Adam Monahan (Earth and Ocean Sciences), Chair (Sept 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014)
Dr. Kenneth Stewart (Economics) (on study leave July 1, 2014 – Aug 31, 2014)
Dr. Tim Haskett (Representative to the BC Council on ATAC, ex-o)
Dr. Leslee Francis Pelton (Curriculum & Instruction) (Acting Chair, July 1, 2014-Aug 31, 2014)
Mr. Joel Lynn (Executive Director, Student Services, ex-o)
Ms. Anne Heinl (Undergraduate Advising Officer, ex-o)
Dr. Cindy Holder (Associate Dean Academic Advising Faculties of Science, Social Sciences and Humanities)
Mr. David O’Brien (Counselling Services, ex-o)
Ms. Lauren Charlton (Registrar & Executive Director of Student Enrolment, ex-o)
Ms. Kathleen Boland (Associate Registrar, ex-o) (Sept 1, 2013-Dec 31, 2013)
Ms. Laurie Barnas (Associate Registrar, ex-o) (Jan 1, 2014-Aug 31, 2014)
Nick Tang (Student Senator)
David Foster (Student Representative) (Sept 1, 2014-June 30, 2014)
Rachel Barr (Student Senator) (Sept 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014)
Dr. Diana Varela (July 1, 2014-Aug 31, 2014)
Dr. Stephen Tax (July 1, 2014-Aug 31, 2014)
Dr. Chapman (English) (July 1, 2014-Aug 31, 2014)
Kayleigh Erickson (Student Representative) (July 1, 2014-Aug 31, 2014)
Lindsey Willis (Student Senator) (July 1, 2014-Aug 31, 2014)

Secretary: Pat Konkin
The Senate Committee on Admission, Re-Registration and Transfer held 14 meetings during the period September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014 inclusive. There were 2 meetings cancelled due to no quorum.

There was a total of 50 appeals (37 from Undergraduate Admissions and 17 from Undergraduate Records) submitted by students. The results: 17 were accepted; 33 were rejected.

The Senate Committee on Admission, Re-Registration and Transfer (SCART) also considered various items/issues. The most noteworthy are as follows:

1. The Committee voted to support a change to the requirements for admission to the Faculty of Humanities. The change is as follows:

   The Faculty of Humanities requests the Senate Committee on Admission Reregistration and Transfer support and recommend for Senate approval of the proposal to eliminate the current requirement that high school first year applicants complete a Grade 11 second language course to qualify for admission to the Faculty of Humanities. The Faculty suggests that the completion of a second language 11 course be listed as an accepted option rather than as a requirement.

2. The Committee voted to support a Calendar change to the requirement for admission to the Bachelor of Science program in Computer Science in the Faculty of Engineering.

   The recommended motion was that Senate approve the introduction of a minimum grade requirement of 65% in Pre-calculus 12 (or equivalent) for admission to the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science program, effective May 1, 2014.

3. Pathway Program: The recommended motions on this issue were:

   That the Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer recommend to Senate that it approve the creation of a new category type for students applying to the Pathway Program.
And

That the Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer recommend to Senate that it approve the following addition of a new admission category type to the section of the undergraduate academic calendar entitled “Other Applicant Categories” that lists other special applicant categories effective May 1, 2014.

4. The Committee voted to support a proposed change to the admission to the Elementary Education program. The change would be that students could be admitted to the program in their first year rather than transferring into the program after their first year.

5. Dr. Monahan presented the revised “Terms of Reference” to the Committee. The main concern was with how the appeals from Graduate Admission & Records were being handled. After a lengthy discussion the Committee voted to approve the changes. In conclusion, the agreement was that the Faculty of Graduate Studies would rule on admission, re-registration and transfer appeals related to graduate students. The Faculty of Graduate Studies will provide the Committee with an annual report in October that includes an outline of the process for making appeal decisions, and a summary of the number graduate appeals heard.
Memo

Date: December 12, 2014

To: Members of Senate

From: Leslee Francis Pelton
        Acting Chair, Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer (SCART)

Re: Proposed revision to the admission requirements for the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts

The Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer received the attached proposal from Dr. Susan Lewis-Hammond, Director of the School of Music on October 27, 2014. The proposal was considered at the SCART meeting on November 4, 2014. The committee agreed with the recommended changes to the admission requirements for the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science and by motion approved recommending the changes to Senate. There were no concerns expressed by committee members.

Background to the proposed revisions

The School of Music currently provides entry to the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science only at the 2nd year level. In the current application process students may apply to one of a few faculties for the first year of the program. Applicants also submit a supplemental application specific to the combined program that is reviewed by an admission panel. Students in 1st year are considered Pre-Music and Computer Science Students (PMC). Upon successful completion of all Year One courses, students not in the Faculty of Fine Arts will request to change faculties to the Faculty of Fine Arts and be coded as a Music and Computer Science Major (MUCS).

The two-step process is cumbersome and many students who want to enter the program are confused by the process. Secondary school students often enquire about applying directly to Year 1 in the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science and are told that this is not an option. There are also instances where students apply to one of the Faculties, assuming (in error) that successful application to the faculty grants them entry into the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science.
**Recommended Motion:**

That Senate approve the proposal to create new admission requirements, effective immediately, that would provide secondary students with the opportunity to enter the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts directly in first year, as recommended by the Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer.

**Recommended Motion:**

That Senate approves the proposed change to the Academic Calendar admission section of the academic calendar adding the admission requirements to the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts:

**Fine Arts**

*Required Grade 11 Courses for Combined Program in Music and Computer Science*
- English 11
- Pre-calculus 11
- Two courses chosen from an approved science 11; an approved language 11; an approved fine arts 11
- Social Studies 11

*Required Grade 12 Courses for Combined Program in Music and Computer Science*
- English 12 or English 12 First Peoples
- Pre-calculus 12 with at least 65%
- An additional two approved academic 12 courses OR one approved academic 12 course and one approved fine arts 12 course
At its meeting on December 10, 2014, the Senate Committee on Academic Standards considered the proposal from the Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer regarding revisions to the admission requirements for the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts. This is to confirm that members of the committee had no concerns with the academic standards aspects of the proposal.

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer
From: Cassbreea Dewis
Acting Associate University Secretary

Re: Revision to the Admission Requirements for the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts
MEMO

Date: October 27, 2014
To: The Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer
From: Dr. Susan Lewis-Hammond, Director of the School of Music
Re: Proposed revision to admission requirements for the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts

Background

The School of Music currently provides entry to the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science at the 2nd year level only. In the current application process students may apply to one of a few faculties for the first year of the program. Applicants also submit a supplemental application specific to the program that is reviewed by an admissions panel. Students in first year are considered Pre-Music & Computer Science Students (PMC). Upon successful completion of all Year One courses students not in the Faculty of Fine Arts will request to change faculties to the Faculty of Fine Arts and be coded as a Music and Computer Science Major (MUCS).

The two-step process is cumbersome and many students wanting to enter the program are confused by the process. Secondary school students often enquire about applying directly to Year 1 in the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science and are told that this is not an option. There are also instances where students apply to one of the Faculties, assuming (in error) that successful application to the general faculty grants them entry into the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science.

Proposal

It is proposed that Senate approve the creation of new admission requirements that would provide secondary students with the opportunity to enter the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science, School of Music, Faculty of Fine Arts directly in first year.

Rationale

Including the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science as a program under Music on the University application page will streamline the admission process for students and the school.

In addition to a more streamlined process and admissions experience, there are a number of positive reasons why the ability to admit students directly into the Combined Program in Music and Computer Science during first year of studies is desirable, including:
• Give students an earlier sense of belonging in their chosen field;
• Provide the ability to identify a potential cohort of students in advance and offer them more specialized advising;
• Attract outstanding students who might otherwise choose to begin their studies elsewhere, where first year admission to a discipline-specific program is already offered; and
• Engage, connect, and retain students to support an outstanding overall student experience.

In order to facilitate the change the high school admission requirements for the Combined Program need to be included under Fine Arts on page 24 of the Calendar. Admission requirements below.

Year 1 Admission Requirements:
BC/Yukon Secondary School Graduation

Fine Arts

Required Grade 11 Courses for Combined Program in Music and Computer Science
• English 11
• Pre-calculus 11
• two courses chosen from an approved science 11; an approved language 11; an approved fine arts 11
• Social Studies 11

Required Grade 12 Courses for Combined Program in Music and Computer Science
• English 12 or English 12 First Peoples
• Pre-calculus 12 with at least 65%
• An additional two approved academic 12 courses OR one approved academic 12 course and one approved fine arts 12 course
**Year 1 Admission Requirements: BC/Yukon Secondary School Graduate**

The academic qualification from secondary school is high school graduation with a competitive average. The admission average is calculated using all required grade 12 courses. Each faculty determines their cutoff and it changes on an annual basis due to limits on enrollment and the competitiveness of the selection process for certain programs. The actual cutoffs for the previous year are listed at <www.uvic.ca/future-students/undergraduate/admissions/thinking/cut-off.php> and generally range from 75 to 90%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Required Grade 11 Courses*</th>
<th>Required Grade 12 Courses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter B. Gustavson School of Business</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td>Pre-calculus 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one approved science 11</td>
<td>two approved academic 12 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional qualitative requirements are considered during the selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process. Please refer to the Gustavson School of Business website at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;gustavson.uvic.ca/apply&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Elementary Education</td>
<td>Foundations of Math 11 or Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td>three approved academic 12 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one approved science 11 course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Year 1 Entry for other Faculty of Education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Engineering</td>
<td>Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td>Pre-calculus 12 with at least 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Software Engineering</td>
<td>Chemistry 11</td>
<td>Physics 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics 11</td>
<td>one approved academic 12 course (Chemistry 12 recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td>Pre-calculus 12 with at least 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one approved science 11</td>
<td>one approved academic 12 course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td>one approved academic 12 course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>three courses chosen from Foundations of Math 11 or Pre-calculus 11; an approved science 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an approved language 11; an approved fine arts 11</td>
<td>two approved academic 12 courses and an approved fine arts 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requirements such as a portfolio, questionnaire or audition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are required by Music, Theatre and Visual Arts. Please refer to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate department entry at the Faculty of Fine Arts website: &lt;www.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finearts.uvic.ca&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Program in Music and Computer Science</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td>Pre-calculus 12 with at least 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two courses chosen from an approved science 11; an approved language 11; an approved</td>
<td>an additional two approved academic 12 courses OR one approved academic 12 course and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fine arts 11</td>
<td>one approved fine arts 12 course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human and Social Development Health Information Science</td>
<td>No required grade 11 courses.</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations of Math 12 or Pre-calculus 12</td>
<td>two approved academic 12 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two approved academic 12 courses</td>
<td>Pre-calculus 12 is required for students wishing to complete the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Pre-calculus 12 is required for students wishing to complete the</td>
<td>Combined Major in Computer Science and Health Information Science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Child and Youth Care, see the Social Sciences academic requirements below. Please refer to the CYC website for additional information about the selection process. No Year 1 entry for Nursing and Social Work or Public Health and Social Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>English 11</th>
<th>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</th>
<th>three approved academic 12 courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations of Math 11 or Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one approved science 11 course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>No Year 1 entry. See Faculty of Law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
<td>two approved science 12 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>English 11</td>
<td>English 12 or English 12 First Peoples</td>
<td>three approved academic 12 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundations of Math 11 or Pre-calculus 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one approved science 11 course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Students who are considering a degree program that requires university-level math courses (which include all Economics and some Geography and Psychology programs) are strongly advised to take Pre-calculus 12. See the department websites for further details on Math requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance met eight times during 2013/14:

- September 20, 2013
- October 18, 2013
- November 22, 2013
- December 13, 2013
- January 24, 2014
- February 21, 2014
- March 21, 2014
- April 17, 2014

The nominations sub-committee met five times:

- September 20, 2013
- October 18, 2013
- December 13, 2013
- February 21, 2014
- April 17, 2014

Review of Draft Senate Agenda

At each of its meetings, the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance assisted the Chair in preparing the Senate agenda and reviewed each of the items proposed for submission to Senate.

Senate Committee Terms of Reference

During 2013-2014 the Committee undertook a systematic review of all Senate committee terms of reference. The following revised committee terms of reference were approved over the course of 2013-2014:

- Senate Committee on Academic Standards
- Senate Committee on Planning
- Senate Committee on Awards
- Senate Committee on Appeals
- Senate Committee on University Budget
- Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance
- Senate Committee on Continuing Studies
- Senate Committee on Curriculum

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Senate
From: Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance
Re: 2013-2014 Annual Report
Committee meeting dates for review and motions are as follows:

At its September 2013 meeting, the committee reviewed and recommended that Senate approve the revised terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Academic Standards, the Senate Committee on Awards, and the Senate Committee on Planning. (Approved by Senate October 2013)

At its November 2013 meeting, the committee reviewed and recommended that Senate approve the revised terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Appeals, the Senate Committee on University Budget, and the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance. Also at the November 2013 meeting the committee updated the recently approved terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Academic Standards, the Senate Committee on Planning, and the Senate Committee on Awards and recommended them to Senate for approval. (Approved by Senate December 2013)

At its December 2013 meeting, the committee reviewed and recommended that Senate approve the revised terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies and the Senate Committee on Curriculum. (Approved by Senate January 2014)

At its January 2014 meeting, the committee reviewed and recommended that Senate approve the revised terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Admission, Re-registration and Transfer and the Senate Committee on Libraries. (Approved by Senate February 2014)

At its March 2014 meeting the committee reviewed and recommended that Senate approve additional revisions terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Planning. (Approved by Senate April 2014)

Revisions to the Rules to Govern the Conduct of Senate Procedures (Senate Rules and Procedures)

The Rules to Govern the Conduct of Senate Procedures underwent a substantial review in 2013-2014 including changing the title to “Senate Rules and Procedures.” The review was prompted by the proposal for Emergency Protocol for Senate Operations and well timed as the Procedures had not undergone a substantial review in several years.

Committee members had several opportunities to provide input to the revised Procedures; the Procedures were discussed at the September and October 2013 meetings. In November 2013 Senate had an opportunity to provide feedback, which was incorporated into the updated Procedures at the November 2013 committee meeting. At the November 2013 committee meeting, the Procedures were finalized and recommended for Senate approval. (Approved by Senate December 2013)

Emergency Protocol for Senate Operations

The need for an emergency protocol for Senate operations was identified by the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance in 2012. Responding to this need, the Office of the Universality Secretary, worked with the committee to the draft protocol and undertook consultations with university stakeholders including the Executive Council, Dean’ Council, other Senate Committees and the Manager, Emergency Planning.
At its September 2013 meeting the committee received a proposal from the Office of the University Secretary to establish an Emergency Protocol for Senate Operations. Committee members provided suggestions and advice at the September and October 2013 meetings and recommended that the document be submitted to Senate for consultation in November 2013. At its November 2013 meeting the committee considered Senate’s feedback and proposed the Protocol be submitted for Senate approval at the December 2013 Senate meeting. (Approved by Senate December 2013)

Convocation Senator Terms

Convocation Senators are elected by the convocation to serve three year terms. Under the Rules to Govern Senate Procedures their terms culminated on December 31 at the end of their third year.

At its March 2014 meeting, the committee was advised that current convocation senators’ terms were scheduled to end in December 2014. However, when the Senate Rules and Procedures were revised, the terms of Convocation Senators were changed to match the rest of the Senate members’ terms. Thus, the existing convocation members would extend their terms six months to allow for a July 1, 2015 start date for the incoming convocation senators and alignment of the terms with the Senate Rules and Procedures.

Faculty of Graduate Studies Governance Structures

Over the course of the year the committee considered, for input, a proposal from the Faculty of Graduate Studies regarding changing its governance structure. Senate considered the proposal at its March 2014 meeting and provided advice to the Dean of Graduate Studies. This item was not brought back to the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance after the March 2014 Senate meeting.

Senate Committee Evaluations

Members of Senate committees are provided an annual opportunity to evaluate their experience serving on their respective Senate committees. Results from the evaluation survey are used to determine possible areas to improve the members’ experience and the committee’s overall effectiveness.

At its October 2014 meeting, the committee received the evaluation results from the 2012-2013 survey.

Senate Committee Attendance

The Office of the University Secretary continued to track Senate Committee attendance and report to the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance on committee attendance trends and concerns.
2013/14 Appointments to Senate Committees

At its **September and October 2013** meetings the nominations sub-committee discussed and approved nominations for vacancies on the Senate Committees for 2013-2014. Senate approved these nominations at the October and November 2013 Senate meetings respectively.

**Special Committees**

*Search Committee for the Chancellor*
At its **October 2013** meeting, the nominations sub-committee discussed and recommended Senators to serve on the Search Committee for the Chancellor. The appointments were approved by Senate at the November 2013 Senate meeting.

*Joint Senate and Board Retreat Committee*
At its **September 2013 and October 2013** meeting, the nominations sub-committee discussed and recommended Senators to serve on the Joint Senate and Board Retreat Committee. The appointments were approved by Senate at the corresponding October 2013 and November 2013 Senate meetings.

At its **December 2013** meeting the nominations sub-committee discussed and recommended Senators to serve on the Non-Academic Misconduct Appeal Board. The appointments were approved at the January 2014 Senate meeting.

**2014/15 Appointments to Senate Committees**

At the **April 2014** meeting the nominations sub-committee discussed and approved nominations for vacancies on the Senate committees for 2014-2015. The appointments were approved by Senate at the May 2014 Senate meeting.

**2014/15 Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance**
Jamie Cassels, Chair  
Alexandra Branzan-Albu, Engineering  
Julia Eastman, University Secretary  
Kathy Gillis, Science  
Valerie Kuehne, Acting Vice-President Academic and Provost  
Robbyn Lanning, Convocation Senator  
Annalee Lepp, Humanities  
Abdul Roudsari, Human and Social Development  
Tracie Smith, Library  
Gabrielle Sutherland, Student Senator  
Cassbreea Dewis (Acting Secretary)
2013/14 Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance
Jamie Cassels, Chair
Peter Bell, student senator
Robert Burke, Science
Julia Eastman, University Secretary
Kathy Gillis, Science
Reuven Gordon, Engineering
Robbyn Lanning, Convocation Senator
Mary Ellen Purkis, Human and Social Development
Tracie Smith, Library
Reeta Tremblay, Vice-President Academic and Provost
Michael Webb, Social Sciences
Carrie Andersen (Secretary)
The Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance met on November 21, 2014 to consider revisions to the terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching. Details of the proposed revisions are set out in the attached documents.

**Recommended Motion**

_That Senate approve the revisions to the terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching._

Respectfully submitted,

2014/15 Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance
Jamie Cassels, Chair
Alexandra Branzan-Albu, Engineering
Julia Eastman, University Secretary
Kathy Gillis, Science
Valerie Kuehne, Acting Vice-President Academic and Provost
Robbyn Lanning, Convocation Senator
Annalee Lepp, Humanities
Mary Ellen Purkis, Human and Social Development
Abdul Roudsari, Human and Social Development
Tracie Smith, Library
Gabrielle Sutherland, Student Senator
Cassbreea Dewis (Acting Secretary)
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING
TERMS OF REFERENCE

The committee shall:

1. Advise Senate on the university’s learning and teaching environment and recommend measures, which are designed to enhance the university’s learning and teaching environment;

2. Assist and advise Senate, after due consultation with the faculties and other appropriate units, in the formulation and promotion of effective academic policy in the areas of learning and teaching, within the context of university policies and negotiated agreements;

3. Respond to specific requests from the Senate, other senate standing committees, or from other groups or individuals within the university community (students, instructors, faculty and staff) when referred through the Senate to the committee;

4. Obtain information from and consult broad sources internal and external to the university as appropriate to deal with issues brought before the committee; and

5. Maintain close liaison and collaborate with the Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre, and others on campus who contribute to the quality of learning and teaching at the university in support of key learning and teaching issues at the university.

Senate standing and ad hoc committee meetings are normally closed and the discussions and meeting documents are considered confidential.

Composition
- 9 faculty members representing the faculties, other than the Faculty of Education (at least 2 of whom shall be senators) (voting)
- Dean, Faculty of Education or designate (ex officio, voting)
- 2 representatives from the divisions (Continuing Studies and the Medical Sciences) (voting)
- 5 students including 2 student members of Senate, 2 undergraduate student representatives and 1 graduate student representative (voting)
- 1 convocation member of Senate (voting)
- 1 Alumni Association representative (voting)
- 1 Librarian selected by the Faculty Association Librarians Committee (FALC) (voting)
- the University Librarian or designate (ex officio, voting)
- the President or nominee (ex officio, voting)
- the Chief Information Officer or designate (ex officio, non-voting)
- the Director, Learning and Teaching Centre (ex officio, non-voting)
- the Executive Director or designate, Coop Education & Career Services, (ex officio, non-voting)
- the Director or designate, Technology Integrated Learning Centre, (ex officio, non-voting)

Total membership = 26 (22 voting members)
The secretary of the committee is the Associate University Secretary.

Approved by Senate October 10, 1973
Revised February 2, 1994
Revised May 4, 2007
At the September 2013 meeting of the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching members reviewed a proposed revised terms of reference. The revisions were set out to standardize the language, and to structure and format of the terms of reference in line with all terms of reference for all Senate committees.

At the September meeting members discussed revisions to the terms of reference. The revisions were incorporated and in October 2013 the revisions were discussed at the committee. At the October 2013 meeting more discussion took place around the role of the committee, its membership, and whether it should note specific positions in the section regarding 'liaising and maintaining close relationships.' After the October meeting, revisions to the terms of reference were tabled until the next academic year.

The revised terms of reference (attached) reflect the need to update the terms of reference to fit with the standard language and format of other Senate committees’ terms of reference. Other updates reflect the discussions at both September and October 2013 committee meetings. The proposed revisions include:

- the re-ordering of the first section of the terms of reference to first describe the committee’s relationship to Senate.
- the addition of a statement recognizing others at the university who contribute to the quality of learning and teaching.
- the addition of a statement that meetings of Senate standing committees are normally closed.
- the addition of voting status to all committee members on the membership list.
- the addition of a member elected by the convocation to the composition of the committee.
- the addition of the Director of Coop Education Career Services (or designate) as an ex-officio non-voting position.
- the addition of the Director of the Technology Integrated Learning Centre (or designate) as an ex-officio non-voting position.
- a change in status to non-voting members for Chief Information Officer and Director Learning and Teaching Centre positions to be consistent with other Senate committee terms of reference.

**Recommended motion**

*That the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching approve, and recommend to the Senate Committee on Agenda and Governance that it approve, the revised terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching.*

Attachment
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING
TERMS OF REFERENCE

The committee shall:

1. Advise Senate on the university’s learning and teaching environment and recommend measures, which are designed to enhance the university’s learning and teaching environment;

2. Assist and advise Senate, after due consultation with the faculties and other appropriate units, in the formulation and promotion of effective academic policy in the areas of learning and teaching, within the context of university policies and negotiated agreements;

2. Recommend to the Senate measures, which are designed to enhance the university’s learning and teaching environment;

3. Respond to specific requests from the Senate, other senate standing committees, or from other groups or individuals within the university community (students, instructors, faculty and staff) when referred through the Senate to the committee;

4. Obtain information from and consult broad sources internal and external to the university as appropriate to deal with issues brought before the committee; and

5. Maintain close liaison and collaborate with the Director of the Learning and Teaching Centre, and others on campus who contribute to the quality of learning and teaching at the university in support of key learning and teaching issues at the university.

Senate standing and ad hoc committee meetings are normally closed and the discussions and meeting documents are considered confidential.

Composition

- 9 faculty members representing the faculties, other than the Faculty of Education (at least 2 of whom shall be senators)* (voting)
- Dean, Faculty of Education or designate (ex officio, voting)
- 2 representatives from the divisions (Continuing Studies and the Medical Sciences) (voting)
- 5 students including 2 student members of Senate, 2 undergraduate student representatives and 1 graduate student representative (voting)
- 1 convocation member of Senate (voting)
- 1 Alumni Association representative (voting)
- 1 Librarian selected by the Faculty Association Librarians Committee (FALC) (voting)
- the Education Librarian University Librarian or designate (ex officio, voting)
- the President or nominee (ex officio, voting)
- the Chief Information Officer or designate (ex officio, non-voting)
- the Director, Learning and Teaching Centre (ex officio, non-voting)
- the Executive Director or designate, Coop Education & Career Services, (ex officio, non-voting)
- the Director or designate, Technology Integrated Learning Centre, (ex officio, non-voting)
Total membership = 2526 (22 voting members)

The secretary of the committee is the Associate University Secretary.

Following Senate's Rules to Govern, the chair of the committee shall normally be a faculty member and a member of Senate

Approved by Senate October 10, 1973
Revised February 2, 1994
Revised May 4, 2007
TO: Secretary of Senate  
University Secretary’s Office

DATE: November 13, 2014

FR: Lori Nolt, Director, Student Awards and Financial Aid  
Secretary, Senate Committee on Awards

RE: Awards Recommended to Senate for Approval

The Senate Committee on Awards recommends that the Senate approves and recommends to the Board of Governors the following awards:

*Administered by the University of Victoria Foundation  
Additions are underlined  
Deletions are struck through

CIBC Bursary in the Peter B. Gustavson School of Business (NEW)  
Bursaries of up to $2,500 are awarded to students in the Bachelor of Commerce program in the Peter B. Gustavson School of Business. Preference will be given to students in the first or third year of the program.

Christine Elworthy Bursary in the School of Nursing* (NEW)  
One or more bursaries are awarded to 3rd or 4th year undergraduate students in the School of Nursing Program. Preference will be given to a student who is a single parent.

David Flaherty Undergraduate Student Library Scholarship* (NEW)  
A scholarship is awarded to an academically outstanding undergraduate student in any discipline who can show how they have utilized library resources—be they print archival, music, multimedia, digital, etc. – for a class project, assignment or research paper. Eligible students must complete a 500 word essay explaining their use of library resources in an application. The University Librarian’s Office will nominate the recipient.
VIKING ALUMNI RUGBY AWARD* (NEW)
One or more awards are given to undergraduate or graduate students who compete on the Vikes Men’s Varsity Rugby team at the University of Victoria. Eligible students must meet all CIS eligibility requirements. Award recipients will be selected on the basis of work ethic, commitment and performance criteria by the Director of Athletics and Recreation in consultation with the Varsity Head Coach and the Manager of Athletics.

SCHULICH LEADER SCHOLARSHIP (REVISED)
One Two renewable scholarships valued at $80,000, payable at $20,000 per year for four years, for a student enrolled in a Bachelor of Engineering program and one renewable scholarship valued at $60,000, payable at $15,000 per year for four years, for a student enrolled in any other S.T.E.M. (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) faculty are offered by Seymour Schulich and the UJA (United Jewish Appeal) Federation of Greater Toronto to support Canadian undergraduate students entering UVic from high schools, secondary schools or CEGEPs in Canada. Students must be enrolled to study in the areas of science, technology, engineering, mathematics or other related disciplines (referred to as S.T.E.M Faculty) as Seymour Schulich believes that these areas will help secure the future economic competitiveness of Canada. The Schulich Leader Scholarships are available to support and encourage young people to embrace science and technology in their future careers. When selecting Schulich Leaders consideration will be given to at least two of the following criteria: academic excellence; demonstrated leadership in school or community or evidence of entrepreneurial talent; or financial need. The scholarships are renewable for an additional three years, or until the first undergraduate degree is obtained, whichever is the shorter period. Schulich Leaders must continue to be enrolled in one of the University’s S.T.E.M Faculties to remain eligible for this scholarship. Students must be nominated by their high school, secondary school or CEGEP to be considered.

HENRY & MARIAN THIEL INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AWARD* (REVISED)
An award will be given to a Canadian 4th year academically outstanding undergraduate student entering 4th year in the Bachelor of Commerce program who has completed the Bachelor of Commerce core and who is specializing in International Business.

HOWLERS RUGBY AWARD* (New)
One or more awards are given to undergraduate and graduate students of Indigenous descent who participate in the Vikes Men’s or Women’s Rugby program at the University of Victoria. Eligible students must meet all CIS (Canadian Interuniversity Sport) eligibility requirements. Award recipients will be selected on the basis of work ethic, commitment and performance criteria by the Director of Athletics and Recreation in consultation with the Varsity Head Coaches and the Manager of Athletics. Preference will be given to students who demonstrate community involvement.
NEW CANADIAN AND IMMIGRANT ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIP (NEW)
A scholarship of $2,000 is awarded to a student entering an undergraduate program at the University of Victoria from a Canadian secondary school who is an immigrant to Canada and can demonstrate financial need. Eligible recipients must be Canadian citizens or permanent residents and must have achieved a minimum average of 80% on secondary school courses used for admission.

CIBC SCHOLARSHIP IN THE PETER B. GUSTAVSON SCHOOL OF BUSINESS (NEW)
Ten scholarships of $2,500 are awarded to academically outstanding entering and continuing students beginning their 2nd year in the Bachelor of Commerce program in the Peter B. Gustavson School of Business. Preference is given to students with demonstrated financial need. This scholarship is renewable for recipients’ 3rd and 4th years of the program. To receive an automatic renewal, recipients must have completed a total of 12 or more units in any two terms of study between May and April and maintained a grade point average of 7.0 or higher on the best 12 units. Students taking a co-op term and 6 units between May and April are eligible for renewal if a grade point average of 7.0 is maintained. A student whose grade point average falls between 6.5 and 7.0 may file a written appeal with the Peter B. Gustavson School of Business to seek special consideration for renewal of the scholarship.

BOB PEART GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP IN TERRESTRIAL PARKS AND PROTECTED AREAS* (NEW)
One or more scholarships may be awarded annually to a student enrolled in a Master’s or PhD program in the Department of Geography or School of Environmental Studies, and whose research is related to terrestrial parks and protected areas. Preference will be given to a student who conducts applied or field research, and to a student whose research includes a focus on: terrestrial parks management, large landscape connectivity, the engagement of children and youth in nature and/or advocacy for children to develop a meaningful connection to the natural world. Selection will be based on a statement prepared by applicants showing evidence of academic achievement and intended research focus. Applicants will each apply to their “home” units by September 8th. Selection will be made by the Faculty of Graduate Studies Awards Committee on the recommendation of the Department of Geography and the School of Environmental Studies.

WILLIAM PETRIE GRADUATE STUDENT LIBRARY SCHOLARSHIP* (NEW)
A scholarship is awarded to an academically outstanding graduate student in any discipline who can show how the student has utilized library resources—be they print archival, music, multimedia, digital, etc.—for a class project, assignment or research paper. Eligible students must complete a 500 word essay explaining their use of library resources in an application. Graduate students must submit an application form to the University Librarian’s Office by May 31st, to the attention of the Grants and Awards Librarian. Selection will be made by the Graduate Awards Committee upon the recommendation of the University Librarian’s Office.
HAKAI FELLOWSHIP (NEW)
A fellowship of $45,000 ($20,000 each year for two years and $5,000 in one-time lab support) is awarded to a graduate student at the MSc or PhD level pursuing a two or three year graduate research project in fisheries and marine ecosystems in the Department of Biology. Selection of the recipient is made by the Graduate Awards Committee upon the recommendation of the Department of Biology.

JESSIE H. MANTLE FELLOWSHIP IN NURSING (REVISED)
A Fellowship of $5,000 is awarded to an outstanding graduate Ph.D. student in the School of Nursing who is doing research in the area of gerontological clinical nursing practice and who is working in collaboration with a health related group or organization that will provide the recipient with an opportunity to conduct research with the intent of positively impacting patient care. Selection of the recipient will be made by the Graduate Admissions and Awards Committee upon the recommendation of the School of Nursing.

A fellowship of $5,000 is awarded to an outstanding graduate student in the School of Nursing who is employed in, studying or researching the area of gerontological clinical nursing practice. The work should be directly applicable to the care of older adults (usually defined as 65+ years) and have the potential to affirm or improve direct care. The recipient must demonstrate a commitment to the field of gerontological nursing practice by submitting an application statement detailing what the student is doing to improve clinical practice in gerontological nursing (e.g. presenting research at conferences, publishing articles, serving in leadership roles in geriatric practice, conducting research to inform clinical practice). Selection of the recipient will be made by the Graduate Awards Committee upon the recommendation of the School of Nursing.

JOHN MICHAEL BROWNUTT SCHOLARSHIP* (REVISED)
One or more scholarships are awarded to academically outstanding undergraduate Aboriginal Indigenous (First Nation Status, Non-Status, Inuit or Métis) students at the University of Victoria. Students must have demonstrated community involvement. Applications may be obtained from the Office of Indigenous Affairs and must be submitted to that office by July 15th. Students may apply through the on-line application via My page under Student Awards and Financial Aid.

CASTAWAY WANDERERS MEN’S RUGBY AWARD (REVISED)
One or more awards are given to undergraduate and graduate students who compete on the Vikes Men’s Varsity Rugby team, Men’s and Women’s Varsity Rugby teams at the University of Victoria. Eligible students must meet all CIS eligibility requirements. Award recipients will be selected on the basis of work ethic, commitment and performance criteria by the Director of Athletics and Recreation in consultation with the Manager of Athletics.
NORAH AND CALVIN BANKS ABORIGINAL LEADERSHIP AWARD IN SCIENCES* (REVISED)
One or more awards are given to undergraduate or graduate Aboriginal students in the Faculty of Science, Faculty of Engineering or School of Environmental Studies who demonstrate leadership by encouraging and/or promoting Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields of study in Aboriginal communities. Undergraduate students apply through the on-line application via My page under Student Awards and Financial Aid. For graduate students, applications may be obtained from the Office of Indigenous Affairs and must be submitted to that office by April 15th, together with Applications must be submitted with reference letters from Aboriginal Community leaders outlining how they demonstrate leadership. Selection of the recipients will be made by the Senate Committee on Awards or the Graduate Admissions and Awards Committee upon the recommendation of the Director of the Office of Indigenous Affairs in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty of Science, and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering and the Director of the School of Environmental Studies.

25TH OLYMPIAD SCHOLARSHIP (REVISED)
A scholarship of $2000 is awarded to an academically outstanding undergraduate student entering the University of Victoria who has demonstrated excellence in extramural athletics while maintaining a high academic standing. Students competing in any of the Vikes Varsity sports are eligible to apply. Male or female students completing in Vikes Varsity sports include: basketball, soccer, volleyball, swimming, cross country and track, running, middle distance running, rowing, men’s rugby, or women’s field hockey, and golf are eligible to apply. Students must provide a coach's reference letter. Award recipients will be selected on the basis of work ethic, commitment and performance criteria by the Director of Athletics and Recreation in consultation with the Manager of Athletics.

_______________________________
Lori Nolt
2014/2015 Senate Committee on Awards
A. Lepp (Chair), A. Baniasadi, K. Barnes, L. Charlton,
A. Cirillo, C. Crippen, K. Erickson, S. Evans, L. Nolt,
Y. Rondeau, M. Sotoudehnia, J. Walsh, J. Wood,
At its meeting of 29 April 2014, the Senate Committee on Planning discussed and approved the Revised Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures. Dr. Mateer has provided a Memo attached with the materials to explain why these changes have been made to the Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures. The following motion is recommended:

*That Senate approve the revisions to the Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures.*

Date: December 9, 2014  
To: The Secretary of the Senate  
From: Dr. Catherine Mateer, Chair, Senate Committee on Planning  
Re: Revised Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures

Committee Membership:
Dr. Catherine Mateer, Chair  
Ms. Lauren Charlton  
Dr. Stan Dosso  
Ms. Katrina Flanders  
Dr. Reuven Gordon  
Ms. Carrie Anderson  
Dr. Howard Brunt  
Dr. Maureen MacDonald  
Dr. Timothy Iles  
Dr. Merwan Engineer  
Dr. Reeta Tremblay  
Dr. David Boag  
Dr. Catherine McGregor  
Dr. Victoria Wyatt  
Dr. Anne Bruce  
Dr. Ann Stahl  
Ms. Emily Rogers  
Ms. Norah McRae  
Dr. Sarah Blackstone  
Ms. Jess Gelowsky (Secretary)
The Senate Committee on Planning has approved and is forwarding for review and approval by Senate the Academic Program Review Policy and Associated Procedures for Academic Program Reviews. The policy supersedes a policy that had been in place since October 2004.

The Academic Review Policy pertains to the regular and systematic review of the operation and objectives of academic programs for the purpose of fostering their ongoing improvement in quality and effectiveness.

The policy was discussed at several meetings of the Senate Committee on Planning in 2012-13 and suggestions for revision incorporated. The policy was also reviewed and discussed by members of the Dean’s Council in the Spring of 2013 and suggestions were incorporated and accepted at a meeting of Dean’s Council on December 10, 2013. The final version of the policy now being presented to Senate was approved by the Senate Committee on Planning at its meeting on April 29, 2014.

The substantive changes in the policy can be summarized as follows:

- The policy is now formatted in the standard University Policy format;
- The policy and the procedures associated with carrying out the policy have been separated, again consistent with University Policy format;
- The Procedures now include a meeting with the Dean of the Faculty, when appropriate the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Chair/Director of the Academic Unit and the AVP Academic Planning in advance of every Academic Program Review to discuss any areas of concern or interest that are identified as a particular focus for the Academic Program Review;
- In order to ensure maximum benefit and follow-through following the Academic Program Review, the Policy now includes an additional step (4.00; f). In addition to a written responses to the review from the Academic Unit head and Dean, an Action Plan from the academic unit and progress report by the Dean on the implementation of the recommendations of the Academic Program Review Committee is to be prepared within three months of receiving the report. The Action Plan is discussed with and approved by the Provost.
Although the content and purpose of the policy is consistent with the prior policy, the change in format rendered a ‘track changes’ version virtually unreadable. The prior policy is, however, appended for comparison.

Dr. Catherine Mateer, AVP Academic Planning

Attachment
University Policy No.: AC1145  
Classification: Academic and Students  
Approving Authority: Senate  
Effective Date: August, 2013  
Supersedes: October, 2004  
Last Editorial Change: March, 2014  
Mandated Review: October, 2020

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Associated Procedures  
Procedures for Academic Program Reviews

PURPOSE

1.00 The purpose of this policy is to:

• provide regular and systematic reviews of the operation and objectives of Academic Programs;
• foster ongoing improvement of the quality and effectiveness of Academic Programs and assess the relevance of programs in supporting the university’s mission;
• maintain the standard of excellence; and
• provide internal and external accountability of Academic Programs.

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this policy:

2.00 Academic Program means the combined undergraduate and graduate educational program of a discipline and the associated scholarly and service activities of its Academic Unit(s). The latter includes contributions by any organized research centre(s) operating under the oversight of the Academic Unit(s).

3.00 Academic Unit(s) means all non-departmentalized faculties, academic departments, schools, interdisciplinary programs and divisions.

4.00 Academic Program Review is the administrative process established to provide systematic quantitative and qualitative review of the operation and objectives of Academic Programs and consisting of the following:

   a. self-study of the program by the Academic Unit;
b. Institutional Planning & Analysis data on enrolment trends, student/faculty ratios, student engagement, and post-graduation employment and satisfaction

c. a site visit and report by the Academic Program Review Committee;
d. response from the Academic Unit;
e. response from the Academic Unit head and Dean; and

f. an action plan from the Academic Unit and progress report by the Dean on the implementation of the recommendations of the Academic Program Review Committee to be prepared within three months of receipt of the review report.

SCOPE

5.00 This policy applies to all Academic Programs in Academic Units. In order to be separately reviewable under this policy, an Academic Unit must have tenured or tenure-track faculty members officially affiliated with the Academic Unit and must offer instruction leading to the award of an academic degree.

POLICY

6.00 Academic Units will undergo an Academic Program Review every five to seven years or earlier if agreed to by the Dean and the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

7.00 At the discretion of the Vice-President Academic and Provost, the accreditation of professional school(s) or program(s) may be substituted for, or serve as a component of, an Academic Program Review.

8.00 Unless otherwise specified, the Academic Program Review will be comprehensive and focus on:

   a. effectiveness of the Academic Program in supporting the university’s mission;
   b. the quality of the learning environment for both undergraduate and graduate students;
   c. quality of the Academic Program’s teaching, creative activity and research within its disciplinary context;
   d. adequacy and effective utilization of resources by the Academic Program; and
   e. the Academic Program’s service to the university and its relevant external communities and professions.

The Academic Program Review will also assess the Academic Program against other comparable peer programs as appropriate.
8.01 The detailed criteria for Academic Program Reviews will be listed in the Procedures for Academic Program Reviews.

**Academic Program Review Committee Composition**

9.00 The membership of the Academic Program Review Committee composition and selection is set out in the Procedures for Academic Program Review.

**Reporting**

10.00 The final report from the Academic Program Review Committee, action plan and progress reports from the Dean will be maintained by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost for the purposes of long-term planning.

11.00 The Vice-President Academic and Provost will report annually to Senate Committee on Planning, Senate and the Board of Governors on the status of the Academic Program Reviews, recommendations and action plans prepared by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

12.00 A summary of the Academic Program Review will be made publicly available subject to issues relating to the University’s Protection of Privacy Policy (GV0235) and associated procedures.

**AUTHORITIES AND OFFICERS**

i) Approving Authority: Senate

ii) Designated Executive Officer: Vice-President Academic and Provost

iii) Procedural Authority: Vice-President Academic and Provost (in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning)

iv) Procedural Officer: Associate Vice-President Academic Planning

**LEGISLATION**

*University Act*

**RELATED POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS**

*Procedures for Academic Program Reviews*
PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

Procedural Authority: Vice-President Academic and Provost
Procedural Officer: Associate Vice-President Academic Planning

Effective Date: TBC
Supersedes: NEW
Last Editorial Change:

Parent Policy: Academic Program Review (AC1145)

PURPOSE
1.00 The purpose of these guidelines is to maintain the standard of excellence; and provide internal and external accountability of Academic Programs.

DEFINITIONS
For the purposes of these procedures:

2.00 The definitions contained within the university’s Academic Program Review (AC1145) policy apply to these procedures.

PROCEDURES

Contents
3.00 Objective
4.00 Basic Principles
5.00 Initiating an Academic Program Review
6.00 Administrative Support
7.00 Components of the Process
   A. Consultation with the Dean(s), Chair/Director and Associate VP Academic Planning
   B. Self-Study
   C. The Academic Program Review Committee
      i) Membership
      ii) Role
      iii) Terms of Reference
      iv) Site Visits and Interviews
      v) The Report
   D. Academic unit’s response to the report
   E. Dean(s)’ response to the report
Objective

3:00 As part of its commitment to offering Academic Programs of high quality and standards, the University of Victoria has established an Academic Program Review (APR) policy.

The Academic Program Review may also provide a basis for making resource decisions to enhance, adjust or redirect funding in order to achieve the academic units, the faculty’s and the university’s goals.

The Academic Program process will consider the following in relation to both current Academic Programs and future directions:

A. Self-Study Guidelines
B. Timeline
C. Administrative and Logistical Information
D. Action Plan
E. Review Summary Sheet

Basic Principles

4:00 The Academic Program Review process is based on the principles that:

• the provision of Academic Programs, teaching, scholarship and research of the highest quality is an important goal;
• academic endeavors should be consistent with the strategic objectives and goals of the Faculty and of the University;
• Academic Programs should make the best use of the resources available to them;
• empirical evidence is a necessary precursor to informed judgment;
• informed judgments of academic quality should form the basis for meaningful decisions, including decisions about resource allocation; and
• Academic Units should periodically have the opportunity to examine their present and future in a more sustained and focused manner.
Initiating an Academic Program Review

5:00 An Academic Program can be initiated in the following ways:

- Academic Program Reviews shall be scheduled, according to Policy AC1145, by the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning in consultation with the appropriate Dean(s); or
- An Academic Unit or a Dean may request that the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning initiate an Academic Program Review.

Administrative Support

6:00 The Academic Unit undergoing Academic Program Review should identify a faculty coordinator and an administrative coordinator to support the Academic Program Review process. Ultimate responsibility for the Academic Program Review will rest with the Chair/Director and the Dean(s). See Appendix C for further administrative and logistical information.

Components of the Process

7:00 The key components of the Academic Program Review process are: Consultation with the Dean(s), Chair/Director and Associate Vice President Academic Planning (AVPAP), the Self-Study, the Academic Program Review Committee’s Visit and Report, the Academic Unit’s response, the Dean(s)’ Response, an action plan from the Academic Unit and a follow up report by the Dean(s). The processes and attachments outlining self-evaluation and peer review may not apply to all academic units and academic units may revise processes set out in the attachments, or develop their own processes in consultation with and as approved by the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning.

A. Consultation with the Dean(s), Chair/Director and Associate VP Academic Planning

Once it is agreed that an Academic Program Review will be scheduled, a meeting will be held well in advance that includes the Dean of the Faculty, and when appropriate, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, the Chair/Director of the Academic Unit and the AVPAP. The goals of the Academic Program Review will be discussed and any particular areas of concern or interest to any of the parties can be identified for particular focus as part of the Academic Program Review (e.g., a new or emerging Academic Program area, a change in enrolment patterns). The main issues identified at this meeting will be identified in the cover letter to external reviewers and they will be asked to address them specifically in their Academic Program Review.
B. Self-Study

The self-study is the starting point and primary document on which the Academic Program Review is based. Therefore, it is important that the self-study be well organized and concise. The self-study allows an Academic Unit to:

- examine its history (since last Academic Program Review, if applicable), development and expectations for the Academic Program
- indicate how its program meets both Faculty and University objectives as defined in their respective mission statements, plans and goals
- conduct a balanced appraisal of strengths and areas for improvement
- review the quality of Academic Program inputs and outputs
- evaluate its own performance
- consider the future direction of the Academic Program within its disciplinary context, including new academic programs, research directions, anticipated or desired growth in enrolments, enhancements to quality, student engagement and success, and faculty development.

The self-study is a significant and valuable phase of the Academic Program Review. Therefore, it is vital that all the academic unit’s faculty, staff, and appropriate student representatives be involved in the preparation of the self-study. Responsibility for ensuring that this occurs rests with the academic unit head. Upon completion, a copy of the self-study will be forwarded to the Dean of the academic unit, the Dean of Graduate Studies and to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP). (Draft is first reviewed by the Dean and the AVPAP)

Institutional Planning and Analysis will provide a statistical package relevant to the academic unit and its program for the self-study process. References to and interpretations of this data should be included in the report when addressing the self-study questions. The Academic Program Review Committee should not be expected to have to carry out its own analysis or to extract the relevant information from unanalyzed data.

Appendix A (Self-Study Guidelines) provides detailed criteria on which the self-study should be based and the format for the self-study document. An academic unit is, of course, not limited to the criteria and may include additional relevant information or statistics specific to its area of study.

Deans may ask to see interim self-study reports, and in any case, must be provided with the final report from the academic unit at least 6 weeks prior to the site visit. Deans may request additional information or explanation of information in the self-study, if they feel this is needed in undertaking a meaningful review of the academic unit. When the dean approves the report, it is forwarded to the AVPAP who also reviews it for consistency with the guidelines.

The report must be made available to the AVPAP at least 4 weeks in advance of the site visit.
C. **The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)**

i) Membership

As stated in the Academic Program Review Policy, an Academic Program Review Committee shall normally consist of three members selected by the AVPAP after consultation with the academic unit and the Dean(s). One member will ordinarily be a member of another Faculty at the University of Victoria. The other two will be external to the University. Except in unusual circumstances, the committee will include a mix of genders.

When preparing the list of potential committee members for consideration by the AVPAP, the academic unit and the Dean(s) should select individuals capable of offering: a breadth of views, broad experience in the respective field, and some level of university or post-secondary administrative experience. When submitting names to AVPAP please provide a paragraph or website providing information on the position and experience of a proposed reviewer.

The Academic Program Review Committee members must be at arms-length from the Academic Programs or academic units that they are assessing. Potential conflict of interest situations include, but are not limited to, a close relative, a collaborator, a former supervisor or supervisee, or a former student. None of these relationships necessarily eliminates a potential committee member but possible conflicts must be identified prior to the decision to appoint an individual as a committee member.

The AVPAP shall appoint one member of the Academic Program Review Committee, normally an external member, to act as Chair.

ii) Role

The role of an Academic Program Review Committee is to provide informed, dispassionate, and critical judgment of the quality of an academic program or academic unit from the perspective of an outside observer. The Academic Program Review Committee will be guided by the Terms of Reference as detailed in the section below.

iii) Terms of Reference

The Academic Program Review Committee will assess a wide range of information designed to address Academic Program quality, efficiency, and sustainability. The interaction between the academic unit and other academic units of the University will also be addressed.

The Academic Program Review Committee will consider, at the very least, the following areas:

- undergraduate and graduate (where applicable) academic programs
- graduate supervision, teaching and learning methodologies and outcomes
• scholarship and research productivity, impact, and direction
• service to the University, the profession and the community
• quality of learning and working environment, and overall administrative
  and organizational structure

The assessment, in the form of a written report, will be evidence-based and “constructively critical,” identifying strengths to be protected and enhanced, weaknesses requiring attention, and new opportunities. It will consider what can be done by the academic unit to use existing resources more efficiently and effectively, along with considering where new resources, if available, would represent a strategic investment to allow the academic unit to grow with quality.

Deans may ask to see interim self-study reports, and in any case, must be provided with the final report from the unit at least 6 weeks prior to the site visit. Deans may request additional information or explanation of information in the self-study, if they feel this is needed in undertaking a meaningful review of the Academic Unit. When the Dean approves the report, it is forwarded to the AVPAP who also reviews it for consistency with the self-study guidelines (Appendix A). The report must be available the AVPAP at least 4 weeks in advance to the site visit.

iv) Site Visit and Interviews

The purpose of the site visit is to provide an opportunity for interviews with faculty, students, staff, and others who can most appropriately provide informed comment and for examination of the physical facilities.

The Academic Program Review Committee should be present together in Victoria for a minimum of two full days. The great majority of their time will be scheduled to be spent on campus.

The Chair/Director will arrange for meetings between the Academic Program Review Committee and appropriate groups or individuals and develop an itinerary which includes a meeting with:

• The Provost, the AVPAP, the Dean of the Faculty; and Dean of Graduate Studies at the beginning of the site visit and again at the end of visit
• Dean(s) or delegate(s) of the Faculty
• head of the academic unit
• faculty members in the academic unit
• undergraduate and graduate students or representatives of the academic unit
• staff or staff representatives in the academic unit
• Dean or delegate of the Faculty of Graduate Studies
• The Vice-President Research or delegate
• Other members of the University community (where appropriate)
• Other members of the external community (where appropriate)

The Dean will forward the itinerary to the AVPAP for approval. Members of the Academic Program Review Committee will be free to seek information from other
sources and, in particular, to suggest other individuals and groups with whom to meet during the site visit.

v) The Report

Based on information gained from the self-study, the site visit, interviews, consultations with appropriate groups and individuals, and independent inquiries, the Academic Program Review Committee may prepare a first draft of the report for submission to the AVPAP. The purpose of this submission is to enable the AVPAP to review the draft document and provide the Academic Program Review Committee with comments on factual inaccuracies or areas needing further clarification.

The first part of the report should consist of a 1-2 page Executive Summary that highlights the major strengths of the Academic Program, identifies any significant areas of weakness or in need of further development, and comments of the future direction of the Academic Program. The Executive Summary will be the basis for the summary of the Academic Review that posted on a public University of Victoria accountability website. For the remainder of the written report, the Academic Program Review Committee should use the outline below as a guide. The headings suggested align closely with the major areas of focus in the university’s strategic plan, and will provide an opportunity to examine the degree to which the academic unit’s goals are in alignment with the university’s stated mission and purpose. The Academic Program Review Committee is, of course, welcome to add any comments and considerations that it deems relevant.

QUALITY

Quality of the Academic Program(s):
- Does the curriculum appropriately cover the field or discipline in terms of breadth and depth?
- Are there elements that should be modified in order better to achieve those goals or to implement a better use of resources?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Academic Program?
- Is the balance of offerings among the years appropriate (and justified in terms of resource allocation)?
- Where new Academic Programs are proposed, or major changes contemplated, please comment on potential suitability and sustainability.
- Have there been changes in the external environment that might increase or lessen the need for and viability of the Academic Program as structured?

Quality of the Student Experience and the Learning Environment:
- Assess any specific initiatives undertaken by the Academic Program to attract and retain a diverse group of talented students and assure their success in the Academic Program
- Assess the appropriateness of the learning outcomes articulated by the Academic Program
Are the methods of teaching appropriate to the Academic Program and of high quality?
What steps have been taken to provide students with enriching learning experiences (e.g., experiential or co-operative learning opportunities)?
What is done to offer students exposure to the international or global dimensions of the field or discipline?
Does the Academic Program offer sufficient intellectual challenge and engagement?

Quality of Research
- Consider the nature and quality of research being carried out in the academic unit.
- Comment on the academic unit’s research foci, directions, and impact.
- Comment on the level and range of external research funding where appropriate.

PEOPLE
- Comment on the Academic Program’s ability to attract and retain a diverse group of high quality students, and to effectively monitor and support student progress.
- Comment on the faculty, the range of their collective expertise, and their ability to adequately provide intellectual leadership and challenge.
- Comment on the level and effectiveness of staff and staff support.
- Comment on the academic unit’s equity plan (faculty and staff hiring objectives), the inclusion of equity concerns in staffing, Academic Program design, and student opportunities. Comment on opportunities to enhance policies, practices and Academic Programs to ensure that a welcoming and inclusive working and learning environment.
- Comment on the overall administrative functioning of the academic unit.
- Address any areas in which administrative efficiencies might be found.
- Comment on the character of working relationships among members of the academic unit, between the academic unit and other academic units on campus, and, more widely, with the community (including professional communities). Suggest where there might be room for improvement.

RESOURCES
- Address the academic unit’s use of faculty and staff resources.
- Given the reality of scarce resources across the University, consider the adequacy of current resources (human, technical, and physical) to fulfill the academic unit goals, with particular attention to priorities for the allocation of those resources.
- Consider the redirection of available resources, or possible new resources, and how they could improve the academic unit’s Academic Program(s).
FUTURE

- Comment on the academic unit’s plans to develop its teaching and research programs in the future.
- Address the Academic Program’s comparative quality in the national or the international context.
- Evaluate the academic unit’s plans for the future in the context of Faculty and University’s goals and priorities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Provide recommendations for improvement and growth.

OTHER

- Address any specific questions put forth by the academic unit.

The final report will be sent directly to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning who will forward the report to the Provost, Dean of the academic unit under review, the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Vice-President Research.

D. Academic unit’s Response to the Report

In departmentalized Faculties the Dean(s) will forward the report to AVPAP, Chair/Director of the academic unit and ask them to circulate the report to faculty, staff, and appropriate students. In consultation with these constituent groups, the Chair/Director will prepare a response and an action plan to the report. In non-departmentalized Faculties, the Dean(s), with appropriate consultation, will be responsible for these tasks.

The academic unit’s response can be relatively brief and should 1) provide an overall impression with respect to the report’s conclusions and recommendations; 2) correct of any factual errors or areas of misunderstanding in the report; and 3) fill out Appendix D (Action Plan) and identify what steps the academic unit intends or would propose to take in response to the report and recommendations of the Academic Program Review.

The academic unit’s response and Action plan should be received by the Dean of the academic unit under review within six-eight weeks of receipt of the report of the Academic Program Review.

E. Dean(s)’ Response to the Report

The Dean(s) of the academic unit under Academic Program Review and Dean of Graduate Studies where required will prepare an independent response to the report. In preparing the response, the Dean(s) will review the academic unit’s response and may need to consult further with members of the academic unit, the Academic Program Review Committee, the AVPAP, the Vice-President Academic and Provost and perhaps others.
The Dean(s) is responsible for submitting both responses to the report to the AVPAP for consideration. Normally, both responses are anticipated to be submitted within 12 weeks of the receipt of the report of the Academic Program Review.

**Completion**

8:00 Upon receipt of the responses, the AVPAP and/or the Vice-President Academic and Provost may meet with the Dean(s), the head of the academic unit and the Dean of Graduate Studies as appropriate to discuss the report. The Office of the Provost will prepare a response to the Dean and Chair/Director of the academic unit.

The report will be maintained by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost for the purposes of long term planning and a summary of the Academic Program Review report as well as the responses from the academic unit and the Dean will be posted on the University's accountability website subject to issues relating to privacy and confidentiality.

The Dean(s) will be responsible for providing a progress report to the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost on the implementation of the action plan 12 months after the submission of the action plan.

The Vice-President Academic and Provost will maintain a record of the progress report and annually provide a summary of the Academic Program reviews to the Senate Committee on Planning, Senate and the Board of Governors on the status of Academic Program Reviews.

A summary of the Academic Program reviews (in the form prescribed by Appendix E) will be made publicly available subject to issues relating to the University Protection of Privacy Policy and Associated Procedures.
APPENDIX A

Academic Program Review
Self-Study Guidelines
Criteria, Considerations, Indicators

Preamble

These guidelines provide academic units with criteria on which the Self-Study can be based. Academic units are encouraged to engage in thoughtful self-examination to ensure that thorough, evidence based information is provided for consideration by the Academic Program Review Committee.

It is anticipated that academic units will address all of the relevant criteria in the guidelines. It is also recognized, however, that each academic unit should draft its Self-Study in a manner which best reflects the nature of its Academic Program(s) (e.g. interdisciplinary, undergraduate, graduate if applicable,) or discipline. Academic units should concentrate on addressing all criteria applicable to the academic unit in as clear and concise a manner as possible, but are also encouraged to provide any additional relevant and discipline specific information deemed appropriate.

Standardized data is available for all academic units by the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) through the Enrolment Portal which is accessible at this link: https://sas.uvic.ca/SASPortal/. Training for the portal is available – contact IPA.

It includes:

- Undergraduate EETs
- Graduate EETS
- Headcounts, FTEs, demographic characteristics
- New to UVic, Previous Institution
- Study Permit and Citizenship
- Coop Enrolments and Work-terms
- Degree Sought
- Credentials Granted
- Indigenous Statistics
- Applicant Statistics
- Section information
- Graduation rate, Retention and Attrition Statistics
- Departmental profile from National Survey of Student Engagement
- Departmental profiles of graduate outcomes surveys (time series, two-years-out, five-years-out)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1: History, Development, and Expectations of the Academic unit</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Provide a brief history of the Academic Program and summarize the academic unit’s strategic plan and goals, over the next five years within the context of the Faculty level and University Strategic Plan. | • Academic unit data  
• University Strategic Plan  
• Academic unit/Faculty strategic plan |
<p>| 1.2 Briefly describe the major academic programs offered by the academic unit. What new Academic Programs are anticipated, if any? | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 2: Quality of and demand for the Academic Program(s)</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 What has been the pattern of enrolment (EETS) in the Academic Program for the past 5-7 years? What is the number and proportion of Academic Program FTEs (students who have declared the Academic Program as their major)?</td>
<td>• Enrolment Portal and/or Academic unit data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 How many EETS has the Academic Program delivered per full time equivalent (FTE) faculty over the last 5-7 years? Compare this to the Faculty average and University averages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 What is the pattern of enrolment in core courses taught by the Academic Program or by the Academic Program’s faculty as electives for other Academic Programs in the University? What can explain the pattern of enrolment, and do you anticipate changes in the next few years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 How does the pattern of enrolment (and declared majors where applicable) compare with other Academic Programs in the region or with national trends?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 To what extent have similar Academic Programs been introduced by other post-secondary institutions in the region in recent years? What characteristics of your Academic Program suggest a unique advantage or difference compared to other Academic Programs in the region?</td>
<td>• Enrolment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 To what extent is the Academic Program’s field of study remaining viable? How is the environment changing that might lessen or increase the need for the Academic Program as constituted? What plans are in place for ensuring an alignment between student interest/demand and Academic Program offerings?</td>
<td>• Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 What has been the profile of students entering the Academic Program in recent years (e.g. out of high school or mature learners, Aboriginal, etc.) What has been the quality of students drawn to the Academic Program in recent years? What is the likely pattern in the next few years? What is the desired student profile?</td>
<td>• Avg course GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 What is the current status of student representation from underrepresented or designated groups (i.e. Aboriginals, visible minorities, women, those with disabilities)? How does this compare with other similar Academic Programs regionally, nationally, or internationally?</td>
<td>• Student Financial Aid (Admin Reg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 What steps is the academic unit taking to attract and retain high quality students? What efforts have the academic unit taken to increase the number of students from under-represented/designated groups, or to make courses more accessible to them?</td>
<td>• Academic unit Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3: Quality of the Student Experience and the Learning Environment</td>
<td>Potential Information Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 What activities undertaken by the Academic Program in the past 5-7 years provide evidence of formal, ongoing curricular assessment at the undergraduate and/or graduate level? What activities are currently underway or planned?</td>
<td>• Academic unit data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 What are the most important learning objectives or outcomes of the Academic Program? What has the academic unit done to articulate and ensure opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills and competencies to be demonstrated by its majors? (e.g., writing skills, other communication skills, critical thinking and analysis, quantitative skills, creative skills).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 In the past 5-7 years, what proportion of EETs, by course level, are taught by a) regular faculty, b) sessional instructors and c) term faculty? What steps are taken to ensure and reward effective and high quality teaching?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Describe student experience for undergraduate students in years 1 and 4 of the Academic Program with respect to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (where appropriate).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 What efforts have the academic unit made to internationalize its Academic Program, (e.g., using diverse student demographics in the classroom as a teaching tool; using research, international consulting and conferences to enrich a course; inviting international guest speakers; rethinking course goals to incorporate global issues and perspectives.) What are the future plans in relation to internationalization?</td>
<td>• Co-op Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 How many students participate in experience learning opportunities during their Academic Program (e.g., co-operative education, work integrated learning, field, community service learning experiences, applied research projects, creative experiences, practica internships etc.)? What are the trends in this respect? Are there plans to create more opportunities for experiential learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 How has the Academic Program sought to integrate research with learning and teaching? What exposure to peer-reviewed research literature do students receive in the Academic Program? To what extent have research findings of the faculty been incorporated into the Academic Program? What opportunities do students have for exposure to various modes of research inquiry? What opportunities do students have for participation in primary or applied research experiences in the laboratory or field (e.g., via co-operative education, practica, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 What efforts has the Academic Program made to make courses inclusive and fully accessible to students with disabilities? What measures have been taken to equip instructors with the knowledge and skills necessary to accommodate the diversity of students in their courses and in the Academic Program? (For resources available to support persons with disabilities, go to <a href="http://rcsd.uvic.ca/">http://rcsd.uvic.ca/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.89 Has the Academic Program encouraged civic engagement on the part of students and faculty within the local, regional, national or international community, and if so, how?

3.10 To what degree are co-curricular activities, student societies, or other forms of student engagement with each other, with other academic units on campus, and with faculty supported and encouraged?

3.11 How do most of the students in the Academic Programs obtain academic advising? Are students who may be at risk for academic difficulty or failure identified and provided with appropriate supports or assistance?

3.12 What activities undertaken by the Academic Program’s faculty demonstrate that they have been engaged in research and scholarship on teaching or learning?

3.13 What demonstrates that the Academic Program has successfully integrated information technology into instructional practices or assessment strategies? What opportunities or challenges are anticipated in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 4: Quality of Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 How many undergraduate degrees have been granted during the past 5-7 years? What is the pattern of retention and attrition of students over the past 5-7 years?</td>
<td>IPA (graduate follow-up survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 What is the pattern of graduate student enrollment over the last 5-7 years? How many graduate students have completed their Academic Programs in the last 5-7 years? What is the average time to completion?</td>
<td>Enrolment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 What percentage of post-baccalaureate students gained employment in the field within two years of graduation?</td>
<td>IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 What percentage of the Academic Program graduates are successful applicants to graduate or professional Academic Programs? What percent of Academic Program graduates applied for and received an assistantship or fellowship for graduate studies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 In the past five years, what percent of undergraduate majors graduated within four years? What percent of graduate students graduated within the expected time-to-degree standard for the Academic Program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 What is the extent of alumni satisfaction with the Academic Program? To what extent are the Academic Program graduates likely to recommend the Academic Program to prospective students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 What evidence exists of alumni success (employment related to Academic Program or return for higher education)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 To what extent are employers satisfied or dissatisfied with students or graduates of the Academic Program? What steps has the academic unit taken to enhance improve employer satisfaction in the past 5-7 years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criterion 5: Quality of Research and Scholarly Activity

| 5.1 | How do the research programs of the academic unit support the academic goals and vision of the academic unit? What are the primary areas of research expertise and how do they relate to each other and to the mission and goals of the university? |
| 5.2 | To what extent have the faculty (regular and sessional) gained recognition in the professional community? What proportion and number of faculty have achieved external recognition or awards? |
| 5.3 | Provide an overview of research and scholarly productivity, (articles in refereed journals, authored books, contributions to books, works performed or exhibited publicly within the past 5-7 years? The academic unit may wish to also attach CVs. |
| 5.4 | Summarize research funding activity. For example, how many of the regular faculty, as principal or co-principal investigators, have submitted a grant proposal seeking external funding in the past 5-7 years? How many have been successful? Of proposals submitted in the past five years, what number and percent of the full-time faculty have had their proposals funded? What is the dollar amount of externally funded research per FTE faculty member in the past five years? Provide any additional information about the funded research effort. |
| 5.5 | To what extent have the Academic Program faculty contributed to, participated in, or been recognized by external bodies or organizations as teachers, scholars, or service contributors regionally, nationally, and internationally? |
| 5.6 | To what extent have the Academic Program faculty been recognized for teaching or research excellence by the University in the recent past? |

### Criterion 6: Faculty and Staff Characteristics

| 6.1 | What has been the pattern of faculty hiring? How are the designated equity groups represented? To what degree is the current complement appropriate to the academic unit? |
| 6.2 | What is the academic unit’s recent hiring history with respect to faculty and anticipated hiring plan for the future? If applicable, in what area(s) will the academic unit concentrate its efforts? |
| 6.3 | What initiatives has the academic unit implemented in the past 5-7 years to promote ongoing faculty mentorship or development? Has the academic unit any plans in this area for the future? |
| 6.4 | Do faculty evaluation policies reflect a high standard for teaching, research and service activity, and an appropriate balance of activities? |
| 6.5 | What actions have been taken to ensure that the academic unit provides a... |
welcoming and inclusive working and learning environment? What policies, procedures and practices are in place to promote the University’s equity goals?

6.6 Is the complement of staff appropriate to the academic unit? How are staff supported and integrated into academic unit activities in support of academic unit goals?

6.7 What support is provided for sessional instructors and how are they mentored and integrated into Academic Program activities and structures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 7: Resources</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 To what extent has the University funded Academic Program improvements or expansions during the past 5-7 years? (e.g., additional faculty and/or staff, TA funding, capital improvements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic unit Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 What activities has the academic unit undertaken to secure external grants or donations to support the academic and research activities of the Academic Program, including student support, the purchase of equipment and other capital items in the past 5-7 years? What activities are planned for the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development/External Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 To what extent has the Academic Program made attempts in developing formal partnerships, collaborations, joint ventures, and other relationships with community stakeholders in the past 5-7 years? What have been the outcomes? What are the academic unit's plans for the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 8: Opportunity Analysis for the Academic unit and Future Directions</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 What other Academic Programs, nationally and internationally, provide comparators for this Academic Program? How does this Academic Program compare? Is the academic unit comfortable with this comparison? In what way, if any, would the academic unit like future comparisons to change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic unit Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National or international comparative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 What aspirations does the academic unit have for its Academic Program over the next 5-7 years? What opportunities have been articulated in the academic unit’s or faculty’s strategic plan to which the Academic Program can respond?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 What plans are there to increase undergraduate and/or graduate enrolments? What steps need to be taken or support is needed to achieve these goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 How has the Academic Program responded to environmental challenges or threats and to environmental opportunities? To what extent has the Academic Program overcome barriers to developing effective responses to these challenges and taken advantage of opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 What are the academic unit’s two most important priorities and what significant gains would come of the realization of these priorities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 To what extent could the academic unit reallocate funds to realize these goals and objectives? What additional funds may be necessary?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### STEPS IN PREPARING FOR AND CARRYING OUT ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Do Date or Check</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Handbook Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-12 months</td>
<td>Decision made to initiate an APR</td>
<td>Dean or Provost</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-12 months</td>
<td>Meeting of Dean, Chair/Director and AVPAP to discuss the review and identify major areas of concern/focus</td>
<td>Dean, Chair/Director and AVPAP</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-12 months</td>
<td>Commence self-study (assistance from Institutional Planning and Analysis)</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>5 A; App A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 months</td>
<td>Identify a faculty coordinator</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 months</td>
<td>Identify an administrative coordinator</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 months</td>
<td>Prepare list of potential committee members in consultation with the Dean's Office for the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP)</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>5 B i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>Select committee members and Chair - identify potential period of site visit</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Identify suitable date(s) - minimum 2 full days</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Sends formal letter of invitation</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>5 B i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Arrange for meetings between the APRC and appropriate groups and individuals; schedule meetings with AVPAP, Provost, Dean of Faculty and Dean of Graduate Studies on first day of site visit and again on final day in Victoria</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>5 B iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Book accommodation for visiting committee members</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>App C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Book travel using Uniglobe for visiting committee members, if required</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>App C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Submit self-study package to Dean for review and approval</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>App C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Once self-study is approved; forward 7 copies to AVPAP for distribution</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Submit itinerary to AVPAP for approval</td>
<td>Unit or Dean</td>
<td>5 B iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Send itinerary to reviewers once approved</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Send information packages to each member of APRC (self-study and other relevant university documents)</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Final report to be sent directly to the Provost's office who will forward the report to the Dean.</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>5 B v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean requests that Chair circulates the report to faculty, staff &amp; appropriate students.  [In non-departmentalized faculties, the Dean's office circulates the report to faculty, staff &amp; appropriate students.]</td>
<td>Dean's office</td>
<td>5 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In consultation with above constituent groups, chair/director prepares a response to report.  [In non-departmentalized faculties, the Dean prepares a response to the report having consulted with above constituent groups.]</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>5 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean's office prepares a response to the unit's report</td>
<td>Dean's office</td>
<td>5 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Administrative and Logistical Information

- Timing of the Academic Program Review is subject to the availability of the Deans and the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP). The Academic Program Review generally takes place over two full days.
  - The Dean in consultation with the Department/School will forward list of proposed reviewers to the AVPAP. The AVPAP will make contact with the reviewers and identify a potential period for a site visit. The Department/School will follow up with the reviewers to confirm dates for on-site visit. This should be done in consultation with the Dean, AVPAP and Provost to ensure availability. The Department/School notifies AVPAP of the confirmed dates and the AVPAP sends formal letters of invitation to the reviewers.

- Self-Study
  - The AVPAP office requires enough copies of the self-study to forward on to each of the reviewers, plus an additional four copies for the Provost, AVPAP, Vice-President Research, and Dean of Graduate Studies.

- Travel and accommodation
  - The AVPAP’s Office will assist Academic Program Review Committee members in conjunction with Uniglobe Geo Travel to make their travel arrangements.
  - The Chair/Director’s office is responsible for making accommodation arrangements, which must be at government rate. The Hotel Reservation & Authorization Form is completed, forwarded to AVPAP office for completion of account code and signature. AVPAP’s office will fax signed form to Purchasing.
  - Only room and room taxes are billed to UVic; the reviewer pays all other hotel charges with appropriate items submitted for reimbursement.
  - Academic Program Review Committee members submit their travel expenses to the Chair/Directors’ office, which verifies them and forwards them to the AVPAP’s office for account code, signature and payment.

- Itinerary
  - The itinerary is developed by the academic unit and/or the Dean. It should include one-half hour meetings with the Dean of Graduate Studies, Vice-President Research (or their designates), and other Chairs/Directors in the Faculty.
The AVPAP, Provost, Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Graduate Studies meets jointly (45 minutes) with the Academic Program Review Committee at the beginning of their site visit and again at the end of the visit (30 minutes).

The VPAC office will cover expenses for one lunch or dinner with up to three faculty members plus the reviewers (up to $25.00 per person).

The itinerary is forwarded to the AVPAP for approval. Once approved the academic unit or the Dean’s office will forward it on to the reviewers.

- Maintaining appropriate relationships with the Academic Program Review
  - During the process of the Academic Review, the members of the Academic Program Review have a duty and responsibility to provide fair, impartial, honest, and unbiased opinions and analyses of the academic unit undergoing review. While interactions with the academic unit are anticipated to be friendly and cordial, it is not considered appropriate to hold social events that extend late into the evening or that otherwise might compromise the objectivity or independence of the Academic Program Review.

- Final Report
  - Academic Program Review Committee submits a final report to AVPAP and Provost, which is then forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty (for dissemination to the Chair/Director), Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-President Research.
  - The AVPAP requisitions one honoraria payment per reviewer upon submission of the final report by the Academic Program Review Committee.
  - Following receipt of the final report, a response to the report from the Chair/Director and Dean is sent to the AVPAP.
  - The Academic Program head, Dean(s) and Associate Vice-President Academic Planning will meet to discuss the Academic Program Review and approve the action plan.
  - An Academic Program Review summary sheet (Appendix E) will be posted on the VPAC website.

N.B. Some Deans delegate certain responsibilities to the academic unit being reviewed.

APPENDIX D:  
Action Plan  
Please continue on a separate sheet, if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Academic Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of action plan:______________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations of Reviewers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)¹:</th>
<th>Person(s) responsible:</th>
<th>Target date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12 month follow up date: ______________

¹ To be filed out by head of the Program or Dean of the Faculty.
APPENDIX E:
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARY SHEET

ACADEMIC UNIT REVIEWED:

FACULTY: Page 21

DATE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW:

DATE OF PREVIOUS ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW:

REVIEWERS:

SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (INCLUDING CONSULTATION PROCESS):

SUMMARY OF REVIEWERS RECOMMENDATIONS:

ACADEMIC UNIT'S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS BY REVIEWERS:

---

1 This summary should be prepared to meet applicable privacy legislation and must maintain the privacy of all those involved in the reviews. The University is required to uphold applicable privacy legislation governing the collection, use and disclosure of any personal information. If you have any questions, please contact the university privacy officer.
The purpose of this policy is to:

- provide regular and systematic reviews of the operation and objectives of Academic Programs;
- foster ongoing improvement of the quality and effectiveness of programs and assess the relevance of programs in supporting the university’s mission;
- maintain the standard of excellence; and
- provide internal and external accountability of academic programs.

This policy applies to all Academic Programs in Academic Units. In order to be separately reviewable under this policy, a unit must have tenured or tenure-track faculty members officially affiliated with the unit and must offer instruction leading to the award of an academic degree.

For the purposes of this policy:

Academic Program means the combined undergraduate and graduate educational program of a discipline and the associated scholarly and service
activities of its Academic Unit(s). The latter includes contributions by any organized research centre(s) operating under the oversight of the Academic Unit(s).

4.00 Academic unit(s) means all non-departmentalized faculties, academic departments, schools, interdisciplinary programs and divisions.

5.00 Academic program review is the administrative process established to provide systematic quantitative and qualitative review of the operation and objectives of academic programs and consisting of the following:

   a. self-study of the program by the unit;
   b. Institutional Planning & Analysis data on enrolment trends, student/faculty ratios, student engagement, and post-graduation employment and satisfaction
   c. a site visit and report by the Academic Program Review Committee;
   d. response from the unit;
   e. response from the unit head and Dean; and
   f. an action plan from the unit and progress report by the Dean on the implementation of the recommendations of the Academic Program Review Committee to be prepared within three months of receipt of the APR report.

POLICY

6.00 Academic units will undergo an academic program review every five to seven years or earlier if agreed to by the Dean and the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

7.00 At the discretion of the Vice-President Academic and Provost, the accreditation of professional school(s) or program(s) may be substituted for, or serve as a component of, an academic program review.

8.00 Unless otherwise specified, the review will be comprehensive and focus on:

   a. effectiveness of the program in supporting the university’s mission;
   b. the quality of the learning environment for both undergraduate and graduate students;
   c. quality of the program’s teaching, creative activity and research within its disciplinary context;
   d. adequacy and effective utilization of resources by the program; and
   e. the program’s service to the university and its relevant external communities and professions.
The review will also assess the program against other comparable peer programs as appropriate.

PROCEDURE

9.00 The Vice-President Academic and Provost, in consultation with Senate Committee on Planning may authorize Procedures under this policy including detailed criteria for the review.

10.00 Academic Program Review Committee will normally consist of three members selected by the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning in consultation with the unit and the Dean(s). The Associate Vice-President Academic Planning will appoint an internal faculty member from another Faculty at the university who is not affiliated with the program being reviewed and two external appointees who have post-secondary administrative experience, broad experience in the respective field and reviewer experience.

Implementation

11.00 On completion of the review, a report will be submitted by the Academic Program Review Committee to the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

12.00 The Associate Vice-President Academic Planning will distribute the report to the Dean, Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-President Research.

13.00 The Dean will share the report with the Chair/Director of the unit who will then share the report with the Faculty of the unit.

14.00 The unit will prepare a brief response to the report for the Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Graduate Studies correcting any factual errors or misunderstanding in the report and will provide its overall impression on the report’s conclusion and recommendations.

15.00 After the Academic Program Review Committee’s report has been approved, the head of the program reviewed and Dean will be responsible for providing the Vice President Academic and Provost an action plan identifying steps that will be taken to address recommendations of the review.

16.00 The action plan will be in the form outlined in the procedures and where the unit disagrees with findings or recommendations of the Academic Review Committee,
the basis for such disagreement or rationale for not implementing a recommendation will be given.

17.00 The program head, Dean of the Faculty, Dean of Graduate Studies, Associate Vice-President Academic Planning and the Vice-President Academic and Provost will meet to discuss the review and approve the action plan.

18.00 The Dean will be responsible for following up with the program head and providing a progress report on the action plan to the Vice-President Academic and Provost. The progress report will be submitted to the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost by the Dean 12 months after submission of the action plan.

Reporting

19.00 The final report from the Academic Program Review Committee, action plan and progress reports from the Dean will be maintained by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost for the purposes of long-term planning.

20.00 The Vice-President Academic and Provost will report annually to Senate Committee on Planning, Senate and the Board of Governors on the status of the program reviews, recommendations and action plan prepared by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost.

21.00 A summary of the program review will be made publicly available subject to issues relating to the University Protection of Privacy policy and Associated Procedures.

AUTHORITIES AND OFFICERS

i) Approving Authority: Senate
ii) Designated Executive Officer: Vice-President Academic and Provost
iii) Procedural Authority: Vice-President Academic and Provost
iv) Procedural Officer: Associate Vice-President Academic Planning

LEGISLATION
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1. Objective

As part of its commitment to offering academic programs of high quality and standards, the University of Victoria has established an Academic Program Review (APR) policy. The policy is designed to provide regular and systematic reviews of the operation and objectives of academic programs, assist academic units and the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost in establishing, maintaining, and enhancing the academic quality and sustainability of their programs in accordance with the university’s mission and strategic goals. The policy is a tool for internal and external accountability of the programs.

The two key objectives of the Academic Program Review (APR) process are:

(1) to assist the academic unit in evaluating the quality, suitability, effectiveness and sustainability of its academic teaching, graduate supervision and research programs with a view to further improvement; and
(2) to provide an opportunity for planning for the future.

The review may also provide a basis for making resource decisions to enhance, adjust or redirect funding in order to achieve the unit’s and the university’s goals.

The APR process will consider the following in relation to both current programs and future directions:

- undergraduate and graduate academic programs
- teaching and learning methodologies and outcomes
- scholarship and research productivity and directions
- service to the University, the profession and the community
- quality of learning and working environment and overall administrative and organizational structure

2. Basic Principles

The APR process is based on the principles that:

- the provision of academic programs, teaching, scholarship and research of the highest quality is an important goal;
- academic endeavors should be consistent with the strategic objectives and goals of the Faculty and of the University;
- academic programs should make the best use of the resources available to them;
- empirical evidence is a necessary precursor to informed judgment;
- informed judgments of academic quality should form the basis for meaningful decisions, including decisions about resource allocation; and
- academic units should periodically have the opportunity to examine their present and future in a more sustained and focused manner.
3. Initiating an Academic Program Review

An APR can be initiated in the following ways:

- APRs shall be scheduled, according to Policy AC1145, by the Associate
  Vice-President Academic Planning in consultation with the appropriate
  Dean(s); or
- A unit or a Dean may request that the Associate Vice-President Academic
  Planning initiate an APR.

4. Administrative Support

The unit undergoing review should identify a faculty coordinator and an
administrative coordinator to support the review process. Ultimate responsibility
for the review will rest with the Chair/Director and the Dean(s). See Appendix C
for further administrative and logistical information.

5. Components of the Process

The key components of the APR process are: the Self-Study, the Academic
Review Committee’s Visit and Report, the unit’s response, the Dean(s)’
Response, an action plan from the unit and a follow up report by the Dean(s).
The processes and attachments outlining self-evaluation and peer review may
not apply to all units and units may revise processes set out in the attachments,
or develop their own processes in consultation with and as approved by the
Associate Vice-President Academic Planning.

A. Self-Study

The self-study is the starting point and primary document on which the review is
based. Therefore, it is important that the self-study be well organized and
concise. The self-study allows a unit to:

- examine its history (since last review, if applicable), development and
  expectations for the program
- indicate how its program meets both Faculty and University objectives as
  defined in their respective mission statements, plans and goals
- conduct a balanced appraisal of strengths and areas for improvement
- review the quality of program inputs and outputs
- evaluate its own performance
- consider the future direction of the program within its disciplinary context,
  including new academic programs, research directions, anticipated or
  desired growth in enrolments, enhancements to quality, student
  engagement and success, and faculty development.
The self-study is a significant and valuable phase of the review. Therefore, it is vital that all the unit’s faculty, staff, and appropriate student representatives be involved in the preparation of the self-study. Responsibility for ensuring that this occurs rests with the unit head. Upon completion, a copy of the self-study will be forwarded to the Dean of the unit, the Dean of Graduate Studies and to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning. (draft is first reviewed by the Dean and the AVPA)

Institutional Planning and Analysis will provide a statistical package relevant to the unit and its program for the self-study process. References to and interpretations of this data should be included in the report when addressing the self-study questions. The Academic Program Review Committee should not be expected to have to carry out its own analysis or to extract the relevant information from unanalyzed data.

Appendix A (Self-Study Guidelines) provides detailed criteria on which the self-study should be based and the format for the self-study document. A unit is, of course, not limited to the criteria and may include additional relevant information or statistics specific to its area of study.

B. The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)

i) Membership

An APRC shall normally consist of three members selected by the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP) after consultation with the unit and the Dean(s). One member will ordinarily be a member of another Faculty at the University of Victoria. The other two will be external to the University. Except in unusual circumstances, the committee will include a mix of genders.

When preparing the list of potential committee members for consideration by the AVPAP, the unit and the Dean(s) should select individuals capable of offering: a breadth of views, broad experience in the respective field, and some level of university or post-secondary administrative experience. When submitting names to AVPAP please provide a paragraph or website providing information on the position and experience of a proposed reviewer.

The APRC members must be at arms-length from the programs or units that they are assessing. Potential conflict of interest situations include, but are not limited to, a close relative, a collaborator, a former supervisor or supervisee, or a former student. None of these relationships necessarily eliminates a potential committee member but possible conflicts must be identified prior to the decision to appoint an individual as a committee member.

The AVPAP shall appoint one member of the APRC, normally an external member, to act as Chair.
ii) Role

The role of an APRC is to provide informed, dispassionate, and critical judgment of the quality of an academic program or unit from the perspective of an outside observer. The APRC will be guided by the Terms of Reference as detailed in the section below.

iii) Terms of Reference

The APRC will assess a wide range of information designed to address academic program quality, efficiency, and sustainability. The interaction between the academic unit and other units of the University will also be addressed.

The APRC will consider, at the very least, the following areas:

- undergraduate and graduate (where applicable) academic programs
- graduate supervision, teaching and learning methodologies and outcomes
- scholarship and research productivity, impact, and direction
- service to the University, the profession and the community
- quality of learning and working environment, and overall administrative and organizational structure

The assessment, in the form of a written report, will be evidence-based and “constructively critical,” identifying strengths to be protected and enhanced, weaknesses requiring attention, and new opportunities. It will consider what can be done by the unit to use existing resources more efficiently and effectively, along with considering where new resources, if available, would represent a strategic investment to allow the unit to grow with quality.

iv) Site Visit and Interviews

The purpose of the site visit is to provide an opportunity for interviews with faculty, students, staff, and others who can most appropriately provide informed comment and for examination of the physical facilities.

The APRC should be present together in Victoria for a minimum of two full days. The great majority of their time will be scheduled to be spent on campus.

The Chair/Director, will arrange for meetings between the APRC and appropriate groups or individuals and develop an itinerary which includes a meeting with:

- The Provost, the AVPAP, the Dean of the Faculty; and Dean of Graduate Studies at the beginning of the site visit and again at the end of visit
- Dean(s) or delegate(s) of the Faculty
- head of the unit
- faculty members in the unit
- undergraduate and graduate students or representatives of the unit
- staff or staff representatives in the unit
• Dean or delegate of the Faculty of Graduate Studies
• The Vice-President Research or delegate
• Other members of the University community (where appropriate)
• Other members of the external community (where appropriate)

The Dean will forward the itinerary to the AVPAP for approval. Members of the APRC will be free to seek information from other sources and, in particular, to suggest other individuals and groups with whom to meet during the site visit.

v) The Report

Based on information gained from the self-study, the site visit, interviews, consultations with appropriate groups and individuals, and independent inquiries, the APRC may prepare a first draft of the report for submission to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning. The purpose of this submission is to enable the AVPAP to review the draft document and provide the APRC with comments on factual inaccuracies or areas needing further clarification.

The first part of the report should consist of a 1-2 page Executive Summary that highlights the major strengths of the program, identifies any significant areas of weakness or in need of further development, and comments of the future direction of the program. The Executive Summary will be the basis for the summary of the Academic Review that posted on a public University of Victoria accountability website. For the remainder of the written report, the APRC should use the outline below as a guide. The headings suggested align closely with the major areas of focus in the university’s strategic plan, and will provide an opportunity to examine the degree to which the unit’s goals are in alignment with the university’s stated mission and purpose. The APRC is, of course, welcome to add any comments and considerations that it deems relevant.

QUALITY

Quality of the Academic Program(s):
• Does the curriculum appropriately cover the field or discipline in terms of breadth and depth?
• Are there elements that should be modified in order better to achieve those goals or to implement a better use of resources?
• What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program?
• Is the balance of offerings among the years appropriate (and justified in terms of resource allocation)?
• Where new programs are proposed, or major changes contemplated, please comment on potential suitability and sustainability.
• Have there been changes in the external environment that might increase or lessen the need for and viability of the program as structured?
Quality of the Student Experience and the Learning Environment:
- Assess any specific initiatives undertaken by the program to attract and retain a diverse group of talented students and assure their success in the program.
- Assess the appropriateness of the learning outcomes articulated by the program.
- Are the methods of teaching appropriate to the program and of high quality?
- What steps have been taken to provide students with enriching learning experiences (e.g., experiential or co-operative learning opportunities)?
- What is done to offer students exposure to the international or global dimensions of the field or discipline?
- Does the program offer sufficient intellectual challenge and engagement?

Quality of Research
- Consider the nature and quality of research being carried out in the unit.
- Comment on the unit’s research foci, directions, and impact.
- Comment on the level and range of external research funding where appropriate.

PEOPLE
- Comment on the program’s ability to attract and retain a diverse group of high quality students, and to effectively monitor and support student progress.
- Comment on the faculty, the range of their collective expertise, and their ability to adequately provide intellectual leadership and challenge.
- Comment on the level and effectiveness of staff and staff support.
- Comment on the unit’s equity plan (faculty and staff hiring objectives), the inclusion of equity concerns in staffing, program design, and student opportunities. Comment on opportunities to enhance policies, practices and programs to ensure that a welcoming and inclusive working and learning environment.
- Comment on the overall administrative functioning of the unit.
- Address any areas in which administrative efficiencies might be found.
- Comment on the character of working relationships among members of the unit, between the unit and other units on campus, and, more widely, with the community (including professional communities). Suggest where there might be room for improvement.

RESOURCES
- Address the unit’s use of faculty and staff resources.
- Given the reality of scarce resources across the University, consider the adequacy of current resources (human, technical, and physical) to fulfill
the unit goals, with particular attention to priorities for the allocation of those resources.

- Consider the redirection of available resources, or possible new resources, and how they could improve the unit’s program(s).

**FUTURE**

- Comment on the unit’s plans to develop its teaching and research programs in the future.
- Address the program’s comparative quality in the national or the international context.
- Evaluate the unit’s plans for the future in the context of Faculty and University’s goals and priorities.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Provide recommendations for improvement and growth.

**OTHER**

- Address any specific questions put forth by the unit.

The final report will be sent directly to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning who will forward the report to the Dean of the unit under review, Dean of Graduate Studies and the Vice-President Research.

**C. Unit’s Response to the Report**

In departmentalized Faculties the Dean(s) will ask the Chair/Director of the academic unit to circulate the report to faculty, staff, and appropriate students. In consultation with these constituent groups, the Chair/Director will prepare a response and an action plan to the report. In non-departmentalized Faculties, the Dean(s), with appropriate consultation, will be responsible for these tasks.

The unit’s response can be relatively brief and should 1) provide an overall impression with respect to the report’s conclusions and recommendations; 2) correct of any factual errors or areas of misunderstanding in the report; and 3) fill out Appendix D (Action Plan) and identify what steps the unit intends or would propose to take in response to the report and recommendations of the APR.

The unit’s response and Action plan should be received by the Dean of the unit under review within six-eight weeks of receipt of the report of the APR.

**D. Dean(s)’ Response to the Report**

The Dean(s) of the unit under review and Dean of Graduate Studies where required will prepare an independent response to the report. In preparing the
response, the Dean(s) will review the unit’s response and may need to consult further with members of the unit, the APRC, the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning, the Vice-President Academic and Provost and perhaps others.

The Dean(s) is responsible for submitting both responses to the report to the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning for consideration. Normally, both responses are anticipated to be submitted within 12 weeks of the receipt of the report of the APR.

6. Completion

Upon receipt of the responses, the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning and/or the Vice-President Academic and Provost may meet with the Dean(s), the head of the unit and the Dean of Graduate Studies as appropriate to discuss the report. The Office of the Provost will prepare a response to the Dean and Chair/Director of the unit.

The report will be maintained by the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost for the purposes of long term planning and a summary of the APR report as well as the responses from the unit and the Dean will be posted on the University’s accountability website subject to issues relating to privacy and confidentiality.

The Dean(s) will be responsible for providing a progress report to the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost on the implementation of the action plan 12 months after the submission of the action plan.

The Vice-President Academic and Provost will maintain a record of the progress report and annually provide a summary of the program reviews to the Senate Committee on Planning, Senate and the Board of Governors on the status of Academic Program Reviews.

A summary of the program reviews (in the form prescribed by Appendix E) will be made publicly available subject to issues relating to the University Protection of Privacy Policy and Associated Procedures.
Preamble

These guidelines provide academic units with criteria on which the Self-Study can be based. Units are encouraged to engage in thoughtful self-examination to ensure that thorough, evidence based information is provided for consideration by the Academic Program Review Committee.

It is anticipated that units will address all of the relevant criteria in the guidelines. It is also recognized, however, that each unit should draft its Self-Study in a manner which best reflects the nature of its program(s) (e.g. interdisciplinary, undergraduate, graduate if applicable,) or discipline. Units should concentrate on addressing all criteria applicable to the unit in as clear and concise a manner as possible, but are also encouraged to provide any additional relevant and discipline specific information deemed appropriate.

Standardized data is available for all units by the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) through the Enrolment Portal which is accessible at this link: https://sas.uvic.ca/SASPortal/. Training for the portal is available – contact IPA.

It includes:

- Undergraduate EETs
- Graduate EETS
- Headcounts, FTEs, demographic characteristics
- New to UVic, Previous Institution
- Study Permit and Citizenship
- Coop Enrolments and Work-terms
- Degree Sought
- Credentials Granted
- Indigenous Statistics
- Applicant Statistics
- Section information
- Graduation rate, Retention and Attrition Statistics
- Departmental profile from National Survey of Student Engagement
- Departmental profiles of graduate outcomes surveys (time series, two-years-out, five-years-out)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1: History, Development, and Expectations of the Unit</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Provide a brief history of the program and summarize the unit’s strategic plan and goals, over the next five years within the context of the Faculty level and University Strategic Plan.</td>
<td>Unit data, University Strategic Plan, Unit/Faculty strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Briefly describe the major academic programs offered by the unit. What new programs are anticipated, if any?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 2: Quality of and demand for the Academic Program(s)</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 What has been the pattern of enrolment (EETS) in the program for the past 5-7 years? What is the number and proportion of program FTEs (students who have declared the program as their major)?</td>
<td>Enrolment Portal and/or Unit data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 How many EETS has the program delivered per full time equivalent (FTE) faculty over the last 5-7 years? Compare this to the Faculty average and University averages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 What is the pattern of enrolment in core courses taught by the program or by the program’s faculty as electives for other programs in the University? What can explain the pattern of enrolment, and do you anticipate changes in the next few years?

2.4 How does the pattern of enrolment (and declared majors where applicable) compare with other programs in the region or with national trends?

2.5 To what extent have similar programs been introduced by other post-secondary institutions in the region in recent years? What characteristics of your program suggest a unique advantage or difference compared to other programs in the region?

2.6 To what extent is the program’s field of study remaining viable? How is the environment changing that might lessen or increase the need for the program as constituted? What plans are in place for ensuring an alignment between student interest/demand and program offerings?

2.7 What has been the profile of students entering the program in recent years (e.g. out of high school or mature learners, Aboriginal, etc.) What has been the quality of students drawn to the program in recent years? What is the likely pattern in the next few years? What is the desired student profile?

2.8 What is the current status of student representation from underrepresented or designated groups (i.e. Aboriginals, visible minorities, women, those with disabilities)? How does this compare with other similar programs regionally, nationally, or internationally?

2.9 What steps is the unit taking to attract and retain high quality students? What efforts have the unit taken to increase the number of students from underrepresented/designated groups, or to make courses more accessible to them?

---

### Criterion 3: Quality of the Student Experience and the Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What activities undertaken by the program in the past 5-7 years provide evidence of formal, ongoing curricular assessment at the undergraduate and/or graduate level? What activities are currently underway or planned?</td>
<td>Unit data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the most important learning objectives or outcomes of the program? What has the unit done to articulate and ensure opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills and competencies to be demonstrated by its majors? (e.g., writing skills, other communication skills, critical thinking and analysis, quantitative skills, creative skills).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 5-7 years, what proportion of EETs, by course level, are taught by a) regular faculty, b) sessional instructors and c) term faculty? What steps are taken to ensure and reward effective and high quality teaching?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe student experience for undergraduate students in years 1 and 4 of the program with respect to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (where appropriate).</td>
<td>Co-op Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What efforts have the unit made to internationalize its program, (e.g., using diverse student demographics in the classroom as a teaching tool; using research, international consulting and conferences to enrich a course; inviting international guest speakers; rethinking course goals to incorporate global issues and perspectives.) What are the future plans in relation to internationalization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many students participate in experiential learning opportunities during their program (e.g., co-operative education, field work, volunteer experiences and service learning, research practica etc.)? What are the trends in this respect? Are there plans to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
create more opportunities for experiential learning?

3.7 How has the program sought to integrate research with learning and teaching? What exposure to peer-reviewed research literature do students receive in the program? To what extent have research findings of the faculty been incorporated into the program? What opportunities do students have for exposure to various modes of research inquiry? What opportunities do students have for participation in primary or applied research experiences in the laboratory or field (e.g., via co-operative education, practica, etc.)?

3.8 What efforts has the program made to make courses inclusive and fully accessible to students with disabilities? What measures have been taken to equip instructors with the knowledge and skills necessary to accommodate the diversity of students in their courses and in the program? (For resources available to support persons with disabilities, go to http://rcsd.uvic.ca/)

3.89 Has the program encouraged civic engagement on the part of students and faculty within the local, regional, national or international community, and if so, how?

3.10 To what degree are co-curricular activities, student societies, or other forms of student engagement with each other, with other units on campus, and with faculty supported and encouraged?

3.11 How do most of the students in the programs obtain academic advising? Are students who may be at risk for academic difficulty or failure identified and provided with appropriate supports or assistance?

3.12 What activities undertaken by the program’s faculty demonstrate that they have been engaged in research and scholarship on teaching or learning?

3.13 What demonstrates that the program has successfully integrated information technology into instructional practices or assessment strategies? What opportunities or challenges are anticipated in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 4: Quality of Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 How many undergraduate degrees have been granted during the past 5-7 years? What is the pattern of retention and attrition of students over the past 5-7 years?</td>
<td>IPA (graduate follow-up survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 What is the pattern of graduate student enrolment over the last 5-7 years? How many graduate students have completed their programs in the last 5-7 years? What is the average time to completion?</td>
<td>Enrolment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 What percentage of post-baccalaureate students gained employment in the field within two years of graduation?</td>
<td>IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 What percentage of the program graduates are successful applicants to graduate or professional programs? What percent of program graduates applied for and received an assistantship or fellowship for graduate studies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 In the past five years, what percent of undergraduate majors graduated within four years? What percent of graduate students graduated within the expected time-to-degree standard for the program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 What is the extent of alumni satisfaction with the program? To what extent are the program graduates likely to recommend the program to prospective students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 What evidence exists of alumni success (employment related to program or return for higher education)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 To what extent are employers satisfied or dissatisfied with students or graduates of the program? What steps has the unit taken to enhance improve employer satisfaction in the past 5-7 years?

**Criterion 5: Quality of Research and Scholarly Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>How do the research programs of the unit support the academic goals and vision of the unit? What are the primary areas of research expertise and how do they relate to each other and to the mission and goals of the university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>To what extent have the faculty (regular and sessional) gained recognition in the professional community? What proportion and number of faculty have achieved external recognition or awards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Provide an overview of research and scholarly productivity, (articles in refereed journals, authored books, contributions to books, works performed or exhibited publicly within the past 5-7 years? The unit may wish to also attach CVs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Summarize research funding activity. For example, how many of the regular faculty, as principal or co-principal investigators, have submitted a grant proposal seeking external funding in the past 5-7 years? How many have been successful? Of proposals submitted in the past five years, what number and percent of the full-time faculty have had their proposals funded? What is the dollar amount of externally funded research per FTE faculty member in the past five years? Provide any additional information about the funded research effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>To what extent have the program faculty contributed to, participated in, or been recognized by external bodies or organizations as teachers, scholars, or service contributors regionally, nationally, and internationally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>To what extent have the program faculty been recognized for teaching or research excellence by the University in the recent past?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Information Sources**

- VPR
- Unit Data

---

**Criterion 6: Faculty and Staff Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>What has been the pattern of faculty hiring? How are the designated equity groups represented? To what degree is the current complement appropriate to the unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>What is the unit’s recent hiring history with respect to faculty and anticipated hiring plan for the future? If applicable, in what area(s) will the unit concentrate its efforts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>What initiatives has the unit implemented in the past 5-7 years to promote ongoing faculty mentorship or development? Has the unit any plans in this area for the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Do faculty evaluation policies reflect a high standard for teaching, research and service activity, and an appropriate balance of activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>What actions have been taken to ensure that the unit provides a welcoming and inclusive working and learning environment? What policies, procedures and practices are in place to promote the University’s equity goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Is the complement of staff appropriate to the unit? How are staff supported and integrated into unit activities in support of unit goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>What support is provided for sessional instructors and how are they mentored and integrated into program activities and structures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Information Sources

- IPA
- Unit Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 7: Resources</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.1 To what extent has the University funded program improvements or expansions during the past 5-7 years? (e.g., additional faculty and/or staff, TA funding, capital improvements) | • IPA  
• Unit Data                                    |
| 7.2 What activities has the unit undertaken to secure external grants or donations to support the academic and research activities of the program, including student support, the purchase of equipment and other capital items in the past 5-7 years? What activities are planned for the future? | • Development/External Relations                    |
| 7.3 To what extent has the program made attempts in developing formal partnerships, collaborations, joint ventures, and other relationships with community stakeholders in the past 5-7 years? What have been the outcomes? What are the unit's plans for the future? |                                                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 8: Opportunity Analysis for the Unit and Future Directions</th>
<th>Potential Information Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.1 What other programs, nationally and internationally, provide comparators for this program? How does this program compare? Is the unit comfortable with this comparison? In what way, if any, would the unit like future comparisons to change? | • Unit Data  
• National or international comparative data |
| 8.2 What aspirations does the unit have for its program over the next 5-7 years? What opportunities have been articulated in the unit's or faculty's strategic plan to which the program can respond? |                                                   |
| 8.3 What plans are there to increase undergraduate and/or graduate enrolments? What steps need to be taken or support is needed to achieve these goals? |                                                   |
| 8.4 How has the program responded to environmental challenges or threats and to environmental opportunities? To what extent has the program overcome barriers to developing effective responses to these challenges and taken advantage of opportunities? |                                                   |
| 8.5 What are the unit's two most important priorities and what significant gains would come of the realization of these priorities? |                                                   |
| 8.6 To what extent could the unit reallocate funds to realize these goals and objectives? What additional funds may be necessary? |                                                   |
### Appendix B

#### STEPS IN PREPARING FOR AND CARRYING OUT ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Do Date or Check</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Handbook Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-12 months</td>
<td>Decision made to initiate an APR</td>
<td>Dean or Provost</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12 months</td>
<td>Commence self-study (assistance from Institutional Planning and Analysis)</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>5 A; App A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 months</td>
<td>Identify a faculty coordinator</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 months</td>
<td>Identify an administrative coordinator</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 months</td>
<td>Prepare list of potential committee members in consultation with the Dean's Office for the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP)</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>5 B i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>Select committee members and Chair - identify potential period of site visit</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Identify suitable date(s) - minimum 2 full days</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Sends formal letter of invitation</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>5 B i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Arrange for meetings between the APRC and appropriate groups and individuals; schedule meetings with AVPAP, Provost, Dean of Faculty and Dean of Graduate Studies on first day of site visit and again on final day in Victoria</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>5 B iv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Book accommodation for visiting committee members</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>App C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Book travel using Uniglobe for visiting committee members, if required</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>App C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Submit self-study package to Provost and Dean for review</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>App C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>Once self-study is approved; forward 7 copies to AVPAP for distribution</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Submit itinerary to AVPAP for approval</td>
<td>Unit or Dean</td>
<td>5 B iv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Send itinerary to reviewers once approved</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Send information packages to each member of APRC (self-study and other relevant university documents)</td>
<td>AVPAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

| Final report to be sent directly to the Provost's office who will forward the report to the Dean. | - | 5 B v |
| Dean requests that Chair circulates the report to faculty, staff & appropriate students. [In non-departmentalized faculties, the Dean's office circulates the report to faculty, staff & appropriate students.] | Dean's office | 5 C |
| In consultation with above constituent groups, chair/director prepares a response to report. [In non-departmentalized faculties, the Dean prepares a response to the report having consulted with above constituent groups.] | Chair | 5 C |
| Dean's office prepares a response to the unit's report | Dean's office | 5 D |
| Submit both unit's and Dean's responses to the AVPAP. [In non-departmentalized faculties, only Dean's response is submitted to the AVPAP.] | Dean's office | 5 D |
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Administrative and Logistical Information

- Timing of the review is subject to the availability of the Deans and the Associate Vice-President Academic Planning (AVPAP). The Review generally takes place over two full days.
  - The Dean in consultation with the Department/School will forward list of proposed reviewers to the AVPAP. The AVPAP will make contact with the reviewers and identify a potential period for a site visit. The Department/School will follow up with the reviewers to confirm dates for on-site visit. This should be done in consultation with the Dean, AVPAP and Provost to ensure availability. The Department/School notifies AVPAP of the confirmed dates and the AVPAP sends formal letters of invitation to the reviewers.

- Self-Study
  - The AVPAP office requires enough copies of the self-study to forward on to each of the reviewers, plus an additional four copies for the Provost, AVPAP, Vice-President Research, and Dean of Graduate Studies.

- Travel and accommodation
  - The AVPAP’s Office will assist APRC members in conjunction with Uniglobe Geo Travel to make their travel arrangements.
  - The Chair/Director’s office is responsible for making accommodation arrangements, which must be at government rate. The Hotel Reservation & Authorization Form is completed, forwarded to AVPAP office for completion of account code and signature. AVPAP’s office will fax signed form to Purchasing.
  - Only room and room taxes are billed to UVic; the reviewer pays all other hotel charges with appropriate items submitted for reimbursement.
APRC members submit their travel expenses to the Chair/Directors’ office, which verifies them and forwards them to the AVPAP’s office for account code, signature and payment.

- Itinerary
  - The itinerary is developed by the unit and/or the Dean. It should include one-half hour meetings with the Dean of Graduate Studies, Vice-President Research (or their designates), and other Chairs/Directors in the Faculty.
  - The AVPAP, Provost, Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Graduate Studies meets jointly (45 minutes) with the APRC at the beginning of their site visit and again at the end of the visit (30 minutes).
  - The VPAC office will cover expenses for one lunch or dinner with up to three faculty members plus the reviewers (up to $25.00 per person).
  - The itinerary is forwarded to the AVPAP for approval. Once approved the unit or the Dean’s office will forward it on to the reviewers.

- Maintaining appropriate relationships with the APR
  - During the process of the Academic Review, the members of the APR have a duty and responsibility to provide fair, impartial, honest, and unbiased opinions and analyses of the unit undergoing review. While interactions with the unit are anticipated to be friendly and cordial, it is not considered appropriate to hold social events that extend late into the evening or that otherwise might compromise the objectivity or independence of the APR.

- Final Report
  - APRC submits a final report to AVPAP and Provost, which is then forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty (for dissemination to the Chair/Director), Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-President Research.
  - The AVPAP requisitions one honoraria payment per reviewer upon submission of the final report by the APRC.
  - Following receipt of the final report, a response to the report from the Chair/Director and Dean is sent to the AVPAP.
o The program head, Dean(s) and Associate Vice-President Academic Planning will meet to discuss the review and approve the action plan.

o A review summary sheet (Appendix E) will be posted on the VPAC website.

N.B. Some Deans delegate certain responsibilities to the unit being reviewed.

**APPENDIX D:**

**Action Plan**

Please continue on a separate sheet, if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Faculty:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date of review: ______________________

Date of action plan: ______________________

**Recommendations of Reviewers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)¹:</th>
<th>Person(s) responsible:</th>
<th>Target date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12 month follow up date: ________________

---

¹ To be filed out by head of the Program or Dean of the Faculty.
APPENDIX E: REVIEW SUMMARY SHEET

UNIT REVIEWED:

FACULTY:

DATE OF REVIEW:

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:

REVIEWERS:

SUMMARY OF REVIEW PROCESS (INCLUDING CONSULTATION PROCESS):

SUMMARY OF REVIEWERS RECOMMENDATIONS:

UNIT’S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS BY REVIEWERS:

---

1 This summary should be prepared to meet applicable privacy legislation and must maintain the privacy of all those involved in the reviews. The University is required to uphold applicable privacy legislation governing the collection, use and disclosure of any personal information. If you have any questions, please contact the university privacy officer.
The UVic Policy on University Policies and Procedures (the Policy) and was approved by Senate and the Board of Governors in November 2007. Amongst its provisions are that UVic policies be reviewed every seven years to ensure currency and alignment with other UVic policies and practices. Accordingly, in November 2014 the University Secretary as the Procedural Officer for the Policy initiated a review of the Policy on University Policies and Procedures and Procedures Relating to the University Policy on Policies and Procedures (the Procedures).

The purpose of the Policy is to define a set of standards for university policies and procedures, including a requirement for their periodic review. It was found that the Policy has served its purpose well since its development. It is a useful tool for guiding policy development and high-level enough to allow for needed flexibility.

Based on the review and consultations with those involved in the development, administration, and review of university policies, we found no need for major revisions to either the Policy or the Procedures and no changes to the Policy are recommended. The purpose of this memo is to inform Members of Senate that the Policy and the Procedures will remain in place for another seven year cycle with a set review date of January 2022. Both the Policy and the Procedures are attached for your information.

**Listing of minor changes to the Procedures:**

Minor revisions to the Procedures are in the attached. In addition to editorial changes:

- “General Counsel” was changed throughout to “appropriate legal advisor” to account for the possible need to seek legal advice from other legal experts at UVic.
- Section 3.00: “through the University Secretary’s office” was removed from sentence in subsection (g) to allow flexibility for policies to be made available to the university community through their Designated Executive Officer.
- Section 16.00: four digit numbers are now assigned to each policy.
PURPOSE

1.00 University Policies and Procedures should be current, functional and readily accessible to the university community. The purpose of this policy is to define and set standards for University Policies and Procedures, including a requirement for their periodic review.

DEFINITIONS

2.00 University Policy: defined by all of the following criteria:

a. It is a principle-based statement to be followed in carrying out the activities of the university;

b. It has broad application throughout the university and is binding on members of the university community; and

c. The subject matter is such that it requires Board of Governors, Senate, presidential or vice-presidential review and approval for policy issuance and revision.

3.00 Procedure: a process or set of steps to be followed in order to give effect to a University Policy.

POLICY

4.00 A University Policy should promote governance, management practices, and behaviour consistent with the university’s core principles; advance the university’s mission; comply with applicable laws and regulations; promote operational efficiencies; and/or reduce institutional risk.

Roles and Responsibilities

5.00 A University Policy will specify:

5.01 An Approving Authority: the individual or body responsible for final approval of a University Policy. Approving Authorities include:
a. the Board of Governors, which approves University Policies relating to the
management, administration and control of the property, revenue,
business and affairs of the university pursuant to section 27 of the
University Act;
b. the Senate, which approves University Policies relating to the academic
governance of the university, pursuant to Section 37 of the University Act;
c. the Senate and Board of Governors;
d. the President, who approves University Policies in his/her capacity as
Chief Executive Officer of the university, pursuant to sections 59-63 of the
University Act;
e. the President acting on authority delegated by the Board of Governors or
the Senate; or
f. a Vice-President acting on authority delegated by the Board of
Governors, the Senate or the President.

5.02 A Designated Executive Officer: the President or Vice-President who is
designated to be responsible and accountable for the:

a. development, implementation, maintenance and review of a University
Policy;
b. education of members of the university community about a University
Policy;
c. promotion and monitoring of compliance with a University Policy; and
d. development of a new University Policy within the scope of his or her
authority or portfolio.

5.03 A Procedural Authority: the individual or body responsible for the approval of
Procedures established under a University Policy and any amendments to them.

5.04 A Procedural Officer: the individual or body responsible for the development and
recommendation of the Procedures established under a University Policy and
any amendments to them.

6.00 A Vice-President will normally be named as the Designated Executive Officer for a
University Policy within the scope of his or her authority or portfolio.

6.01 If a University Policy is within the scope of authority or the portfolio of more than
one Vice-President, multiple Designated Executive Officers may be named.

6.02 The President will normally be named the Designated Executive Officer for a
University Policy that is institutional in nature and transcends Vice-Presidential
portfolios.

7.00 The Designated Executive Officer for a University Policy may also be specified as the
Procedural Authority or the Procedural Officer or both.

8.00 Members of the university community are responsible for familiarizing themselves with
and complying with University Policies and Procedures.
9.00 Individuals in senior administrative and management positions are responsible for making a reasonable effort to ensure that members of the university community in their areas and units are informed of University Policies and Procedures that govern their activities.

10.00 The Office of the University Secretary is the official repository for University Policies.

10.01 The University Secretary will maintain records of delegations of authority by Approving Authorities that occur under this policy.

11.00 The University Secretary may make editorial changes to a University Policy or Procedures, provided that such changes do not substantively affect the University Policy or Procedures. Editorial changes are subject to approval by:

   a. the Designated Executive Officer, in the case of editorial changes to a University Policy; or
   b. the Procedural Authority, in the case of editorial changes to Procedures.

Format

12.00 A University Policy will be classified and presented in the format prescribed by the Procedures Relating to the Policy on University Policies and Procedures.

Procedures

13.00 Procedures associated with a University Policy may be developed subsequent to the establishment of the University Policy.

13.01 The Approving Authority for a University Policy has the authority to specify:

   a. the Procedural Authority; and
   b. the Procedural Officer.

Effective Date

14.00 A University Policy becomes operational and enforceable upon approval or at a later date specified by the Approving Authority.

15.00 Procedures associated with a University Policy become operational and enforceable upon approval or at a later date specified by the Procedural Authority.

Review

16.00 A University Policy must undergo a substantive review every seven years, but may be reviewed at any time as needed.

17.00 Procedures associated with a University Policy must be reviewed when the University Policy is reviewed, but may be reviewed at any time as needed.
Other Policies and Agreements

18.00 Faculties and other academic and administrative units may establish local unit policies and procedures, but such policies may not contradict University Policies.

19.00 Where a University Policy or Procedures conflict with the Framework Agreement or any existing collective agreement between the university and its faculty or staff, the provisions of the agreement will prevail.

Reporting

20.00 The President will report annually to the Board of Governors and the Senate on University Policies developed and reviewed during the year and the action taken or recommended.

AUTHORITIES AND OFFICERS

21.00 The following is a list of authorities and officers for this policy:

a) Approving Authority: Board of Governors, on the recommendation of Senate
b) Designated Executive Officer: President
c) Procedural Authority: President
d) Procedural Officer: University Secretary

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

University Act
Development and Revision of University Policies

1.00 Individuals, bodies or groups who perceive the need for the development of a new University Policy or the revision of an existing University Policy should consult the proposed (for a new University Policy) or named (for an existing University Policy) Designated Executive Officer, who will decide whether to develop or review the University Policy.

2.00 When a Designated Executive Officer decides to begin the development or revision of a University Policy, he or she will notify the University Secretary.

3.00 The Designated Executive Officer will assign an individual or team to carry out the development or review of a University Policy, which may include the following steps:

   a) identify pertinent legislation and policy;
   b) collect and analyze pertinent information;
   c) determine, in conjunction with the University Secretary, who ought to be consulted and conduct these consultations as appropriate;
   d) draft a preliminary University Policy and associated Procedures, if any, that meet the criteria set out in the Policy on University Policies and Procedures using the prescribed format and revise the draft as necessary during the consultation process;
   e) submit the draft to the Director of Equity or Human Rights and the General Counsel/appropriate university legal advisor, who will provide feedback to the Designated Executive Officer;
   f) revise the draft as necessary and submit to the Designated Executive Officer for review;
   g) make the draft available to the university community through the University Secretary’s office for comment, if appropriate; and
h) finalize the draft and submit the final draft to the Designated Executive Officer so that he or she may recommend it for approval.

4.00 The Designated Executive Officer will submit the final draft to the University Secretary, who will submit the proposed new or revised University Policy and associated Procedures, if any, for approval to the appropriate Approving Authority.

Development and Revision of Procedures Associated with University Policies

5.00 Procedures may be developed or reviewed simultaneously with a University Policy or subsequently.

6.00 When Procedures are developed simultaneously with the development or review of a University Policy, the process in sections 3.00 and 4.00 will be followed.

7.00 When Procedures are developed or reviewed after a University Policy has been approved, the Procedural Officer will assign an individual or team to:
   a) draft the Procedures;
   b) conduct consultations as appropriate and revise the draft as necessary during the consultation process;
   c) submit the Procedures to the Director of Equity and Human Rights and the General Counsel/appropriate university legal advisor for review; and
   d) submit the final draft of the Procedures to the Procedural Officer so that he or she may recommend it for approval.

8.00 The Procedural Officer will submit the final draft to the University Secretary, who will submit the proposed new or revised Procedures to the Procedural Authority for approval.

Approved University Policies and Procedures

9.00 Once a University Policy and associated Procedures, if any, have been approved, the University Secretary will:
   a) maintain a record of the current, enforceable version of the University Policy and Procedures;
   b) publish copies of the University Policy and Procedures and make them accessible to the university community; and
   c) maintain a record of the initial approval of a University Policy and Procedures and of all subsequent substantive and editorial changes.

10.00 The Designated Executive Officer will communicate the approval of new or revised University Policies and associated Procedures as appropriate.
Rescindment of University Policies and Procedures

11.00 A University Policy or Procedures may be rescinded at any time, subject to approval by:
   a) the Approving Authority, in the case of a University Policy; or
   b) the Procedural Authority, in the case of a Procedure.

Mandated Periodic Review of University Policies and Procedures

12.00 The University Secretary will set a cyclical schedule for the mandated review of all University Policies and Procedures.

   12.01 The University Secretary will advise a Designated Executive Officer of the schedule for mandated review of a particular University Policy.

   12.02 The University Secretary will advise a Procedural Authority of the schedule for mandated review of a particular Procedure.

   12.03 In cases where a University Policy undergoes substantive review outside the regular review cycle, the mandated review date should normally be re-set at the standard number of years following the review.

13.00 The Designated Executive Officer for a University Policy will:

   a) initiate and direct the mandated reviews according to the steps set out in these Procedures;

   b) recommend revisions when warranted; and

   c) report to the President, through the University Secretary, on the outcomes of the review.

Standard Format and Components of University Policies

14.00 The standard components for University Policies include the following:

   a) The Heading, which includes:
      • the University of Victoria logo
      • policy title
      • university policy number
      • policy classification
      • Approving Authority (e.g.: Board, Board on the recommendation of Senate, Senate)
      • effective date (the date when the policy or revised policy comes into force)
      • the effective date of the previous version which is superseded by the new version
      • the date of the last editorial change
• mandated review date (the date by which the mandated review must be completed)

b) **Policy Purpose**

c) **Definitions** (optional)

d) **Jurisdiction/Scope** (optional)

e) **Policy** (A clear and concise statement of the policy. This section should not include Procedures.)

f) **Authorities and Officers** (A list of all authorities and officers for the policy.)
   i) Approving Authority
   ii) Designated Executive Officer
   iii) Procedural Authority
   iv) Procedural Officer

g) **Relevant Legislation** (optional)

h) **Related Policies and Documents** (optional)

**University Policy Functional Classification System and Numbering**

15.00 University Policies will be classified according to the following functional classification system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GV</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Academic and Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Buildings and Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Information Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.00 The University Secretary will assign each University Policy a three-digit number following the relevant two-letter alpha code associated with the functional classification system outlined above.