**PROGRAM REVIEW: External Review Team - Candidate Recommendations** 

**Program Name:**

**Date:**

| **Candidate Type \***  **(see Notes below)** | **Name & Credentials** | **Title & Company/Institution** | **Contact Information**  **(include email and telephone)** | **Outline brief rationale for nomination** | **Describe any prior contact with the program under review** | **Describe any conflict of interest issues** | **Describe any previous experience with Program Reviews** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **External Academic** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **External Industry** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Internal (BCIT)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**\* Notes:**

1. The final External Review Team (ERT) will be 3 members (see Program Review Manual for details):
2. External academic peer from another post-secondary institution (ideally from similar programs that are represented in the benchmarking table in the SSR)
3. External academic peer OR member from industry (e.g. an employer of graduates of the program who is not a PAC member)
4. Internal academic (internal to BCIT, outside your school and from a program currently not under review)
5. Programs should put forward 4 - 6 external candidates and 2 – 3 internal candidates respectively, making sure there are representatives for all 3 categories outlined above. Final ERT members will be selected from the list of candidates by the School Dean and the Dean, Academic Planning & Quality Assurance.
6. Refer to the following page for more details about conflict of interest (adapted from the Program Review Manual)

**ERT Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Guidelines for External Reviewers Participating in Program Reviews**

**(Appendix L, Program Review Manual)**

**Purpose**

These guidelines are to assist program areas in their nomination of external review team candidates and to assist the external reviewers themselves. These guidelines reflect the requirements as outlined by the DQAB  *(*[*http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/education-training/post-secondary-education/institution-resources-administration/degree-authorization/degree-quality-assessment-board/conflict-of-interest-and-confidentiality-policy*](http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/education-training/post-secondary-education/institution-resources-administration/degree-authorization/degree-quality-assessment-board/conflict-of-interest-and-confidentiality-policy)*)*

*External reviewers must avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest including that which might impair or impugn the independence, integrity or impartiality of the review. There must be no appearance of bias, based on what a reasonable person might perceive.*

When identifying candidates to serve on the external review team, select those experts who are recognized by their peers for having a broad outlook, open mind, and sound judgment. Candidates should possess the qualifications to engender the confidence of all those involved in the development, results, and actions resulting from the program review.

**Definition of a Conflict**

(Adapted from DQAB Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Policy)

An actual or potential conflict of interest arises when an expert is placed in a situation in which a) his or her personal interests, financial or otherwise, or b) the interests of an immediate family member or of a person with whom there exists, or has recently existed, an intimate relationship, conflict or appearance of conflict with the expert's responsibilities to the program under review, BCIT, and/or the public interest.

External experts appointed by the school dean and Dean, APQA should not have had any actual, perceived, or potential conflict of interest to the program under review within the previous two years, have any such connection or for a period of up to three months following the completion of their duties related to the program review. Some examples of such connections include:

* Preparing an application or providing expert advice used in developing the program,
* Making public comment for or against a program or institution that might result in the apprehension of bias,
* Working for or previously employed in the program,
* Being a learner or a recent graduate of the program, or
* Working as a consultant for the program
* Serving in an advisory capacity or on a board for the program
* Having financial or other business interests with the program
* Supervising learners or employees of the program
* Collaborating regularly with anyone in or associated with the program