

EXTERNAL REVIEW POLICY

Responsibility of	Faculty Senate
Approved by	Faculty Senate (May 9, 2014)
Revision History	
Next Review	Term

POLICY OVERVIEW

This policy both expresses Briercrest College and Seminary's commitment to external program review and outlines the parameters under which external reviews will function.

PRINCIPLES

This policy is guided by the principles of integrity and transparency.

SCOPE

The policy applies to all Systematic Program Reviews (SPR) at Briercrest College and Seminary (BCS).

POLICY STATEMENT

Systematic Program Reviews at Briercrest College and Seminary (BCS) will always include more than one external reviewer. External reviewers will be committed to the principles and practices of quality assurance in post-secondary education and will avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest. No word limit will be placed on their reports.

PROCEDURES

Definitions

External experts are invited to review programs as a part of BCS Internal Systematic Program Reviews.

Guidelines

1. External experts must not reveal or divulge confidential information received in the course of their duties. Confidential information must not be used for any purpose outside of the systematic internal review process.

2. External experts must be committed to the principles and practices of quality assurance in post-secondary education and be recognized by their peers as having a broad outlook, open mind, and sound judgment. Individuals appointed in these capacities must possess the necessary qualifications to engender the confidence of the Minister, the applicants, the public, accrediting bodies, other degree-granting institutions, and other jurisdictions.
3. External experts must avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, including that which might impair or impugn the independence, integrity, or impartiality of the review process. There must be no suggestion of what would be reasonably understood as bias, including:
 - Participating in any decision that appears to directly or preferentially benefit the member or any individual with whom the member has an immediate family, intimate, or commercial relationship;
 - Having a connection to the applicant institution within the previous two years, or for a period of up to three months following completion of their duties in connection with the review process.

The following are examples of unacceptable connections to the institution:

- Preparing an application or providing expert advice used in developing the review, not including information on the standards and criteria, guidelines, and procedures;
- Making public comment for or against the institution that may result in the appearance of bias;
- Current or past employment by the institution;
- Being a student or a recent graduate of the institution;
- Working as a consultant for the institution;
- Serving in an advisory capacity or on a board or committee at the institution;
- Having financial or other business interests with the institution;
- Supervising students or employees of the institution;
- Collaborating regularly with the institution; and/or,
- Teaching at the institution.

Disclosure of Conflict

Where there is an actual or potential conflict of interest, the external expert must disclose the circumstances and consult with the institution. If the external expert is unsure if a conflict exists, she or he should seek advice from the President of the institution, who will determine whether a conflict of interest exists.

Action Required When a Conflict Exists

If it is determined that an external expert has an actual or potential conflict of interest, she or he cannot serve as an External Reviewer for the institution.

APPENDIX A

Related Forms/Policies	Systematic Program Review Policy - Faculty Handbook
Where is this policy published	Faculty Handbook
Contact Information	Vice-President Academic