

StEAR Evaluation Approach

Version 2.0: May 2025

UBC Equity and Inclusion Office

Introduction

This document provides an overview of the evaluation approach being used to track progress and evaluate UBC's [Strategic Equity and Anti-Racism \(StEAR\) Framework and Roadmap for Change](#).

The purposes of the StEAR evaluation are to:

1. Understand:
 - the extent to which UBC is making progress towards the goals of the StEAR Framework, as articulated in the four domains of change (structural, curricular, compositional and interactional);
 - the extent to which UBC is progressing the systems interventions articulated in the StEAR Roadmap's objectives and strategic actions; and
 - what is learned about the patterns and conditions that are conducive to change.
2. Surface and activate opportunities for these insights to shape our ongoing and evolving strategies.
3. Communicate about how change is happening.
4. Contribute to the field of knowledge about approaches to systems change to advance EDI and anti-racism in the postsecondary context.

Background: Accounting for complexity

StEAR efforts at UBC are characterized by complexity. The multiple, overlapping systems at UBC are never static, and change unpredictably. Events in one part of the system affect all other parts of the system, and cause and effect are not necessarily linear or straightforward – yet patterns do emerge. Context and relationships are important factors in determining outcomes, often more so than the interventions themselves. As Lynn and Coffman (2024, p. 142) articulate, “in complex adaptive systems, pathways to change rarely can be known in advance, solutions cannot be imposed, small actions can produce big and unanticipated changes, and there is no one right answer.”

As described by Preskill et al (2014), the complexity of social change efforts has a number of implications for evaluation of such efforts. These include:

- designing evaluation approaches that are flexible, adaptable, and iterative;
- prioritizing information exchange and feedback loops;
- attending to the system as a whole as well as its component parts and sub-systems; and
- monitoring and responding to changes in context.

Haldrup (2024) suggests, then, that complexity-informed evaluations should serve three distinct functions:

1. **Regularly learn and adapt**, taking action based on insights and embracing new opportunities.
2. **Capture changes at the system level**, while acknowledging that it is usually difficult or impossible to isolate a specific intervention's contribution to systems-level changes.

- 3. Track and report on intermediate progress**, to account for ongoing efforts in the face of long time horizons on the ultimate goals of the projects, and to communicate to partners about steps that are being taken.

These recommendations are in alignment with guidance to enhance equitable approaches to evaluation (Equitable Evaluation Initiative, 2023).

Given that these approaches differ from commonly accepted norms around evaluation and accountability for institutional change efforts, it is useful to consider Lynn and Preskill’s (2016) new definition of rigor for evaluating complex, adaptive systems, which consists of four components:

- 1. Quality of thinking**, including engaging in deep analysis, using systems thinking, and seeking alternative explanations and interpretations;
- 2. Credible and legitimate claims**, including considering the trustworthiness of the data and discussing level of confidence in the findings;
- 3. Cultural context and responsiveness**, including responding to the questions, perspectives, and values of those involved in and effected by the efforts being evaluated; and
- 4. Quality and value of the learning process**, including enabling the learning and insights to contribute to decision making and improve future processes and outcomes.

Lines of Inquiry

In light of the above considerations and drawing on Cabaj’s (2019) inquiry framework for evaluating systems change efforts, the EIO has developed a StEAR evaluation approach that addresses three broad lines of inquiry: systems interventions, outcomes, and strategic learning.

Figure 1
StEAR Evaluation Approach Lines of Inquiry (adapted from Cabaj, 2019)

Outcomes	Systems interventions	Strategic learning
<p>How are the experiences of people and groups changing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For individuals • For targeted groups • For the whole community 	<p>How are institutional and decentralized systems, processes and practices changing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In system behaviours and processes • In behaviours of actors in the system (individuals, groups, units) 	<p>What insights are we gaining to inform our ongoing efforts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About the context in which we are operating • About what we are doing • About how we are thinking • About how we are being

These lines of inquiry are cyclical, connected, and influence each other. Reflecting on new insights (strategic learning) is critical for developing effective strategies (system interventions). It is important to monitor and

understand the behaviour of the system (system interventions) to make sense of any change observed (outcomes).

Outcomes

In inquiring about outcomes, the aim is to understand how the experiences of people at UBC are changing in alignment with the goals of the StEAR framework; and characterize what is changing for people, whether on an individual, group, or whole-community level. This includes building an understanding of UBC community members' trajectories through the university, as well as their subjective experiences during their time here.

While it is hoped that StEAR efforts at UBC have profound individual-level impacts, this inquiry focuses primarily on understanding the changes at the group level, whether for targeted groups (such as people who hold identities that have been historically, persistently, or systemically marginalized) or the UBC population as a whole. This is due to capacity constraints and institutional information infrastructures, which limit the extent to which impacts at an individual level are assessed. Nevertheless opportunities may arise to draw on stories of individual change to better understand the broad range of outcomes people may be experiencing.

In large systems, such as UBC, change is non-linear, slow-moving, and may lag significantly in respect to a specific intervention (Meadows, 2008). The desired StEAR outcomes exist on a continuum of earlier and later anticipated changes; for many of the institutional outcome measures and indicators of change, it is not expected to see large shifts on a year-to-year basis.

It is also important to note that the StEAR Roadmap brings together many existing efforts, some of which have been active for several years and predate the lifespan of the StEAR framework. Potentially relevant changes from prior years may not be reflected in this evaluation approach. Outcome measures and indicators are also influenced by a number of factors beyond the scope of StEAR.

Systems interventions

Inquiry into systems interventions seeks to understand whether and how relevant processes, practices, and structures are changing. For the primary system of UBC as a whole, systems interventions are articulated as the strategic actions in the StEAR Roadmap for Change. For sub-systems such as UBC's decentralized Faculties, vice-president portfolios, departments, and units, systems interventions may vary across different contexts.

To understand the systems interventions taking place, Cabaj (2019) encourages keeping attention to: how deep and durable the changes are, whether there have been any unanticipated changes, and whether there are indications that the system might 'snap back' into old patterns.

Strategic learning

Strategic learning refers to the "extent to which efforts uncover insights key to future progress" (Cabaj, 2019). These insights may relate to the broader context in which we are operating, about how we are being (approach), about how we are thinking (strategy), and about what we are doing (implementation).

Strategic learning is a critical component of the evaluation approach, given the complexity of the system and desired changes. It allows for adaptation of efforts in response to improved understanding of the task at hand.

Information-gathering components

Information-gathering activities to address these lines of inquiry consist of four components:

- Institutional outcome measures and indicators of change
- Status of institutional strategic actions
- Inventory of unit-level activities
- Continuous assessment and reflection

Each information-gathering component is described in more detail below.

Institutional outcome measures and indicators of change

Cyclical collection and analysis of institutional data helps to describe the current and changing EDI and anti-racism landscape at UBC. Indicators of change are primarily drawn from administrative data or institutional surveys that are connected to one or more StEAR objectives.

The selection of outcome measures and their associated indicators of change is determined through a comprehensive review of available institutional data. Through this review and examination, the following six desired characteristics for institutional data were identified as key criteria to inform the selection of outcome measures and indicators of change:

- **Availability:** existing/already collected or feasible to collect now or in the future
- **Accuracy:** specific and representative (not too small a sample size)
- **Comparability:** across population groups (e.g., students, staff and faculty), contexts (e.g., unit/dept, faculty/portfolio) and time (can establish a trend)
- **Simplicity:** ease of interpretation, minimize caveats and nuances that need explanation
- **Reliability:** validated data collection tool and/or measure, when possible
- **Efficacy:** useful and meaningful (evaluative) indicator of change

There is no expectation that any one indicator will meet all six criteria, rather the criteria are useful guideposts for characterizing the utility of different datasets and indicators. In some cases, the desired measures have been identified but the data infrastructure to collect, appropriately analyze and report on them is still in development. The set of outcome measures to be monitored is intended to be expanded over time as additional data and analysis becomes available

Each outcome measure is associated with a primary StEAR domain and consists of a number of sub-components:

- **Outcome measure:** Describes the desired results of the StEAR Framework and Roadmap in a measurable way. An outcome measure may be informed by one or multiple indicators.
- **Indicator:** A specific data point that can be compared over time to track progress.
- **Baseline indicator:** Denotes the first time an indicator is reported, for newly introduced outcome measures.
- **Change from previous:** The differential from the previously available indicator data point⁸. For some indicators, new data is not available on a yearly cycle.

- **Reference point:** A comparator data point (where available) or specific target (where relevant) to situate the indicator in context.

Table 1
Definitions of StEAR Outcome Measure Components and Examples

Term	Definition	Example
Outcome measure	The desired measurable results, which may be informed by one or multiple indicators.	Diverse senior leadership
Indicator	A specific data point that can be compared over time to track progress. When a specific data point is reported for the first time for a newly introduced outcome measure, this is referred to as a baseline indicator .	Proportional representation of select HPSM groups in the UBC Executive Group and Executive Senior Leadership Group as reported in the employment equity survey. <i>For example, the proportion of women in executive senior leadership group in 2024: 50%</i>
Change (from previous)	The differential from the previously available indicator data point. For some indicators, new data is not available on a yearly cycle.	The indicator is compared to data from the 2023 Employment Equity Survey. <i>For women in the executive senior leadership group, the previous indicator is 49.1%. The change from previous is +0.1%</i>
Reference point	A comparator data point (where available) or specific target (where relevant) to situate the indicator in context.	Representation of employment equity federally designated groups in the senior manager occupational group at national level <i>For women in the executive senior leadership group, the reference point is 30.4%. The difference between the indicator and the reference point is +19.6%.</i>

Indicators are classified according to whether they either meet or exceed their reference point (if available), and how they have changed from the previously available indicator data point. For ease of analysis, indicators that are unchanged from the previously available data point are classified together with indicators that have changed in the desired direction, in cases where the indicator is meeting or exceeding the reference point, and classified together with indicators that have moved away from the desired direction, when the indicator is below the reference point. This approach makes it possible to look for patterns among the indicators, rather than privileging individual indicators and outcome measures as more meaningful than others (Preskill et al, 2014).

For a summary of outcome measures and indicators currently being tracked, refer to the Appendix.

Status of institutional strategic actions

StEAR's intended institutional-level systems interventions are articulated in the Strategic Actions of the StEAR *Roadmap for Change*. Through ongoing consultation and continuous engagement, the EIO identifies appropriate sponsors, leads and partners to drive forward implementation of the strategic actions, as well as identifying whether the actions would be appropriately implemented through a shared process for both of UBC's campuses (*pan-institutional actions*), or whether they pertained to systems and processes that run separately at each campus (*campus-specific actions*).

To gather information on the implementation of strategic actions, EIO project managers liaise with the leads of each strategic action. In consultation with strategic action leads, each action is assigned one of the following status categories:

- **Not Yet Started:** This status indicates that work on the strategic action has not begun, for example due to resource or operational constraints. The EIO will work collaboratively with the leads of these actions to determine what supports are required to advance the work.
- **In Progress:** This status signifies that the leading/co-leading units are actively advancing the strategic action.
- **Completed/Ongoing:** Actions with this status have achieved their primary objectives yet may require ongoing attention to maintain the impact and/or address evolving needs and challenges. Actions with this designation may be updated or re-framed to enable more efficient progress reporting in future years.
- **On Hold:** This status indicates that work on the strategic action has been temporarily paused. This can be due to external dependencies or strategic shifts. Actions on hold are not actively being worked on but may be resumed once the reasons for the pause are addressed.

In aggregate, the results of this exercise provide a picture of the extent to which StEAR's intended systems interventions are being enacted.

Inventory of unit-level activities

A wide range of decentralized interventions to advance EDI and anti-racism are being implemented within UBC's faculties, vice presidential portfolios, units, and departments. The *StEAR Inventory: Mapping UBC's Decentralized EDI Practices & Initiatives* serves as a mechanism to understand these efforts, as well as the barriers to engagement that decentralized units experience. Units participated in a pilot version of the StEAR Inventory in the 2023-24 reporting year, and an updated Inventory was created for the 2024-25 reporting year.

All Faculties and Vice-Presidential portfolios at UBC are invited to participate, and Faculties and portfolios are given the option to submit one response on behalf of the whole Faculty/portfolio, or to ask departments or sub-units to submit independently.

In the inventory, an objective of the StEAR Roadmap is expressed as an area of focus relevant to the decentralized department/unit level. For each objective, inventory participants were asked to provide:

- (Required): The status of their engagement in this area of work (e.g., not started, planning, underway, completed/sustainment)

- (Optional): Any challenges or barriers that prevent or hinder work in this area

Participants are also provided the option to share descriptions of up to three notable initiatives or practices within their unit (in the pilot year, units could share unlimited initiatives and examples).

Units are invited to reflect on their observations about the impacts of these efforts and any insights into what has helped them succeed. They are also asked to specify if these initiatives or practices related to a specific HPSM group or university audience (student, faculty, staff, etc.).

Because participation in the inventory is not mandatory, results are not expected to be a representative sample of UBC's decentralized units and departments. Inventory respondents are likely more highly engaged with EDI and anti-racism work. The results, therefore, provide a picture of engagement and barriers faced by decentralized EDI champions and leaders who likely have an above-average commitment to advancing EDI and anti-racism at UBC.

Continuous assessment and reflection

Gathering information for strategic learning requires continuous assessment, reflection, and dialogue with StEAR governance bodies, implementation partners, and EDI champions and communities of practice undertaking this work. The information exchange and feedback loop established is critical for making sense of how the work is unfolding and what is helping or hindering progress. These mechanisms serve to continually improve understanding of changing contexts and conditions and surface insights about the benefits and drawbacks of current strategies.

The EIO will regularly document adjustments to implementation tactics and approaches, based on strategic learning, and document these changes in StEAR annual and interim reports.

References

Cabaj, Mark. 2019. Evaluating Systems Change Results: An Inquiry Framework. Tamarack Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/hubfs/Resources/Publications/Paper%20Evaluating%20Systems%20Change%20Results%20Mark%20Cabaj.pdf>

Equitable Evaluation Initiative. 2023. Equitable Evaluation Framework™ (EEF). Retrieved from: <https://www.equitableeval.org/framework>

Haldrup, Søren Vester (UNDP Strategic Innovation). 2024. How to do M&E when you're working with complex problems. Medium. Retrieved from: <https://medium.com/@undp.innovation/how-to-do-m-e-when-youre-working-with-complex-problems-b91622ebc9b2>

Lynn, Jewlya & Coffman, Julia. 2024. Passing in the dark: Making visible philanthropy's hidden and conflicting mental models for systems change. *The Foundation Review*, 16(1). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.9707/1944-5660.1700>

Lynn, Jewlya & Preskill, Hallie. 2016. Rethinking Rigor: Increasing credibility and use. FSG. Retrieved from: <https://www.fsg.org/resource/rethinking-rigor/>

Meadows, Donella H. 2008. *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Preskill, Hallie, Cook, Joelle, Mack, Katelyn, Gopal, Srik. 2014. Evaluating Complexity: Propositions for Improving Practice. FSG. Retrieved from: <https://search.issuelab.org/resource/evaluating-complexity-propositions-for-improving-practice.html>

Appendix: StEAR Outcome Measures and Indicators

Definitions

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous	Reference point
The desired measurable results, which may be informed by one or multiple indicators.	<p>A specific data point that can be compared over time to track progress.</p> <p>When a specific data point is reported for the first time for a newly introduced outcome measure, this is referred to as a baseline indicator.</p>	The differential from the previously available indicator data point. For some indicators, new data is not available on a yearly cycle.	A comparator data point (where available) or specific target (where relevant) to situate the indicator in context.

Structural Domain

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
<p><i>Level of reporting</i></p> <p>A diverse Board of Governors & Senates</p> <p><i>Pan-institutional</i></p>	Representation of select HPSM groups in UBC's Board of Governors and Senates ¹	n.a.	While there is no specific reference point identified, the 50:30 challenge ² may serve as a useful guideline (50 per cent women and/or non-binary people, and 30 per cent members of other HPSM groups, on Canadian boards and/or senior management).

¹ In fall 2024, the UBC's Employment Equity Survey questionnaire was replicated, for the first time, to collect demographic data from UBC's Board of Governors and Senates. The survey was created in Qualtrics with a request for submission before Nov 29, 2024. The survey remains open, and members of UBC's Board of Governors and Senates are able to submit or update their responses at any time by visiting the survey link in Qualtrics

² Government of Canada, The 50 – 30 Challenge: Your Diversity Advantage, accessed March 2025, https://ised-isde.canada.ca/site/ised/en/50-30-challenge-your-diversity-advantage#About_the_50/30.

Outcome measure <i>Level of reporting</i>	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
High rates of participation in the Employment Equity Survey <i>Campus-specific</i>	Response rate to the 2024 Employment Equity Survey (EES). ³	Indicator is compared to the 2023 EES response rate.	The Federal Contractors Program requires 80% response rate
High rates of participation in the Student Diversity Census <i>Campus-specific</i>	Response rate to the 2024 Student Diversity Census (SDC). ⁴	n.a.	n.a.
Positive faculty and staff perceptions of UBC's level of commitment to equity and anti-racism <i>Campus-specific</i>	<i>Focusing on the 2024 Workplace Experiences Survey (WES)⁵ statement (Q35), "UBC takes its commitments to equity and anti-racism seriously."</i> For all respondents , the proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the statement. For select HPSM groups , the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.	n.a.	For all respondents , n.a. For select HPSM groups , the reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM employees' experiences.

³ The Employment Equity Survey (EES) is UBC's mechanism for centralized and standardized collection of demographic data on faculty and staff. The annual data capture for reporting is taken on October 31st of each year, however, the survey remains open, and employees are able to submit or update their responses at any time by visiting the live link on Workday.

⁴ Student Diversity Census (SDC) is the UBC's primary tool to collect student demographic data and was officially launched in September 2024. The data capture for reporting was taken on November 1, 2024, however, the SDC remains open, and students are able to submit or update their responses at any time by visiting their unique link to the survey.

⁵ The Workplace Experiences Survey (WES) is the primary tool for all faculty and staff to share feedback on their experiences of working at UBC and is offered every three years.

Curricular Domain

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
<p>Positive and equitable academic experiences for students</p> <p><i>Campus-specific</i></p>	<p><i>Focusing on the 2024 Undergraduate Experience Survey (UES)⁶ statement (A1_0), “To what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your overall academic experience?”</i></p> <p>For all respondents, the proportion of respondents indicating satisfaction or high satisfaction with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in satisfaction or high satisfaction with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>	Indicator is compared to the 2022 UES.	<p>For all respondents, n.a.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM students' experiences.</p>

Compositional Domain

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
<p>A diverse UBC workforce</p> <p><i>Campus-specific</i></p>	Proportional representation of select HPSM groups in UBC's workforce reported in the EES.	Indicator is compared to data from the 2023 EES.	Representation of employment equity federally designated groups in the workforce at the national level.
<p>Diverse senior leadership</p> <p><i>Pan-institutional</i></p>	Proportional representation of select HPSM groups in the UBC Executive group ⁷ and Executive Senior Leadership group ⁸ as reported in the EES.	Indicator is compared to data from the 2023 EES.	Representation of employment equity federally designated groups in the senior manager occupational group at the national level.

⁶ The Undergraduate Experience Survey (UES) is administered by UBC's Planning and Institutional Research (PAIR) office on UBC undergraduate students every year (in Winter Session Term 2) except when UBC participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

⁷ UBC Executive group includes the President, the Okanagan Principal, Provosts for UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan, and the Vice-Presidents.

⁸ Executive Senior Leadership group includes the President, Vice Presidents and Provosts, Associate Vice Presidents and Provosts, Deans and Principals, and Other Senior Academic Executives.

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
<p>Robust recruitment, representation and retention of Black faculty and staff</p> <p><i>Campus-specific</i></p>	<p>For current faculty and staff: Representation of Black employees among current faculty and staff in UBC's workforce.</p> <p>For faculty and staff new hires: Representation of Black employees among new hires in UBC's workforce.</p> <p>For faculty and staff retention: Change in population of Black faculty and staff⁹</p>	<p>Indicator is compared to data from the 2023 EES.</p>	<p>Current: Representation of Black people in the Canadian population.</p> <p>New: Representation of current Black faculty and staff in UBC's workforce.</p> <p>Retention: Change in population of all faculty and staff in UBC's workforce.</p>
<p>Positive and equitable experiences of faculty tenure and promotion process</p> <p><i>Campus-specific</i></p>	<p><i>Focusing on the 2024 WES statement (Q20), "Overall, I am satisfied with the merit and promotion process."¹⁰:</i></p> <p>For all respondents, the proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>		<p>For all respondents, n.a.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups: The reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM employees' experiences.</p>
<p>Robust and equitable supports for employee wellbeing</p>	<p><i>Focusing on three 2024 WES statements: (Q21), "I feel supported in my workplace to make decisions that benefit my physical health."; (Q22), "I feel supported in my</i></p>	<p>Q21 and Q22: n.a.</p> <p>Q28: Indicator is compared to 2021 WES.</p>	<p>For all respondents, n.a.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the</p>

⁹ Change in population for any selected group of employees is calculated by dividing the difference in the number of responses recorded in two consecutive years by the number of responses recorded in the first year. Change in population is an estimate of actual change in the population of the selected group and is not necessarily equivalent to the change in the headcount of that group.

¹⁰ Feedback on this Workplace Experiences Survey 2024 statement was only collected from tenure stream faculty.

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
<i>Campus-specific</i>	<p><i>workplace to make decisions that benefit my mental health.”; and (Q28), “UBC is committed to the wellbeing of its people, places and communities.”:</i></p> <p>For all respondents, the proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>		reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM employees’ experiences.
A diverse student body <i>Campus-specific</i>	Proportional representation of select HPSM groups in UBC’s student body reported in the SDC.	n.a.	n.a.
Robust and equitable supports for student wellbeing <i>Campus-specific</i>	<p><i>Focusing on the 2024 UES statement (D1_6), “UBC cares about my wellbeing.”:</i></p> <p>For all respondents, the proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>	Indicator is compared to the 2022 UES.	<p>For all respondents, n.a.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM students’ experiences.</p>

Interactional Domain

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
Leaders who promote respectful and inclusive workplaces	<p><i>Focusing on the 2024 WES statement (Q70), “[UBC’s senior leadership] demonstrates the skills and attributes necessary for promoting a respectful, healthy, and inclusive workplace.”:</i></p>	Indicator is compared to 2021 WES.	<p>For all respondents, N/A.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the</p>

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
<i>Campus-specific</i>	<p>For all respondents, proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p> <p><i>Focusing on the 2024 WES statement (Q61), “[My unit head/manager] demonstrates the skills and attributes necessary for promoting a respectful, healthy, and inclusive workplace.”:</i></p> <p>For all respondents, proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>		reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM employees’ experiences.
Employees who feel valued for their unique knowledge, identities, and cultures	<i>Focusing on the 2024 WES statement (Q30), “My personal background, including my knowledge, identity, and culture, is valued in my workplace.”:</i>	Indicator is compared to 2021 WES. ¹¹	For all respondents , n.a. For select HPSM groups , the reference point is

¹¹ In Workplace Experiences Survey 2021, this question was phrased differently: “My diversity (e.g. lived experiences including knowledge, identity, culture, experiences) is valued in my workplace.; which might have also created some variability in responses.

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
<i>Campus-specific</i>	<p>For all respondents, proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>		zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM employees' experiences.
<p>Students who feel valued for their unique identities, experiences and beliefs</p> <p><i>Campus-specific</i></p>	<p><i>Focusing on the 2024 UES (C4), "I feel that my beliefs, identity and experiences are valued at UBC."</i>:</p> <p>For all respondents, the proportion of respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statement.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>	Indicator is compared to the 2022 UES.	<p>For all respondents, n.a.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM students' experiences.</p>
<p>Students who are respected regardless of their identities and backgrounds</p> <p><i>Campus-specific</i></p>	<p><i>Focusing on the 2024 UES statements, "Students are respected at UBC regardless of their" (C5_0) socio-economic status, (C5_3) religious beliefs, (C5_4) political beliefs, (C5_6) English language ability:</i></p> <p>Proportion of all respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statements.</p> <p><i>Focusing on the 2024 UES statements, "Students are respected at UBC regardless of their" (C5_1) gender, (C5_2) race/ethnicity, (C5_5) sexual orientation, (C5_7) disabilities or ongoing medical conditions:</i></p>	Indicator is compared to the 2022 UES.	<p>For all respondents, n.a..</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the reference point is zero to represent parity (no difference) between HPSM and non-HPSM students' experiences.</p>

Outcome measure	Indicator or baseline indicator	Change from previous (as of 2025)	Reference point
	<p>For all respondents, proportion of all respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement with the above statements.</p> <p>For select HPSM groups, the difference in agreement or strong agreement with the above statement between the selected HPSM group and all other respondents who do not identify in the selected HPSM group.</p>		