

Feedback by Category

August 16 – September 17

Category	Sub-Category	Comments
Introduction		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need picture of continuity and of change • What need to be protected? • What needs to be strengthened? • What needs to be changed? • Why are changes proposed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community perspective ○ Opportunities, etc. ○ E.g. indigenous focus? Why? • Recognize that Senate has authority for many of these items • Important to define Senate procedures • Should reflect what we do (do we need to change?) with rationale for why we do what we do. Then frame the future.
Vision		
	Government Mandate: Regional University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not assume we are only a regional university <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We are presuming what it means ○ More professional programs? ○ short-sighted • Recognise role in assisting community members to move out of social/economic stress to new situations. How do we quantify this? •
	Vision Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability is missing, i.e. creating a sustainable environment (separate bullet) • Students are mentioned only twice: Is this a philosophical shift? • Where is International aspiration? • International: a spin off? • Are we an economic driver?

- **Focus on ends of education**
- **Focus upon our particular student-teacher relationship**
- Vision seems market driven
- **Importance of knowledge, expansion, sharing**
- Rich history of institution
- **Seems like a retreat from the 1st draft, accountability, and bioregion**
- **Has less focus upon ecological sustainability**
- Economic focus: sustainable economy not well defined.
- Accessibility within region and social justice missing
- Community should be a thread not a single activity
- No sense of continuing to do well what we did previously, e.g. academic things
- Did not feel connected to the past
- **We need a common vision that can be supported by the different academic and service areas**
- Concern for language related to application of b/c analysis – needs to recognize regional differences
- Is it too long? Need a concise/succinct pithy measurable statement
- Race = ethnicity
- Issue: discrimination related to program students are in
- Need to **recognize passion for learning** as a goal – creating curiosity
- **Does not provide useful direction/meaning;** seems very general, and is **not inspirational.**
- Seems to do everything; **should focus on learning**
- Learning is buried in Vision
- Bullets imply a rank order (need learning at the top)
- Vision **should apply to all areas of university and not separate out Nanaimo and regional campuses** (leave references to regional campuses to Outreach and Community Engagement plan)
- Needs to identify our core values and distinguish VIU from other
- **Too many values?** E.g. combine celebration and achievement
- Life value – how does it relate to our VIU values; it is too abstract
- **Needs to be expressed in such a way that the message/vision fits all aspects of the overall University (i.e. regional and Nanaimo);** remove all language that seems to refer to only one part of institution
- Is the Purpose Statement about the institution or document?

- I'm also happy to read that **Student Success** may remain as one of our core values at VIU. Teaching excellence, Experiential & Applied Education (which includes Co-operative Education /Internship/Service Learning), Civic & Community Engagement all add value to our students education and potential success.
- Student Success includes giving a student the ability to obtain the very best academic education possible at VIU but Student Success **ALSO** includes the ability to use their great education to follow their dreams after they graduate from VIU.
We often forget that the high majority of our students invest in a post-secondary education to be able to obtain a job and a career. We would definitely continue to encourage support for this mandate.
- p. 9 Sustainability is well represented in the document but does not have sufficient recognition in the Vision Statement. I suggest a separate bullet with words like: Sustainability: we strive to operate our facilities in a sustainable way and to foster a culture of sustainability in everything that we do.
- More consistent reference to students; ***student success and quality of learning experience***
- What does student success look like? Need ***sustainable support and services that lead to student success.***
- Where is reference to students with ***access challenges***, e.g. 1st generation students? Also, inclusion of non-traditional learners.
- Reference to ***life-long learning***
- Open access
- Commitment to ***servicing region*** and responsive to regional needs
- Question if vision provides direction/focus or if it is all things to all people – ***need increased clarity***
- Service side ***needs to know where to direct energy***
- Consider becoming a little narrower and a little deeper
- Important to maintain long term relationship with students
- It is difficult to judge many of the recommendations in that the mission, vision and values are still fluid. If these elements of the organization are to act as a foundation for the development of programs, structures and processes we adopt, then it is not possible to judge the “fit” as we have not yet agreed on the fundamentals.
- We need a clear statement that it is students that are our core commitment - that students come first - the use of technology enables us to achieve this vision by helping us meet the needs of our particular student profile (older, with multiple responsibilities), who would most benefit from a more flexible (eg. hybrid) approach to the delivery of learning experiences.

		<p>Other thoughts to inform the Vision include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The notion of a learning "space", not necessarily a learning "place". ○ Serving students where they are, not where we are. ○ Equipping faculty, staff and students with 21st century skills ○ Appropriate use of technology as a tool for learning - not technology for its own sake. <p>My stab at a vision that encompasses these ideas: The University puts the well-being of students at its heart, and will focus on providing a superior student experience through access to learning spaces, contexts, and encounters both physical and virtual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Loss of centralization of students, where other parts of the document identifies centrality and uniqueness of students, e.g. NSSE
<p>Building a Unique Identity</p>		
	<p>General</p>	
	<p>Cross-Disciplinary Themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not practical for all departments to deliver such content (themes) ● P. 12: para. 3: "We work so that we may live, and live well." I couldn't believe it when I read this sentence; we already live too well! How about "We work so that we may live, and contribute to building a world in which everyone can live well." ● P. 12: para. 5: What are the "five cross-disciplinary themes"? ● Consider adding "exploring opportunities for student language teachers in the Faculty of Education to benefit from the expertise of language instructors within the Faculty of International Education" under Recommendations on p.25. Student language teachers can benefit by spending some time in ESL classes, meeting students from various countries and learning how to communicate with them; ESL instructors can benefit by having student language teachers be language partners for the ESL students and assist the instructor with class activities. ● Cross-disciplinary themes (page 16): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5th theme – Aboriginal Culture – should be about relationships ○ Building a Unique Identity (page 2) – Aboriginal culture: VIU should not build its identity on Aboriginal culture. Leads to question of are we taking that idea and misusing it (i.e. putting in one bottle) ○ An important theme but use of the term 'culture' is problematic

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of ‘engagement’ as a means to direct service action ○ Need broader discussion around the disciplinary themes – what are the possibilities for cross/multi-disciplinary approaches that would benefit students, faculty, community and the institution? ○ Themes need meaning ○ Themes should be measurable ○ Definition of terms, e.g. Aboriginal/Indigenous, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need clarity related to respect; place; need to involve First Nations people ○ Reference need to change and adapt to financial, political, cultural, environmental change ○ Sustainability theme is example of one that changes and there needs to be greater meaning in relation to VIU ○ Reference experiential component with student success and delivery and potential to increase student success thru more experiential focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The cross disciplinary themes present an interesting amalgam of possibilities. In part I am curious as how this list was arrived at. The notion of looking at coastal BC and our place within the world is appealing. However, while themes ii, iii, and iv are laudable and important to all of us as citizens of a global community, it’s not entirely clear what “adopting” them actually means. Moreover, if we were to accept these as organizing principles for our programs, then the list is likely too long to be of practical utility. A tighter focus on two or three of these would seem more appropriate. Further, what are the practical considerations to embedding cross disciplinary themes in the programmatic mix that we have? For example, how might these be integrated into programs outside the BA/BSc stream, particularly at a non-degree level. Finally, it is not clear whether these themes are also intended to point the way to new or more robust areas of specialization or niche programming in our program profile? If this is the case, then further work would be required to actually make the case that such niches existing, and there is merit in our pursuing them. ● Cross-Disciplinary themes–again the issue of cross union jurisdictions becomes an issue. Laddering opportunities with credit being given for completed studies, allowing students to use credits towards further studies, again issue of who has jurisdiction over courses that have assign credits.
	Dynamic Diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Diversity of students should be central ● Importance of maintaining our strength while balancing our role as a new university ● Shared disciplinary learning experiences; diverse community ● Appears that some aspects of regional/Cowichan not adequately referenced, e.g. Student services not discussed in detail

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a community serving students in different ways • Despite an obvious desire to recognize honour, develop, and formalize Aboriginal heritage and presence, I would like to see the overall diversity of our campus population highlighted. • My first comment will be that this plan is slanted I feel towards Academic programs and does not reflect our diversity •
	<p>History</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notion of differentiation from other institutions (student recruitment, work); <i>needs to be based on our history, e.g. t & p</i> • <i>Ensure we recognize what we are doing and have done, e.g. Education Plan</i> • <i>Build upon successes</i> • <i>Can we build on our history and existing strengths?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should be an evolution rather than a revolution? ○ <i>Need clarity to our identity</i>
	<p>Identity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks profile of VIU as we go forward (had to anticipate future of institution), e.g. Grad studies (degree, scale, scope) • <i>Document needs to provide greater clarity of institutional profile</i> and specific recommendations, e.g. Grad studies • Interesting themes in document but <i>need to build on existing strengths</i> and identify deficits • I will now turn to matters of a broader institutional nature, the first having to do with curriculum. The draft plan makes quite a big deal about indigenizing, internationalizing, citizenifying, technologizing and sustainablizing the curriculum, especially the first-year curriculum. Yet it provides no evidence that weâ€™re doing a poor job in these areas. Are we? Should all programs provide all these things in all courses? Can they? Some courses? Which ones? Can they provide these and everything else theyâ€™re supposed to provide at the same time? While a discussion about the first-year curriculum, especially in the BA programs, has been recognized for many years across VIU as one that needs to take place, why these themes? Are there others? And how are these recommendations to be squared with academic freedom and the authority of academic areas to propose curriculum to Senate based on their own expertise? Is it really imaginable that Senate will simply dictate these as priority areas? Why? • Do we need a new identity? • <u>Regarding Citizenship & the Civil Society, page 18:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The plan recommends the development and integration of a “<i>common first year experience</i>” to include global, civic issues, sustainability (page 26) along with other points.

		<p>Why? What is the purpose? Evidently, despite statements later on in the document, the writer does not recognize the nature of our commuter population, part time students, transfer students, working parents and so on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This is tokenism and lip service at its finest. Some years ago the business program discussed the need for a course in Ethics. This discussion came largely in part because of the fallout from Enron and Arthur Anderson debacles, and as such was seen as the knee jerk reaction that it was. The decision was made at that time that rather than having one discrete course that would allow the business faculty to say ‘Okay, we have a course in ethics so no need to discuss it in my course’, that we would work on integrating and threading the issue of ethics throughout the curriculum, throughout all years. ○ Programs at VIU should be encouraged and supported for integrating topics such as global affairs, sustainability, ethics and respect for First Nations throughout their particular curriculum as appropriate, not a top down push. It smacks of wanting to be ‘seen’ as having these critical subjects as part of VIU but not really understanding how or really, why. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In terms of programmatic changes discussed on page 18, there is a reference to a “common first year experience” and “required civic participation” for all students. While these ideas have been mooted in the past, and a have a certain face validity, the discussion does not develop the them in terms of what the current status is, why attention is required for this matter, what such “an experience” might look like, and if and how non-BA/BSc students might participate. In part, this recommendation seems to presume a more typical array of university programs, rather than the eclectic mix that we have and value.
	<p>Uniqueness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Should declare what we do well, what is going on, e.g. creative writing, NSSIE scores ● Needs to retain our specialness/uniqueness ● Need to seek innovative solutions based upon our unique history ● Importance of identity ● What makes us different? Use that to attract students ● Document does not reflect what some do; it should celebrate what we do – much of which is good ● Ignores what we do now/do well ● Don’t mess up what works ● Build on strengths ● Reinforce one institution ● Uniqueness of campus cannot be discussed only with data ●

<p>Community Engagement</p>	<p>Community Engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On pg 9 we are provided with a proposed institutional purpose. I support this construction with a couple of qualifying points. First, the <i>purpose</i> identifies “community engagement” in parallel with “teaching and learning, research and scholarship”. I would encourage considering community engagement as a means (hopefully a preferred means) by which teaching etc. are conducted. While I support strongly the value inherent in this statement, I would like us to view community engagement as a thread that is woven through our core academic activities, rather than as a separate form of endeavour. <p>I also note that in the draft Outreach and Community Engagement plan, there is reference to the work of the Association of Commonwealth Universities and its discussion of engagement as a “core commitment of the institution”. The Association identifies several ways in which “engaged universities” relate to communities outside the campus in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting universities’ aims, purposes and priorities; Relating teaching and learning to the wider world; Enabling dialogue and collaboration between researchers and practitioners; and, Assuming wider responsibilities as neighbours and citizens. <p>In turn, these categories of activity align quite well with the Talloires Declaration and the Carnegie Foundation’s classification for “community engaged” universities. There would be benefit in considering how our definition of this approach aligns with the ACU (if it is used as a foundational document in the development of our community engagement plan).</p> <p>Finally, I note that this section does not explore the meaning of “community”, and the subsidiary question of the degree to which we serve “public good” and “private interest”? These are not issues easily answered, and are topical across many higher ed institutions debating their commitment to community engagement (e.g. which communities for what purposes?). However, I think that we need to acknowledge these questions in the document, and perhaps consider how we might engage in dialogue to address them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement does not mention types of contribution to the community by the trades faculty. HEO program has just completed upgrading 4.78 Km of the Trans Canada Trail for example.
<p>The Learning Experience</p>		
	<p>Changing Conditions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to critically assess the value of the NSSE reports before jumping on a band wagon as it is only one model. By all means we need to improve and build on those areas that we are perceived as being strong and but more work is needed before assuming that one report really reflects the reality of areas that may need improvement.

	Guiding Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is baloney. As a member of this committee since February 2010, to my knowledge we have never made any formal submission to the Academic Planning committee. The only, singular item that we have had agreement on was the Table of Contents outlining the role of the committee back in early spring. Internally, we worked with Steve Beasley of the Student Union with a survey that their organization conducted. The results of that survey were discussed internally but there was no motion to submit the results to the Academic Planning Committee. Yet, much of what is written on pages 38 - 41 seem to come from the survey questions. <p>The statements on page 39“Students will continue to be the lifeblood....”. I can’t believe that someone felt it necessary to even articulate that thought. Doesn’t it go without saying? It seems to indicate that there was some doubt that students are the most critical aspect, in fact the only reason that we exist.</p>
	Core Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing as a practice/pedagogy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 9/39: reading as a key literacy ○ Foundational level and what happens in higher levels, i.e. writing in disciplines • p.34, bullet 10: In my opinion, high quality instruction is a function of many things, such as qualified faculty, small classes, instructor-student rapport, active learning and so on. It cannot be represented by "supportive institution-wide infrastructure". • The statements in this section are all very lovely, fuzzy, feel good, and abstract. The pursuit of ‘life-long interests’ what does that actually mean? What would we actually have to do in order to instill a desire to pursue ‘life-long interests’? Nowhere are there statements that talk about quality, challenges, work, or even education. • On pg 40, the section on “<i>core experiences</i>” opens with statements about “<i>students developing a conceptual understanding of the world around them</i>” and that “<i>programs will foster an understanding of the interdependence of life forms</i>”. As the father of a student in a BSc program at VIU, I applaud these aspirations. However, as a dean responsible for Developmental Ed programs, and a variety of shorter term training programs, I am unclear how these expectations would be actually be achieved.
The Academic Community		
	Academic Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Academic Freedom and Free Speech’ to better clarify notion • Academic Freedom. Unions have long argued for language in collective agreements on academic freedom without success. Does not protect faculty if only in policy of institution, non grievable • Collegiality contributes to student success

- Many examples of collaborations and cooperation
- Necessary **to maintain collegial environment** as students notice it
- p. 43: "Integral to academic freedom and the attainment of academic excellence is the benefit of tenure, rank and title." Rank and title have NOTHING to do with academic freedom
- These questions, for me, are connected with a larger one, regarding the strong theme in the document of respecting "ways of knowing", including indigenous and other cultural ways of knowing. There is a huge current of academic debate here which this document purports to settle (!) at the institutional level. While no one would disagree that the academy should always have as its mission the fostering of respect for the great number of ways of understanding the world that are out there, the academy also originated in a spirit of disciplined criticism and such criticism remains at the heart of the academic enterprise. The document presents itself as equally supporting two horns of a logical dilemma: one the one hand, learning about, combined with uncritical respect for, the received opinions of others as constituting the heart of academic culture; robust academic freedom of inquiry and criticism as constituting that culture on the other. The document cannot have it both ways. There may be a place in the middle but the document neither explores nor identifies it.
- "Respect for all forms of knowledge":
 - I simply do not understand why it is that the academic values section says nothing about the pursuit of truth. Implicit in the above section is an approach to knowledge that is sometimes called "standpoint epistemology." Such a theory of knowledge claims (in essence) that the generation of knowledge is restricted to the standpoint one comes from (whether this is cultural specificity, biology, experience, etc...). The implicit conclusion is that truth cannot be found across such means of inquiry or communities of being. This is an approach to knowledge that has its adherents in universities; it also has its critics. It is a position that is debated. The universal claim of standpoint epistemology is that there is no universal truth but only particular or situated ones (and make no mistake about it: *this is a universal claim*, one that must be argued, not accepted as a value).

Also implicit in the section quoted above is a belief that somehow knowledge and truth claims cannot be argued without the loss of respect. This is a misunderstanding both of the pursuit of truth and of academic respect. Academic respect is based on the giving of arguments, not on *a priori* positions. Moreover, the pursuit of truth is not anathema to respect. Respecting the person is not incompatible with challenging the same person's truth claims. Where would we be in the university if it were?

I get the sense that the Academic Plan is being used to put forth narrow political agendas that are out of keeping not only with an Academic Plan but also out of step with academic freedom, which is, ironically, the very next section in the draft plan.

I also don't think any thoughtful person will accept the draft Plan's account of "academic"

values (how are they *academic* values?). Here is a thought experiment:

Imagine toiling for years doing academic research on a book (of textual analysis, of historical study, a study of some technical problem for concrete form builders, of sociological analysis, etc). Then imagine its publication being met with wide criticisms along the lines of “this is a valid argument for *you* and *those who share your experience or culture or way of being* but it lacks truth value outside of that context.” Who would be happy with this response? The point is that we research to convince others of the truth value of our work and to be respected for our claims, not for our cultural position or for who we are or our way of being. I think this would be true even for someone writing a book giving a theory of indigenous knowledge. This person might argue for specific cultural knowledge but he or she would probably want that to be extended to a claim that all knowledge generation is culturally bound. In short they probably wouldn’t be happy with a response that said: your claims are fine for your way of being but outside of that way of being there is a unified and different truth. The point I want to make is that the academic value is recognition and respect *of the truth claim and its concomitant augmentation* and *everyone* wants this, even if our truth claim is that there is no universal truth claim. But we should get that recognition **in the academic sphere of debate not via an academic plan.**

There are other instances where the draft plan overextends itself to encroach on academic freedom. I note a part in the citizenship section where specific research questions are selected as of value. As a democratic theorist who has published on citizenship theory, I find the questions to be fairly standard ones. The problem is that academic freedom should extend to the questions asked and not have the questions weighted by an academic plan. All research begins with a good question and it is the selection of the right question which marks the first (and perhaps most crucial) point of creativity on the researcher’s part. Sometimes researchers must break with old and stale and accepted questions to find new ones to reorient the research. (sometimes returning to an old question is the better way to get to truth... it depends). The point is that the questions that are of value for a political scientist or a sociologist or a geographer to be asking about citizenship *are to be determined by the academic community as it looks at the research, not by an academic plan... that is if you want to preserve academic freedom.*

I find this draft Plan so strange because in many ways it wants to direct the university towards a traditional model (as in the approach to faculty rank, title and tenure) and yet it erodes the core values of the traditional university. The above section on so called academic values would spell – *if it was truly* lived – the death of the university.

So what do traditional universities say about academic values? Well, I spent only a few minutes perusing some academic plans of traditional universities and what they say about academic values. They do not get all twisted up inventing conflicts between the pursuit of truth and respect; they know that what matters is the sanctity of the university as a place where the argument about truth can happen.

		<p>Here is a sample, which comes from McGill: “Universities embody a hard-won, time-honoured tradition of free inquiry, of following knowledge where it leads, of a tireless quest for data, knowledge, and truth.” Source: http://www.mcgill.ca/strategic_academic_plan/purpose/</p> <p>This simply stated vision is completely at odds with our Draft Plan’s “academic” values. We need to think about how “hard won” the tradition that is being jettisoned truly was. It might be that we would be unintentionally and carelessly jettisoning it through well-meaning but thoughtless writing... but jettisoning it we none-the-less would be if we accepted this draft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support the values identified on pg 43, with a couple of caveats. First, as noted by others, the proposition to accept “all forms of knowledge” needs elaboration to clarify that there is evidence of rigour employed in the generation of said knowledge. This does not assume a “positivist” perspective, but simply that a systematic and defensible approach has been taken to arrive at authentic knowledge. <p>Further, there is no mention of “academic integrity”, which many view as complementary to, and perhaps even more important than, “academic freedom”. Presumably, this is because our adherence to academic integrity engenders the credibility and trust necessary for university members to be entrusted with such freedoms.</p> <p><i>Academic integrity, in our view, is the commitment to stand up for these five values - honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility - even in the face of adversity.</i></p> <p>http://ethics.sandiego.edu/eac/Summer2000/Readings/Principles.html</p>
	<p>Scholarship</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boyer model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ seems like it has been adopted ○ Seems to be a hasty decision ○ <i>Needs more discussion because it influences service</i> • The School of Business is currently accredited by ACBSP in which the Boyer model has been adopted in a modified fashion that expands the definition of review beyond the limitation of exclusively academic peer review. See figure 5.6 of ACBSP Accreditation Standards Model. Our current scholarship practices are more relevant and aligned with our international accreditation. The Chairs of the School of Business would not support any deviation from the current scholarship practices recognized by ACBSP and would advocate that there would need to be multiple definitions of scholarship given the diversity of academic activity at VIU. • On pg 46, we endorse Boyer’s model to scholarship. Personally, I am supportive of this approach, particularly in the expanded form in which Boyer added the “Scholarship of Engagement”. However, the discussion is silent on how we arrived at this as our preferred model. Did we examine several approaches and select this one? For example, Boyer’s work is situated in certain

		<p>traditions of the American post secondary system. Were models of “engaged” scholarship from other institutions in Canada, or in other countries, considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarship must be define to be more reflective our diversity in programs and faulty. How do we define scholarship for a trades instructor. It is difficult for some faculties to access funds for scholarly activity as language/definitions does not equate to what they do. • Expectations for BCGEU faculty are even worse for scholarly activity and institutional service as our teaching load starts in Sept. and continues till the end of June. Student contact hours that are sometimes double that of academic faculty. Funding if you compare what is available for VIUFA faculty and what is available to BCGEU faculty it is abundantly clear that the gap is not acceptable. VIU and Malaspina University does or did not support non academic faculty in anyway that could be considered fair. Unless we address issues such as workload, PD/CD funds, funds for scholarly activity the ability of VIU to bring faculties closer will continue to be a challenge.
	<p>Faculty Evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation (faculty, services, administration) as a process is important <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key questions remain ○ Not necessarily tied to ranking system • Evaluation is important to continually improve • Evaluation should incorporate student evaluation • An evaluation paper with detailed process has been developed previously • Evaluations need to be positive to help instructors grow • How do we hold to our standard of education? • p. 50 rec. 3: "The CFE may also be used as a summative evaluation, in which case it must be matched to the promotion and tenure plan. If the CFE is supposed to be formative, but can also become summative then you can forget the idea that it is formative. If it's primary purpose is for formative evaluation, then it should be only that. • Absent from the draft Plan is a discussion of the responsibility and accountability of management to provide the necessary resources and work conditions required to enable faculty to accomplish their functions and goals as defined by this plan and our existing collective agreement. This must be present in this Plan in order to even consider the evaluation of faculty performance by whatever means and methods may be devised. <p>In the absence of clarity in terms of the proposed approach to performance management in this Plan, there appears to be a conflict with our existing collective agreement (see article 7). Article 7 provides, in particular, the means to address non-performance described as a “professional” concern. Article 8 provides further direction with regard to disciplinary action.</p> <p>We see significant problems with antiquated models of “performance management”. Primarily the document focuses on management of negative performance and not on the pursuit of</p>

		<p>excellence and advancement.</p> <p>The FOM Chairs would be receptive to the adoption of approaches to Appreciative Inquiry (the recognition of accomplishments and leveraging of strengths) and believe these should be the nexus of our practices to foster a supportive culture of achievement throughout the University. The FOM Chairs believe that Appreciative Inquiry supplants the notions of performance management or evaluation and that, as a community of academics, this is a self-driven process that may include multiple stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is discussion of faculty evaluation on pg 49. The choice of the Western Carolina University framework is curious. Though the material seems promising, it is not made clear how we arrived at an approach from this particular school. Is this a notable or exemplary model? Is WCU similar to VIU? More rationale on this would be helpful. • Faculty evaluations. BCGEU has worked very hard with human resources to bring faculty evaluations into the 20 century. We agreed on a process that was we thought was comprehensive and took into account more than just student opinions. We wanted to make faculty feel an evaluation outcome was positive and to be used as a learning tool on where improvements could be made. The BCGEU also agreed that a online evaluation was positive step forward as one of our biggest complaints was how long it took to get results from an evaluation exercise.
	<p>Recognition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rank and title contains many assumptions, is currently over determined <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Based on US models ○ Assumes opposition based on benefit questions ○ Question of cost/who does it? ○ Relationship to interest of students ○ Cross jurisdictional issues require attention – Plan needs to address ○ Keep rank and title separate from competitiveness issue ○ Rank and title does not automatically affect collegiality ○ If tied to salary and workload, rank and title affects collegiality ○ Need evidence of opinions • Rank and title: Senate should discuss (not a recommendation) • Evaluation and rank and title should not be tied together, but examined separately • Rank and title need to be developed for current times. Academic Plan does not need to define final recommendation • Important to recognize the diversity of community (pg. 13) and the fact that rank and title may not be important to all of the communities • Notion of title and how it relates to our unique identity – our flat structure works for us

- Is a **unique institution** – collegial and collaborative now, but **will rank and titles disrupt this?**
- **Issue with tenure** – regularization, and creating that language, took a lot of time
 - Tenure does not help trades
 - Many are left out of tenure track process
- Rank and title as attainment of academic excellence and freedom – is that correct?
- If we did move towards rank and title, **how would we reward?**
- Plan relates rank and title to evaluation – they do not need to be linked
- In regards to rank and title, not everyone is research oriented, how do we sort that out?
- **Question of the plans relationship to contract** (e.g. rank and title, evaluation)
- p. 43: "Integral to academic freedom and the attainment of academic excellence is the benefit of tenure, rank and title." Rank and title have NOTHING to do with academic freedom!
- Imperative to have discussion on evaluation and rank and title
 - Way we operate now is not a good fit with current Faculty structure
 - Plan needs to more clearly articulate process to determine rank and title and evaluation system
- p. 44: This document needs to recognize that our existing collegial atmosphere could be undermined by rank and title.
- Process has appeared **top down** , e.g. rank and title
- I will begin my response to the current draft plan by trying to say something about what I think are its virtues. There are two, I think, perhaps three. The first is a thoughtful discussion about a system of rank and tenure, etc. that might work for VIU. While people make take issue with elements of and even the whole proposal, it's well written, offers a rationale, and a good process for having a meaningful discussion.

Vancouver Island University is at an important crossroads. As Malaspina, it built an impressive legacy of commitment to teaching, trades, and community engagement. As a regional, undergraduate, teaching university, we have opportunities to enhance and extend that legacy without losing the essential elements which have contributed so strongly to past success. As we grapple with making this transition and determining the focus and values of the "new" VIU, it is vital that we carefully consider what attributes have contributed to our success thus far and how we can continue to differentiate ourselves in a positive way from other institutions. What is it about VIU that makes it an educational destination, one that *attracts and retains* students and that differentiates it from what others (UBC, UVic and SFU) offer? The academic plan is not always clear on these points, and the recommendations it contains are often at odds with the purported goals for the institution, especially with regard to the undergraduate learning experience. Rather than comment generally on the plan as a whole, I will focus on one of the core

issues –the role of faculty at VIU in the undergraduate learning experience.

Among the recommendations seemingly at odds with a primary goal of excellence in teaching is that of linking faculty evaluation and rank-and-title. The two have little to do with each other, as is readily apparent when examining the undergraduate teaching records at many research universities. If excellence in undergraduate teaching is in fact a primary goal, then there is no question that VIU does need to expand and improve on its current evaluation process; a two year probationary period, with its lack of peer review and ongoing evaluation, is clearly unsatisfactory in properly assessing how well faculty are doing in the classroom and in helping them to improve. Other elements would also need to be addressed - the systemic lack of recognition for teaching excellence at VIU (for example, there are no teaching awards and no formal institutional recognition of teaching or community outreach). However, while changes to the current system are warranted, there is no evidence that rank-and-title or tenure will address existing concerns and *improve undergraduate teaching* (in fact, quite the opposite). Furthermore, despite repeatedly referring to an institutional focus on undergraduate learning, the current academic plan admits that the model of faculty evaluation and scholarship that it proffers has practical difficulties in implementation, even at teaching-progressive institutions (that is, over time there is a tendency to fall back to the more traditional research-based measures of scholarship and productivity). In the proposed evaluation process, for example, significant weight is given to publication and research grants, even for those engaged in “non-discovery” scholarly activity, but without justification as to how (or if!) these measures serve to forward the primary goal of teaching excellence.

The resources and time commitments required to create and maintain a research program (of any kind) are significant. As most research is funded by outside granting agencies which assess applications based largely on publications, time in the classroom becomes time away from what “really matters” - research and publications - and teaching becomes valued less and less, both by administration and by faculty. Invariably, this leads to an overwhelming emphasis on research over teaching. While the plan mentions the “danger” of this it does *not* offer guidance as to how the proposed model will successfully manage it. Similarly, the plan mentions the issue of time to *perform* scholarly activity but again without concrete recommendations. So how will faculty with substantial teaching loads find time to do original research? It is doubtful that teaching workloads will simply be cut in half to bring us in line with most research-based institutions, given that VIU was created with no additional monies. Thus, either faculty will be asked to add to their workloads or there will be significant restructuring (TA’s, increased class sizes, reduced program offerings). As an example, consider the replacement of an instructor with a lab instructor/TA. It seems innocuous, but continuity and integration between the lab and course suffers, student evaluation is a step removed, and instructors removed from the lab miss out on an experience to interact with and evaluate their students in a way not

possible in lectures. Is the standard TA dominated, research-based university model *really* the best way to offer an undergraduate education?

There is also the issue of differentiating ourselves, especially if we adopt a similar model to others in our area. There are already three large research-focused institutions in the region: UBC, SFU and UVic. We cannot compete with their size, prestige, or resources on a research basis, and it is questionable whether we can attract any *significant* number of students away from those institutions based strictly on research related offerings here (I offer, as one example, the Saturday August 21, 2010 Nanaimo News Bulletin article on ten of the brightest high school students in Nanaimo. Of these ten top-rated students, only two plan to attend VIU; of those, only one plans to actually pursue a degree here. This caliber of student is the kind who, for example, typically goes on to graduate programs, research and academia. If we are *not*, in general, attracting *those* students, then what sort of students is VIU *actually* serving? As part of our plan, and in setting our institutional identity, we need to be pragmatic, realistic and above all *enthusiastic* about the student population we serve now and are likely to serve into the future.). However, VIU can (and does) shine in our ability to offer a more personal, effective *undergraduate experience*. Feedback from students is almost universally the same – they value their VIU experience, especially in comparison to the large classes and impersonal nature of most other universities. Student engagement and interaction with faculty are proven to facilitate *learning* but require time and commitment from faculty to prepare and deliver innovative and engaging courses. Engagement also depends on small class sizes to promote and allow for such interaction. Abandoning or weakening these elements - a focus on teaching undergraduates in small classes, accessible faculty that truly love to teach, and a supportive undergraduate learning environment – does nothing to differentiate us from other institutions and robs us of a chance to excel where the others do not.

Are the standard tenure and rank-and-title models being advocated because they are *shown* to achieve better *learning*, or simply because they are familiar and comfortable to implement and administer? If the goal is truly teaching excellence then the academic plan should contain recommendations that *support that goal* and which *clearly* articulate *how* they do so. I am unconvinced that the model currently put forth best leverages the possibilities available to VIU to achieve its educational goals.

We have a golden opportunity, here and now, to build a world-class *teaching* institution. Why choose as a basis for the future a model which has research as its primary objective and which has been shown time and again to produce an inferior *undergraduate learning experience*? It is almost as if as an institution we are embarrassed to be learner focused or to be seen as primarily a teaching institution. Why? That difference in focus is what distinguishes us from “the rest” and is arguably our biggest promotional asset as an institution. Let us have the imagination and courage to envision, articulate and embrace a model of teaching and scholarship that is truly commensurate with VIU’s stated goals of

		<p>teaching excellence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted previously, the FOM Chairs does not support the proposed approaches to “performance management” and as a consequence cannot support the proposed approach to Rank and Title. In addition, the academic plan does not sufficiently recognize the applied focus of Faculty, many who, along with their academic accomplishments, have significant applied work experience and achievement. Any future consideration of Rank & Title must recognize the competencies that characterize achievement in the discipline of business. This includes traditional academic achievement and / or the achievement gained through applied and practical experience which is consistent with the ACBSP accreditation in the School of Business. There is a lack of clarity in the plan with reference to existing faculty being “grandfathered” (at their choosing) with respect to Rank and Title. “Grandfathered” is not defined and it is unclear what this actually means. • Rank and Title/ Tenure: The BCGEU does not support either rank and title or going to a tenure model. Rank/title does not foster building a strong community of faculty whose main goals are on student success. The BCGEU fought for years for language on how faculty could achieve regular faculty status. Although not perfect from the union perspective, we would defend this language to our utmost ability. I agree we are not a traditional university and for that reason we should not adopt tradition for the sake of tradition • How does tenure affect those teaching in non-VIUFA positions?
Programs		
	<p>Instructional Programs (Program Array)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to focus on student success and breadth of delivery and programming • Not all programs are part of a laddering process • Page 56: Access should be ‘a’ goal, not ‘the’ goal • Page 56 – concern about laddering statement • Underlying assumption that laddering into degree programs is focus (page 56/57) and <i>no value placed on lifelong learning, applied programs, literacy and access, and ABE</i> • <i>Laddering possibilities should be explained</i>, e.g. carpentry into business • The document indicates that work is needed to determine capacity, hours of work and so forth but nothing about class size and of special interest to myself in the business faculty, class composition. • The Draft Academic Plan does not address the need for breadth in university programs. VIU’s current Breadth in Degree Programs policy was drafted quickly when the institution was requesting approval from DQAB (Degree Quality Approval Board) and it has not been applied consistently across programs (and perhaps not at all in some programs). Breadth in learning experience has been recognized as an important component of university education. It also provides an avenue to foster multi-disciplinary connections. Therefore, I encourage the Academic Plan Committee to consider inclusion of language / guidance on this topic in the Plan.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section on Access (pg 56) indicates that “<u>the</u> goal of a comprehensive array is to promote laddering into university programs.”While I can accept this as <u>a</u> goal, I was not aware that it was <u>the</u> goal for our program mix For example, I have always believed that this mix reflected a valuing of a range of learning experiences and outcomes, and that it responded to local and regional interests and needs was also a key reason for such a mix. While someone in hairdressing or HEO may choose to ladder, and this is a strength of our model, there is also considerable merit in those credentials providing designation in their own right. • There is an overview of institutional programs on pg 57. While the document affirms the type of program mix (i.e. developmental ed, trades and tech, university, etc) we plan to maintain, it does not discuss the balance or proportion of activity that we anticipate for the future. Is it expected that the current profile will remain in place, or is it planned to change? Nor does the document speak to the considerations or principles that we would bring to bear in making such broad programmatic changes. I would expect that such a Plan would consider this question and recommend a future profile, and/or the principles and approach with which this balance might be adjusted in the future. To illustrate, there is no discussion about the future scale or scope of graduate programs. However, there is a recommendation to create a Faculty of Graduate Studies. Is it our plan to develop a large number of graduate degrees? If so, why? Further, what is the resource implication for the institution is we expand our footprint in this area? Will all of our graduate degrees be partial or full cost recovery? If so, what implications does this have for the program profile of the institution? • I fully agree that programs should have the ability to partner with one other to offer unique programs combining academic and trades education. The issue becomes a union jurisdiction problem. What union does faculty belong to. Until we work out an agreement on how work is defined, this will be an ongoing problem. • CD program happens all through Nanaimo but misses local perspective • Importance of local input in program and course offerings and student needs; need to retain that model •
	<p>Organization</p>	<p><u>Adult and Continuing Education:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Unbundling of Adult and Continuing Education:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>How will that work?</i> ○ Who will deliver is questionable because of the move ○ <i>Centre for Continuing Studies provides entry point to VIU</i> ○ Will increase fear factor if there is no special continuing studies model

- Distinction between Adult Basic Education and Continuing Studies may get lost
- **Adult Basic Education and Faculty of Education are not a natural fit**
- the observation that the recommendation that instructional Faculties absorb programs offered by CCS and, indeed, many of the recommendations regarding CCS, are not accompanied by evidence demonstrating a sufficient understanding of the complexities involved for me to have any confidence in them. No rationales are given, no exploration of some of the things that might be required, no discussion of the costs or benefits. I have no idea where these proposals have originated from, what problems they’re supposed to address, and what the consequences of going down these roads might be. It would be hard to support such recommendations without an argument that fairly addresses these things.
 - Process question regarding ACE/CAP unbundling idea – seemed to be random
- As a faculty member in FACE (Faculty of Adult and Continuing Education), specifically ABE, I find the recommendation about moving ABE to another faculty particularly curious. I would hope for some discussion about options and some sound rationale before any recommendation about such a change. We have had neither.
- Strong relationship with First Nations training, how will Academic Plan address this work?
 - Getting money for training
 - Training
 - Preparation for transition to Nanaimo
 - Strategic Enrolment Management Plan will address?
- Change in regional plan name: **What are implications for regional campuses and university program delivery?**
- Question moving Continuing Education programs to other faculties (page 71) – **What is the rationale?**
- Implications of unbundling upon certificates and Centre for Continuing Studies – in regional campus a central delivery, e.g. importance of local business cards/contact; if decision not made locally it has implications for credibility
- Question about “unpacking” of delivery of programs – does it mean getting rid of or delivering differently?
- This should be an opportunity to explore value to institution
- Unpacking of Centre for Continuing Studies threatens long term viability – separate profit centre could be wiped out
- **Lack of appreciation for importance in region** and regional credibility
- History – at one time it made a lot of money for VIU

- **Need more thorough discussion of implications of unpacking Centre for Continuing Studies** and how we can continue to deliver in the region
 - Unbundling methodology: **need to explain rationale, i.e. around ABE**. Is it only money?
 - Plays an important role in representing the institution
 - Sense that Centre for Continuing Studies not part of VIU
 - Similarly, for the proposed unbundling of ACE, several recommendations are made that interestingly seem to point away from “economies of scale”. No evidence is offered to substantiate that there is an issue that needs to be addressed, nor to support assertions of potential advantage (e.g. improved laddering for ABE students – if so: how, for whom, other options considered, etc?). Regarding the deconstruction of CS to “regional coordinators”, this suggestion appears unaware of the history of this function, trends in the field, the “efficiencies” realized by a larger unit, or the opportunities that such integrated activities create for those CS personnel working at regional campuses. There is no obvious analysis of the relative strengths and weaknesses of various departmental configurations and approaches.
- The one concern raised that does merit attention is the need to comply with Senate requirements for Faculties composition. Here, if a decision is required prior to a more thorough structural review, I would advocate that CAP stand alone as a Faculty of Access or Developmental Education. This recommendation would be based on the unit’s size and scope, and its critical role as a gateway to post secondary education for many adult learners and a conduit for students flowing into all Faculties in the institution. In turn, Continuing Studies could be constituted as a Division, similar to UVIC or SFU. Legislation provides for the “director” of continuing education to be represented on Senate. Curricular matters for CS activity could be managed at a Senate committee level.
- Finally, the notation on pg 69 discussing CCS funding is, as far as I can discern, the only place in the entire report where a specific unit is singled out for a recommendation on how much funding it should or should not receive. Moreover, no criteria are provided for why 1-2 programs would be funded, instead of 0 or 3-4, or in deed why we would choose to fund or not fund any particular program within the institution.
- Intersession
 - The FOM Chairs view the role that Continuing Studies plays with respect to the summer session as services that could be provided by Registration and Student Services (the FOM Chairs view intersession as being no different than the other semesters).
 - The FOM should manage these courses so as to better integrate these course with the regular semester (offerings, staffing, etc.).
 - As a result of the year round MBA teaching loads, the FOM must often consider these sections as regular workload, this should be standard practice for all of these offerings. This is complicated by the fact that these courses are typically structured so that faculty

must be paid at the sessional rate. Clarity is required in terms of the institutional costs related to delivering a course so that a proper business case can be developed in support of these and other cost-recovery sections.

- The FOM Chairs also notes that there are ongoing issues with respect to support staff during the summer session also need to be addressed.
- Other offerings
 - The FOM Chairs see a continuing role for Continuing Studies with respect to community-based, skill-based courses.
 - The FOM's community engagement plans include the development of the Fraud and Ethics Research and Education Centre and the FOM Research Centre. These centres will be responsible for marketing, developing and delivering community-based contract research and/or training projects for corporate clients.
- First of all, the idea of unbundling the Access, Literacy and CAP departments from the Centre for Continuing Studies is a good idea. I have never understood how providing developmental education could coexist in a partnership with a moneymaking arm of the institution. These are two very separate groups with different goals. The evolving needs of developmental students are inconsistent with revenue generation. I think aligning us with the Faculty of Education or with ESL makes more sense.

Faculty of Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences:

- While I have no issue with the proposition that VIU might, at this time, want to examine its organizational structure for a variety of reasons, this recommendation is, for me, absolutely stunning. First, I note that, while other areas were explicitly invited to the committee's meetings to answer questions about themselves, neither I nor the Dean of Arts and Humanities were ever consulted about what we thought about this proposition and neither were our Faculties. The proposition is not a new one at VIU. It has been discussed in the past and rejected as a) entailing no cost savings (the understanding has been that a well-functioning super-Faculty of Arts, given its size and complexity, would bring increased costs to the institution); b) increasing bureaucracy in what are already large areas; c) the Faculties are already very much integrated in a number of ways and it's not clear that a "super-Faculty" would bring increased integration. I will also observe that the draft plan appears to completely ignore the high level of integration of the Faculty of Social Sciences with the Faculty of Science and Technology (it offers BSc programs) and its deep connections with Management, and Health and Human Services with which it has engaged in a number of highly successful, significant research and development collaborations over the years (maybe they should all be integrated into one Faculty?).

I would like to point out, however, that the assumption that Social Sciences somehow has a more natural "fit" with Arts and Humanities than these other areas, which would somehow result

in a blossoming of integration and collaboration if the two were put together, perhaps sadly, flies in the face of history and the nature of the disciplines in each Faculty. And this has nothing to do with the way the Faculties regard each other, which is generally highly. Possibilities for integration have always existed at VIU as the cross-Faculty cooperation, integration and collaboration of Social Sciences with other Faculties should make abundantly clear. If the Social Sciences' integration with Arts and Humanities has not been as broad and deep as it has been with other areas, it's likely that the potential simply has not been as great. Certainly a super-Faculty of Arts would certainly not erase the disciplinary distinctions among its existing divisions (fine and performing arts; humanities; social sciences) and, as a much larger bureaucracy, it's hard not to see the current nimbleness of these areas being eroded in such a large, heterogeneous area.

And, of course, one wonders about the Arts programs which lie outside Arts and Humanities, and Social Sciences (e.g. Economics, Phys Ed, CYC). Where will they go and how will they connect with the other Arts' programs.

Further, what will happen to the Social Sciences science programs (which are taught by some of the same people delivering the arts' programs)? Given the potential size and complexity of the programs that would fall into such a Faculty, is it reasonable that they give up three of their Senate seats? What message does that convey about the place and importance of the largest set of programs at VIU?

The recommendation to merge the two Faculties for the sake of integration, however, ends up being completely undercut by proposals that are made later in the document. It is recommended that Political Science and Global Studies move to International. The assumption seems to be that Political Science is an international relations or comparative politics program, which it is not. Its program requires students to study Canadian and provincial politics as well as intense political theory. Is it to be revamped into something other than it is? Global Studies, in turn, is not a department. It is an interdisciplinary social sciences program, whose courses and faculty are supplied, overwhelmingly, by five Social Sciences departments. There are only 7 Global Studies courses that make up any GLST degree. Are the courses and faculty in the five other departments to be moved to International as well? Who will these faculty report to?

Where will their appointments reside? Which Faculty Councils will govern what aspects of which curriculum in these areas? Or, will International simply become the new Faculty of (International?) Social Sciences? Social Sciences has long had a high level of international content in all of its program areas. Why then move only Political Science and GLST to International? Why not move chunks of the rest as well?

If so, it's easy to see that the proposed merger of Arts and Humanities with Social Sciences is not a merger really at all. It's really a proposal to gut the Social Sciences (and some Humanities) qua Social Sciences (unless there were far, far more faculty members in these areas than there are), and to assign much of them to International and the Faculty of Indigenous Studies leaving the rump (Liberal Studies, Philosophy and Psychology) to the now-not-so-super-Faculty of Arts (with maybe a few other Social Sciences activities going to Milner to work with the new Centre

envisaged there, and other pieces of Psychology and Geography going to the Faculty of Science and Technology).

How any of this would improve things at VIU, I have no idea. Students line up for our current Social Sciences offerings, all of our programs are highly wait-listed and demand for them has been consistent for years. Whether the proposed dispersal of Social Sciences programming to other areas will attract the same number of students would remain to be seen.

VIU certainly does not have the number of social scientists that would be required to support its existing programs as well as integrate offerings with Faculties of International and Indigenous Studies. And yet, without such integration, it is hard to see where these Faculties would get the critical mass to offer substantial programs. Certainly the current ability of the Faculty of Social Sciences to act as a facilitator of integration and collaboration across wide areas of VIU would be eviscerated were its programs to become solely focused on International and Indigenous activities.

For all of these reasons, I find myself asking what problems any of the above recommendations are designed to solve, what enhanced opportunities and improvements they will bring, and what some of the real consequences of these recommendations might be that are simply not identified or explored in the draft plan. While the net result of such changes might be a university with a nifty market niche, the cost would be to programming with a long history of success with students, to programming that students consistently enroll in, to faculty expertise (where will those political theorists go?) and to an important source of academic integration and collaboration across VIU.

For example, the plan suggests that merging AH and SS would realize “economies of scale”. If so, what are they? Would there actually be any savings? What rationalization might be achieved? What are the examples of success alluded to? Are there any contraindications?

Faculty of Indigenous Studies:

- Given the very few programs that even the document notes that VIU offers in this area, the largest being FNAT and the CYC program, where will this Faculty get sufficient critical mass and coherence to function as a Faculty, especially as the FNAT program has had huge enrolment challenges over the years (it simply fails to draw sufficient student interest to comfortably support the program). It seems hard to imagine how such a Faculty would merit the three Senate seats lost by the super-Faculty of Arts unless the Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities courses with indigenous content (a great number of Anthropology and Geography courses, for instance) along with faculty with expertise in these areas, are to be assigned to this new Faculty.
- On pg 31 there is a recommendation to consider the feasibility of creating a Faculty of Indigenous Studies, while on pg 69 there is a recommendation to create such a Faculty. Here the initial recommendation seems to follow from the argument developed in the accompanying section. The second recommendation is not buttressed with this same robust rationale. Moreover, the former recommendation aligns with my earlier suggestion to conduct an organizational review in a more comprehensive fashion. If Aboriginal Education is to be one of our key themes and areas of

specialty, then we will want to determine the best structure and service mix to enable this goal.

- **Support Aboriginal section**, discussion and involvement of elders, and increased support for faculties and aboriginal awareness
 - Question the viability of a Faculty of Indigenous Studies
 - ***This is an area where VIU can distinguish itself***
- ***First Nations Studies concerned about Indigenous Faculty proposal. Arts and Humanities would like First Nations Studies to remain where it is***

General

- There is no mention of the role of Associate Deans although this level of administration is already in place in some departments on campus. What is the role of the Associate Dean? Where would the money come from to pay for that position?
- Another omnibus consideration relates to the report's recommendations regarding decanal and administrative restructuring across the institution. I would strongly support the proposition that, given a common understanding of our mission, values and goals, and our programmatic profile and direction for the future, we should analyze the Faculty and administrative and service structure to determine how best to support these institutional directions. However, in the draft Plan we are presented with a number of very specific recommendations to change several Faculties, without a clear articulation of issues addressed, rationale for these suggested action, and implications of making these changes. A more grounded, thoughtful and integrated development and examination of options is indicated.
- First, I contend that any realignment of resources or departmental units needs to consider how the change supports the mission and goals of the institution, and more particularly, how the change will benefit students, or, if the realignment is to save money, then how this will avoid or minimize degradation of educational quality. The current analysis is silent or weak on these points.
- Role of chairs in plan is to facilitate scholarship – this is the Dean's role
- With respect to Reporting Structure, the regional campus principal should be an Operations Manager and all teaching departments (ABE, UP, Applied) should report directly to the appropriate Dean in Nanaimo.
- How does regional administration fit into Nanaimo administration? Question need for a Dean?
- Cowichan does things differently because it is smaller
- Ability here to ***respond quickly*** e.g. late registration, interest, and student advise
- Need to ***address the trades feeling of isolation and disconnection from "university"***
- Cowichan should be seen more and 'Nanaimo' Deans, etc., should make a presence
- Question of staffing levels – therefore people need to wear different hats to address different

needs; can do that at Cowichan because *constantly focused on students* and ability to easily work with others on campus

- How we report – part-time people have numerous reporting line, is there a solution?
- Lack of voice of regional principle should be rethought
- I am vehemently opposed to appointing a regional dean. The Cowichan Campus has suffered over the years by not being fully integrated with the main campus activities and initiatives. If anything, the various departments on our sites should be reporting directly to their deans with the deans holding the budgetary responsibility for the members of their faculty on ALL sites. I note that this was proposed in the academic plan and I fully endorse it. I would like to see much more integration with the Nanaimo campus and not continued fragmentation. This would provide for more consistency for students across the institution.

I think our current situation causes inefficient use of resources and duplications in services. In particular, the administrative allocation on this site (Cowichan) is excessive. If we were all reporting along decanal lines, we would only require a facilities manager on site with a considerable savings to the institution. The old model of having a campus principal evolved from the community college model that had far flung campuses across a large geographic area. This obviously does not apply to the Cowichan Campus of VIU with our close proximity to the Nanaimo Campus. With the increasing sophistication of real time communication systems, the need for regional autonomy is even less.

Graduate Studies:

- Do we need a separate Faculty of Graduate Studies?
 - ***Concerns about future grad program management***
 - Not convinced
- As currently drafted, the Academic Plan is unclear with respect to the proposed Faculty of Graduate Studies. At most universities this is a support and service department that helps faculties to coordinate their graduate student body from application to graduation. If this is what is intended then it would not constitute a separate Faculty. The FOM Chairs are supportive of a service department being established in this role.

If the Academic Plan is instead considering establishing a Faculty comprised of faculty teaching at the graduate level, then the FOM Chairs have the following comments:

1. There are no distinct graduate studies faculty. All graduate instructors teach in undergrad and grad and are resource managed via departments. This provides for flexibility in planning in resource management.
2. The integration of faculty across both our graduate and undergraduate programs is

essential. The graduate program could not support fulltime independent faculty on its own nor could the undergraduate program support the breadth of faculty specialization currently available to it as a result of being able to 'share' faculty with the graduate program. This interchange is also a function of our "applied orientation" in the graduate programs. This situation may be unique within the FOM as pure research studies are not currently a focus of the graduate program. This situation is not expected to change in the future.

3. The FOM School of Business's ACBSP international accreditation necessitates a balance of qualified PhD level faculty throughout both undergraduate and graduate programs. If we separated faculty into graduate and undergraduate faculties it would lead to losing our international accreditation.
 4. The FOM Chairs acknowledge efficiencies and learning opportunities for coordinating graduate students across the institution. Our current approach eliminates silo management and facilitates interdepartmental integration between academic and support departments as evidenced by our MBA program.
- Consider adding "linguistics" as one of the Master's degree to help transform VIU into a global campus.

International Education:

- The FOM Chairs view International Education ("IE") as a service and support function, not as an academic faculty.

If IE were to become an academic faculty, there are potential conflicts with regard to directing international enrolments to their faculty and directing practices to faculty members that conflict with pedagogy / concern for quality education.

IE is tasked with and does a very effective job at marketing the university internationally. It is not and should not be tasked with delivering academic programs.

IE, in consultation/coordination with the various academic faculties, should have a leadership role in identifying and establishing VIU's presence in new markets, enhancing VIU's position within existing markets and facilitating "internationalization" efforts at VIU, at all levels including institutional, faculty and students.

The current budget model with respect to IE and the academic faculties does not recognize the current realities of program and course delivery requirements. As it currently stands, it is negatively impacting the quality of education and learning. It also results in conflicting objectives between IE and the academic faculties. The FOM is most directly affected by these.

The proposed organization of academic disciplines within IE does not appear to be supported by a coherent argument. As a result these proposed changes are not supported by the FOM Chairs.

**Assessment and
Prioritization**

- **Need to rationalize any program restructuring, i.e. identify consequences**, as well as data and financial consequences
- **Implications on what faculty do and their time, e.g. P. 81: research services relationship to collective agreement**
- Academic plan making gestures to these matters requiring serious debate
- Assessment and prioritization piece needs increased budget accountability and discussion
- Viability and Sustainability may vary by location
- Need to be more responsive – Powell River innovation (envelope process) as a model
- Powell River able to make quick decisions/responses
- Lack of transparency in decision making/planning re: regional campuses
- **Commitment to keep regional campuses open and viable with an assessment of viability regarding numbers. Need a different, sensible, model recognising the populations numbers as separate cohorts.**
- All education/learning is important and has value – how do you measure that in a cost/benefit analysis?
- Analysis seems quantitative – needs qualitative analysis
- Quantitative analysis:
 - Subjective
 - Types of data used
 - Need involvement here
 - E.g. ABE #'s (class size is composed of many separate cohorts)
- **Evaluation process not considering needs/elements of areas**
- Need to retain local envelope accountability and needs to reflect **local context that addresses local issues/needs**
 - Needs to be consistent with VIU mandate
- **In regards to programming, how do we determine relevance and responsiveness** with the range of interests
 - Needs to make clear who is responsible for making that decision
- Need a local flavour, not from afar; program planning has been cut back 50%
- Cuts affect overall management and delivery at Cowichan
- As centralization occurs, will decisions be made that detrimentally affect regional campuses?
- Can not apply similar economics of scale between varied sized delivery areas
- Potential to build on regional campus strengths and move to increased collaboration across

		<p>institution, e.g. Centre for Continuing Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second is its recommendations on program priority planning. While overly wordy, far too long and overly determined, it gives recognition to a top priority for VIU that is almost universally recognized across the institution. It could, however, be summed up in a paragraph with a couple of references. The third area concerns evaluation of programs and people. Good stuff, worth debating and doing something about, but it too could be summed up in a few paragraphs with references. • What happens when a program does not meet whatever criteria is finally agreed upon? • Pg 73 recommends that the evaluation template is to be applied to the assessment of regional sites. In principle this is a sound recommendation. However, there is considerable work required to achieve this, particularly if we want to consider not only the programs operating at those sites, but also the role(s) that they play in their service areas. In addition, if we are apply such metrics to programs and sites, then similar assessment should be used with our services, to ensure best deployment of resources to achieve academic goals.
<p>Academic Support Services</p>		
	<p>General</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invest funding to support innovation realistically and ensure that innovation is nurtured with institutional support. • I couldn't help but notice that the section on Academic Support Services only listed academic and non-academic support, but went into considerable detail in First Nation Student Services, Research Services, Library Services, the Teaching and Learning and Technology Centre. In particular, I noticed that the Library and the TLTC had very long lists of recommendations and ideas for consideration—were there opportunities for input from that centre that other areas of Academic Support Services did not have? If so, why? • Academic Plan should link academic and service side – need collaboration • Academic Plan should be our growth management plan • Need to recognize that <i>'student life/well being' is critical to student success</i> • How do we work with students to generate useful and appropriate data (capturing student experience)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exploring student involvement in 'new' ways and of student engagement methodology
	<p>Student Services (Academic & non-Academic)</p>	<p><u>Student Support Services:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic student services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where is financial aid, writing centre

- **Need in depth discussion** of restructuring – why was this recommended?
- **Focus on communication**
- List is odd
- Concern for division between academic and management side of student services (**needs massaging**)
- Pg. 38 – need to invest in increased student support and **need more discussion on student services (see Ohio State University Academic Plan [20 pages])**
- How do we adapt what we do to what learners want and how does that relate to our delivery of what is needed?
- Student Services restructuring:
 - **How was Campus Career Centre placed in non-academic area** (e.g. they have full-time faculty)? They need to be placed in the academic area
- Appears that **some aspects of regional/Cowichan not adequately referenced**, e.g. Student services not discussed in detail
- Student services: **Role as teaching** and rank and title and how it affects all
- **Reference importance of student support** in new and existing programs (leads to student success)
- **How do you separate out experiential component from academic, e.g. Campus Career Centre?**
- Problem creating an academic divide
- Services that support student life, e.g. food services, housing, could be placed in separate service function
- First Nations Student Services are very much a part of Student Services
- **Need clear service structure to identify roles and responsibilities**
- Need to examine **disconnect between our rhetoric and our practice**
- Appears to be a contradiction within document between elements of the plan
- Strengthen connections between our populations on campus
- What is the critical part of Student Services that needs to get into the Academic Plan?
 - A continuum of student experience – Student Services touches all of that experience.
 - **Providing clarity for student experience and support for student success**
 - **Need to fill gaps between what we currently do and what we need to do**
 - Institution is unbalanced
 - Adding new programs has implications upon service side
 - Important to identify importance of Student Services and other services to institutional success

○ **Need data that supports decision making and service investment**

- Increase evaluation of our student service side – need to do it strategically
- ***Need to meet and integrate student services across campuses***; share resources and ideas with other campuses. There is a need for cross-training and planning policy development
- ***Concern with proposed division of student services, e.g. health and wellness***
- What is interface/linkage between Aboriginal Student Services and Student Services?
- What happens to Aboriginal students at Cowichan campus where Aboriginal students numbers are increasing?
- ***Pieces missing regarding Aboriginal student advising; Aboriginal student centre***
- In 20 years, Aboriginal student numbers have grown exponentially
- At Cowichan there is a different delivery model, e.g. student services is smaller and addresses a variety of needs
- Challenged by academic and non-academic student services separation (how was this determined?) – ***seems to be in conflict with collaboration notion on page 2***
- Comprehensive approach to students seems to be detrimentally affected by recommendations for split of student services
- ***Student services history has been one of good collaboration*** – it may be possible to make student services more efficient but it is a big topic that requires more careful thought
- ***Opportunity to create a Student Services Plan***
- Issues of growth in instruction versus lack of growth in services, e.g. 43% increase in number of students with registered disabilities
- Frequency and intensity of ***student service needs increasing significantly***, therefore, strain upon service delivery increasing
- Lack of health and wellness centre affects employee and student well being
- Experience in all aspects of health and wellbeing including recreation is important
-

Campus Career Centre:

- On Page 78 & 79 it describes the breakdown of the departments divided into these new proposed areas. David, to be honest, I am quite perplexed of how the Campus Career Centre was placed in the “Non-Academic Student Services” area rather than the “Academic” Student Services ???
- I would like you to reconsider this placing the Campus Career Centre in the Non-Academic Students Services based on the following information:
Of our 12 full-time employees in the Campus Career Centre --- **8 are FT Faculty** with instructional

		<p>responsibilities included in their job descriptions.</p> <p>In fact, of all 12 departments listed (including the 6 departments proposed for the “Academic” Student Services area) the Campus Career Centre is the only department that is directly involved in the teaching and full delivery of CREDIT courses. The Campus Career Centre is responsible for approximately 220 credit hours of coursework related to Experiential Education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference experiential component with student success and delivery and potential to increase student success thru more experiential focus <p>Writing Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values: reading and writing are a key ingredient, and should be seen as practice as well as a part of critical reading, academic reading, disciplinary knowledge, and interdisciplinary knowledge. • Writing Centre: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ only mentioned twice ○ relationship to learning centre ○ a key institutional delivery
	<p>Research Services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Office will be greatly impacted by Academic Plan and plan needs to detail implications • Focus on research dealing with region and communities can isolate some faculty whose area is not region related <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Currently there is an issues of load of time ○ Research Office should support those people who have time and interest ○ Curiosity driven research is important • Pg 66 includes a recommendation for a new administrative organization structure that positions VIU to build national credibility... in research. The next page suggests that such a structure will “optimize opportunities for cross-disciplinary collaboration”. This recommendation is illustrative of the concern raised earlier, regarding recommendations appearing with no logical development. The previous several pages seem to be profiling the strengths that VIU has built in a relatively short period of time. If we are to consider developing a new structure to coordinate these activities, there needs to be a more thoughtful explanation of the problems or opportunities that the existing model is unable to address, and how the “new model” would ameliorate these issues.
	<p>TLC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is its focus? Is it teaching, technology? This will influence how people work there and access it • I value the work that TLTC do, and participate often, but there seemed to be some confusion as to

		<p>the role of the centre. The mandate of the centre is clearly to provide services to support <i>employees</i>, but it seems to be interested in supporting <i>students</i> as well (p 87). Communication and collaboration is important, but the distinction between services for students and services for employees must be clear. Imagine telling a student at Powell River that she should go to the TLTC for learning support! The comment on page 87 that <i>the TLTC would like to be involved with supporting student success considering a majority of the TLTC team already support students with Moodle questions and issues</i> is not a reflection of an increase in students needing to be supported by the centre, but rather of the rapid increase in Moodle offerings and the merging of Technology with the Teaching and Learning Centre. Learning Support Services is a function of Student Services and if offered by Education Counselors. If students are not aware of this, then more needs to be done to highlight the services offered.</p>
	IT/IS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT appears to be top down – <i>identity real problems/issues first and then seek solutions</i> • Need to address the top down delivery of technology and explore opportunities to make better use of regional expertise thru delivery back to Nanaimo, e.g. Mac support not present • <i>IT Plan should include: VIU technology and associated support be delivered by student needs</i>
Administrative Infrastructure		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are we out of balance? ○ Should we be spending more money? ○ <i>Where is this coming from? Needs more rationale</i> ○ How will the money be spent? • On pg 94, there is an assertion that the administrative infrastructure support services are inadequate. Before endorsing or rejecting this pronouncement, there needs to be empirical evidence provided • <i>Support services are also critical</i> to student success – these areas are under resourced (to students and to other student service areas)
	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern for capacity if program planning function not replaced • Need a local flavour, not from afar; program planning has been cut back 50% • Cuts affect overall management and delivery at Cowichan

<p>General Questions and Comments</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Campus has nurturing role in the community and in students lives.</i> • Too much on environmental issues – support student critical thinking instead • How is this planning work being financially supported? • Confirm equal value of all campuses, e.g. on-line Powell River to Nanaimo, not just Nanaimo outwards • <i>Would we come at Academic Plan differently if not a budget issue?</i> • Consider putting up international flags representing the countries where VIU students come from, not just in the Bldg 255, but also in other major areas, such as the library and the student services building. • It would make sense if the Academic Plan asserted the reduction of a small barrier of non-profit’s having to pay a rental fee for university spaces as one way to increase dialogue between community associations and the university. This is especially so given the Draft Plan’s apparent commitment to community engagement. • Unlike the well-written section on rank and tenure, much of this document appears to be cut and pasted, highly repetitive and, most important, includes highly controversial recommendations with little or no rationale for their inclusion, and little exploration of the consequences of their adoption. • Further, many of the recommendations and observations in the document are inherently contradictory. It’s also not at all clear to me where some of them originated. • Did not identify the key, specific issues needing to be addressed right away (e.g. the budget situation, burgeoning wait-lists) and how what it proposes is at all connected to any of these things; • offers no suggestions as to which issues are of higher priority than others and why; • proposes that we’re trying to do too much with too little but includes recommendations for which the costs and resources (never analyzed) would be much higher than what we spend now; as a solution to this problem, it suggests that we can’t be all things to all people (true) yet it proposes adding even more things to the institutional agenda than what we have now (unless it’s all to be accomplished through the complete re-purposing of much of Social Sciences and some of Arts and Humanities); • it stresses the need for data and evidence in educational planning and yet offers almost none to support its own recommendations (the claim that our administrative areas are starved appears to be based upon anecdotal evidence alone, and no comparable comparison of the health of our instructional areas with other institutions is offered, let alone entertained as an area for investigation); • it stresses the need to focus on and promote our NSSE scores while suggesting that VIU has to do
----------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

much to improve its teaching and learning climate, a conclusion the scores themselves do not support (the material on teaching and learning [apparently cut and pasted from other documents, like much else], while not a problem in itself, seems to suggest that we engage in a lot of the same practices as other institutions when we demonstrably do not).

- At its meeting on September 1, 2010, the Faculty of Social Sciences passed the following motion concerning the current draft of the academic plan: “That this body direct the Dean to inform the Vice President that this document is insufficiently refined and lacking the detail and rationales required to allow for fruitful feedback and input; we are looking forward to the next draft.”
- There is a great absence of metrics and financial implications that makes this plan inoperable. Some key issues exist regarding the quality of accessible information on registration and recruitment, costs and budgeting processes. There is a great lack of transparency and relevancy in the financial impacts of decisions at the Faculty and Department level. Rational processes to arrive at institutional priorities need to be brought into the process of the refinement and implementation of this plan.

The Plan also needs to include data on and discussion of the performance of VIU relative to its peers. This discussion must be comprehensive and must move beyond simply addressing the NESE score.

The FOM Chairs understand that the Vision Statement has been decoupled from the Academic Plan and, as such, we have not addressed its deficiencies in the response to the Academic Plan.

- Finally, I would offer an observation regarding the process that we have followed to reach this stage in developing the AP plan. At the outset of this process, I believe that there was considerable optimism and support for the initiative, founded on a belief that an integrated approach to planning and development was indicated and long overdue. Through this collaborative effort, we would have an opportunity to shape a future direction for the university. However, over the past six months, we have eroded considerable good will for and confidence in this process, not to mention the eventual product.

Further, in this journey I believe that at least some members of the institution have been treated in a way that signals that their past contributions are not of value. Clearly, a process that explores new possibilities for the future will almost certainly precipitate change, where we cease to engage in certain activities in lieu of new directions that are pursued. However, for members of the institution whose focus of work must change or cease, this does not negate the contributions that they have made to the institution across time, on activity that was thought to be of importance to the university. I would hope that when the university undertakes such planning processes in the future, it attends more closely and sensitively to messages and action that signal value, or lack thereof, for those affected by the consequent change.

- Many people work on multiple campuses – we are one community and ***we have common goals***
- Nanaimo campus should not be called “Malaspina Campus”; that name should be used for theatre,

		<p>etc. Campuses should be VIU @ Cowichan, VIU @ Nanaimo, VIU @ Powell River, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise we have gone through major restructuring, but have not caught up to that reality • Part of organizational restructuring discussion should involve those with experience in the changes • How we sell ourselves is important • Key to create interface that supports student success • How you do it is key • Efficiency and production should be simply numbers • Need to recognize there are many forms of learning and that learning happens everywhere, e.g. student employment opportunity on campus; field trips; student co-ops; internships; experiential learning. Need more focus and discussion upon learning across the institution • International students are not discussed in detail; what is future for international students? • Page 57 – ESL is listed under pre-entry to University, however, many have completed some university or high school and are included with high school students, this is not respectful. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two top levels of ESL should give students credit • Concern for inequity of workloads, e.g. nursing department has 32 hours/others have 24 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collapsing into larger class sizes decreases learning experience and increases workloads
Plan Format		
	Define	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of community: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A conflict? ○ Needs clarity → in engagement of international students. • Lack of clarity on delivery of several matters, e.g. sustainability, indigenous • Need definition of what constitutes a Faculty • Need clarification around open University with language that addresses that • Definition of terms, e.g. Aboriginal/Indigenous, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need clarity related to respect; place; need to involve First Nations people • Sustainability theme is example of one that changes and there needs to be greater meaning in relation to VIU • Page 56 – question regarding Access policy and entry requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is this external access or Access? • What does access to education mean? For whom?

	<p>General</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to develop consistency between definition of issue, solution, and recommendation, eg. Combining of faculties, faculty of graduate studies • Take an organic approach • Concern that this reads as a traditional university document that is fixed • Needs to be concise and readable • Instil confidence that methodology is sound • Document makes good effort to address educational issues but creates too much language; needs to be more concise and use plain language • Anticipated statement of principles, overarching goals, plan seems prescriptive e about unarticulated issues; should be more about principles/process • Regarding the library information, the data provided was helpful (and was one of the few sections where such data was provided). However, both this section and the TLTC needed to be edited and recommendations reviewed and culled. Particularly for the TLTC, what are the priorities relative to broader institutional goals? • Focus need to be on professional development; student success • Important that Academic Plan focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Student success ○ Learning ○ Facilitation of what instructors do, i.e. advise/support for students • Concern Academic Plan is bloated and does not address real issues •
<p>Process and Implementation</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern for some recommendations that do not seem to have a basis in process • Need to link ideas to rationale • Some ideas have been discussed and others parachuted in • Concern about how to provide comments especially for those feeling directly affected • Describe process for on-going change in the Academic Plan • What happens between needs, words and actions? Need mechanism to respond in a timely manner. • Important to be aware that Senate has limited resources in relation to recommendations calling for a senate sub-committee and prioritization of items • The proposed plan raises some very real resource considerations, not only in terms of the potential

cost of some proposed structural and programmatic changes, but simply in relation to the capacity of the Senate and/or administration to manage the number of committees or work groups proposed. In part, this may be a matter of establishing priorities and sequencing. However, we are already stretched thin in terms of the people available to participate on various institutional committees and working groups. If establishing a cadre of new committee, we will need to have considered priorities for action, and how to manage the human resource and work load implications.

- **Concern for timeline** and does Senate reflect all interests?
- I think that this document recognizes and attempts to address many of the **issues** that are causing problems at VIU, rapid growth and change being among them.
- Where is the **funding** going to come from for all the recommendations? It seems to be that we are going full tilt now, and we have been in cutback mode for several years.
- Mind you, I have subsequently been told by members of the committee itself that they're not sure where many of the recommendations in the plan have come from either, and that the committee has never had an opportunity to endorse the current draft. And, while the web-page for Integrated Planning leads one to believe that a great deal of consultation has gone in to the development of the draft plan, this has not been my experience at all. Rather, various documents have been presented to me and to my Faculty with little opportunity for discussion, we were asked few questions, no minutes were taken, and I have never been asked for advice on some of the more significant recommendations in the draft plan. I am not someone who is opposed to institutional change. I've embraced it and contributed to it. My astonishment at some of the recommendations in the document is that I don't know where they have come from (minutes of the committee are far too sparse for an outsider to get any sense of this, no minutes of any consultation meetings appear to have been kept), and they seem disconnected from any data-supported considerations of the realities of where I work and spend most of my days. Given the magnitude of some of the changes being proposed, I would have expected far more due diligence and considered explication before they were released to the public.
- The document would benefit from even a cursory explanation of methodology. This would help the reader to understand the process by which the key questions or issues to be addressed by the plan were identified, how evidence was collected and analyzed, and what criteria were employed to formulate the proposed recommendations (i.e. was a search done of how other institution's tackled similar challenges? Were options weighed in terms of pros and cons?).
- Overall, there is unevenness to the document. Some sections are quite thoughtful in describing a context, providing some measure of analysis and offering recommendations that build on the analysis. In a couple of sections, there are even "next steps" offered. In other instances, the recommendations appear with no or little indication of what the issue is that needs to be addressed and/or why the proposed recommendation would make any difference in improving the circumstance of the institution.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On a related point, there are a number of recommendations contained in the plan which lack a logical development as to: the issue being addressed, including evidence assembled to validate the perspective; options considered to rectify the situation; and how this particular option was chosen. Hence, evaluating the need for and the potential benefit from many of the recommendations is difficult. In addition, the variation of specificity of the recommendations gives unevenness to the document. Some recommendations are highly general while others prescribe very particular actions. A more consistent style and structure would be beneficial. Further, the manner in which some recommendations seem to materialize in the document does, I believe, contribute to a perception that certain outcomes were preordained and that the plan is simply a vehicle with which to deliver these decisions.
<p>Students</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our students are unique/different therefore VIU needs to respond to our particular group of students • Diversity of students • Need to prioritize students and measurement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where are they from? ○ How are we/they doing? ○ Follow-up ○ Managing student ‘lifetime of experience’ needs a stronger focus • Important to focus on student success and breadth of delivery and programming • Need to value relationships with local students, families, communities – these are special
<p>OCEP</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public good versus private interest? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where do we fit? ○ How, and where, do we direct our capacity regarding private interest? ○ Should encourage that conversation • Who we serve needs to be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Start with who the community is ○ Partnerships • Change in regional plan name: What are implications for regional campuses and university program delivery? • Issue of connection to Senate – need a standing committee that addresses regional delivery issues

(page 11)

- I had the same response regarding **regional campuses**: What is this document based on? I have a deep interest and a long career in supporting VIU students at the Cowichan Campus. I was not consulted, the type of learning support we offer through Student Services was not recognized, and I was left wondering if I was reading the wrong document! Clearly, regional campuses (or at least this one) are not fully represented in the plan. Why not?
- I would like to bring up a specific problem around community-based non-profits' access to university space. I raise this with the Academic Plan Committee as I think it is related to the concern with community engagement expressed in the Draft Plan. No distinction is made between a non-profit society that works in and for the community and a for-profit business seeking to use university space. If we want to be more open to engaging the community, should we be charging community-based non-profits who want to use our space to increase collaborative work or simply generate more dialogue between VIU and the communities it lives amongst? (SEE "A Team" document) It would make sense if the Academic Plan asserted the reduction of a small barrier of non-profit's having to pay a rental fee for university spaces as one way to increase dialogue between community associations and the university. This is especially so given the Draft Plan's apparent commitment to community engagement.