AGENDA

1. Approval of the Agenda
2. Approval of the Minutes of December 17, 2010
3. Discussion of Academic Priorities and Vision documents
4. Adjournment

Next Meeting
February 25, 2011
9:00 am – 12:00 pm
G-2110

Attachments
- December 17, 2010 minutes
- Academic Priorities
- Vision & Commitments
Minutes

Present:
Dana Cserepes
Bob Davis
Wade Deisman (Chair)
Jason Dyer
Aysha Haq
Minni Kalra
Paul Tyndall
Robert Wood

Regrets:
David Atkinson
Kathleen Bigsby
Arvinder Bubber
Harj Dhaliwal
Tru Freeman
Jane Hobson
Stephanie Howes
S Lee
John McKendry
Robin Russell

Recorder: Elizabeth Merritt, University Secretariat

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 10:15 am.

2. Confirmation of Agenda
The agenda was confirmed by consensus subject to the following additions:
- TEDX
- Theatre conversion

3. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of November 19, 2010 were approved by consensus.

4. Report from Chair

4.1 Report on the World Congress of Polytechnics, Birmingham, UK
The Chair identified three areas of focus identified at the World Congress that would be useful for Kwantlen to pursue.
1. Become a member of the Congress including joining Polytechnics Canada to be part of the global network of polytechnic institutions
2. Establish key partnerships with institutions similar to Kwantlen (e.g., Charles Darwin) and examine what they are doing
3. Identify a skills focus that includes traditional academic programs

Jason Dyer noted that at the Innovation Conference in Ottawa, the government reinforced the idea that colleges and polytechnics are the driving force behind innovation as they are more agile and flexible (e.g. George Brown University and Algonquin College)

4.2 Priority Setting Challenges
The Chair outlined the challenges facing the committee:
- Timeline
- Source documents
  - Prior year’s priorities
  - Mission and mandate
  - Vision and commitments
  - Retreat information

The committee will address the process of program prioritization, review, new program criteria and development, feedback, and degree approval, jurisdiction.

Action
- The Chair will send the committee a package of information including the source documents and instructions for discussion and the January 2011 meeting.

4.3 Outstanding Issues
The committee discussed a number of outstanding issues that need consideration:
- Continuing Education – the Chair will ask the Director of Continuing Education to attend a meeting
- Policy on Creation/Dissolution/Amalgamation of Faculties – the policy is under review in the office of the VP Academic
- Committee SharePoint site – the Chair has met with IET and will bring more information to the next meeting
- Task Force on Bicameral Governance – the Chair reported on the December 3, 2010 initial meeting of the Task Force indicating that there will be monthly meetings; all meetings will be open to the university community; and that one of the first tasks of the Task Force will be discussion regarding legislation in terms of jurisdiction and developing policy and procedures about the budget development process.
5. Old Business

5.1 Committee Mandate and Membership Review
The committee discussed changes to the mandate and membership of the committee.

Action
- The Chair will work with the Senate Vice Chair to review and write up the proposed changes including those identified at the November meeting and distribute them to the members.

5.2 Vision and Commitments
The Vision and Commitments document has been reviewed by the Board of Governors and by Senate. The Vision will be posted on the website for feedback.

5.3 Faculty Council Level Academic Planning & Priority Setting
Deferred to next meeting.

6. New Business

6.1 Academic Calendar
The committee discussed its jurisdiction and the rationale behind potential changes to the academic calendar, including changing the semester length. A policy revision request has come forward and has gone to the Registrar for development and to the VP Academic for a literature review on the subject.

6.2 Academic Priority Setting

Vision and Commitments
- Jason Dyer will contact the Chair of the Task Force regarding the possibility of including input from the Task Force on Academic Freedom in the final Vision document.
- It was suggested that the Vision committee ask the Kwantlen elders for their input regarding the aboriginal commitment.

Mission and Mandate
- The Chair will send out the source documents for committee review prior to the January meeting.

Setting the 2011/12 Priorities
- The committee will use the January and February meetings for a priority setting exercise.
7. Other Business

7.1 TEDx (Technology, Entertainment, Design www.ted.com)
The Chair reported on the TEDx conference held in Vancouver.

7.2 Ed Tech Subcommittee
Robert Wood reported on the Ed Tech Subcommittee workshop held on December 4, 2010. The subcommittee is working on setting meaningful ground rules and writing a philosophy statement.

7.3 Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)
Jason Dyer noted that Kwantlen has received funding from CFI for two projects in Social Sciences.
- dry lab space (proposed for Surrey Campus) for disciplines such as Sociology, Psychology, Criminology, Business, Teaching Methods lab, GIS lab.
- environmental testing lab (proposed for Richmond, but could go to Cloverdale) for Fashion & Design testing of soft goods, and for Trades & Tech testing of materials.

7.4 Theatre Conversion
Paul Tyndall reported that the Humanities Faculty Council, IET and Purchasing have been in discussion regarding the conversion of D128 into a theatre that can be used for film instruction and eventually a film society.

8. The meeting adjourned at 12:15pm.
Academic Priorities 2010/2011

A. Knowledge & Skills Development

1. Implement & support new programs, especially those that reflect community needs, labour market and broad societal education needs, and which are in keeping with Kwantlen's values and mandate as a Polytechnic University.
   a. Maintain and enhance certificate, diploma, degree and trades programs
   b. Develop undergraduate programs that support Kwantlen’s values in academic areas where there is need
   c. Develop theoretical and practical learning opportunities to inform program design
   d. Consider the potential for new and existing non-degree programs to bridge into degree programs

2. Provide opportunities that encourage faculty to develop new teaching interests and methodologies in keeping with the institution’s mandate.

3. Further develop continuing education and professional studies programs.

4. Provide preparatory courses and support services that are responsive to the needs of all students.

NON-BUDGETARY ITEMS

5. Develop Senate endorsed policy framework for the development of new programs

6. Develop Senate endorsed policy framework for graduate program development and implementation

B. Improved Student Experience

1. Expand applied learning opportunities, including co-op education, service learning, practica, and international study.

2. Additional programming and new students will create demands on service areas that will require sustained support.
   a. Enhance advising and mentoring for students
   b. Provide more support to students — upgrading and intervention
   c. Develop a comprehensive student success and retention system

NON-BUDGETARY ITEM

3. Create overarching structure to coordinate the delivery and evaluation of student services
   (Services Council)
C. Quality Improvement

1. Support and maintain regular, on-going educational program reviews

2. Implement regular and on-going service reviews

3. Promote scholarship of teaching and learning throughout the university that fosters collaboration between faculty and students

4. Define the responsibility of faculty to include a balance between teaching, scholarship, university service, and community involvement

5. Develop a wider diversity of rewards and incentives throughout the University structure to recognize and encourage service and dedication to the institution as well as excellence in teaching, research and service

6. Enhance the Library collection
   a. to match new program development
   b. to support scholarly activity

**NON-BUDGETARY ITEMS**

7. Create a new structure for faculty search and hiring that provides for broader department wide faculty and student involvement and that is predicated on principles of transparency and openness

8. Establish academic freedom and responsibility as foundational and entrench these as bedrock principles within the University.

D. Increased Enrolments

**D. Increased Enrolments**

1. Implement a comprehensive and integrated Strategic Enrolment Management system to increase enrolments of domestic and international students. In particular, take steps to:
   a. Ensure that entry policies and admission requirements will encourage enrolments
   b. Facilitate the transfer of students from other institutions
   c. Encourage students to take a greater number of courses each term
   d. Encourage development of effective program retention strategies

2. Implement tracking systems to allow for reliable analysis of all issues related to success of enrolled students.

3. Implement a research program to improve understanding of the impact of entrance requirements, admissions policies and retention strategies at Kwantlen.
Academic Priorities 2010/2011

E. Improved Collegial & Supportive Working Environment

1. Establish a mechanism that supports a culture of transparency, openness, dialogue, and mutual understanding regarding the purpose of the University through retreats, workshops, and other venues for the exchange of ideas.

2. Explore the development of a structure that allows academic administrators to have faculty appointments.

3. Foster faculty and department identities through the development of faculty colloquia and designated office and classroom space for individual departments.

F. Growth of Innovation and Application

1. Support initiatives to increase scholarly and research activity within and across a range of Faculties (E.g., grant writing support, compliance awareness, intellectual property rights)

2. Encourage and support development of new teaching interests and methodologies
   a. Direct support for teaching and learning innovation through units such as Educational Development and the Centre for Academic Growth
   b. Support the use of enhanced/advanced technology in the delivery of program material as well as the evaluation of new student markets

3. Provide administrative and technical support for programs currently in development (approval and implementation are subject to Senate, ministerial and budget approval) and ensure resources exist to implement new programs
G. Improved Infrastructure

1. Develop and upgrade physical infrastructure to meet or exceed best practices; e.g. design and pedagogical efficiency, and sustainability.

2. Develop physical infrastructure that fosters faculty, departmental and program identities.

3. Maintain currency with technological advances to ensure Kwantlen operates with the most cost effective modern infrastructure.

4. Ensure that Kwantlen maintains a modern highly effective e-business environment including all web and e-commerce instances.

H. Community Engagement and Outreach

1. Cultivate relationships with high schools at the faculty and student level including alumni support and liaison

2. Create campus community advisory committee

3. Develop Continuing Education
OUR VISION

Innovative, transformative, and ambitious, Kwantlen Polytechnic University serves the needs of British Columbia and beyond. We inspire students to excel in their careers, lead in their communities, and succeed in their lives.

OUR PROFILE

A New Kind of Institution

We are a new kind of post-secondary institution which encompasses a comprehensive range of university degrees, programs in technology and trades, career and preparatory studies, and continuing and professional education, all of which reflect and express our polytechnic mandate.

A Teaching University

We are committed to currency of knowledge and disciplinary engagement, and deliver a well-rounded undergraduate education that provides students with the moral framework, critical understanding, and social awareness that encourages good citizenship.

A Polytechnic

We provide applied education that prepares our graduates for successful and rewarding careers.

OUR COMMITMENTS

To achieve our Vision, we are making the following commitments to our students, our programs, our community, and our university:

OUR STUDENTS

Accessibility and Flexibility

Kwantlen is committed to open access, multiple entrance and exit points, program bridging, acknowledgement of relevant experience, and flexible learning pathways.

Continuing and Professional Education

Kwantlen provides learning opportunities that support personal and professional enrichment by responding to the interests of the non-traditional student and the needs of the workforce.

Degree Education

Kwantlen provides every student pursuing a degree with a broad-based education, and acknowledges the importance of balancing depth and breadth of study.

Educational Opportunity

Kwantlen seeks out students of diverse ages, backgrounds, and aspirations.

Student Experience

Kwantlen is committed to providing an outstanding student experience through support programs, services, and systems that enhance and enrich student life.
Our Programs...

Applied Science and Technology

Kwantlen commits to develop its applied science and technology programs to advance its polytechnic mandate and meet the emerging needs of British Columbia.

Flagship Programs

Kwantlen supports the development of exceptional programs that reflect the institution’s applied mandate and further its reputation.

Service Learning

Kwantlen commits to providing experiences that integrate academic learning with principles of civic responsibility and community engagement.

Work-integrated Learning

Kwantlen commits to providing experiences that integrate academic learning with practical workplace experience.

Our Communities...

Aboriginal Engagement

Kwantlen commits to develop meaningful partnerships, pedagogical approaches, program offerings, and student services to better meet the distinctive needs of all aboriginal peoples.

Alumni

Kwantlen alumni are amongst the institution’s most important ambassadors. We will develop and maintain relationships that create institutional pride leading to increased understanding and support of the University.

Applied Research and Innovation

Kwantlen promotes applied research and scholarly activities that enhance our teaching and enrich our communities.

Engagement with our Partners

Kwantlen establishes strong and productive ties and external relationships to inform curriculum and new program development, to provide work-integrated learning, and to identify applied research and innovation opportunities.
OUR UNIVERSITY...

Academic Freedom

Kwantlen safeguards freedom of inquiry, thought, expression, publication, and peaceful assembly, which along with individual responsibility are the cornerstones of our identity.

An Exceptional Workplace

Kwantlen provides an environment that inspires commitment and leadership, and provides an attractive and vibrant place to work and to grow.

Institutional Participation

Kwantlen supports collegial, transparent, and collaborative decision-making processes and establishes mechanisms to encourage broad participation from all areas of the University.

Internationalization

Kwantlen is committed to providing a global perspective by developing a vibrant international student body and partnerships that encourage faculty and student participation.

Promoting Excellence

Kwantlen will inspire, support, and celebrate outstanding achievement throughout the institution.

Sustainability

Kwantlen informs and transforms attitudes, values, and practices that confirm its role as an educational institution committed to environmental, social, and economic sustainability.

Technology

Kwantlen is committed to the innovative, creative, and considered use of technology to enhance teaching, learning, and the day-to-day environment of students, faculty, and staff.
### A. Knowledge & Skills Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Implement &amp; support new programs, especially those that reflect community needs, labour market and broad societal education needs, and which are in keeping with Kwantlen’s values and mandate as a Polytechnic University.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Develop undergraduate programs that support Kwantlen’s values in academic areas where there is need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Develop theoretical and practical learning opportunities to inform program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Consider the potential for new and existing non-degree programs to bridge into degree programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Provide opportunities that encourage faculty to develop new teaching interests and methodologies in keeping with the institution’s mandate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Further develop continuing education and professional studies programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Provide preparatory courses and support services that are responsive to the needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-BUDGETARY ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Develop Senate endorsed policy framework for the development of new programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Develop Senate endorsed policy framework for graduate program development and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Improved Student Experience

1. Expand applied learning opportunities, including co-op education, service learning, practica, and international study.

2. Additional programming and new students will create demands on service areas that will require sustained support.
   - a. Enhance advising and mentoring for students
   - b. Provide more support to students – upgrading and intervention
   - c. Develop a comprehensive student success and retention system

**NON-BUDGETARY ITEM**

3. Create overarching structure to coordinate the delivery and evaluation of student services (Services Council)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Quality Improvement</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support and maintain regular, on-going educational program reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implement regular and on-going service reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promote scholarship of teaching and learning throughout the university that fosters collaboration between faculty and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Define the responsibility of faculty to include a balance between teaching, scholarship, university service, and community involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop a wider diversity of rewards and incentives throughout the University structure to recognize and encourage service and dedication to the institution as well as excellence in teaching, research and service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enhance the Library collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. to match new program development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. to support scholarly activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON-BUDGETARY ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Create a new structure for faculty search and hiring that provides for broader department wide faculty and student involvement and that is predicated on principles of transparency and openness.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish academic freedom and responsibility as foundational and entrench these as bedrock principles within the University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Increased Enrolments

1. Implement a comprehensive and integrated Strategic Enrolment Management system to increase enrolments of domestic and international students. In particular, take steps to:

   - **a.** Ensure that entry policies and admission requirements will encourage enrolments
   - **b.** Facilitate the transfer of students from other institutions
   - **c.** Encourage students to take a greater number of courses each term
   - **d.** Encourage development of effective program retention strategies

2. Implement tracking systems to allow for reliable analysis of all issues related to success of enrolled students.

3. Implement a research program to improve understanding of the impact of entrance requirements, admissions policies and retention strategies at Kwantlen.
### E. Improved Collegial & Supportive Working Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Establish a mechanism that supports a culture of transparency, openness, dialogue, and mutual understanding regarding the purpose of the University through retreats, workshops, and other venues for the exchange of ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Explore the development of a structure that allows academic administrators to have faculty appointments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Foster faculty and department identities through the development of faculty colloquia and designated office and classroom space for individual departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Establish a mechanism to discuss development of an academic rank system that values all Faculty members' contributions to the University and in which merit measures are used to determine advancement through the ranks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Growth of Innovation and Application</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Support initiatives to increase scholarly and research activity within and across a range of Faculties (E.g., grant writing support, compliance awareness, intellectual property rights)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourage and support development of new teaching interests and methodologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Direct support for teaching and learning innovation through units such as Educational Development and the Centre for Academic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Support the use of enhanced/advanced technology in the delivery of program material as well as the evaluation of new student markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide administrative and technical support for programs currently in development (approval and implementation are subject to Senate, ministerial and budget approval) and ensure resources exist to implement new programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**G. Improved Infrastructure**

1. Develop and upgrade physical infrastructure to meet or exceed best practices; e.g. design and pedagogical efficiency, and sustainability.

2. Develop physical infrastructure that fosters faculty, departmental and program identities.

3. Maintain currency with technological advances to ensure Kwantlen operates with the most cost effective modern infrastructure.

4. Ensure that Kwantlen maintains a modern highly effective e-business environment including all web and e-commerce instances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Community Engagement and Outreach</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultivate relationships with high schools at the faculty and student level including alumni support and liaison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create campus community advisory committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop Continuing Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meet Societal Challenges by Changing the Culture on Campus

By Elliot L. Hirshman and Freeman A. Hrabowski

American higher education has an extraordinary record of accomplishment in preparing students for leadership, in serving as a wellspring of research and creative endeavor, and in providing sustained public service. Despite this success, we are facing an unprecedented set of challenges. To maintain America's global pre-eminence, we must substantially expand the number of students we educate, increase the proportion of students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and address the pervasive and longstanding underrepresentation of minorities who earn college degrees, including in those STEM fields.

We will also need to increase our research efforts to deal with global and national challenges involving the environment, security, health care, and the economy. American higher education will undertake these efforts in a fiscal climate characterized by shrinking resources from governments and students' families.

These conditions are requiring institutions to identify priorities, plan strategically, and make the most efficient use of their resources. In addition, accomplishing our goals may require cultural changes within our institutions and the integration of these changes with our planning processes. At the University of Maryland-Baltimore County, we view the culture of the institution as manifesting itself in every aspect of daily life on the campus. It is reflected in the questions we ask (and those we don't ask), the achievements we measure and highlight (and those we ignore), and the initiatives we support (or don't support). In this context, we believe that changing our institutional cultures to focus more directly on broad societal challenges is critical to the future of higher education—and to the larger society.

This approach may have profound implications that some higher-education leaders may not have considered. For example, consider the issue of increasing the number of Pell Grant-eligible students who graduate, an issue that is central to social mobility. While many would agree, no doubt, that this issue is important, changing our
institutional cultures to focus on it might also mean changing the way we assess our performance as institutions and the ways in which we hold ourselves accountable and allocate resources. Imagine, for example, if additional factors in determining college rankings in *U.S. News & World Report*’s annual survey included the numbers of Pell Grant-eligible students who graduated, pursued graduate study, or found jobs after graduation.

We recognize that many institutions already focus on both institutional and societal interests. Nonetheless, the urgency of today’s challenges requires American higher education to refocus some of its efforts in specific areas to ensure the nation’s long-term strength. That is why we are encouraged by UMBC’s success in helping students of all races and backgrounds succeed at the highest levels academically. We view our efforts to ensure diversity and excellence as representing one model of how changes in a university’s culture can help tackle a challenge of significant societal importance.

Since its creation, in 1988, UMBC’s Meyerhoff Scholars Program has graduated hundreds of underrepresented minority students, most of whom have gone on either to complete STEM Ph.D.’s (or M.D./Ph.D.’s) or to pursue STEM postgraduate degrees. These graduates, including some who hold faculty positions at top universities, are emerging as leaders in their disciplines. In addition, retention and graduation rates for underrepresented minority students equal our rates for all students at UMBC (both in STEM fields and across all disciplines). But the situation at UMBC in the late 1980s was quite different. Not only did underrepresented minority students fail to go on to Ph.D. programs, but the majority of those who aspired to STEM careers became discouraged and did not graduate.

The process of cultural change began for us with focus-group discussions involving students, faculty, and staff concentrating on minority-student underachievement. Such inclusive conversations are key because, although institutional culture reflects subjective values, cultural change requires rigorous analysis, both qualitative and quantitative. It begins when an institution looks carefully at itself, identifies its strengths and weaknesses, recognizes the challenges it faces, and understands how its response to those challenges can lead to desired outcomes.

Process is an important factor in creating cultural change, and thus shared governance and broad consultation are critical to campus discussions. An inclusive approach helps to create support for institutional change and harnesses the ingenuity and creativity of
faculty, students, and staff. For example, faculty members who initially raised questions about whether the university could or should influence minority-student achievement eventually played leading roles in securing external grants to support the success of all students in undergraduate research.

The components of the Meyerhoff Scholars Program, which is supported by the Baltimore philanthropist Robert Meyerhoff, reflect what we learned from our campus conversations and from research into other programs across the country. We encouraged minority students to study in groups; strengthened tutorial centers; encouraged faculty to give these students feedback earlier in the semester; emphasized the need for faculty and staff members to communicate with incoming students about the demands they would face in STEM fields; and focused on supporting students during their crucial freshman year.

For more than two decades, we have tried to create a community of student scholars who not only work together in labs and form study groups to master coursework but also consult closely with faculty and staff who understand and appreciate the important roles they play in supporting these aspiring young scientists and engineers. The program's success also illustrates the essential role that philanthropic support and partnerships with donors must play in higher education's efforts to address broad societal challenges.

Regular assessments have been invaluable as well. From the start, the program's strengths, weaknesses, and outcomes have been rigorously assessed by teams of independent experts. In these evaluations, there has been no substitute for specificity—knowing how individual students and groups of students are performing in specific classes and majors. We have learned, for example, that we need to examine different groups based on such factors as gender, race, major, socioeconomic background, level of high-school preparation, and college performance. Documenting successes has helped build momentum, and, perhaps more important, documenting challenges and responding to them have demonstrated a commitment to substantive improvement.

Such thorough and honest evaluations have been instrumental in building campus support for the Meyerhoff program and for broader change in the institution's culture. The program has served as a model for developing other campus programs focused on academic excellence and inclusion, broadly defined. These have included endowed special scholars programs for high-achieving undergraduates in the arts, humanities, and public affairs, and
graduate programs supported by the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health.

Our successes have also provided motivation for broader curricular and pedagogical initiatives. For example, our faculty members have redesigned the curriculum in first-year chemistry to increase active learning through collaborative interactions, resulting in a 15-percent increase in course pass rates and in doubling the number of chemistry majors over a four-year period. (Such course-redesign efforts are part of an overall effort to improve academic outcomes in challenging introductory courses at the University System of Maryland, under the leadership of its chancellor, Brit Kirwan.) In other disciplines at UMBC, similar efforts relying on group study and collaboration, technology, and active learning have also yielded positive results, including higher retention and grades and increased coverage of content during the semester.

Institutionalizing cultural change requires that campus support be sufficiently broad and strong to ensure that the change can be sustained beyond a particular group of leaders. In the case of the Meyerhoff program, the campus has derived substantial benefits, including national recognition and external funding from agencies and foundations. This recognition and support, coupled with the academic success of our students, have helped build campuswide consensus about the importance of the program and an increasingly strong sense of ownership among faculty and staff.

We hope that aspects of the broad framework developed and nurtured at UMBC can serve as a useful guide for other institutions as they make cultural changes to meet the challenges of the world around them.

Elliot L. Hirshman is provost and senior vice president for academic affairs at the University of Maryland-Baltimore County. Freeman A. Hrabowski III is president of UMBC.
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Scientists Fault Universities as Favoring Research Over Teaching

By Paul Bosken

The United States' educational and research pre-eminence is being undermined, and some of the chief underminers are universities themselves, according to articles this week in *Science* and *Nature* magazines.

Universities are aggressively seeking federal dollars to build bigger and fancier laboratory facilities, and are not paying an equal amount of attention to teaching and nurturing the students who would fill them, scientists say in the articles.

"It's a Ponzi scheme," said Kenneth G. Mann, a professor of biochemistry at the University of Vermont, whose concerns were described by *Nature*. "Eventually you'll have a situation where you're not even producing the feedstock into the system."

A group of researchers, led by two biology professors, Diane K. O'Dowd of the University of California at Irvine and Richard M. Losick of Harvard University, made a similar point in a commentary in *Science*. "Teaching is suffering at universities because the institutions prize research success above all other factors in promotions, they said. The job of educating students offers little reward, and instead "often carries the derogatory label 'teaching load,'" they wrote.

Those faculty members raise the issue at a time of growing anxiety for universities and their research enterprises. Republicans took control of the House of Representatives this month, after party leaders promised during last year's election campaign to cut nondiscretionary federal spending to 2008 levels. That is likely to mean deep budget cuts at the federal science-financing agencies. The National Institutes of Health, the largest nonmilitary provider of research money to universities, could see its budget fall 9 percent below its anticipated 2011 level of $31.3-billion.

And universities have been seeing even more dire budget scenarios at the state level, the traditional foundation of their governmental support. Those worries, and the hope among universities that the federal government might take up more of the load from the states,
helped encourage the National Research Council, a private federally chartered institution, to form a study panel of 22 university and corporate leaders. The group, due to issue a report this spring, has been drafting arguments for why the federal government should recognize university science as a national asset deserving of more resources.

Skewed Priorities?
That is a worthwhile argument, Mr. Mann said. "Research is essential" to the overall success of a university and the country, he said.

At the same time, Mr. Mann said, universities have become so obsessed with using federal dollars to build new research facilities that they’ve skewed their priorities, leading both faculty members and students to see the competition for federal money as their main professional mission.

Mr. Mann, who served as chairman of biochemistry at Vermont from 1984 to 2005, said grant money made up about 22 percent of his salary as an assistant professor at the University of Minnesota back in 1970. Now it’s 60 percent, as he pulls in about $3-million a year in federal support, and administrators at Vermont are asking him to push it even higher.

"Nobody has ever asked me how good my papers were, and I think you would find that universally true," he said, "They basically say, Well, how many research dollars are you bringing in?"

Some university leaders have recognized the potential for a financial crash if the federal government eventually proves itself unable or unwilling to support the number of university research labs it has already helped to build. Robert M. Berdahl, who plans to retire in May as president of the Association of American Universities, asked Congress in 2009 to help determine the optimal size of the nation’s university-research enterprise, giving impetus to the current study by the National Research Council.

Mr. Losick said his commentary in Science had put teaching into that equation because it questioned how research universities balanced research and teaching. The authors recommend that universities take steps that include helping their science faculty members improve their teaching practices, and basing tenure and promotions on teaching skills.

Mr. Mann said he saw a direct correlation between universities' promoting and paying for those teaching skills, and improving the quality of science research. Among other problems, he said, universities rely heavily on the integrity of their faculty to produce
trustworthy science. "As the pressures become higher for people to generate grant income to support their salaries and their enterprise," he said, "then the pressure for the absence of integrity gets higher."

The health of universities, and the overall U.S. economy, depends on finding that right balance, he said. "There's a real risk at the present time to have a system that's not stable."
Agenda – approved by consensus

Minutes – consensus bob/paul

Chairs comments
- Question raised last meeting re policy status of amalgamation, creation etc faculties
- On john’s desk
- Received request from hort who are concerned that creation of faculty wouldn’t follow the policy being created – wade sent message to john and president who said we are following the policy and he’ll speak to john about it – a related issue will be ss/humanities amalgamation
- Vision – last meeting – addition of aboriginal commitment which has been done

- Distributed 2 chronicle articles

- Main thing is academic priorities

- Reviewed priorities

A
  - Did approve 10 new degrees in august and all 10 of them were approved by Ministry
  - Region lacking in educational oppys – need to offer broad range of degrees – done that, science degrees, moving minors to majors
  - Bob – financial restraints to implement degrees and done it before mission mandate, vision etc completed. But have had to move forward.
  - Jason – amazed at number of new degrees that have come through – speaks to drive of faculty and depts. And vision of institution – major in sociology developed in 1 semester
  - Dana – as priorities and mission mandate being considered there were already degrees under development so weren’t going to throw them out
  - Paul – 500% increase in BA programs in Humanities – wait to see what kind of support there are for these programs – e.g. admin support for depts with new programs – strains resources
  - Robin – what is the purposefulness of criteria in developing new degrees –
  - Dana – philos and creative writing were aware of polytech designation – included service learning, practicums, co-ops to differentiate our phil/cr wr degree from other institutions – these issues were addressed in most degrees
  - Wade – is she driving at program prioritization – we need to provide some principles for faculty councils
  - Robin – serve a population that is not degree ready – raises question of student readiness, etc.
  - Kathleen – for students not looking for degrees Kw is only game in town so shouldn’t lose sight of need to be comprehensive partly because of our mandate and our location
First priority states implement and support new programs, not degrees – Bob – scope should be broader than just degrees

Dana – cognizant of need for bridging in program development

Harj – thinks that marketing is selling us as degree institution and not so much on dips certs

Bob – also a fact that registrar’s office is asking students to declare what program they’re in

Kb – more we market our degrees, less comty understands dips certs other programs available – not seeing higher retention rate of first year students. 30% first year students vanish – nothing that suggests we’re reaching out to bigger group of people – data doesn’t support it

Aysha - support services (#4) – if adding more degrees, programs where’s support for students – e.g. early alert program, counseling, financial aid, etc.

Wade – takeaways – need to dev mechanism/principles for program implementation and budget support, whether admin, iet and service support keeping pace with dev of new programs, program prioritization before implementation, support courses and programs to allow students to succeed

Wade – where are we with grad programs – knows strong interest in them in business and social sciences – come back to it later

Jason sees 3 or 4 areas where grad prog could be launched successfully but do we have educational infrastructure to support them – thinks this will be as big a challenge as introd of science programs – lot of work

Paul thinks before we offer grad pgms should have wide ranging undergrad programs first – already have short comings in terms of supporting what we have without stretching ourselves

Bob – good idea to have framework developed before we need it – let’s have something in place before diving into it – money isn’t there

Dana – don’t have exempt status for graduate degrees – more arduous process than getting ug exempt status

Wade will ask committee to put a time frame around it eventually – say 3 year or never or ...

John said board sees this as being 5 years away for similar reasons, as well as accreditation issues

Part of consideration is name of committee – planning and priorities – both have to be considered and committee needs to put its mind to dev that

Jason – need to know faculty retirement schedule to help prepare for replacement of faculty and introduction of new grad program prepared faculty – wade – would be useful information to share at committee

Robin – need active scholarly faculty, need solid base of ug programming, planning for grad programs – could take 5-7 years. Could develop policy or plan within 3 years to assess this. Robin’s husband says govt pushing excellence, stardom, post docs,

S – grad programs – oldest degree in kw is interior design – keep in mind definition of scholarly activity and keep it broad given the individuality of certain faculties - re continuing education speaking to committee – re what – design has invented their own way –

CE in commitment – yet unclear to this committee and institution at this moment – work in progress – john says 3 takes on it – continuing and prof studies, what are
prof studies, contemporary approach to open learning and open university, and cost efficiency of CE (S says design has made money) j disagrees as there are lots of indirect costs of CE across institution – SFU has senate committee on CE – open learning has emphasis on degree track studies – lots of issues to address

- Discussion about CE -
- John – anything provided by inst could need to have same standards applied – senate discussion
- Wade – pres newsletter has blurb on CE – credit/fee, services and conference (look up) – currie will spk to app eventually

B Improved Student Experience

- Jason seeing practica placement occurring – eg hort students off to cuba
- Kb – separates us from other inst – and work placements for students has increased, kb will send link re coop contribution to student learning, accountability tracking international study
- 2. Service support lacking says Aysha
- Engl grad high school requirements says Paul that more support will be required - enabled students to get into ENGL 1100 and who are unprepared
- Robin – dropping of prov exams and change in grade ENGL 1100 used to have 60% failure rate
- Jane – seeing science students with below minimal English schools and she’s told that internat student requirements are different = their engl skills haven’t been challenged before entry into programs – seen an increase over last 2 years – if increasing inter stud component need to address this –
- Paul thinks need to track inter students success – if students fail, sends bad message
- Rob Hensley and ron maggiore tracking inter students
- Homework – committee check documents and make notes for discussion next time – also consider validity of priorities – do we want to champion them still – also what level do we want to fly at! Shouldn’t have to be concerned with operatios – need to fly higher!

Budget committee

Agenda confirmed by consensus

Minute approval deferred to next meeting

Gordon – provides overview and context to budget
- As we add more programs, costs higher to fund first-4 year - not just one year programs, prioritization of programs
- 21million of budget requests
- 2% increase in tuition = 2 million in op costs
- Propose taking some money out of investments to fund capital needs but not operating costs
- Priorities to new programming and new degrees and improved student experience, also around legal issues – in house lawyer to cut costs re human rights and other issues
- No new money – provides context – how much in capital account – about $40 million in investments
- Reno of Langley campus, Richmond campus, financing student union building commitment
- Would like to see govt support for renewal and hoping for that
- If we take more $ from capital account, needs to be small
- Need to take salary increases into account, carbon emissions, hydro etc.
- Enrolment growth and increased tuition
- Estimated incremental funds
- Ran through budget requests by faculty of which 8 million out of total 22 million in asks – see slide
- Requests by dept
- Criteria – priorities, vision, mission mandate – used to choose elements in draft budget
- Budget priorities – page 5 – use acad priorities
- Some adjustments still to come because of other requests

- Chris burns – new hum programs – but no funding to support them – as they’re going ahead in 2011/12 - Gordon will be coming back to committee with sequencing of launch and requests for sections etc. Chris surprised that funding for bba marketing funded this year if not ready to go til 2012. Art – program is already offered. Funding request is for additional sections

- Requests for humanities – initially was for chair release – finance asked humanities if they need sections to launch programs – board will make final decision –

- Cathy dube – if board is making the decisions – what’s the timing re reallocation of funding – board finance cmtte will meet in march and make recommendation to board end of march

- Under CE – what about funding – reference made to university act – targeting mature returning student – bob says there’s no requirement for CE – but given nature of new degrees etc why so much offered to CE given it’s fledgling status – Gordon need to invest in it with modest infrastructure – currently been done off side of desks by fac staff and deans.

- John – ce supposed to be based on cost recovery – this funding seen as seed funding that would be paid back eventually – expectation of legislation includes CE/extra mural – open to interpretation – carry over from college and inst act. Bob doesn’t see ce as required by act

- Robin Russell – board’s decision – how bound are they by priorities document

- Bicameral governance task force working on these issues – one of the things they’re working on is dev of policy around budget process

- Looking at costs of implementing degrees- 4 year program can be quite expensive – john – will give board pause and will look to senate and admin for advice

- Does board get asks the way we do? Gordon – board hasn’t seen all the asks in previous years - they see it as part of budget doc and they take advice from senate
- Wade – slack idea of Geoff’s — budget with slack in mind — if you had to cut $ from budget for pet projects where would you cut it — e.g. discovery layers for library —

- Gordon provides ongoing allocation to library for capital and there are significant surpluses in that fund. Would like library to deal with those surpluses before asking for $ - ditto for IET

- Chris – starvation funding in previous years – no assurance of future funding so library evolved savings program – so when there’s money in capital accounts that’s next year’s money – thinks it’s a mistake to view that money as surplus. Chris – says budget allocations document skips over library funding for supporting degree programs (section f(?)) – how committed are we to that as academic priority if we’re not committing funding to it – chris says discovery layer request was for 30K not 50K

- Harj – do these budget allocations meet app priorities – wade – difficult to answer as priorities quite expansive – shared awareness that we need to provide more admin, stu serv and program support – can’t think of things in vacuum.

- Harj – are there funding allocations that doesn’t meet our standard of app and that could be used elsewhere

- Administrative gaps need to be addressed – paul tyndall – soc sci requested advisors – that kind of support needs to go beyond certain faculty and consider other areas of support required – doesn’t see resources devoted to these sorts of problems – esp with emphasis on inter-disciplinary studies – ongoing challenge that ought to be ongoing priority

- Dana – are there competing requests re advisors for example as new programs often want advisor embedded in program where expertise resides as opposed to generic advisor – could there be shared resource oppys

- John – should be something in institution from library re support, open access, shifting of role of libraries in universities, library as learning hub, changing nature of university libraries – understand where your intellectual assets are – univ. open either physically or virtually

- Chris burns – question re categorization – sees them as administrative (p.11) ! Gordon – because they’re in faculties as opposed to general admin support – serves students and fac members – this is academic administration

- Admin considered hr, facilities, central services

- Different format that budget presentations – will there be similarity eventually - Gordon – final budget proposal will be in same format as last year

- Wade – is administration growing at expense of academic programming – what other faculties have assoc deans and how do they compare in size

- Soc sci, business have assoc deans (bus has 2), ACA – 1000 FTE, Hum doesn’t have one (hard to distinguish hum from ss – together haround 3300 FTE, CHS has 1 funded ass dean and one on interim basis (under 700 FTE)
- Hum has had 7 or 8 deans – issue of continuity –

- Still under discussion – additional sections for humanities, ss, business and ACA; restricting around capital $ for science in Langley; ss FF&E asks; degree launch dates for new degrees

- Chris – fte’s from 9/10 - hum 1400 FTEs and social sciences 2000 (faculty hum 75 and soc sci 85)

- Why do we ask for xtra section funding when we’ve agreed to implement new programming? In the past requests received xtra funding requests to provide access to students. Now asking who are these students, what program are they in, not just open access

- Need to incorporate all needs of program in development – class size, infrastructure, capital costs, demand for program, support for degree, polytechnic mandate, student retention, enrolment management, etc.

- Wade – student union building very important – where are we with this proposal – when etc. – currently in negotiation with KSA to develop MOU – Gordon – working with space director to incorporate student space in Richmond and Langley – concern that sub will only be here in surrey

- Chris burns – langely reno does it include CHS collection – Gordon – being discussed

- Chris – enrolment mangmt is one of our priorities – omitted from budget request – didn’t have presentation from enroll mgmt. – student retention crucial – why wasn’t it included – john – ron maggiore was asked to dev enroll plan – thinks theres sufficient money in place now

- Coop area for crim/mkting 100K – shared – requ for coop placement officers to evaluate work places – new hire to service these 2 areas re coop – it’s a faculty position coop instructors part of KFA and teach at scale

- Should not coop support be factored into program development

- Coop and practica practices in different faculties need to be shared and discussed cross faculties – competition for placements in CHS is brutal – could learn from each other’s practices – also formalized agreements

- Dale simonson – amazing story how Kwantlen and partners assist students – shd be part of kw story – on website – big part of being polytechnic

- Coop, practica, service learning huge boost for student engagement

Next meeting feb 4 – will be draft budget proposal – app welcome to attend

Adjourned – noon -