



The following Motions and Documents were considered by the Board Learning, Research and Student Experience Committee during an electronic vote of the committee held from June 9 to 11, 2021

---

Agenda Title: **Metrics Associated With Academic Restructuring Motion**

APPROVED MOTION: THAT the Learning, Research and Student Experience Committee, on the recommendation of General Faculties Council, recommend that the Board of Governors approve the proposed interdisciplinarity metric associated with academic restructuring, as set forth in Attachment 1.

Final Item: 1.

---

Item No. 1

**Governance Executive Summary  
Action Item**

<b>Agenda Title</b>	<b>Metrics Associated With Academic Restructuring</b>
---------------------	---

**Motion**

THAT the Learning, Research and Student Experience Committee, on the recommendation of General Faculties Council, recommend that the Board of Governors approve the proposed interdisciplinarity metric associated with academic restructuring, as set forth in Attachment 1.

**Item**

Action Requested	<input type="checkbox"/> Approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation
Proposed by	Steve Dew, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Presenter	Steve Dew, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

**Details**

Office of Administrative Responsibility	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)	The proposal is before the committee to consider a set of metrics to measure the success of the Colleges and academic restructuring.
Executive Summary ( <i>outline the specific item – and remember your audience</i> )	<p><b><u>Current</u></b> On December 11, 2020, the Board of Governors passed a motion that approved a leadership model for the new colleges that includes leadership by a Council of Deans, with implementation led by a College Dean chosen from among the members of the Council. The motion noted that the structure would be reviewed in 18 months. Reporting requirements were described as follows:</p> <p><i>With clear metrics, including financial and quality of shared services (including clinical, excellence in interdisciplinary research, and education), to be developed by the Board of Governors, with progress to be reported monthly to GFC, the Board of Governors, and administration over the next 12 months.</i></p> <p><b><u>GFC Role in Recommendation</u></b> On February 8, 2021, GFC participated in a committee of the whole discussion on collegial governance. One of the motions passed during that session was: <i>That the Committee of the Whole adopt for inclusion in its report the recommendation that the agenda for the meeting of February 22nd include an item for GFC to determine a process for developing its position on metrics.</i> On February 22, GFC agreed that the Academic Planning Committee was an appropriate venue to develop a position on metrics associated with academic restructuring for GFC's consideration.</p> <p>In considering GFC's position on metrics, the Academic Planning Committee has focused on the following areas, which are priorities for the Board of Governors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cost-Reduction:</b> One of the goals of the new structure is to reduce costs by realizing economies of scale in larger academic units.</li> </ul>

Item No. 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality Assurance: The new model must entrench high quality shared services.</li> <li>• Interdisciplinarity: The new model is intended to enhance interdisciplinary program and research opportunities within and across Colleges.</li> </ul>
Supplementary Notes and context	<i>A similar motion on the proposed financial and quality of shared services metrics was considered and recommended by the Board Finance and Property Committee on June 8, 2021. All three metrics were considered and recommended by General Faculties Council on June 7, 2021.</i>

**Engagement and Routing** (Include proposed plan)

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation	<p>General Faculties Council, Committee of the Whole, Feb 8, 2021          General Faculties Council, February 22, 2021          Academic Planning Committee (APC), March 17, 2021          APC Working Group on Metrics, March 29, April 9, May 11, 2021          GFC Executive - April 12, 2021          GFC APC- April 14, 2021          GFC - April 26, 2021          BFPC - April 27, 2021 (discussion of financial, service quality metric)          BLRSEC - April 30, 2021 (discussion of interdisciplinarity metric)          APC - May 5, 2021          BFPC - May 26, 2021 on financial and shared services metrics (discussion)          BLRSEC - May 28, 2021 on interdisciplinary metric (discussion)</p>
Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)	<p>APC - May 19, 2021 (recommendation)          GFC - June 7, 2021 (recommendation)          BFPC - June 8, 2021 - on financial and shared services metrics (recommendation)          BLRSEC - June 10, 2021 - on interdisciplinary metric (recommendation)          Board - June 18, 2021 (approval)</p>

**Strategic Alignment**

Alignment with <i>For the Public Good</i>													
Alignment with Core Risk Area	<p>Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Enrolment Management</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Relationship with Stakeholders</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and Staff</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Reputation</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Resource Management</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Research Enterprise</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> IT Services, Software and Hardware</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Safety</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leadership and Change</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Student Success</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Physical Infrastructure</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Enrolment Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Relationship with Stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and Staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Resource Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Research Enterprise	<input type="checkbox"/> IT Services, Software and Hardware	<input type="checkbox"/> Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leadership and Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Success	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical Infrastructure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Enrolment Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Relationship with Stakeholders												
<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and Staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Reputation												
<input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Resource Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Research Enterprise												
<input type="checkbox"/> IT Services, Software and Hardware	<input type="checkbox"/> Safety												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leadership and Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Success												
<input type="checkbox"/> Physical Infrastructure													
Legislative Compliance and jurisdiction	<p>General Faculties Council Terms of Reference          APC Terms of Reference          Section 60(1) of the Post Secondary Learning Act (PSLA) The board of a public post-secondary institution shall          (a) manage and operate the public post-secondary institution in accordance with its mandate</p>												

---

Item No. 1

	<p>Section 26(1) of the PLSA states that “Subject to the authority of the board, a general faculties council is responsible for the academic affairs of the university and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, has the authority to(...):</p> <p>(o) make recommendations to the board with respect to (...) matters considered by the general faculties council to be of interest to the university”</p> <p>BFPC Terms of Reference BLRSEC Terms of Reference</p>
--	--

Attachment 1: Metrics associated with academic restructuring (pages 1-2)

*Prepared by:* Kathleen Brough, Chief of Staff, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

## Metrics associated with academic restructuring

### Background:

On December 11, 2020, the Board of Governors passed three motions that created the new College structure and its leadership model for the University. Reporting requirements were described as follows:

*With clear metrics, including financial and quality of shared services (including clinical, excellence in interdisciplinary research, and education), to be developed by the Board of Governors, with progress to be reported monthly to GFC, the Board of Governors, and administration over the next 12 months.*

The intent of this part of the motion is to provide a mechanism to monitor the effectiveness and progress of the college model through the first year of implementation. However, a major complication is that academic restructuring and SET are tightly integrated and complementary. Both are strategies (economies of scale vs workflow/workforce optimization) to mitigate the organizational impacts that result from the budget cuts so that the academic mission is sustained even as the number of people available to support it is significantly reduced. That they produce overlapping outcomes makes it virtually impossible on a month-by-month basis to separate the financial and service quality impacts resulting from the two strategies. For that reason, the financial and service metrics below are looking at outcomes that result from both elements of UAT.

#### 1) Financial

The purpose of this metric is to track progress towards achieving the UAT goal for cost reduction.

Proposed metric: The annualized cost related to administrative staff and academic leader salaries and benefits (on an FTE basis) will be tracked separately with their sum intended to meet a reduction target of \$29M over the fiscal year ending March 31, 2022. These reductions are inclusive of Deans, College Deans, Vice Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs, Associate Chairs and all salaried administrative staff, excluding student employees.

#### 2) Quality of Shared Services

The purpose of this measure is to provide reassurance that acceptable quality of service is being maintained despite the reduction in expenditure to provide those services.

Proposed Approach: Through a monthly survey of key stakeholders, shared service quality will be monitored at a high level through standardized questions using a 5 point Likert scale, recognizing that different services are being restructured at different times. This will be administered by the SET office to faculty, staff and students as part of its monthly pulse surveying.

Key stakeholders that will be surveyed include key client leaders such as College and Faculty General Managers and Academic Department Managers. For student-facing services, student leaders and a representative sample of users would be polled. For faculty-facing service, faculty leaders and a representative sample of users would be polled. These individuals will be asked to reflect on their personal experience with the services. Respondents will be asked about various aspects of the service including timeliness, whether their particular needs were met and overall satisfaction.

(Note that experience at other institutions indicates that service quality indicators generally initially fall before eventually recovering when restructuring occurs as both providers and users struggle to adjust to new processes. For that reason, a target is not proposed.)

3) Interdisciplinarity

The purpose of this measure is to validate that the college structure is successful at supporting interdisciplinary academic activities.

Proposed Approach: Interdisciplinary scholarship and learning occurs in diverse contexts across the university, making it difficult to quantify in a manner that reflects the different approaches to scholarly work across the academy. We propose that this is an area that is more appropriately assessed through qualitative means and narrative and is perhaps better assessed at the 18 month review rather than on a month by month basis.