

WES Results for Faculty, Barber School of Arts and Sciences, 2011, 2014 and 2017

Peter Wylie, Department of Economics, Philosophy and Political Science, March 2018

The following are the results of the 2011, 2014 and 2017 *Workplace Experiences Surveys* (WES) based on the responses of all faculty in the Barber School – that is, all regular, permanent faculty members as well as sessional faculty, deans, associate deans, heads, post-docs, and research associates. The 2011 and 2014 results are presented in absolute terms and the 2017 results are presented both in absolute terms and relative to the responses of all faculty at UBC (UBCO plus UBCV).

The company that completed the 2017 survey, *TalentMap*, states: “Generally, a % Favourable of 70 or above is considered good, a % Favourable in the 60s is considered acceptable, and a % Favourable of lower than 60 would indicate the need to investigate further.” Or, to put in the parlance of what faculty members might better relate to, an overall grade of above 70 is good (B- and above), a grade in the 60s is acceptable (C), and a grade lower than 60 is generally unacceptable. An overall grade in the 50s is a marginal pass (D), but generally seen as still not good enough, and a grade lower than 50 is a fail (F) and entirely unacceptable.

The 2011 results overall

54 faculty in the School completed the 2011 survey, a reported response rate of 32%, implying that there were approximately 165 such faculty in the School when the survey was completed in November 2011. The vast majority of the faculty respondents were permanent faculty members (47) and the others respondents were 3 sessional faculty and 4 deans, associate deans, heads etc. The survey misclassified heads as non-bargaining unit faculty.

The 2011 WES results for all faculty in the Barber School were generally negative, reflecting an overall disengaged faculty. The average percent of all faculty giving favourable responses (“very satisfied/satisfied” or “agree/strongly agree” etc.) across all 79 questions in the survey was 47%, which in most faculty members’ estimation is an F, fail.

The results were known as of February 2012 but no action was undertaken by the Barber School Dean’s Office to discuss them with faculty until, on the initiative of faculty members themselves, an ad-hoc committee of the Barber School Faculty Council was established in February 2013. This was the first such committee ever established by Faculty Council, and it was to study the poor results in detail and to make recommendations that would help make the Barber School a better, or at least a less bad, place for faculty to work. No interest was shown by the Dean’s Office in the work of this committee over its approximately one full year of deliberations, and both the Barber School acting dean at the time and the Barber School dean at the time the survey was completed (the then acting provost) refused to meet with the committee.

The 2014 results overall

The 2014 results were brought to the attention of faculty in the School by the Dean’s Office only in November 2017, and, it appears, were not analyzed nor acted upon by the School before then. The 2014 survey reported a response rate of 33%, the same as in 2011, but did not report the actual number of responses. If there were approximately 180 faculty in the School in November 2014 inclusive of all permanent faculty members as well as sessional faculty, deans, associate deans, heads, etc., then a response rate of 33% implies that approximately 60 faculty or so in the School completed the survey in November 2014. The survey in 2014 again misclassified heads as non-bargaining unit faculty.

The 2014 WES results for all faculty in the Barber School were again generally negative, reflecting an overall disengaged faculty. The average percent of all faculty giving favourable responses (“very satisfied/satisfied” or “agree/strongly agree” etc.) across all 69 questions in the survey was 57%, which in most faculty members’ estimation is a D grade, a marginal pass, but generally unacceptable.

The 2017 results overall

The 2017 results were brought to the attention of faculty in the School by the Dean’s Office in February 2018. 82 faculty in the School completed the 2017 survey, a reported response rate of 44% and implying that there were approximately 185 or so such faculty in the School when the survey was completed in November 2017.

The 2017 WES results for all faculty in the Barber School remain generally negative, reflecting an overall disengaged faculty. The average percent of all faculty giving Favourable responses (“very satisfied/satisfied” or “agree/strongly agree” etc.) across all 91 questions in the survey was 49%, which in most faculty members’ estimation is an F, fail.

For UBC overall, the average percent of all faculty at UBC giving Favourable responses (“very satisfied/satisfied” or “agree/strongly agree” etc.) across all 91 questions in the 2017 survey was 61%, so just marginally acceptable. Results for the Barber School are hence an average of 12% lower, pushing the Barber School into the fail, unacceptable range.

So there has been little improvement overall in the Barber School in the results 2011 to 2014 to 2017, and the average grade is an F across the period. So I think we have to ponder why, in our School with its \$15m endowment and commitment to “an environment of academic excellence” and “a liberal arts and sciences school in the finest tradition” workplace experiences of faculty are apparently so poor, both in absolute terms and relative to faculty elsewhere at UBC.

Comparison of results of similar questions across the 2011, 2014 and 2017 surveys

Of course an overall grade across all categories and across three different surveys where the questions differ to different degrees, and the respondents differ to different degrees, is only a fairly crude comparison, but still valid to a large extent (we do the same comparisons in the student grade averages in our courses across sections and years). However, if some of the questions remained largely the same across the three surveys it is also instructive to look at the results of specific questions. Unfortunately, the questions change quite a bit across the surveys, especially for the 2017 survey relative to those of 2011 and 2014.

The ad-hoc committee of Faculty Council established to analyze the 2011 WES results for the Barber School identified four major themes of workplace dissatisfaction:

1. Low Level of morale and organizational engagement
2. Dissatisfaction with senior leadership, managerial communications and transparency
3. Dissatisfaction with workload, workload flexibility, support/resources and work-life balance
4. Dissatisfaction with opportunities for career progression and professional development

Themes 1 and 2 fell into the category of “general work atmosphere issues” and themes 3 and 4 into the category of “personal work and workload issues”. The committee presented its final report to Faculty Council in March 2014 and made a number of recommendations that it felt would improve things in each of these two major categories, but none of these recommendations were implemented by the

School. The acting dean and provost at the time showed no interest in the final report of the committee, and made no official response to it, and when its report was brought to the attention of the new (and current) dean in 2016, he said he had never heard of it and hence had never read it.

We will however use these categories found to be the major areas of concern in the final report of the ad-hoc committee to discuss below the differences and similarities between the 2011, 2014 and 2017 results, because these areas still show up in 2017, not unexpectedly given the lack of attention to the results of the 2011 and 2014 surveys by Barber School or University management to date, as the major areas of concern.

Comparison of results of inside and outside the Barber School at UBCO, 2017 survey

The total results for faculty of the 2017 WES for UBCO overall have not been released to the UBCO academic community yet. What has been released is a PowerPoint presentation put together by the survey company for the UBCO Department of Human Resources (HR). In this presentation, only results of 35 of the 91 questions are revealed for faculty only. Avoided entirely in the presentation are the results for the most negative areas for the Barber School and presumably UBCO overall for faculty; work environment, work/life integration, communications, collaboration, immediate unit head/manager, UBCO's senior leadership, and health and wellbeing. It is perhaps to be expected that HR might wish to dwell on the positive rather than the negative. More worrying is the fact that on the PowerPoint, all of these areas where the % responding favorably at UBCO are the lowest are assigned a "medium to low priority" by HR! Maybe these areas are seen as lost causes?

So the focus of the PowerPoint is only on the "key strengths" to "leverage and expand" that is, the most positive results. It states "focusing on the low...scores...may not fully address what is needed..." Is this not perhaps contradictory to the survey company's argument that low scores "would indicate the need to investigate further"?

The PowerPoint then states that the focus should be on the areas where the performance is low but that are somehow designated as "key drivers of engagement" - faculty support, senior leadership and collaboration. But then presented are only the detailed results for faculty for only the three most positive scoring areas - professional growth, student focus, and inclusion and respect. Very odd indeed.

The faculty response rate for UBCO overall was 173 out of 459 faculty; or 38%. Since the response rate in the Barber School was 82 out of 185 (44%), that implies that the response rate outside of the Barber School was 91 out of 274, that is a response rate of 33%, for an overall UBCO response rate of 38%. So there was a better response from faculty in the Barber School than from faculty in the rest of UBCO.

Of the results of the 35 questions revealed, for 22 of these questions the results were more-or-less identical for the Barber School and for UBCO overall. For 13 of the questions, the results are much worse in the Barber School than outside of the Barber School. For no question or statement of these 35 were the results for the Barber School more favourable than for UBCO overall. The results of the 13 questions are below where the results for the Barber School faculty (UBCO-BS) are much worse than for faculty outside of the Barber School (UBCO-O). This can be inferred from decomposing the UBCO overall results into UBCO-BS (which is known) and UBCO-O (which is inferred from the overall UBCO results, which are also known).

How are we to interpret these results? Is it just that the Barber School has a higher proportion of grumpy old members (e.g. "heritage faculty"?) than elsewhere at UBCO, or is it that there are there serious problems in the Barber School that don't exist elsewhere at UBCO? Probably not the first

hypothesis (FCCS, Nursing etc. also perhaps have a high proportion of “heritage faculty”) so perhaps the second hypothesis should be taken seriously by the UBCO senior administration and HR?

2017 WES	UBCO-BS	UBCO-O	Difference
I am satisfied for the resources provided for teaching	44	54	-10
I am able to meet expectations regarding teaching	75	89	-14
I believe that leadership appointments are made fairly	30	44	-14
Professional growth overall	63	75	-12
At UBC I have opportunities to grow professionally	62	78	-16
My career aspirations can be achieved at UBC	48	62	-14
Overall student focus	55	69	-14
I would recommend UBC to students	61	81	-20
In my department there are sufficient resources for students	24	42	-18
UBC has effective policies for inappropriate behaviour	29	45	-16
I feel part of a community at UBC	41	63	-22
Engagement overall	50	64	-14
In the last year I have actively searched for a job outside of UBC	50	38	-12

General work atmosphere issues: 2011, 2014 and 2017 WES results

The WES results for the Barber School which the 2013-14 ad-hoc committee of the Faculty Council argued supported an emphasis on general work atmosphere were the following, and the results for 2011, 2014 and 2017 on these same or very similar questions across the three surveys are compared in the table below.

	Difference to UBC in 2017	2011	2014	2017
I feel proud to work for UBC	-17	46	65	62
I would recommend UBC as a good place to work	-13	41	52	43
Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your current role/job at UBC?	-18	50	66	48
I would recommend UBC to prospective students	-15	56	66	61
I feel involved in decisions that affect me in my day-to-day work.		31	32	*

**Question not asked in 2017*

Responses throughout all three WES surveys support the interpretation that Barber faculty suffer from poor morale and low levels of engagement in decision-making processes that are of vital importance to the quality of their workplace experience. Only 31% of Barber faculty responded favorably, for instance, in 2011, to the statement “I feel involved in decisions that affect me in my day-to-day work” and this response had improved to only 32% in 2014. The statement was dropped from the 2017 survey. In 2011 only 41% reported that they “would recommend UBC as a good place to work” and this had improved to only 43% in 2017, 13 percentage points behind the response of all UBC faculty. In response to the question “Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your current role/job at UBC?” the percent favorable in the Barber School has fallen from 50% in 2011 to 48% in 2017, remaining 18 percentage points below the favorable responses of all UBC faculty.

Hence no significant improvement in these responses between 2011 and 2017 can be detected using these metrics. The results show that faculty in the Barber School do not have a deep connection and commitment to the university they work for and are not currently satisfied with the job they have or the role they play in it. Barber School faculty member responses are particularly negative relative to those of all faculty at UBC, 15 to 18 percentage points below the responses of all UBC faculty in 2017. Overall, these are very poor results for the Barber School. There appears to be an overall poor work atmosphere, poor morale, lack of pride in the university leading to low satisfaction with current roles, and faculty members appear to feel generally uninvolved in decisions that affect them in their day-to-day work.

On related questions in the 2017 WES, for example, new questions that were not in the 2011 or 2014 surveys, only 41% of faculty responded favorably to the statement “I feel I am part of a community at UBC”, 20% below the % responding favorably at UBC overall, only 41% to the statement “UBC inspires me to do my best work”, 18% below the % responding favorably at UBC overall, only 49% to the statement “I am optimistic about the future of UBC”, 18% below the % responding favorably at UBC overall, and only 33% of faculty responded favorably to the statement “There is a strong feeling of collegiality and cooperation in my workplace,” 22% below the % responding favorably at UBC overall.

Regarding the new questions in the 2017 survey related to health and wellbeing, only 30 % in 2017 responded favorably to the statement “I feel supported in my workplace to make decisions that benefit my physical and mental health,” 19% below the % responding favorably at UBC overall, and only 40% to the statement “I feel supported in my workplace when I am dealing with personal and family issues,” 22 % points below the % responding favorably at UBC overall. Regarding how to improve the overall work environment, 58% of faculty respondents said “better support for research” and 49% said “better workspace.” So these are all areas where the survey company would argue “would indicate the need to investigate further.”

The following findings also show little change in the poor results across the three surveys with respect to managerial communications and faith in senior management. In relation to issues of transparency, the most negative single response rate from Barber faculty in 2011 was to the statement: “I believe that UBC’s senior leaders will take meaningful action on the issues identified in this survey.” The response by Barber faculty to this was 9%. Only 22% of Barber Faculty responded positively to the statement: “UBC’s senior leaders communicate a clear, strategic vision of the future direction of the University” and this response has improved only marginally to 2017.

	Difference to UBC in 2017	2011	2014	2017
UBC's senior leaders communicate a clear, strategic vision of the future direction of the University.	-16	22	21	31*
I believe that UBC's senior leaders will take meaningful action on the issues identified in this survey	-18	9	16	29
I feel well-informed about UBC's priorities.	-18	33	-	32^
I have confidence in UBC's senior management	-15	19	29	31*
I understand the relationship between my individual objectives and UBC's objectives.	-16	33	46	37\$

**The average of 5 questions on senior management. ^2017 question was "UBC's senior leadership clearly communicate their priorities" ^2017 question was "My unit head keeps me well informed" \$2017 question is "I can see a clear link between my work and UBC's long-term objectives."*

Faculty in the Barber School appear to be particularly poorly informed about university, Faculty and unit priorities and the relationship between their individual objectives and university objectives. They have a particularly negative view on state of senior leader communications, and apparently absolutely no faith in senior leadership to follow through on problems - the lack of attention to any WES results to date, 2011 or 2014, by Barber School management tends to indicate that this lack of faith is and has been well-placed. This all of course contributes to the overall poor work atmosphere. So in the 2017 survey, still only 31% of faculty have faith in senior leadership, 15 % points behind the results for all UBC faculty, with no significant improvement in this metric since the extremely poor results of 2011.

One of the strong results of the 2011 survey on the bright side was general satisfaction among faculty in the Barber School with their department (then unit) heads, who are non-management bargaining unit faculty such as themselves, are close to the needs of the faculty of the department, and in 2011 were exceptionally well-regarded by them. There appeared in 2011 then to be excellent collegiality at the department (unit) level at least, and on this metric, the Barber School stood in 2011 well above UBC norms, the one area where the Barber School was excelling.

However this collegiality appears to have been significantly eroded by 2017. In 2011 the Barber School was well above the UBC average on these scores by about 15 percentage points, but by 2017 are now well below the UBC averages (about 8 percentage points below the UBC norms). The hiring of externally-appointed heads for all departments except one, and these heads being encouraged by senior administration to take on a more managerial stance than a faculty stance, may well be related to these worsening results over the last six years. Regarding the question in the 2017 survey as to how faculty and their department head could improve their relationship, 63% of respondents cited "more recognition/feedback", 50% "more supportive" and 42% "improve communication."

	2011	2014	2017
My immediate head/manager is accessible	89	78	58*
My immediate head/manager treats people fairly	85	65	58*
My immediate head/manager encourages open and honest two-way communication	76	66	58*
My immediate head/manager takes effective action on work-related matters	67	^	58*

**Average of 7 questions on immediate unit head/manager ^ question not asked in 2014*

Personal work and workload issues, 2011, 2014 and 2017 WES results

Barber faculty also provided negative responses in 2011 to questions on workload, support and resources, career navigation and tenure requirements. Only 22% of Barber faculty in 2011, for instance, responded positively to the statement: "My work allows me to achieve an acceptable balance between my work life and personal life" and only 19% thought that their work had a positive influence on their overall health and well-being. Only 25% responded positively to the statement: "I think the balance of time for teaching, research and service is appropriate" and only 19% to the statement: "I am satisfied

with the resources that UBC provides to support my research". Only 43% responded positively to the statement: "I receive recognition for my accomplishments at work" and only 37% to the statement: "I am confident I can achieve my career objectives at UBC." Main barriers to achieving these career objectives were cited as "workload" by 46% of respondents and "promotions not conducted fairly" by 42%. Only 26% responded positively to the statement: "I am clear about what is expected of my performance in order to be awarded tenure" and only 48% to the statement: "my performance is assessed fairly".

The responses of Barber School faculty to some of the additional and open-ended questions in the 2011 WES supported these findings. The top four area for improvement of work experience most cited by Barber School faculty and the % citing that area was "workload" 64%, "resources" 43%, "administrative support" 43% and "compensation" 30%. The barrier to the achievement of long-term career objectives most cited by Barber School faculty and the % citing this barrier was "my workload" 46%. The three themes most cited (by 35%, 19% and 17% of respondents respectively) as to what an "outstanding work environment" means to them, were "work atmosphere", "workload flexibility and schedule", and "career advancement, training and development".

In the 2014 WES survey, only 32% of Barber faculty responded positively to the statement: "I am satisfied with the resources that UBC provides to support my research" and only 48% thought that they were able to meet expectations related to research. Only 51% responded positively to the statement: "my unit does what it can to make my personal/family obligations and a career compatible" and only 46% to the statement: "my performance is assessed fairly". Main barriers to achieving long-term career objectives were cited as "workload" by 61% of respondents, "promotions not conducted fairly" by 36% and "lack of department head help and support" by 33%. The two main source of stress in 2017 were cited as "workload" (35% of respondents) and "funding for research" (31%). In response to the question of what the top three priority areas for improvement of work experience in the Barber School, the four areas most cited (by 47%, 46%, 31% and 22% of respondents respectively), were "research support", "workload", "administrative support" and "leadership of the department." So largely the same as in 2011.

The results for 2017 show little improvement, although almost all the questions were different to various degrees. The questions were different, but the general thrust of the answers largely the same. Only 36% of faculty responded positively to the statement "I am satisfied with resources for research", only 53% felt that they can meet expectations related to research (19 % points below overall UBC faculty response), and in response to the question of how UBC could best improve faculty support, 71% of respondents said "support for research." In response to the question of how UBC could best improve academic excellence, the most cited way was "better resources for research." In regard to how UBC could improve faculty tenure and promotion processes, 69% of faculty respondents in the Barber School said "more clarity about the criteria." Only 48 % of faculty in 2017 responded positively to the statement "my career aspirations can be achieved at UBC", 15 % points below UBC overall responses. On being asked what the major barriers to this are, 51% of Barber School faculty respondents said "workload" and 44% said "lack of department head's help and support." Only 41 % of faculty responded positively to the statement "I receive recognition at work," only 33% to the statement "I have control over my workload," and only 30% to the statement "I have energy left at the end of most workdays for my personal life."

Causes of poor work atmosphere issues

So what is contributing to the poor work atmosphere in the Barber School and how might we make this better? The causes could perhaps be Faculty/University level governance/leadership issues, poor managerial communications, perhaps a lack of collegial decision-making with little regular faculty involvement and/or consultation on major decisions at the Faculty/University level.

In the absence of a well-articulated managerial organizational vision that they might buy into, faculty are perhaps not clear on what university priorities are and what the medium-term plans are for their disciplines and how they fit into them. Whatever the cause, there is apparently among the regular Barber School faculty members little confidence in senior management on the UBCO campus at the Faculty and University level.

The Barber School is a large and diverse Faculty with no central place and until very recently no academic or strategic plan. Regular faculty members do not know what the Faculty plans are for their disciplines, programs, or departments. Regular faculty members appear to deal in no matters of Faculty governance, direction and management therefore faculty members appear to be largely left in the dark e.g. faculty members do not know what the funding of the Faculty is, what revenues it gets and how revenues are spent; and are not consulted on important faculty matters. This might in part explain the overall low level of morale and engagement in the Barber School.

In the Barber School all decisions are made by a Leadership Team - dean, associate deans, heads, executive staff – but faculty do not see agenda or minutes of Leadership Team meetings. All budgetary matters and executive decision-making is held entirely out of the purview of the faculty, a non-transparent, anti-consultative, and unaccountable state of affairs. There is also a lack of transparency regarding the budget and academic priorities of the School. Clearly, Barber School faculty are not being engaged enough in the affairs of the Faculty, are not being consulted enough, and seem to be effectively excluded in decision-making regarding the affairs and business of the Faculty. More consultation and engagement is obviously required with faculty. Collegial communication between the Dean's Office and the regular faculty has become less and less over recent years and is now practically non-existent in the Barber School.

It is probably not going too far to say that regular Barber School faculty have basically never been consulted at UBCO on anything to do with strategic, academic and space planning on the campus e.g. classrooms, student spaces, admin and teaching space, faculty offices, new buildings, academic priorities etc. Perhaps the autocratic top-down hierarchical managerial culture of "command and control" at UBCO in its early first 12 years and lack of accountability and transparency with management at UBCO and in the Barber School is the major factor contributing negatively to workplace satisfaction among Barber School faculty members, and the same managerial culture at the Faculty level is perhaps compounding these problems. Nothing appears to have improved significantly since 2011 and the publication of the findings of the Faculty Council ad-hoc committee report in March 2014.

Causes of personal work and workload issues

Workload and workload flexibility appears to be a top area for improvement in the Barber School. Faculty appear to be finding that the demands of teaching and service are leaving inadequate time for research and hence causing stress, and that there is little support for research. Faculty appear to feel that there is an unacceptable balance between work life and personal life leading to poor overall state of physical and mental health and wellbeing, and that an outstanding work environment would mean more workload flexibility, more resources and support especially for research, and better physical

workspaces. So excessive workload, inadequate workload flexibility, inadequate support and resources especially for research, and poor physical workspace are all problems that are leading to poor work-life balance, and these problems appear to be more severe in the Barber School than elsewhere at UBC. Again nothing appears to have improved significantly since 2011.

Also career paths seem to be even more limited in 2017 than they were in 2011. Department head and subsequent administrative streams appear to be being largely cut off for regular faculty members, and there is little to no investment in professional development programs for regular faculty. This appears to have worsened since 2011. What else has worsened is that faculty used to know more or less what their standard teaching workload and class sizes would be year by year; 2-2 at standard sizes for lower and upper level. Now, in 2018 however, teaching workload year to year appears to be something that is variable depending on heads' assessments of annual activity reports, and entirely unpredictable, and average class sizes have been on an inexorable escalator ride upwards.

My personal recommendations re: general work atmosphere

These largely echo the recommendations of the 2013-14 Faculty Council ad-hoc committee, of which I was an active member. That committee argued that Faculty Council can provide a key role in improving the work atmosphere, morale and Faculty engagement of faculty in the Barber School. Senate Policy O-2: Faculty Councils states that "one of the powers and duties of a Faculty is to make rules for the government, direction and management of that Faculty and its affairs and business" and that "each Faculty shall meet regularly as a Faculty Council which is the Faculty sitting as a governance body for the consideration of Faculty matters".

A Barber School Faculty Council that actually did this might lead to higher levels of morale and Faculty engagement among the faculty in the Barber School. The Barber School Faculty Council has just one standing committee, on curriculum. There is no, say, standing Faculty budget advisory committee, academic (e.g. faculty hiring priority) planning committee, strategic (e.g. space and infrastructure) planning committee, or Barber School endowment advisory committee (advisory to the Faculty Council, not the dean) – the \$15m endowment with which Ike Barber (\$10m) and UBC (\$5m) jointly established the School.

Recommendation 1: Establish a Faculty Budget Advisory Committee as a Standing Committee of Faculty Council

Regular faculty members require more (indeed some, any) transparency on the overall Faculty budget and management needs to be more (indeed, minimally) accountable on its sources of revenues and how it deploys them in expenditures, and why. Noted in the UBC 10-year Finance Plan is the budgetary need at UBC for "transparency, flexibility and accountability at the Faculty and departmental level".

Recommendation 2: Implement a budgetary framework as already in place at UBCV, one that allocates resources to Departments based on enrolments, with simplification and transparency to the budget process

Noted in the UBC 10-year Finance Plan is that for UBCO a key objective is to "develop a campus budget model that supports sustainable decision-making in alignment with long-term strategic priorities." Faculty members in the Barber School in order to feel more engaged and incentivized require transparent budget mechanisms that tie resources to results e.g. to enrolments and to enrolment of e.g. international visa students, with a more open and transparent approach to the budget process. Also, budgetary authority in the Barber School needs to be devolved down to the program or at least the

department level e.g. for deciding the departments' own hiring priorities etc., as at UBCV, in order to engage the programs and departments and their faculty members and to get away from central authority "command and control" of the Dean's Office.

Recommendation 3: Establish a Faculty Academic Planning Committee as a Standing Committee of Faculty Council

The Developmental Review of UBCO of 2011 noted a need for UBCO academic planning engaging the broad campus community including attention to the size of faculties and departments, strategic enrolment management at the campus level, and external reviews of all academic programs, with especially more consultation and transparency on program and department enrolment management. The Barber School now had an academic plan, so this committee of Faculty Council is required to monitor it and update it on a continuous basis, engaging the faculty members, and not just the Dean's Office, in that on-going process.

Recommendation 4: Establish a Faculty Space Planning Committee as a Standing Committee of Faculty Council

Space (or strategic) planning should be put into the hands of the Faculty Council and out of the hands of the Dean's Office as this is a matter of the "management of the Faculty and its affairs and business."

Recommendation 5: Publish in a timely fashion, as does e.g. Senate, Agendas and Minutes of Barber School Leadership Team meetings

Since the Barber School began regular faculty members have not seen any agendas or minutes of Leadership Team meetings. All budgetary matters and executive decision-making are hence held entirely out of the purview of the faculty, a non-transparent, anti-consultative, unaccountable state of affairs that should not be allowed to continue any further.

Recommendation 6: Continue the practice of collegially recommending and appointing Department Heads from among the faculty members in the departments.

This was in 2011 in the category of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" as there was wide satisfaction with department (then unit) heads in 2011, yet the School (was this under pressure from the provost and/or DVC?) decided to change the way heads were collegially recommended and appointed within the departments, by insisting on bringing in all external heads in all departments except one. It appears that this was fixing a non-existent problem at a very high financial cost and in retrospect (given the results of the 2014 and 2017 WES) a high cost in terms of faculty morale, engagement, and satisfaction. At the approximately \$1.5 annual cost of bringing in 7 external heads, double the number of assistant professors fully engaged in research and teaching could have been hired, with correspondingly more sections and smaller class sizes, or each faculty member in the School could have been provided with about \$10,000 in annual research funding for conferences, research collaborations, etc.

Recommendation 7; Hold more informal regular Barber School town hall-type meetings with faculty, staff and students regarding the Barber School budget allocations and overall Barber School academic matters e.g. enrolments, growing and static programs, space, class sizes, support, etc.

The Dean's Accountability Forums held in 2017-18 are a good start on this, but more structure, and wider invitation, to these forums is perhaps needed.

Recommendation 8: Implement a Question and Answer Period at the beginning or end of each Faculty Council meeting for faculty members to ask questions of the managerial Leadership Team.

Again the Dean's Accountability Forums held in 2017-18 are a good start on this, but more structure to these forums is perhaps needed, perhaps by incorporating them into each Faculty Council meeting at the start or the end.

My personal recommendations re: personal work and workload issues

Recommendation 1: Implement more teaching workload flexibility

For example, 0-4. 4-0 teaching loads, teaching in only one of the three terms leaving two open for research, flexibility to teach in one winter term, one summer term leaving four winter months and two summer months open for research. Allow the flexibility to bank courses from one academic year to the next e.g. teaching more in one academic year opening up a term or terms free of teaching in another academic year.

Recommendation 2: Review physical workspaces

Seek better configurations of unit and faculty offices and unit common areas, rather than the current rather haphazard nature of space used by the Barber School in the Arts, Science, AS2 and Fipke buildings (e.g. Nursing/FHSD faculty displacing arts faculty in the Arts Building without consultation with the Barber School faculty affected). Need proper head/administrative assistant inner/outer offices and department space, kitchens, lunch rooms, student reading rooms etc. Better faculty lounge and lunch room in the Arts Building, showers in Arts, Science, AS2 and Fipke buildings for cyclists. Faculty lounges perhaps similar to student Collegiums in each of the Arts, Science, AS2 and Fipke buildings. The current UBCO-wide faculty lounge in the Admin building is of limited use because no Barber School or UBCO faculty have offices in that building (recall the Arts Building kitchen debacle).

Recommendation 3: Review class sizes and TA/Tutorial/Seminar/Lab Support

There are largely no small group lab/tutorial/discussion group support for lower-level courses in the Arts except in geography, nor in large upper-level classes. Average class sizes at lower level are 200+; students are lost in the crowd. Class sizes are constantly bigger with no tutorial support; TEQs in large lecture classes with no tutorials are consistently poor; need tutorials on all large enrolment lower-level classes and some large-sized upper-level courses.

Recommendation 4: Implement external reviews of all academic programs and departments in Barber School

To see if they have the faculty numbers, TAs, resources, class sizes, sections etc. administrative support and space they need. Perhaps programs and departments need additional faculty, staff, TAs and space resources, RAs and administrative assistants. External reviews in multi-disciplinary departments need to be done at the program rather than the department level, e.g. economics, not all of economics, philosophy and political science, international relations etc. all rolled in together.

Recommendation 5: Implement an external review of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences/Barber School

This should have been done before the reappointment of the acting dean in 2014 and the appointment of the new dean in 2015 was considered, as per UBC policy (Policy 23: "normally scheduled for the penultimate year of a dean's term in office"). As a result of the ad hoc committee on the 2011 WES

results, the Barber School Faculty Council passed a motion in April 2014 calling for the provost and principal to initiate an external review of the School with the main areas of review being scholarly activities, academic programs and teaching, governance, organization, leadership and administration, interactions and service, physical infrastructure and financial resources including space, educational environment and institutional culture, morale, work atmosphere. This request came from the Faculty Council of the largest by far Faculty on the campus. Somewhat astoundingly, the provost and principal denied the Faculty Council's request.

Recommendation 6: Implement a program and departmental budgetary model that matches resources to enrolments and student: faculty FTE ratios

Devolve the budget down to the program and department level, from where it is currently held at the Dean's Office level, for disbursement by the dean unrelated to enrolments and student: faculty ratios. Devolution to the program and department level would hopefully provide departments to provide financial support to faculty members for the research and conference travel via the department. It is remarkable that a university such as UBC does not provide faculty with conference travel funds, for example.

Recommendation 7: Within the Barber School allocate Merit units and PSA funds on a pro-rated basis to each department or program based on faculty FTEs, and allow for a wider disbursement of Merit/PSA over time (1/2 merit units and smaller PSA units)

There is a growing perception in the Barber School that Merit and PSA has been going over recent years to fewer and fewer faculty members and in larger and larger but fewer amounts, and especially it has been going to heads, getting both Merit and PSA each year. More and more faculty each year seem to be getting no merit or PSA for many years on end. This is bad for morale and for faculty feeling their efforts are being fairly recognized and awarded. Having a larger amount of smaller Merit/PSA awards will help with appreciation/recognition of faculty achievements. Also consider time since last Merit/PSA award in making new awards.

Recommendation 8: Keep open opportunities for regular faculty career advancement by keeping department head and subsequent higher administrative-stream appointments open to regular faculty members; use external hiring in these posts only as a last resort, not as a general policy.

Recommendation 9: To supplement teaching/research/service professional development of Barber School faculty for training and learning conference and professional development opportunities, institute reasonable but substantial non-discretionary and non-competitive funding per faculty member paid from the Barber School endowment.

Recommendation 10: To supplement teaching/research/service professional development of Barber School faculty for training and learning conference and professional development opportunities, institute reasonable but substantial discretionary funding for competitive application per faculty member paid from the Barber School budget.

Applications via the Dean's Office if the budget for this is not devolved down to the programs and departments; better, devolve the budget to the department level on a pro-rata number of faculty members in the department basis.