FACULTY OF ARTS UNIT REVIEW

Summary Report

The Site Visit of the Unit Review Team for the Faculty of Environmental Design took place from March 13-14th, 2018. The Unit Review Team consisted of:

Dr. Nancy Gallini, University of British Columbia
Dr. W. Andrew Marcus, University of Oregon
Dr. Cindy Graham, University of Calgary (Faculty of Science)

The fourth member of the review team, the Provost of the University of Manitoba, Janice Ristock, was unable to join the rest of the team for the site visit at the last minute due to a family emergency.

Following the Site Visit, the Unit Review Team prepared a written report containing comments and recommendations. The Faculty of Arts subsequently provided responses to the recommendations. General comments and the recommendations and responses follow.

General Comments of the Unit Review Team

Since 2010, the Faculty of Arts has seen tremendous changes in structure, culture and, in some cases, focus. Over that period, the Faculty has: developed a new strategic plan - Energizing Arts - coinciding with the refreshed university Eyes High (2012-2017) Strategic Plan; completed the Faculty merger with the creation of the School of Performing and Creative Arts and the School of Languages, Linguistics, Literatures and Cultures; and had a major renewal in academic staff with 129 new faculty joining the Faculty of Arts in the last 5 years. The scope of these changes over such a short period makes this a once-in-a-generation transformation for the Faculty of Arts -- a transformation that lays the groundwork for major advances, but also poses significant challenges as the academic culture and administrative structures and practices evolve to accommodate the changes. Adding to the challenge of this transformation is the fact that it coincided with the university's shift to increasingly centralized personnel, budget, and decision-making processes. Moreover, over this same period, there has been a shift in students' interests in different fields within the arts, humanities and social sciences. To say that this has been a period of change for the Faculty of Arts is a tremendous understatement. The degree to which the individuals and units in the Faculty of Arts have already accommodated these changes is impressive, as we outline below.

Paramount among the major changes was the amalgamation of the Faculty of Arts in 2010. This was a massive undertaking – one that the review team views to have been a worthwhile endeavour. However, some units did not enter it voluntarily, so the current dean (new in 2012) inherited the herculean task of continuing the restructuring and implementation of new administrative systems, while guiding the amalgamated Faculty toward becoming a productive and collegial unit. Although the synergies from the amalgamation appear to be modest and localized at this time, there has been significant progress. There appeared to be general acceptance of the change; no student, staff, faculty member, or administrator with whom we visited suggested that the amalgamation should be reversed to its former structure. To the degree that there are lingering concerns about

the benefits of the amalgamation, they appear to be largely generational; the majority of concerns we heard were voiced by individuals who were in the present Faculty before the 2010 change.

The most significant change has been the remarkable number of new faculty – 129 since 2012 – all of whom joined the Faculty of Arts without major preconceptions about "how it used to be." The quality of these hires is high; the high success rate on SSHRC Insight Development Grants (IDG) is just one indicator of this quality. These new faculty also bring perspectives from a wide range of subfields and consistently express a strong desire to take advantage of the interdisciplinarity within their Faculty to initiate more collaborative endeavors – although they also noted a number of obstacles to such collaborations. The majority of residual concerns expressed about the amalgamation came for senior faculty, although senior faculty also provided some of the most positive commentary regarding the consolidation and have taken leadership roles in envisioning new opportunities within the Faculty.

Based on conversations with the Provost's leadership team, other deans, and faculty, it also appears that consolidation of the four previous Faculties under one roof has given the "human sciences" a stronger collective presence and voice at the University. The Faculty has gained stature within the University and has a stronger voice at the table compared to the smaller faculties more fragmented voices. Although it is only one indicator, the citation rate for the all the Faculty indicate that 77% of the Departments/ Schools either exceeded or were within 90% of the index of its comparator Department at the 5th ranked "top-5" University; the others were not far behind. This is a Faculty that is poised to move to the next level and achieve even higher stature.

The Dean is well respected by his fellow Deans, the Arts faculty, staff and alumni, all of whom express a desire to have "more of the his time." Many faculty and staff also went out of their way to comment on the tireless efforts of the Vice-Dean; she is much appreciated. The Dean and his leadership team are to be commended for their hard work, as are the leadership in the Departments and Schools, and the dedicated staff, all of whom have navigated a time of immense change to create the foundation for an increasingly strong Faculty of Arts.

Although the advances are impressive, the Faculty still faces many challenges, some of which stem from the amalgamation. In this report, we discuss the challenges suggest recommendations for addressing those challenges. We note that many of these challenges are similar to those faced by other arts colleges across North America, especially as they relate to: developing a sense of identity across disciplines, addressing the differential needs and standards of those subfields, developing high quality space, addressing the faculty's sense of loss of influence within a large unit, and the severe constraints imposed by tight budgets. Other challenges in the Faculty are not universal, however, particularly as they relate to consistency and efficacy of processes, clarity of communications, concerns about advising and student environment, and decisions to centralize staffing in the college and human resources decisions in the university. Even in the face of these challenges, it is clear the overall trajectory of the Faculty of Arts has been an upward one. Remarkably, over the past eight years, the Faculty of Arts has: weathered a major structural transformation, put in place strong leadership, developed a robust reputation within the university, undertaken and successfully carried out an aggressive hiring campaign, created integrative departments within the Faculty, and displayed the scholarly potential to become a top 5 Faculty. Yet, at the same time, the pace of changes and demands have put serious stresses on the people

and structures of the Faculty as it undergoes this once-in-a-generation transformation. How these stresses and the ensuing challenges are handled over the next five to ten years will be pivotal in determining whether this tremendous transformation has unleashed strains that lead to long-term disillusionment by the faculty and a failure to realize the unit's potential, or has set the Faculty of Arts on a major upward trajectory that places it among the top such colleges in Canada. It is a very positive moment for the Faculty of Arts, but one in which action must be taken immediately to address the many pressures it faces if it wishes to reach its potential.

Reviewer Recommendations and Unit Response Follow-up

QUESTION I: HAS THE FACULTY OF ARTS DEVELOPED A COLLECTIVE IDENTITY?

A. Lack of Faculty Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure and Merit

RECOMMENDATION 1 (Faculty and University): It is imperative that the Faculty of Arts develop Faculty Guidelines to guide promotion, tenure, merit and hiring processes as soon as possible. This must be done thoughtfully and in close collaboration with the Heads and Directors, recognizing that "one size doesn't not fit all," and that criteria for excellence differ across units. In particular, departments/schools should provide guidance on tenure standards in their disciplines. Current procedures for merit/tenure/promotion need to be clarified with all academic staff until new guidelines are in place.

RESPONSE: The Faculty of Arts currently uses the guidelines for promotion and tenure from the four faculties that merged (Social Sciences, Humanities, Communication and Cultures, as well as Fine Arts). These guidelines are applied appropriately according to the specific context. We nevertheless share the view expressed by the reviewers that faculty guidelines for promotion and tenure should be updated. As soon as the General Faculties Council (GFC) approves a framework to allow faculties to update their guidelines we will be prepared to do so in the Faculty of Arts.

In the meantime, we completed and passed through Faculty Council a document, Work Assignment Guidelines that describes the different research, teaching and service activities and formats in the Faculty of Arts. It can serve as a starting point that will help the process of developing tenure and promotion criteria.

On the basis of the recommendation from the reviewers, we will continue to review our communication practices to ensure broad and effective dissemination of relevant information on these policies and procedures.

B. RECOGNITION AND VALUE OF THE DIVERSITY OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP IN ARTS:

RECOMMENDATION 2 (Faculty and Units): The Dean, in collaboration with the Heads and Directors, should develop a framework for identifying and communicating relevant research and teaching metrics (both quantitative and qualitative), that reflect excellence in the diverse units of the Faculty of Arts. These metrics should be clear and verifiable, and should be compared with appropriate peer comparators rather than between departments.[1]

> **RESPONSE:** We recognize the need to develop clear "metrics" that are discipline specific. This is a sensitive and important issue. For many of our disciplines – primarily but not exclusively in the social sciences – there are fairly well-established disciplinary metrics based on, say, the quantity of publication and the quality of the venues of publication. In other areas, the metrics are less easy to quantify. We are working collaboratively to identify relevant measures of excellence in all disciplines.
>
> Since 2014, the Faculty has developed its "Quality Assurance Process". We are happy to report that 10 departments have undergone an external review as part of this process. The last four academic units will undergo external review in 2019 (these are the four units that went through a merger). Then the cycle will restart. These reviews achieve what is suggested here: they compare disciplines against the same disciplines elsewhere and the recommendations received have been specific and useful.

RECOMMENDATION 3 (Faculty): The data from the above exercise should be widely circulated and discussed within the Faculty. Transparent dissemination of data is essential for improving quality and avoiding potential resentment between units.[2]

> **RESPONSE:** Agreed. The process leading to the development of the metrics is transparent. In addition, the reviewers involved in the unit reviews (as part of the Quality Assurance Process) submit a report to the Dean, which is then conveyed to the unit itself. Units are given the opportunity to respond. The response is shared and discussed openly at Faculty Council, in the interest of transparency.

RECOMMENDATION 4 (University): In support of the above exercise, the Provost and President's Offices should also work with the Faculty of Arts to understand the differences and complementarities between Arts disciplines. It is also important that the Provost and President continue to make public proclamations of the value of Arts in their speeches and in establishing priorities for the University.

---

[1] It should be noted that a similar recommendation was made by the reviewers five years ago.

[2] Better data on quality given the above framework that reflects academic diversity need to be kept. The review team was given hundreds of pages of tables without explanations or narratives, so it was difficult to determine if this was being done.

RESPONSE: The Provost and the President are highly supportive of Arts. The accomplishments of the Faculty of Arts feature regularly in public speeches and in the community reports delivered by the President.

QUESTION II: ARE THE CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION AND GOVERNANCE APPROPRIATE FOR ACHIEVING THE FACULTY'S GOALS?

A. Relationship between the Dean and Heads/Directors (H/Ds)

RECOMMENDATION 5: Dean's Advisory Council (DAC) should be reduced in size to include only the H/Ds, Associate Deans, Vice Dean and the Dean in order to facilitate more meaningful discussions.

RESPONSE: While DAC includes HR, Finance and IT Partners in the general session, each two-hour meeting has a 30- minute period dedicated to heads, directors and ADs only.

DAC allows faculty leaders to connect with each other, and to connect with the Dean's Management Group (specifically the Partners). It is a setting which allows the Partners to learn about department, school and faculty concerns. It is important for them to be present at DAC to engage in discussions with H/Ds and ADs. Given the major concerns raised in this report (see below) about the Partners and the Partner model, it would seems counter-productive to exclude them.

RECOMMENDATION 6 (Faculty and Units): The Dean should meet with Heads/Directors, individually, at regularly scheduled time throughout the year. The purpose of the sessions would be to engage in mentorship, proactive strategic planning, rather than reactive crisis management, and to share information on awards, challenges etc.

RESPONSE: Our practice has been for the Dean to meet with Heads and Directors individually on a regular basis. Most Heads and Directors see the Dean much more often (sometimes every two weeks), as issues in their units arise and require consultation and a common approach to solving problems. On the basis of this recommendation, the Dean now meets with Heads and Directors individually on a monthly basis (while he continues to meet with them as needed on specific issues as well) in a more unstructured fashion. In addition, the Dean meets at least once a year with each department or school. The purpose of these meetings is to connect directly with faculty members in their own space.

RECOMMENDATION 7 (Faculty): Whereas the Dean should continue to be accessible to the faculty, it is important that he not make decisions, especially on teaching or budget, based on individual faculty requests, at least not without consulting with the relevant H/D. All decisions that should be made at a department level should be referred back.

RESPONSE: As a principle, the Dean always consults with heads and directors on teaching issues. There are instances where it is appropriate for individual faculty members to approach either the Dean or the Associate Dean (Research) with a request that involve a budget request. Efforts are always made to inform heads/directors about any such matters, but such budgetary decisions are within the authority of the Dean or ADR. The Dean's Office will continue to ensure rapid and transparent communication with the relevant head/director in this area.

RECOMMENDATION 8 (Faculty and Units): Faculty leaders and H/Ds should move to an inclusive multi-year strategic planning process to specifically determine how the faculty complement will grow or contract through strategic investment. This should include a transparent discussion of how dollars associated with future retirements will be reallocated to faculty and staff positions (or are already committed to bridging) and how dollars will be used to reduce the salary to total budget percentage. A transparent process for setting hiring priorities and criteria for allocations future resources should be developed and communicated.

RESPONSE: Our faculty has a new strategic plan that drives our priorities and strategic investments. Our faculty complement is not expected to grow over the next years as we reconcile bridge hires with central administration. The renewal of the faculty depends on retirements. These can happen at any time: sometimes they are immediate, sometimes they take place a year out. Projecting faculty and staff positions into the future is not an exact process. The faculty implemented a consultative process for the annual allocation of new positions a few years ago, which involves all department heads and school directors providing feedback on all submissions for new positions. We communicate the outcomes of our annual position allocation process to all academic units. However, there is too much uncertainty for this to include guarantees for position allocation into the future. Still, we encourage departments and schools to develop strategic hiring priorities for their units that project their needs in upcoming years. These projections help significantly in the planning process, but are still subject to changing budgetary and strategic circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION 9 (Faculty): The Dean should lead an inclusive and consultative appointment process for Heads that ensures effective, forward-looking leadership. The Dean should meet with each unit to discuss succession planning, the unit's priorities, and the effective mentoring of heads.

RESPONSE: We agree that appointments of Heads and Directors are critical moments in the life of units. Our policies and procedures for the appointment and re-appointment of department heads and school directors include an inclusive and consultative process for both appointment and re-appointment. They also include a visit by the dean to each unit to explain the process and ask for feedback.

With regards to mentorship, every new Head/Director is paired with a mentor – one of our experienced and successful Heads or past Heads. In addition, we offer a variety of workshops aimed at developing Department Heads and Directors in their role. Moreover, the University of Calgary is a leader in Canada in terms of providing a full suite of mentoring opportunities

and support for department heads. For instance, the Academic Leadership Academy provides learning opportunities for heads. And all heads throughout the university have the rather rare opportunity to meet as a group directly with the Provost on a regular basis through the Head's forum.

QUESTION III: ARE ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT STAFF RESOURCES ADEQUATE FOR ACHIEVING THE FACULTY GOALS?

A. The Dean's Office

RECOMMENDATION 10 (Faculty): The Dean should delegate more decision-making authority to the Vice-Dean, Associate Deans, and especially to the Heads and Directors that would allow timely issues to get done more efficiently. If delegation has happened, the Dean needs to communicate this to the units.

RESPONSE: The Vice-Dean and ADs have extensive decision-making authority relating to their portfolios. Heads and Directors have authority that flows from designated university policies; they cannot be assigned responsibility that exceeds or deviates from these assigned roles.

RECOMMENDATION 11 (Faculty/University): At least one additional support staff position should be created to support the operations of the Dean's office.

RESPONSE: It would be ideal to expand the capacity within the Dean's Office to meet the high demands faced within such a large and diverse academic unit. Effort will be made to achieve this goal. However, this would require additional resources or reallocation at a time when the faculty's budget is under pressure.

RECOMMENDATION 12 (Faculty): The Dean, in close collaboration with the Vice-Dean, Associate Deans, and H/Ds, should communicate the responsibilities held by the Dean, Vice-Dean, Associate Deans as well as support staff and partners (see below).

RESPONSE: We agree with this recommendation, and recognize that roles and portfolios are sometimes evolving. The Dean's Office's main webpage contains easy-to-find links to the web profiles of each of the positions in the Dean's Office. These profiles clearly outline the roles and responsibilities for each position. These roles and responsibilities are regularly reviewed and updated. Information about change in responsibilities or personnel is disseminated electronically as well as in person by the Dean at DAC and at Faculty council.

B. RESPONSE TIME AND PARTNER MODEL:

RECOMMENDATION 13 (University and Faculty): The partner model needs to be re-evaluated, and possibly restructured, especially regarding HR, with clarity of roles, decision-making authority, and constraints. The Faculty of Arts is the largest faculty on campus and as such should have dedicated HR, finance, IT partners that are not shared with other Faculties.[3]

RESPONSE: The partner model is currently under review at the university level and we are awaiting the results of this process.

RECOMMENDATION 14 (Faculty): Approval of faculty hiring needs to be expedited significantly, if Arts is expected to compete with the top universities for the best candidates.

RESPONSE: We are committed to working with all units and with central HR to improve the timeliness of the hiring process.

RECOMMENDATION 15 (Faculty): Roles and responsibilities of how Communications and Development teams work with departments and programs should be clearly delineated and communicated to ensure appropriate support is provided and the level and type of support given to units is clear.

RESPONSE: Following a recommendation in our strategic plan, Energizing Arts 2017-22, we are implementing a strategic communications plan that clarifies roles and responsibilities of the Dean's Office and the departments/schools. The development team works closely with units on area-specific priorities, while coordinating faculty-wide initiatives. The Dean will regularly communicate the fundraising priorities at DAC and Faculty Council.

C. COMMUNICATION AND GOVERNANCE – SUPPORT STAFF

RECOMMENDATION 16 (Faculty): The current MaPS reporting structure should change so that the primary reporting authority should be to the H/D of the relevant Department/School. Alternatively, there could be parallel reporting and better interaction between the H/D and the Director of Faculty Administrative Services. The Dean's Office and H/Ds should work together to determine the best structure and implementation.

RESPONSE: The position of Director, Administrative Services (to whom the department managers had been reporting for a brief period in 2017-18) was eliminated after the

[3] This echoes a recommendation in the previous review: "Roles and responsibilities of the administrative partners should be clarified and recorded in service level agreements with their central units, and should be communicated to all stakeholders in the Faculty."

departure of the incumbent of this position. All managers report back to their heads/directors. We have begun a discussion with heads and directors, as well as with managers on how to continue to ensure consistent practices and compliance in the future.

RECOMMENDATION 17 (Faculty): The Dean should lead a discussion with the MaPS and H/Ds to better understand the challenges, staff ideas for in improving systems in the Faculty, and suggestions for further engagement. The Dean should expand staff awards for excellence to increase the number and visibility; work with the H/Ds to develop a plan to provide consistent everyday recognition to staff.

RESPONSE: This discussion is under way. A survey of MaPs and H/Ds has been conducted. The feedback we received will help shape the content of the meetings and workshops that occur monthly with MaPS, HR and the Vice-Dean (DMAC). The Vice-Dean is also leading the Engagement Committee to improve engagement and satisfaction – in particular among MaPS staff. New initiatives are also underway to provide recognition for the commitment of staff to their work and to their unit, including in the form of a new staff award.

RECOMMENDATION 18 (Faculty and Units): The Dean's Office, in collaboration with the H/Ds should discuss how Communications and Development might be restructured to better serve the Units.

RESPONSE: Our Directors of Development and Communications report both to the Dean of Arts as well as to supervisors in central administration. We work closely with units in our day-to-day operations, in alignment with priorities established in our strategic plan.

QUESTION IV: ARE RESEARCH PRIORITIES AND ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE FOR ACHIEVING THE FACULTY'S AND UNIVERSITY'S AMBITIOUS GOALS?

A. Measures of Excellence

RECOMMENDATION 19 (University): If there is no SSHRC coordinator in the VP-Research Office, it is essential that one is created. It is also important that the coordinator be a faculty member from the Social Sciences, Humanities or Creative and Performing Arts, who understands at a deep level the diversity of research in Arts and can represent the University at the SSHRC Leaders table. SSHRC Leaders are among the most valuable advisors to SSHRC Executive and Council.

RESPONSE: There is a SHHRC Leader at the University of Calgary. Psychology Professor Dr. Penny Pexman (previously Arts AD, Research and now Associate Vice-President, Research) has served in that role for the past two years. The SSHRC Leader prior to her (Dr. Anne Katzenberg) was also an Arts faculty member.

RECOMMENDATION 20 (Faculty and Units): The Dean's Office should discuss with the H/Ds incentives for encouraging a culture of grants across the Faculty and continue to promote applications to tri-council funding.

> **RESPONSE:** We have worked hard to create a culture of grants success in the faculty. Every new hire meets individually with one of our Associate Deans Research and with the Research Grants and Awards Facilitator. We have a full suite of grants workshops and writing groups that are popular and well attended. We have provided funds to top grant applicants who fell just short of approval and we are currently implementing a policy to grant all successful grant holders with a course release. Our faculty members have been increasingly successful in recent years. However, we recognize that there is still work to be done. It is imperative that H/Ds continue to participate actively in helping to promote a culture of grant application in all disciplines within the Faculty of Arts.

RECOMMENDATION 21 (University and Faculty): The University needs to work with the Faculty of Arts to correct the slow 6-9 week delay for receiving human/animal ethics approval for research. Procedures for different types of ethics applications need to be clearly communicated to all faculty.

> **RESPONSE:** We will work closely with the VPR office to improve both communication around different types of applications as well as the process itself.

RECOMMENDATION 22 (Faculty): Toward improving research in the Humanities and Creative Arts Faculty, the Dean should consider appointing an Associate Dean of Research from the Humanities or Creative and Performing Arts.

> **RESPONSE:** Both of our ADs Research need to have broad knowledge of all Tri-Council agencies and other granting boards. One of our current ADs Research, Dr. George Colpitts, has extensive experience with the SSHRC portfolio and comes from History, a traditional humanities discipline.

B. SUPPORTING JUNIOR FACULTY

RECOMMENDATION 23 (Faculty): The Dean should invite units to provide information on standard teaching loads in their disciplines, benchmarking against their comparator universities. After reviewing the data, the Dean should work with the H/Ds to ensure that their teaching responsibilities align with those of their comparator units.

> **RESPONSE:** We have "Work Assignment Guidelines", approved by Faculty Council, that detail all the factors that go into the assignment of teaching. In 2014, we analyzed teaching assignments against comparator universities and found that we are consistent with other

research institutions and their faculties of similar size and composition. We will update this process and communicate the results of this exercise to all H/Ds and their units.

RECOMMENDATION 24 (Units): Junior faculty should be protected from heavy service roles within their units. If service assignments are given, then there needs to be a fair and transparent evaluation of workload (including teaching release) that does not advantage or disadvantage them from achieving high standards of excellence in research and teaching relative to their peers.

RESPONSE: Assignment of duties is primarily a department head or school director responsibility. We encourage H/Ds to assign responsibilities that are appropriate for all faculty members at each rank and level of seniority. We understand that pre-tenure faculty members are not be involved in "heavy service roles" in their departments, although some service (as deemed appropriate by heads/directors) is usually encouraged. The Dean's Office organized a faculty development workshop this year (January 24, 2018, open to all) on "Negotiating Service in Your First 3 Years of Appointment". We will add this item to a recurring workshop for H/Ds on mentoring junior faculty towards success.

RECOMMENDATION 25 (Faculty and Units): The Faculty should implement comprehensive mentorship program to guide new faculty in teaching and research (including a formative peer review of teaching program).

RESPONSE: We have a comprehensive mentorship program for new faculty that covers research, teaching and learning, service, tenure and promotion, and community engagement as recurring basics. In addition, we provide a series of workshops with rotating themes, such as book publishing, developing a public profile, working with Indigenous communities, and doing research with international partners. This mentorship series has been a significant success. The details were discussed in the self-study that was provided to reviewers. We take mentorship very seriously, and would welcome a careful assessment and analysis of our program, to ensure there are no gaps remaining. Indeed, our mentorship of new faculty is one of the things we have prioritized in recent years, and we feel that the success of this very comprehensive mentoring program is evident.

RECOMMENDATION 26 (Units): Department Heads should meet with junior faculty in their Units regularly (at least once/year) to discuss progress and expectations for tenure. Heads should be mentored by the Dean on tenure expectations for their unit and how to provide accurate formative feedback to pre-tenured faculty each year.

RESPONSE: We agree that this is essential. Heads and directors meet formally with junior faculty regularly, at least once a term. We consider that this is a minimum. As part of the H/Ds mentoring that we offer, we will continue to emphasize the need to systematically

mentor junior faculty members in every aspect of their work, and to discuss tenure expectations regularly.

RECOMMENDATION 27 (University and Faculty): Departments should be given approval of positions in no later than the summer before the academic year in which hiring is to take place so that they can begin advertising and evaluating candidates in the Fall, so as to compete with other top universities following the North American market schedule.

RESPONSE: This is our current practice unless there are late additions to the hiring roster. See response to recommendation 14.

C. RESEARCH CENTERS

RECOMMENDATION 28 (Faculty): The Directors of the Centers should be given a forum for meeting with the Dean and H/Ds to further academic and fundraising collaborations. The Dean should convene a working group to examine the possibilities of better integrating the Institutes with development priorities of the Faculty and units, and possibly with other Faculties.

RESPONSE: Arts has three faculty centers, CMSS, LARC, and the CIH. The Dean meets regularly with the directors of the centers, both to discuss strategic directions and fund development. Both CMSS and CIH have benefited extensively from development, each with multi-million-dollar donations. DAC (Dean's Advisory Council) also now extends an invitation to directors of faculty centers to attend once a year. This gives them opportunities to share information and network with H/Ds and ADs. CIH has research collaborations with researchers in science, law, social work, education, and engineering.

RECOMMENDATION 29 (Faculty): Formal reviews of each institute and centre should be completed within the next five years. The review should specifically consider how the institutes fit within the new Arts structure and focus on integration, governance, goals and how to measure outputs/outcomes.

RESPONSE: Centres that report to the Dean are formally evaluated regularly. For instance, CMSS has just undergone review in 2018. CIH and LARC are scheduled to be reviewed in the 2019/20 cycle. The centres located within academic units (such as the Language Research Centre and the French Centre in SLLLC) have very different mandates closely linked with the academic unit in which they reside. They will be reviewed as part of their academic units.

RECOMMENDATION 30 (University, Faculty and Units): The review team commends the Dean and Arts units for this entrepreneurship. But it nevertheless remains the equal responsibility of the University and Faculty to engage in a conversation around the six University themes in order to

understand how, going forward, they might be amended to be more inclusive and better reflect the strengths of the new Faculty of Arts, building on its nodes of excellence.

> **RESPONSE:** The Faculty of Arts has researchers in four out of six research themes that define the Strategic Research

Plan, and the self-study highlights some of the interdisciplinary research groups involved and the large amount of funding received. There is now a call for "Emerging Cross Cutting Research Theme" proposals, which will recognize new, emerging research areas, including in Arts.

QUESTION V: IS UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDENT ENROLMENT, SUPPORT AND EXPERIENCE APPROPRIATE AND IS DOES THE FACULTY HAVE THE "RIGHT BALANCE" BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE ENROLMENT?

RECOMMENDATION 31 (University): The University needs to make greater efforts at explaining to students how to report issues. The Office of Diversity, Equity and Protected Disclosure needs to report its actions to the university community so that faculty, support staff and students understand that these issues are being dealt with. It is important that this issue be addressed immediately.

RESPONSE: We encourage students, faculty and staff to report issues when they occur. We also encourage H/Ds to share information about process with their faculty members and with their front office staff, in order for this information to be disseminated to students.

RECOMMENDATION 32 (University): It was outside the purview of the review committee to review university- wide policies related to diversity, equity and inclusion. However, based on what the review committee heard and knowing the clear commitment of the University to ensuring a positive working and learning environment, we recommend the University consider evaluating policies and revising practices that affect this environment. Specifically, the University should consider evaluating if its code of conduct for faculty and staff is adequate and if face-to-face (not online) training should be provided.

RESPONSE: The code of conduct is currently under revision. The University of Calgary is also a leader in identifying the need for an institution-wide sexual violence policy and has formalized a new position of Sexual Violence Support Advocate. We work closely with this office to help ensure a safe and welcoming environment in Arts.

RECOMMENDATION 33 (Faculty): Department Heads should be provided specific training about how to deal with issues around professional conduct.

RESPONSE: This matter is a key, recurring agenda item for our DAC meetings. We also provide specific workshops related to this issue for department heads.

RECOMMENDATION 34 (Faculty): Faculty leadership should develop a Student Advisory Committee to discuss issues (both with professional conduct but also broader issues of concern or areas of opportunity to the Faculty). This group should consider conducting a climate survey of students to gauge the degree to which students perceive that they are experiencing forms of discrimination.

RESPONSE: The faculty takes allegations of sexism, racism and discrimination very seriously. The Faculty of Arts established a standing committee on Equity and Diversity, composed of faculty, staff (AUPE and MaPS), and students (one SU rep, and one GSA rep). Members of the committee link back to their group for feedback, information and coordination. The committee works on a number

of fronts (such as regular workshops on sexual violence, bystander intervention, unintentional bias, etc.).

A. ACADEMIC ADVISING

RECOMMENDATION 35 (Faculty/University): The Faculty should hire at least one additional academic advisor to support student advising. A review of the Arts Student Centre should be undertaken with an aim toward improving the service.

RESPONSE: We agree that efforts should be made to increase advising capacity. Ideally, Arts needs to hire not just one, but two additional program advisors. In addition, there is a need for advisors to specialize in supporting Indigenous and international students.

A review of student satisfaction with advising services in ASC will be undertaken by soliciting feedback from students after they meet or talk with an advisor. Students will be sent an email asking them to rate and comment on their experience and assuring their anonymity. Problems identified will be promptly addressed.

RECOMMENDATION 36 (Faculty): The Faculty should discuss and determine a model for the delineation of advising between the ASC and departments. This model should be clearly communicated to students annually. There is some confusion among students about where to go for the kind of advice/support they are seeking. When students come to ASC for advice and have to be sent elsewhere, they often experience frustration at getting a runaround. The problem is aggravated by the lack of complete knowledge on the part of departmental staff of central student services offered at the Faculty and University levels. The key to alleviating the confusion on the part of both students and departmental staff is communication. ASC will send out an email to students at the start of each term informing them of important dates and where to go to get the advice/information they need.

RESPONSE: ASC offers training sessions each Fall to departmental staff. Department Heads have to ensure that staff with student advising duties in their units attend, and an information sheet will be developed for reference purposes throughout the year.

B. CAREER ADVISING AND WORKPLACE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

RECOMMENDATION 37 (Faculty/University): The Faculty should expand its co-op program to include all majors in the Faculty of Arts. Additional career advisors (minimally 1 but likely 2) should be hired to support career development for Arts students.

RESPONSE: We agree that additional career advisors would be ideal and that students would benefit from the expansion of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) programs in Arts. The current co-op program is currently undergoing a full review. A research report comparing our program to those of other comparator universities has been completed, as have extensive surveys of current co-op students, alumni of the program, and students who did not complete the program. Overall, increased emphasis on WIL is a high priority of the Faculty of Arts, and we look forward to developing increased opportunities for our students in alignment with university-wide commitments to this effort.

RECOMMENDATION 38 (Faculty/University): Development staff should work with community partners to develop and fund an Arts Career Centre.

RESPONSE: Preparing students for a variety of careers is an important feature of our strategic plan. The Dean together with the Associate Dean Teaching/Learning/Student Engagement will work with the development staff to explore the possibility of developing and funding more opportunities for students to transition into careers.

C. UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH

RECOMMENDATION 39 (University): Opportunities for research positions should be communicated more broadly to students. Information events should be set up for students. Positions available should be advertised so that students can apply for positions.

RESPONSE: Positions such as the PURE awards are advertised through both our ADRs and the various departments and schools.

RECOMMENDATION 40 (Faculty): Each department should set up research information events for students. Independent research opportunities should be communicated to students so that they are aware of who is interested in taking on students. This responsibility should not fall entirely to student groups.

RESPONSE: The Associate Dean Teaching/Learning/Student Engagement will work with the Associate Deans (Research) to foster more opportunities for undergraduate student research assistantships, and to determine the best method to communicate these opportunities to students (information events, centralized faculty website, etc.)

RECOMMENDATION 41 (Faculty): Faculty members should be encouraged and rewarded for incorporating undergraduate students into their research programs. This is important for STEM as well as non-STEM areas of Arts.

RESPONSE: We will continue to encourage faculty members to integrate undergraduate students in their research program. Contributions to the integration of undergraduate students in research will be recognized in the APR and in the tenure and promotion processes.

The University of Calgary's PURE program provides undergraduate students with opportunities to experience research beyond the walls of the classroom. The Dean, together with the ADs, will consider ways to fund a program like this at a smaller scale for the Faculty of Arts.

Several of our academic programs offer the option to do an honours thesis affording students the opportunity to engage in a research project under the supervision of a faculty member. This is a contribution by faculty members that needs to continue to be recognized.

Most of our programs also have a "directed study" course shell which can be used by students to undertake a semester-length research projector under the supervision of a faculty member.

D. INTERNATIONALIZATION AND INDIGENIZATION INITIATIVES:

RECOMMENDATION 42 (University and Faculty): The Faculty should work in collaboration with University of Calgary International and the Registrar's office to increase the percentage of international students. We understood that increasing international students would not displace domestic students; nevertheless, we note from the last review: "reduction of domestic undergraduate spaces corresponding to an increase in international student enrolment should be well rationalized and effectively communicated internally and externally."

RESPONSE: The Faculty of Arts AD Internationalization and Global Initiatives is developing a multi-faceted plan to increase international undergraduate student enrollment. This is a key component of our new Internationalization Strategy, which was passed in November of 2017. In November, 2018 the Dean traveled to Beijing, Tianjin, Xian and Shanghai to meet with partners at Chinese universities to develop exchange and student mobility agreements that will increase undergraduate student enrolment in Arts.

RECOMMENDATION 43 (Faculty): The Faculty must decide and act on how it will target international recruitment either through 3+2/2+2 international articulation programs, Pathways programs or regular international recruitment.

RESPONSE: The Faculty of Arts will continue to embrace a multi-faceted approach to international student recruitment. Direct recruitment will continue to be our primary means of international recruitment because it offers the best potential increase in numbers. We have increased our investment in direct, targeted recruiting in cooperation with the International Office. However, we are also committed to formalize 2+2 and 3+2 international articulation programs with specified partner institutions, starting with several institutions in China.

E. GRADUATE STUDENTS

RECOMMENDATION 44 (Faculty): The Dean should provide a forum in which H/Ds can share strategies for increasing transparency on graduate offers and encouraging graduate students to apply for external awards.

RESPONSE: The Graduate Academic Review Committee (GARC), where graduate program directors (GPDs) meet on a regular basis, provides such a forum. In 2018 we began a practice of having a discussion among GPDs about how their graduate admissions and offers were proceeding, challenges they were facing in making offers, etc. Since H/Ds delegate their graduate admissions and funding decisions to GPDs, this seems like the best forum for such discussions.

RECOMMENDATION 45 (Units): The units in Arts need to check that the graduate offer letters are clear on funding and how it changes with external offers.

RESPONSE: FGS has been working with all units for some time to help clarify funding letters. In addition, this will be a topic for discussion at future GARC meetings.

RECOMMENDATION 46 (Faculty and Units): The Dean should discuss with the H/Ds a strategy for bearing the risk for units with a reputation for recruiting high-quality students, in the case in which the Department "overshoots" and accepts more students than it has funding for. The supervisory capacity would constrain a department from taking advantage of this every year but, in any case, constraints on how this fund can be used would need to be worked out.

RESPONSE: We do not think that Departments should be making more admission offers than they have funding to support.

RECOMMENDATION 47 (University and Faculty): The Faculty of Graduate Studies should work with the Faculty of Arts (and other Faculties facing this timing problem) to identify a new funding formula that can support a more dynamic graduate strategy. The Faculty of Graduate Studies might also consider setting aside a surplus fund to support units that succeed in recruiting more, highly talented graduate students.

RESPONSE: We will be happy to engage in a conversation with FGS to make our graduate student recruitment strategy more dynamic.

RECOMMENDATION 48 (Faculty): As recommended elsewhere, the Faculty of Arts needs to engage in a multi- year strategic planning process in which units are made aware in advance which positions they will gain/lose, so they can make adjustments in their graduate programs.

RESPONSE: The Dean considers graduate program needs in determining position allocations. Multi-year planning is challenging because retirements come in at any time of the year and there is no mandatory retirement age. We simply cannot anticipate which or how many positions academic units will "gain/lose" in outgoing years. Moreover, the Dean will not guarantee that when there is a retirement in a specific unit or sub-field that there will be a direct replacement in the same department (and certainly not in the same sub-field). All positions are new positions, and position allocation is based on a variety of strategic factors.

QUESTION VI: Is Interdisciplinarity Supported in the Faculty?

RECOMMENDATION 49 (Faculty): The Faculty needs to discuss and decide how resources will flow to interdisciplinary programs and how teaching responsibilities will be determined both within and between departments.

RESPONSE: Interdisciplinary programs are very important in the Faculty of Arts. In fact, almost one in five majors in the Faculty of Arts is in an interdisciplinary program. We restructured the administration of interdisciplinary programs by giving them an administrative home in an existing department. This has increased the staff support as well as the teaching resources for

most of our ID programs. At the departmental/program level, considerable effort is spent gathering information about course availability, match with program, and tracking new courses for IDP. At the same time, we have hired a number of faculty members specifically dedicated to interdisciplinary programs, which has also increased the teaching resources for these programs.

RECOMMENDATION 50 (Faculty): An Associate Dean should be tasked as a liaison for interdisciplinary programs.

RESPONSE: With respect, we will not accept this recommendation: Appointing an Associate Dean for interdisciplinary programs would reproduce a failed model from the past. Indeed, when the Faculty of Arts was created, the position of an AD for Interdisciplinary programs was introduced. Administering IDPs at the dean's office level led to an increase of sessional labor, programs were not kept current and the disciplines most invested in our diverse interdisciplinary programs felt shut out. Moreover, the students in these programs did not have an office of their own to go to and be supported; they were all routed to the AD in the central faculty office. When the AD interdisciplinary position was eliminated five years later, the IDPs were moved into departments. Each department took on the obligation to retain the interdisciplinarity of the program, provided students with an academic home and staff to go directly to, committed to having the IDPs be part of the annual curriculum process in each department. The program directors work closely with H/Ds. There remains work to do to jointly agree on resourcing these programs. But we firmly think that the current model is much better than to have an AD IDP.

RECOMMENDATION 51 (Faculty): Interdisciplinary program directors should be involved in Faculty governance. At the least, a representative for interdisciplinary programs could be appointed to the DAC.

RESPONSE: Elsewhere, the review report recommends that DAC should be reduced in size; adding IDP directors would achieve the opposite. Heads are responsible for all programs in their unit. Indeed, several of our departments and both of our schools have multiple programs within the unit, in addition to any IDP programs. These program directors are not part of the faculty-level governance body. The IDP directors, like the other program directors, should be actively involved in department-level governance, for instance as members of the head's/director's advisory or executive committees. But to add them to DAC would make this body unwieldy.

QUESTION VII: IS THE BUDGET AND BUDGET ALLOCATION PROCESS APPROPRIATE FOR ACHIEVING THE FACULTY'S GOALS?

RECOMMENDATION 52 (University and Faculty): The Dean should engage the H/Ds in a budgetary framework for allocating budgets and positions across units. Criteria used for allocations how they align with Faculty/University priorities should be identified and transparent.[4]

[4] This is similar to a suggestion in the last review, the Faculty, in which reviewers recommended taking "a hard look at the Faculty operations and re-examin(ing) budget allocation envelopes. Define Faculty priorities and realign budgets accordingly, accepting the inevitability of trade-offs in order to achieve the most important goals.

RESPONSE: The annual budget process is precisely about allocating budgets and positions across units. Departments/schools are directly involved each year in the budget process for their units and the faculty as a whole. For positions, departments and schools are asked to submit up to three proposals that reflect hiring priorities in their units and to rank all proposals other than their own according to a number of criteria. These assessments inform resource allocation in the faculty. These procedures are clearly laid out and transparent.

RECOMMENDATION 53 (University and Faculty): The Faculty should be allowed to retain some portion of its carry-forward funds (e.g., 2-5% of budget) for one year, which the Dean could allocate to Units (through an allocation process developed collaboratively with the H/Ds) for unexpected or multi-year opportunities. If the University is constrained to claw back end-year excess funds, then it should create a fund, allocated to the Faculty, to give it greater flexibility to pursue strategic opportunities.

RESPONSE: The Faculty can submit a plan to retain its carry-over. If approved, the funds must be spent within the current budget year. The university is currently committed to spending down its Internally Restricted Net Assets (IRNA) rather than building them up. A multi-year fund, as suggested in this recommendation, would increase IRNA, exposing the institution to a high level of risk.

RECOMMENDATION 54 (Faculty and Units): Departments/Schools should be allowed to retain positions vacated by faculty members who are hired away by a competitor university. Attempts should be made to replace the faculty member at the same academic level of seniority. In this way, the University and Faculty would share the risk with Units striving to hire strong candidates.

RESPONSE: Arts usually replaces pre-tenure hires who leave the university, returning the position to the academic unit. However, we do not and will not automatically replace all departing faculty members with a new position in their home departments at the same level of seniority. To do so would not be strategic.

When a senior faculty member resigns, it may present an opportunity to capitalize on new trends, to re-examine program and research needs, or to align with university and faculty strategic priorities. We are committed to investing strategically. Automatically replacing all departing faculty members with an identical position in their home department would not be strategic.

RECOMMENDATION 55 (Faculty and Units): Although positions are held centrally, the Dean should allow Departments to retain some percentage (e.g., 50-75%) of one-time dollars from (1) salaries of faculty members on unpaid leave and (2) salaries from positions not filled because the Units' first-choice candidates accepted an offer at another university.

RESPONSE: All academic units in Arts receive sessional positions to address gaps in their teaching plans due to positions not filled, as well as vacancies due to faculty on leave. If a faculty member is on leave for a long duration, the faculty normally commits to a limited term appointment to give the unit stability.

RECOMMENDATION 56 (University, Faculty and Units): The Faculty should explore alternative funding opportunities. Among the possibilities listed by the Dean that should be further explored are: (1) Increased international enrolment (as long additional resources are allocated to Arts advising); (2) Broader range of summer programs; (3) Introduction of Professional MA programs (e.g., Masters in GIS) and undergraduate certificate programs (e.g. in English); (4) Greater fundraising activity with the help of the alumni or the Dean's Advisory Board.

> **RESPONSE:** We agree with these recommendations. (1) The Dean and AD International are actively involved in efforts to increase international enrollment. This is a priority identified in our Internationalization Plan. (2) Spring/summer programs are incentivized to departments in a cost-share program. (3) Greater utilization of professional MA programs and undergraduate certificates has already begun. However, without provincial changes to allow for differentiated tuition, these initiatives may not result in significant increases in funding. (4) Fundraising activities that engage alumni as well as the Dean's Advisory Board have shown success so far, especially in terms of our Faculty's excellent performance in the annual Giving Day. Future plans include expanding alumni activity to our community abroad and to working strategically with donor research officers in identifying a broader range of potential donors.

RECOMMENDATION 57 (Faculty): The Dean, in collaboration with the H/Ds, should consider expanding the responsibilities of the Alumni Advisory Committee to help develop a mentoring program for students, and to engage in career fairs/industry days for the students.

> **RESPONSE:** We agree. Both the Arts Alumni Advisory Committee and the Dean's Advisory Group have expressed interest in mentoring students in an informal fashion, and in supporting career awareness through a variety of means. We will pursue these opportunities. In addition, alumni relations is centrally involved in developing an alumni mentoring platform which should become available in 2019.

RECOMMENDATION 58 (Faculty/Departments): The Dean and Faculty development team should engage the Heads/Directors in prioritizing and implementing the development plan.

> **RESPONSE:** We agree. We are working to fully engage department heads, school directors and institute/centre directors in the development plan. This engagement is vital to fundraising success in our faculty. There have been some good examples of key initiatives in units coming to fruition through the combined efforts of the head/director and development staff. For instance, Psychology worked proactively with the Arts Development Director and the Dean to secure funding for the Psychology Clinic and he Director of the CIH worked with us to attract significant donor support for that unit. We look forward to enhancing these activities across units and to achieving greater success.

QUESTION VIII: ARE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE ADEQUATE TO MEET THE FACULTY'S GOALS?

RECOMMENDATION 59 (University): The University should lobby the provincial government to provide funding for the new Interdisciplinary Science Innovation Centre identified as the top capital project in the Comprehensive Institutional Plan (CIP) as soon as possible. It is unclear from the CIP whether the

government understands the dire situation of animal-care facilities on campus and the serious outcomes that will result if UCalgary loses its accreditation from the Canadian Council on Animal Care.

> **RESPONSE:** We agree that it is vital for the University of Calgary to move ahead with its plans to construct a building that would house the animal-care facilities for the Faculty of Arts. We are pleased to have the full support of the university administration in this matter and look forward to the creation of a state-of-art facility in the near future.

RECOMMENDATION 60 (Faculty): The Faculty needs to align CAR/FAR requests with the significant issues around animal care that exist in the Faculty. While prioritizing animal care facilities (writ large) to a new building construction would help to mitigate this situation, the timeline for such builds can be long. Leaving the current facilities in place puts the faculty and university at risk.

> **RESPONSE:** As stated above, there is a pressing need for new animal-care facilities. Moreover, the Department of Psychology in its entirety needs to be accommodated in the new Interdisciplinary Science Innovation Centre. In the meantime, the current facilities need to be adequately maintained and risks mitigated. While some animal care issues might be addressed through CAR/FAR, the obligation to stay compliant with animal care requirements nationally makes such maintenance a faculty and university priority.

RECOMMENDATION 61 (Faculty): The Faculty should prioritize co-locating units in all space needs going forward. Significant progress needs to be made in this area within the next 3 years.

> **RESPONSE:** Space is at a premium on campus. We work closely with the central administration to secure adequate physical resources and to make the best use of the space available on campus. The Faculty of Arts is spread out over numerous buildings and we strive to co-locate academic units. As mentioned above, a top priority is the co-location of members of the Department of Psychology, along with a significant upgrade to their departmental facilities.

Concluding Remarks:

We thank the reviewers for the time and effort they put in to investigating our situation and providing this list of recommendations. They provide an opportunity for us to do better, particularly in the areas of transparency, communications, collaborative resource planning, preparing students for a variety of careers, and mentoring department heads and school directors. We pledge to move quickly to meet these challenges. Plans are either already in place to address these specific recommendations, or they will be soon.

However, the sheer number (and the narrow focus) of the recommendations in this review make it difficult to determine exactly what are the overarching priorities we should set going forward. Many recommendations suggest initiatives already under way, as explained in our self-study, or they are matters that are already identified as priorities in our strategic or internationalization plans. Some recommendations are also based on a misinterpretation of policies and procedures, or a misperception about who has authority to make changes. We hope that this response helps clarify those matters. But we are still left with a series of recommendations that fail to rise to the higher level, helping us aim to meet our highest aspirations.

These are challenging times, especially for Faculties of Arts, and innovation and resilience will be required by all of us. In many ways, the social sciences, humanities and fine arts are under siege across North America, suffering from attacks on our value and worth. In many places (but not here) Arts is experiencing enrollment declines and under-funding of research initiatives. At such a time, it would have been useful to get some more powerful feedback on how we in Arts at the University of Calgary are dealing with some of these challenges. Have we set the right strategic direction? How are we doing relative to comparable units nationally and internationally? How can the Faculty help each department, school, institute/centre and program achieve and maintain standards of excellence in research and teaching? Have we created a coherent institutional culture of excellence in the Faculty of Arts since amalgamation? Are there specific suggestions for the re-allocation of resources so that our existing undergraduate and graduate programs can be successful? And what about our Indigenous initiatives? Have they met the challenge or is there much work yet to be done?

Many of these questions remain unanswered or unaddressed in this unit review. This will not impede our determination to work hard, to improve, and to stay on target with the direction set in our strategic plan. And we will continue to align with the university's aspirational goals and objectives.

Of course, a number of elements in this report will help us focus on specific issues in the upcoming years. We are glad for that. And we will act quickly and effectively on the many solid recommendations identified in this report. The Faculty of Arts will be better for it, as we move ahead confidently in our implementation of our strategic plan. Through the realization of its goals, the Faculty of Arts will make a difference in the lives of our students, faculty, staff and alumni, and in our community, nation and the world.