Comments Provided on the Parameters – Draft presented at the March 13th Budget Forum:

Add: Student needs for transfer flexibility is very important (we would lose too many students if we cut out or reduce that transfer flexibility).

Possibilities for interdisciplinary and/or ladder opportunities, **#discipline-based credential development.**

Add: Global, critical thinkers; acquire depth and range of learning that provides students with capacity to engage, adapt, and lead in a shifting and ever changing world.
_____

Using the

The efficiency of the collegial model.
Using coordinators/chairs/stewards/deans, etc. :
Administering human resources /collective agreement

Define academic integrity, e.g. Reading, Writing, Math, Computer Skills, All Programs?

*Must be measurable in some way.
Define terms before using them
Increased coordination and cooperation between functional areas – enhance collegiality
Enhance access – for any potential student
Improve transferability – BCCAT unique and envied in N.A.
_____

We felt that every group and/or individual would rank these differently – even within a specific area's recommendations.

Need to be thinking both short-term and long-term.

Looking for "biggest BANG for the buck!

What are the most significant negative consequences for cuts?
_____

Changing demands /needs of the internal and external communities changed to:
Current and changing demands /needs of the internal and external communities

Continue to serve vulnerable populations

Minimize cuts to areas that already took major cuts.

Serve our communities
_____

Long-term academic sustainability of the institution *VISION!!!*

DATA-DRIVEN: DECISIONS / TARGETS / ACCOUNTABILITY

TECHNOLOGICAL
EFFICIENCY

MAINTAINING & GROWING A <u>POSITIVE POSITIONING</u> IN THE MINDS OF OUR PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS
_____

Remove the word "academic" from the first point.

Overall student experience beyond the classroom – duplication or #1
_____

:

Possibilities for interdisciplinary and/or laddering opportunities – Connecting Circles
Academic integrity of the institution – What is it?

Comments by Email:

To: Senate Budget Advisory Committee

The Coordinators of the School of Access and Academic Preparation want the Senate Budget Advisory Committee to include "Prior Reduction" as a parameter.   **The School of Access and Academic Preparation has suffered severe cuts to teaching sections for the past three years (compounded up to 40% in some programs in the School) dramatically decreasing the access to education for the most vulnerable students in the University. The School of Access and Academic Preparation proposes that we not be required to cut anything in the process of balancing the budget because of the very negative impact on education students in our School have already experienced.**   We feel that the University should recognize that when programs have been cut in the past this should emerge as a parameter in the budget decision making process.

My feedback on the draft parameters discussed at today's meeting:

1) there is an emphasis on "experience" as opposed to "support" - in my mind there is an important distinction here - you can provide an exceptional "academic experience" (for example, attending talk from leader in field; or working with state-of-art software; or tackling real problems in our local communities) without necessarily providing exceptional "academic support" (for example, small class sizes, contact with instructors, academic advising, disability services, etc.)

I assume you have included the various support services - both within and outside the classroom - in the definition of "experience", but I think it's important enough to make that explicit.

2) Nothing in there about faculty (except implicitly, perhaps, in "long-term academic sustainability"). If faculty are not well-supported, if they do not enjoy academic freedoms, if they are not provided with adequate PD, if they do not feel some autonomy and some control over the fate of the institution, it will not be possible for the institution to meet its other objectives.

These parameters were unlikely to fall out of the 5% exercise, yet they represent key criteria that the institution must actively guard and explicitly acknowledge.

These are budget-related parameters because some have direct budgetary implications (e.g., PD period and PD days, coordination, ETRC, TLC), while others inform the very process used to develop budget proposals.

3) "Academic Integrity" needs to be defined more explicitly. I think many people will associate this with the integrity of the academic programs (e.g., what happens to value of a program when you remove or

revise an integral component). However, in more common usage it tends to simply refer to the integrity of academic standards (meaningful, consistent grading standards, strict cheating and plagiarism policies, etc.)

Both are important, but if "academic integrity" means the latter (and it does in common usage), then the former principle is missing. I suspect, in the context of budget discussions, the latter is more relevant in any case.

I might suggest:

"Diversity of academic opportunities and pathways that maintain the integrity of programs and contribute to student success, both within the institution and in their transition out of the institution."

This principle, I believe, would be implicit in the items NOT proposed for cuts in the 5% proposals.

4) Perhaps the "diversity" parameter is embodied by the "Overall academic experience", but I find that one so motherhood that it could mean anything to anyone, and is thus rendered somewhat meaningless for decision making. Probably worth picking it apart a little to define the more concrete parameters that contribute to that "overall academic experience".

Thanks for organizing an interesting session - look forward to more involvement as the budget process proceeds.

We discussed the budget parameters at our department meeting. We did feel that these parameters were very broad and open to multiple interpretations. We also thought the parameter "Management of Risk " should be included. For example, if students with disabilities do not receive the services they are entitled to, a Human Rights complaint can be made against the university.   Also, if inadequate resources or expertise are on campus to deal with violent or suicidal students, the whole institution is at risk. While departments, such as Counselling & Learning Support, don't make money for the institution directly, they play an important role in managing risk, risks that could cost the institution money and its reputation in the community as being a safe place to go to school.

We were also unsure of what exactly these parameters were going to be used for and how they would be applied if they were being used to determine which programs stayed and which programs were cut. If a program was to be cut, how many parameters would they have to fail to meet, all of them or one of them? If it was deemed a program did provide for an adequate "overall academic experience for the majority of students," how would that be measured or determined in comparison with other programs. What does the overall experience comprise of and what number defines "the majority of students?" Finally, if a program was cut, would they know which parameters it failed to meet and would the program have a chance to respond and prove otherwise?

A response to these concerns and questions would be much appreciated.