REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

The Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy External Academic Review

November 14, 2014

CONFIDENTIAL

Submitted to the Dean, Faculty of Education

by:

Dr. James Thompson, Chair, Review Committee
Dr. Ted Riecken
Dr. Dennis Thiessen
Dr. Rena Upitis

Executive Summary

The External Academic Review of the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy (EDCP) was conducted by Dr. James Thompson (UBC, Chair), Dr. Ted Riecken (University of Victoria), Dr. Dennis Thiessen (University of Toronto), and Dr. Rena Upitis (Queen's University) in November, 2014.

In our role as reviewers, we were sent the self-study documents several weeks in advance of the site visit, which took place from November 3 to November 5, 2014. During the site visit, we met with over 80 individuals, including administrative staff, faculty, departmental staff, and students. Additional materials were provided at the request of the reviewers, both prior to the site visit and during the visit itself. The people we interacted with were welcoming and made every effort to make our visit both pleasant and productive. We are grateful to the staff and faculty who provided materials and otherwise made the process as fruitful as possible.

We found a thriving and lively department, with much to commend its work in teaching, research, and service. Under the leadership of the current Head, the Department has seen an increase in the number of events designed to stimulate fulsome discussion and debate about relevant curricular and pedagogical issues. There are many thriving scholars in this research-intensive Department, scholars who are also committed to teacher education and community outreach.

Recommendations arising out of the review challenge the Department to develop a strategic plan that will help it move forward in a constantly evolving educational landscape. Clearly identifying a focused set of priorities in teacher education and graduate programming will help the Department increase its impact within the University, and at the national and international levels.

The review team offers the following recommendations that we have categorized into short, medium, and long-term time frames for implementation.

1) Develop a 5-year Strategic Plan (short term).
2) Take the lead in undergraduate teacher education (TE) (short to medium term).
3) Expand the EDCP-based M.Ed. Program offerings (medium to long term).
4) Redefine and promote the M.A. and Ph.D. programs solely in terms of curriculum studies, without reference to specializations (short to medium term).
5) Further differentiate research-intensive programs (M.A. & Ph.D) (short to medium term).
6) Ensure equitable workloads (short to medium term).
7) Enhance the doctoral student experience (short to medium term).
8) Increase staff complement (short to medium term).
9) Continue to enrich and sustain the intellectual vibrancy present in the Department. (short to long term; ongoing).
10) Update dysfunctional lab equipment and spaces (short, medium, and long term).
11) Produce a more critical, reflective, and useful self-study for future reviews (short, medium, and long term).

I. Context

A. Provincial and Regional Context

These are challenging times for Faculties of Education in British Columbia. In the eleven years since this Department's last review, the number of teacher education programs in the province has nearly doubled from five to nine. With a resultant increase in output that has produced an oversupply of qualified teachers throughout much of BC, the government has repeatedly expressed concern about the number of institutions offering teacher education programs.

In addition, changes to Canada's overall demographic structure have created a smaller cohort of 18–24 year old applicants for post-secondary programs. A decreased post-secondary applicant pool at the very time that more institutions are marketing teacher education programs has meant stiff competition between institutions. The shortage of full-time teaching positions for program graduates and a decade long distrust between teachers and government, have yielded an environment in which teaching has understandably lost much of its allure as a profession.

Beyond the recent challenges in the area of recruitment, at the program level, teacher education programs are also being challenged to reconceptualize curricula. They are faced with a shift away from discipline and subject-based models to new structures that reflect the BC Ministry of Education's new education plan with its emphasis on interdisciplinarity, personalized learning, and broad core competencies across an interconnected range of subject areas. Located in the most senior of the Province's four designated research-intensive universities, the Faculty of Education at UBC is strongly positioned to address these changes through its expertise in research and in graduate studies.

New approaches to curriculum, and the evolving needs, interests, and motivations of 21st century learners are presenting teacher education programs and their faculty with significant challenges for program redesign and pedagogical change. Embedded within these challenges are interesting and relevant lines of inquiry for faculty to pursue, along with opportunities for collaboration and research with practitioners in the field. The strong and active coterie of curriculum scholars in the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy have a longstanding national and international reputation for excellence in research and this will continue to grow as the Department's scholars provide research-based responses to the challenges ahead.

It is in this context that the teaching, research, and creative and scholarly work of the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy (EDCP) is currently situated.

B. Departmental Context and Terms of Reference

We were informed that the purpose of the review was to ascertain the strength and balance of the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy in terms of teaching, scholarly and professional

activities, academic programs and service; to evaluate the Department's leadership and administration; to assess the Department's standing nationally and internationally; and to advise on the future development of the Department. The full terms of reference for the review appear in Appendix A.

To summarize, the review committee was asked to:

- review and evaluate the quality of the scholarly and professional activities of the Department;
- review and evaluate the quality of curricula, enrolment and effectiveness of the Department's undergraduate academic programs;
- review and evaluate the quality and extent of its graduate education;
- consider the diversity and areas of expertise;
- review and evaluate the demography and balance of the Department's faculty;
- consider the environment provided to faculty, including attracting and retaining faculty, workloads, use of administrative credits, and use of sessionals;
- consider the effectiveness and productivity of staff support, and the working environment provided to staff;
- consider the Department's approaches to educational and employment equity, and to provide advice on gender and diverse populations and issues for staff and faculty;
- consider interactions within the Department, including faculty and staff morale, and communications between faculty, staff and students;
- review and evaluate the Department's interactions with other units within the University and with its external communities, as well as the Department's success in aboriginal and international engagement;
- review and evaluate the governance, organizational structure, leadership, and diversity of leadership;
- review and evaluate the physical and financial resources of the Department, including its space, teaching facilities, research facilities, equipment and financial base;
- assess the adequacy of implementation of the recommendations of the previous external review;
- review and evaluate the Department's strategic plans for the future; and
- provide other advice, as appropriate, relative to the general purpose of this review.

Not every aspect of the Terms of Reference is addressed in the pages that follow. As noted at the outset, it has been more than a decade since this Department has been reviewed (B. Frank, personal communication, November 3), and thus, some aspects of the terms of reference – for example, addressing recent external reviews – were not applicable. Further, while the review team was provided with a lengthy prose narrative as part of the self-study, along with CVs of faculty, lecturers, instructors, and sessionals, some of the information that we would have needed to assess the areas outlined above was not made available to us, making it difficult to comment meaningfully on the basis of the evidence provided. For example, we were asked to comment on the curricula and effectiveness thereof; to do that fully, we would have required course outlines, samples of student work, course evaluations, and the like. These items, and others like them, were missing from the self-study. Thus, our focus in the current report was not to comment on every area outlined in the Terms of Reference, but rather, to concentrate on

the areas that seemed most salient at this point in the Department's history, suggesting ways that the Department might harness its considerable potential to further align itself with the Strategic Plan of the Faculty and the University as a whole.

Before arriving for the site visit, which took place from November 3 – 5, 2014, we requested additional materials. These included details about teaching and supervision for faculty members and sessionals, and a research productivity table. During the visit, we asked for additional documentation and clarification on the time to completion and retention rates for Ph.D. students, funding for graduate students, the guidelines for external reviews prepared by the Provost's office, the five-year hiring plan for the EDCP, and the Faculty of Education's guidelines for faculty workload planning.

Over a two-day period, the review team met with the Dean of Education, the Head of the Department of the EDCP, students, staff and faculty groups, members of the Dean's senior leadership team, and representatives from the Provost's office and the Faculty of Graduate and Post Doctoral Studies (see Appendix B for the schedule of meetings). Overall, we spoke with 35 individuals the first day and 47 the second, most of whom met us in small groups. Of the 82 people we interviewed, over half of the faculty and lecturers were represented, 29 graduate students representing the M.Ed., M.A, and Ph.D. programs were interviewed, and 7 EDCP staff shared their views. No undergraduate or diploma students were interviewed, and a tour of the facilities was not provided.

Unless otherwise noted, all page numbers cited are from the self-study.

II.   Objectives, Priorities, and Activities

There is an immediate need for the Department to develop a Strategic Plan to guide its scholarly activities, programs, and engagement in the university community. The Department's Strategic Plan should highlight its considerable strengths that are already aligned with the University's Place and Promise vision, and reconcile some of the deeply rooted problems facing the Department. In particular, the Strategic Plan must reconcile the tension between the disciplinary perspective and the interdisciplinary/issues-based perspective. By reconciling the tension, we do not mean that the tension should be removed: tension is needed to keep a sail tight, to hold a bubble together. We comment further on this disciplinary-interdisciplinary tension in sections III and IV.

As a general comment, we commend the EDCP for its commitment to both disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship. In recent years, too many "curriculum" departments either have drifted or have deliberately moved to an emphasis on one or the other, either through faculty appointments that change the faculty complement or through program revisions that redefine curriculum and pedagogy. In the EDCP, this review reminds us of the many advantages of a balanced department, and of scholars who increasingly understand the value of engaging with colleagues who represent a wide range of perspectives and orientations.

Recommendation:

Develop a 5-year Strategic Plan *(short term)*

This could be addressed during the proposed two-day retreat suggested in the Preliminary Department Action Plan in the self-study. See point 1, pp. 133–134: Revisit the mission of the Department and clarify scholarly, curricular, pedagogical, and community engagement priorities. It is important to ensure that the Strategic Plan of the Department is aligned with the Strategic Plan of the Faculty as well as that of the University as a whole (Place and Promise).

As outlined on p. 134, the deliberations about a Strategic Plan could begin with the priorities proposed by the Head (Indigenous Education, Internationalization, Community Engagement, Sustainability, Teacher Education). As the Department further considers its record and its ambitions in the areas of scholarship, curriculum, pedagogy, and community engagement, it likely is important to simultaneously consider what it most values, what has priority, and what is feasible. Following the two-day retreat, the Head could also re-examine and revise the other six initiatives in the Preliminary Action Plan, which currently focus on workload (points 3 and 7), celebrating achievements and building relationship (points 2, 4, & 5), and extending international partnerships (point 6). He could also review and modify the current EDCP Hiring Plan for the next five years in light of the strategic directions emerging from and further refined after the retreat.

III. Scholarly and professional activities

The EDCP has an excellent national and international reputation, one that is based on the publication and research records of faculty members of the Department. This global reputation in the field of curriculum and pedagogy involves faculty members whose scholarly work is focused on disciplinary or interdisciplinary research, and often both. The productivity of faculty members is comparable to other Canadian Departments of its type and size. The work of the Department extends to various international settings through a number of affiliations and collaborative projects. The Department has been supported in its scholarly evolution by the Head. For example, there is an expectation that faculty members who have not had external research funding for three years are expected to apply for such funding. The variety and diversity of the work of the faculty members has also been celebrated and made visible by the Head, a process that he plans to enhance (see p.134, the Department's preliminary action plan).

The academic stature of the EDCP is further recognized through the appointment of two Tier I Canada Research Chairs, the Eleanor Rix Professorship, and various large-scale national grants (for example, a SSHRC Strategic Knowledge Clusters grant and a team-based SSHRC Insight grant). Along with their impressive research record, the faculty members have received a number of teaching awards. In addition, the EDCP faculty members are to be commended for their strong commitment to community engagement and interdisciplinary studies, both within the University and beyond (pp. 119–122). For example, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Leadership Program (an interdisciplinary initiative) has involved

institutional leaders at UBC and in countries worldwide. Similarly, such discipline-based initiatives as the Math for Aboriginal Learners project, the Historical Thinking Project, the Intergenerational Landed Learning Project, and the Let's Talk Science Project all engage a number of communities and are strengthened by the research programs associated with these projects.

Recommendations:

None.

IV.   Academic Programs, Teaching and Learning

A. Undergraduate education (B.Ed. program)

In one sense, examining the B.Ed. program as a whole is outside the scope of the review, as the EDCP does not have the sole responsibility or authority to develop and deliver the undergraduate program; many other offices and departments contribute to the B.Ed. program. However, we were not asked to examine the related services and offices. Nonetheless, given the deep commitment and extensive involvement of the EDCP in teacher education, we feel that some observations about the Department's role in teacher education are warranted. It should be noted that we could not fully assess the Department's participation in the undergraduate program, as we were not provided with course outlines, teaching evaluations, or access to undergraduate students.

Nevertheless, on the basis of our discussions with faculty, staff, and the materials available to us in the self-study, we make the following recommendation.

Recommendations:

Take the lead in undergraduate teacher education (TE) *(short to medium term)*

The expression "Take the lead" means that EDCP would initiate a process in the Faculty of Education that would eventually result in the relocation of most, if not all, of the undergraduate TE program to the Department. This process would explore various options and timelines. For example, it might be advisable for the leadership in teacher education to be shared between EDCP and LLED, with partnerships with EDST and ECPS for the delivery of relevant courses from the fields represented in these two Departments. Or if the EDCP was the sole leader, it might be prudent to devise a staged plan of implementation, with the Department initially assuming responsibility for certain cohorts or for secondary education, etc. Over time, and after careful study, the scope of the EDCP's leadership could expand further.

EDCP (or EDCP and LLED) would become the "intellectual" and professional home of TE. As the Report notes, the EDCP is already responsible for more than 60% of the B.Ed. courses. The Department also has the leading scholars in TE and the deepest investment in the professional lives and development of teachers and schools. There are recent examples elsewhere (e.g., Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at OISE; Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Victoria) where "Curriculum" departments now have this lead role in Teacher Education.

B. Graduate and postdoctoral education and training

As a professional department in a research-intensive university, the EDCP is able to make a significant contribution to professional education through research-based graduate programming. A large variety of programs are offered (well over a dozen programs), especially at the M.Ed. and M.A. levels where students may elect to specialize in one of many disciplinary areas are listed. This varied and extensive commitment to graduate education is both a strength and a burden. The variety gives students considerable choice. It also seems inordinately high for a department with a faculty complement of approximately 30 members.

The self-study provided data regarding enrollments in each of the programs, graduation rates tied to completion, time to candidacy for Ph.D. students, and leaves of absence. The self-study also summarizes the "Awards and Achievements of EDCP Students and Recent Graduates 2008-2014" (pp. 54–57) and their success of students in SSHRC funding and two noteworthy scholarship competitions (Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship and the Killam Scholarshp). We learned about the perspectives of graduate students themselves through the "World Café" document included in Appendix F (pp. 146–153). We also interviewed graduate students (both full-time and part-time) and spoke with administration, faculty, and staff regarding these programs. What we did not receive from the self-study, nor glean through the interviews, was information about subsequent career trajectories for graduate students, the publication and conference presentation record of students (other than a brief reference to 3 to 5 presentation per year on p. 52), recruitment strategies, course syllabi, teaching evaluations, or samples of capstone projects (M.Ed.) or research theses (M.A./Ph.D.).

The following recommendations are comprised of broad programmatic suggestions, followed by recommendations that might consolidate the graduate programs as experienced by students, staff, and faculty. By consolidating the operations and structures of the graduate programs, the Department might realize efficiencies, make the programs more sustainable, enhance the relevance and academic excellence of both professional (M.Ed.) and research [programs (M.A., PhD), reduce workload for faculty members, produce higher retention rates, and provide clearer indications to prospective students regarding graduate program possibilities.

Recommendations:

Expand the EDCP-based M.Ed. Program offerings *(medium to long term)*

The key to this recommendation is the reference to "EDCP-based." We commend the Department on its innovative, responsive, and responsible approach to the delivery of the M.Ed. program, especially through cohorts in various specializations (e.g., Home Economics, Physical Education, Technology Studies—see p. 40). However, we feel that it would be more efficient and effective if the various M.Ed. delivery strategies/models were located and fully managed/coordinated within the Department.

In addition to improvements in efficiency and effectiveness of program delivery, the Head would have direct control of any administrative buyouts (e.g., for advising or coordinating) and thus would be able to make more equitable decisions about such releases. Furthermore the Head could better coordinate the number of graduate courses offered per year, combining the current OGPR allocation (27 courses) with the number of courses generated by the off-campus and online offerings.

Redefine and promote the M.A. and Ph.D. programs solely in terms of curriculum studies, without reference to specializations. *(short to medium term)*

In a research-intensive university, it is crucial to have academically rigorous research degrees. One way to ensure this standard is to have faculty who are world-class scholars, a condition that is readily and impressively met in the EDCP. It is also important to have a "critical mass" of scholars in the program whose research spans the breadth and depth of the field they represent. Here again, EDCP faculty members offer doctoral students much choice in terms of research expertise in curriculum studies, across a spectrum of interests and perspectives in their various disciplinary-based and interdisciplinary-based scholarship.

However, the description of the various curriculum areas indicates that students can pursue M.A. or Ph.D. degrees in these speicializations. For example, they can get a Ph.D. in Curriculum Studies with a concentration (or a specialization at the masters level) in Art Education, Home Economics, Mathematics Education, Music Education, Physical Education, Rural Education and Rural Teacher Education, Science Education, Social Studies Education, and Technology Education (and presumably, with another appointment, Business Education). The Department should determine if there is a critical mass or a core group of faculty members to support research degrees with concentrations in each of these areas.

What constitutes a critical mass or a core group? We argue that there should be at least four (and preferably five) research-based professors in a group, tenured and tenure-track scholars who regularly conduct research, receive research grants, publish in refereed journals, etc. Four or five faculty members ensure some breadth in the field or sub-field, as well as provide for support for supervision, offering a range of courses, providing continuity when one or more are on leave, etc. Most of these areas do not have a core complement, although, in some cases, it depends how one "counts" associate members. And given plans for new appointments, and the current issues around resources, it seems unlikely that any of these areas will significantly increase in appointments.

Further differentiate research-intensive programs (M.A. & Ph.D.) *(short to medium term)*

We further recommend that the EDCP explore how best to further differentiate these research degrees from the professional degrees (M.Ed./M.M.Ed.). At the present time, the M.A. program is more closely aligned with the M.Ed. program in that students in both programs are required to take EDCP 562 and EDUC 500, within a similar program structure (i.e., both require 30 credits, with M.Ed. typically requiring 27 course credits and a 3-credit Graduating Paper, and M.A. typically requiring 21 course credits and a 9-credit thesis). The thesis is the key feature that distinguishes the M.A. for the M.Ed. program, a condition that aligns the M.A. more with the thesis requirement in the Ph.D. program.

We recommend that the EDCP consider ways to enhance the research-intensive components of the M.A. program. We acknowledge that the self-study indicates that M.A. students "should take at least one additional research methodology course to support their planned thesis research" (p. 41), but argue that the Department could do more to develop M.A. students as researchers. One suggestion would be to make a second research course a requirement rather than as something (albeit strong) advised or recommended. A second suggestion would be to have an additional required core course, such as a masters version of EDCP 602 (just as the required EDCP 562 seems to be a masters level version of EDCP 601). A third suggestion would be to require M.A. and Ph.D. students to take one joint course, perhaps one focused on contemporary issues in curriculum and pedagogy. We see value (e.g., mentorship, networking) in having M.A. and Ph.D. students work together in an advanced course in curriculum studies. Finally the Department could consider the development of a required M.A. research seminar open only to M.A. students, to reinforce and mutually support their development as beginning researchers.

The Ph.D. program is more clearly differentiated from the M.Ed. and M.A. programs, especially in the requirements of a comprehensive examination, a dissertation, two doctoral seminars (EDCP 601 & 602), and two research methodology courses. Following from the above suggestions for the M.A. program, the EDCP could consider the joint course with M.A. students and a Ph.D.-level research seminar, a requirement that could extend across more than one year, and, among other things, serve as a research-in-progress forum for the doctoral students. Another suggestion would be to convert EDCP 602 into a 6-9 credit research module and incorporate lab-like experiences in research methodology or internships in various research settings in either the field or one of the EDCP-based research clusters (see World Café suggestion on p. 152). Some Ph.D. students also recommended the addition of research methodology courses (e.g., mixed methodology).

Finally, and following from the previous recommendation (Redefine and promote the M.A. and Ph.D. programs solely in terms of curriculum studies, without reference to specializations), the M.Ed. program would be the only one offered with a specialization (with

all of its associated specialization course requirements). While some M.A. and Ph.D. students might opt to take specialization courses and do their thesis research on topic related to one of the disciplines, they would not be required to take two courses in a specialization.

Enhance the doctoral student experience *(short to medium term)*

Many doctoral students we interviewed reported that they felt supported in their work by faculty members, staff, and peers. One Ph.D. student commented, "There's an amazing pool of faculty to work with here." A number of students described formal and informal scholarly communities in the Department and Faculty that supported them both professionally and personally.

However, as noted in the self-study, Ph.D. completion rates are significantly lower than in the remainder of the Faculty and in the University itself. Research universities across the country are presently engaged in attempts to improve retention rates and time to completion. Indeed, one of the Faculties of Education represented by the reviewers, has reduced the time to completion to an average of 4.3 years, and the retention rate is 89.5%. The considerably lower completion rates of the EDCP need to be further investigated and addressed.

In our discussions and reading of the self-study, we noted several factors that might improve the completion rates and, consequently, the overall outcomes for Ph.D. students. Many of these factors are part of a larger portfolio of good management practices. The students themselves have engaged in several strong management practices, including the peer advisory system, and in various strategies outlined in the "World Café" document appearing as Appendix F in the self-study. The Department might strengthen these management practices further, by re-examining its orientation procedures for new students, and ensuring that any difficulties identified through the annual reports submitted by all graduate students are addressed in a timely fashion.

Completion Time and retention rates are also often linked to the level of student financial support, especially for doctoral students. We urge the Department to explore ways to increase student funding (a suggestion also made in the Self-Study, see p.135 and pp.50-52). For example, while the EDCP ranks second in the Faculty of Education in total research funding (with numerous SSHRC grants)(pp.80-82), the Department is below the average in Research Assistantships (GRA) in the Faculty (p.52). The EDCP may want to explore strategies that increase student GRAs on SSHRC-based research.

It is also important to review activities leading to candidacy, since many of the departures from the Ph.D. program seem to occur at that time.

V.   Faculty, staff, and other personnel matters

A. Faculty

The self-study and our subsequent interviews did not provide in-depth information on recruiting and retaining faculty, the demography of the Department's faculty, nor on mentorship of faculty through the ranks. We also received a copy of the Faculty's workload document. The five-year Hiring Plan of the EDCP provides some information regarding the make-up of the faculty; however, as noted in Section II, this plan needs to be reconsidered in light of the larger Strategic Plan still to be developed. We urge the Department to create a strategic Hiring Plan, rather than a one-for-one replacement plan.

We did, however, receive data regarding faculty workloads, and issues of workload were raised in a number of the interviews conducted during our site visit. Administrative credits and use of other buyouts were also discussed, as were course assignments and the use of sessionals. Workload discussions must also address the issue of supervision, both in terms of quantity and the nature of the supervisions undertaken. We strongly endorse the 7th initiative in the Preliminary Action Plan: Ensure service loads are equitable (p. 136). We offer a few comments about how to frame a review of service loads, but based on the limited information we have on this type of work, we have no recommendations to offer in this report. We note that the self-study suggests or implies (e.g., pp.132, 136) that service needs to be considered in light of overall workload, a position we also endorse.

Ensure equitable workloads *(short term to medium term)*

The Guidelines for Faculty Workload Planning document provides a useful framework for addressing the various concerns expressed about workload. We suggest that to ensure equitable workloads of EDCP faculty members, the Department should consider the following specific guidelines:

Teaching

- ➢ The majority of faculty members should teach 4 courses (12 credits).
- ➢ All faculty members should teach a minimum of one course in each of the undergraduate and graduate programs.

We support the position that the normal workload of a faculty member consists of 40% teaching, 40% scholarly activity (research), and 20% service. Stated differently, teaching is comparable in importance to research in how the EDCP assigns and faculty members allocate their time. Teaching is the faculty members' commitment to the quality of the student experience. The time devoted to teaching is the Department's and faculty members' investment into the development of educators and educational researchers.

The 40% teaching load involves four courses (or 12 credits) plus supervision. In our analysis of the information provided to us on teaching assignments for 2011-12 and 2012-13, only a small number (by our calculations about one-third) of the faculty members taught 4 EDCP courses, with averages per year at 2-3 courses for full professors, around 3 courses for associate professors, and 3-4 for assistant professors. In these two years, few (3-5) full

professors taught an undergraduate course in either year, most associate professors taught one undergraduate course (two taught two) per year, and two of the five assistant professors taught two or more undergraduate courses in each year. Thus the distribution for most associate and assistant professors was more evenly balanced between undergraduate and graduate courses than was the case for full professors.

Buyouts

> With the exception of the Head, the number of buyouts in one year should not exceed the equivalent of 2 courses (6 credits).
> Decrease the use of administrative credits for coordination.
> Discontinue the use of course releases for advising.

We recognize that buyouts or course releases are both necessary and critical to support some facets of the work in the EDCP (e.g., administrative buyouts for Head, Deputy Heads, Graduate Advisor, Undergraduate Advisor). In our view, the above three suggestions about buyout would work best if most of the previous recommendations were accepted. For example, if the EDCP becomes responsible for most if not all of the undergraduate program and for all steps in the delivery of the M.Ed. program (e.g., including on- and off-site cohorts, online courses, etc), then the Head would be in position to determine if and to what extent the allocation of buyouts are required to work in these programs.

In the teaching data provided to us for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, there were a significant number of administrative buyouts or course releases for the two activities—coordination and advising—that is, over 12 course releases/buyouts in each year. The Guidelines for Faculty Workload Planning does not include coordination or advising as one of the reasons for a workload adjustment (see pp. 5-7). Coordination is listed under service (see Service comments below). When this was put to the Head, he responded that all of the buyouts, except for those given to the Head, Deputy-Head, Graduate and Undergraduate Advisers, came from the organization of off-campus cohorts that was made by the Professional Development and Community Engagement (PDCE) unit and were beyond departmental control under current arrangements. The EDCP hiring plan, however, includes a recommendation for the allocation of 3 credits (typically one course) for one coordinator in each of the EDCP's curriculum groups. There may be reasons to support administrative buyouts for coordination in some curriculum areas; however, these need further analysis and justification on a case-by-case and year-by year basis. We have since learned that we were referencing the 2009 EDCP Hiring Plan which was changed in 2011 to eliminate all department controlled administrative credits for curriculum areas in accordance with a directive from the Dean. Hence, we recommend that the arrangements between EDCP and PDCE for off-campus cohorts be examined to permit fewer administrative buyouts occurring in the coordination of off-campus cohorts and wish to underscore that the department continue its practice of not using administrative credits to support coordination of curriculum areas.

Like supervising, we see advising as one of the teaching responsibilities of a faculty member, and thus, except for unusually large advising loads, we recommend that course releases are not provided for advising.

Supervision

> For any five-year cycle, faculty members should have a comparable Ph.D.-M.A. supervision load.
> The distribution of MEd Graduating Projects should be more evenly distributed among the faculty members.

Based on a file provided by the Head (EDCP Supervisions October 2014) of supervisions by faculty members between the years 2009 and 2013, the total number of M.A. and Ph.D. supervisions among all faculty members was reasonably balanced, with averages at 3–4 Ph.D. and about 1 M.A. for full professors, about 3 Ph.D. and 1–2 M.A. for associate professors, and 1–2 Ph.D. and 1–2 M.A. for assistant professors. Based on these numbers, it would appear that most faculty members have a reasonable load, with a 3:1 ratio in Ph.D.–M.A. supervisions.

For MEd Graduating Projects, the number of supervisions varied considerably. Consideration could be given to moving to a course-only degree or to embedding the Project in a capstone course with smaller classes. Or if the faculty members feel strongly about retaining the M.Ed. Project (as some faculty members suggested), then more careful attention needs to be given to how those projects are assigned (e.g., set minimum and maximum loads over a two-year cycle).

Service

The Guidelines for Faculty Workload Planning (p. 9) makes the following statement about service:

Service to University and community includes a wide range of activities including serving on and chairing Departmental, Faculty and University-wide committees. In principle, all faculty members should rotate serving on various committees, providing coordination within programs, and serving in other leadership roles.

In the context of the EDCP, it is important to further define what constitutes service and what would be a normal yearly service workload for a faculty member. This service expectation is typically characterized as 20% of a faculty member's time, which, allowing for 6 weeks of holidays and/or breaks in December, etc., amounts to about 46 days (or approximately 300 hours @ 6-7 hours per day). While it is often difficult to be precise about the demands of each service activity, it is possible to determine the likely time commitment of most of service activities. For example, a committee that has two-hour meetings 6 times a year and some preparation time for each meeting may require 20-30 hours in total. Furthermore each faculty member's service assignment can be monitored over time to track any fluctuations in service workload from one year to the next, and thus provide some basis for both comparing service workloads across the EDCP faculty members and assessing fair and equitable practices on a

yearly basis or on a 2-3 year cycle. Of course, this internal service has to be considered in relation to the external service record of each faculty member as he/she makes "their professional knowledge and skills available to the local community, province, nation, and world" (p. 9).

B. Staff

The Department's staff members are deeply committed to supporting faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students. Throughout the self-study, they are referred to in glowing terms — "a "dream team" who provide excellent, consistent and good-spirited support." The staff members respond in a timely manner whenever possible. Many are highly skilled, often in areas for which they seek their own professional development, sometimes on their own time. As one staff member said, "During weekends, when I have time, I would check out the PowerPoint tutorials and other forms of online support." This type of dedication speaks to their commitment to their work and to the Department. While it is laudable, it is not necessarily sustainable.

Recommendations:

Increase staff complement *(short to medium term)*

As noted in the self-study, "The staff members themselves underscored an 'increase in responsibilities and complexity of work duties' and that there are 'less staff' to do what is required even though they work as a community and try to help each other out as much as possible, but the stresses, commitments and specialization of each position often makes this difficult" (p. 127). We fully endorse this statement and recommend that an increase in staff members should occur through re-assignment from other units or through new appointments. Increasing the staff complement, regardless of how it is accomplished, is crucial to the ongoing work of the Department, and is especially important if many of the above recommendations are implemented (i.e., if EDCP is responsible for most if not all of the undergraduate program and for all steps in the delivery of the M.Ed. program).

C. Equity

The self-study lists an "Increasingly Diverse Society" as one of the "Current Challenges and Opportunities" facing the Department (p. 27). It also frames this under-representation (e.g., in enrolment in initial teacher education, staff, and faculty members) as part of a larger problem across the University and in the province.

Information on diversity in the self-study is about the composition of the graduate students, but only in relation to international students, Aboriginal students, and male-female distribution. We do not have information on other forms of diversity (e.g., ethnicity, religion, socio-economic status, age, etc) for graduate students, teacher education candidates, staff members, or faculty members.

EDCP Reviewers' Report, Faculty of Education, November, 2014

We have an understanding of the University's and of the Faculty's commitment to inclusion and equity, but did not receive information about the specific policies and practices at both levels that support this commitment (e.g., guidelines for appointments, support for recruitment, resources).

In short, it is difficult to comment further on how the EDCP approaches educational and employment equity or to "provide advice on gender and diverse populations and on issues for staff and faculty" (See Appendix A, p.21 in this Report for the Terms of Reference for the External Review).

Recommendations:

None.

D. Interactions within the Department

The Head has made extraordinary and vital changes to the climate of the Department. There are many references to the Head's leadership, especially in relation to building a new culture in the department and in his efforts to be transparent and helpful in his actions and interactions. Comments on the leadership team include descriptors such as "collegiality, fairness, honesty, positive spirit" (pp. 129–130). Further, it is stated that the Head has "shifted the departmental temperament from functional to fluid," enhancing intellectual engagement. The Head intervenes quickly on "anything not representative of respectful and joyous quarrelling." The Head is also described as being "unusually forceful on this issue: he will not permit any negative actions to take away from the current intellectual vibrancy the department is beginning to enjoy" (p. 135).

Fostered by the Head and facilitated by a number of faculty members, the Department is building an environment in which faculty and students can "share, discuss, and debate ongoing and completed projects" (p. 14), presumably in contexts where faculty "quarrel joyously about ideas that matter but do not involve themselves in nasty business" (p. 5). The seminar series, presentations, and research cafés are important venues for this culture making. Our reading of this impressive list of EDCP Seminars and Presentations 2008 to 2014 (pp.72-80) shows that the past several years have seen a marked increase in the number of such events, reflecting a concerted effort by the Head and members of the department to build a collegial intellectual culture.

During our visit, a number of department members commented directly to the review team that Peter Grimmett's leadership has made for significant improvements in the overall operation and spirit of collegiality in the department. Such comments echoed similar ones contained in the self-study itself, with for example, one faculty member noting that, "A greater spirit of collegiality has developed since Peter Grimmett became EDCP Head, owing largely to his extraordinary efforts to establish equity, honesty, and a positive spirit in the department. His leadership has marked a great step forward for EDCP" (p. 129).

The self study's section on the Department's leadership notes the emergence of an inclusive and supportive community, which is civil, scholarly, and respectful, with strong overall support for this positive change in climate (pp. 129–130).

Recommendations:

Continue to enrich and sustain the intellectual vibrancy present in the Department *(short to long term; ongoing)*.

In the experiences of the reviewers, the type of intellectual vibrancy that is present in the Department is not common, and should be protected and enhanced.

E. Interactions outside the Department

We have already noted the Department's laudable work across the Faculty and University in projects related to aboriginal engagement, sustainability, and eco-justice (see section III). In addition to the international reach of the SoTL Leadership initiative, there are many other examples of programs and scholarship that have international perspectives and impact. For example, the Department has had considerable impact on the internationalization of curriculum studies. It also has plans to create a two-year diploma program for refugee teachers in Dadaab, Northeast Kenya. We further note the increase use of technology in such virtual projects as those housed in the arts education area also engage in this case art educators from around the world (pp. 121-122).

Recommendations:

None.

VI. Governance, organization, and administration

A. Quality and effectiveness of governance

Governance of the Department is complex, as many aspects of governance are intermeshed with the Faculty as a whole. For example, some of the decision-making regarding teacher education happens outside of the Department, and there are times when the EDCP Undergraduate Advisory Committee makes recommendations that are not heeded with resulting tensions and frustrations.

We understand that there are regular Department meetings and that they are well attended. Department meetings are more than business meetings; they are a place for faculty to engage in discussion and share research. Meetings like this are vital for maintaining the positive morale that has been evident and are part of the Head's deep commitment to fostering a collegial and civil environment with civil discourse where ideas can be explored and critiqued without personal attack.

We have no specific recommendations regarding governance. However, if the major recommendations described above regarding teacher education and workload are pursued, these would necessarily involve re-thinking some of the governance structures.

Recommendations:

None.

B.   Infrastructure and resources

We had limited information regarding the physical and financial resources of the Department. However, during the course of our interviews, there were many comments made about the library, lab spaces, and graduate student workspaces.

Those who commented on library services had only positive comments. Graduates students expressed some concern about the lack of private working spaces, noting that they often share desks. By the same token, they were nonetheless very appreciative of the spaces provided to them, noting especially, the value of having places to eat and prepare food.

Several interest groups spoke about the dedicated lab spaces in the Department. These spaces were described as important to the Department, but out of date in terms of equipment and other resources. Further, many of the labs that require support from skilled technical staff are thinly stretched, with staffing complements having been reduced through previous budget cuts. Additional cuts to staff (see section V.B above) would be extremely problematic.

Recommendations:

Update dysfunctional lab equipment and spaces *(short, medium, and long term)*

We do not have a prescribed solution for updating the lab spaces, but we encourage the Department to think broadly about whether there might be ways to generate ongoing budget support for lab equipment by sharing some of the lab spaces with others in the Faculty and the University as a whole. Other institutions have moved to more centralized booking and maintenance of space, and there have been benefits to these shifts (e.g., access to University-level funds to support the needs of these spaces).

We understand that the Faculty of Education is involved in a space audit and the ways in which the labs are equipped, booked, and maintained are undoubtedly part of that audit. The EDCP should have input into the Terms of Reference for the audit.

C.   Recommendations from previous review

We did not receive a previous review.

Recommendations:

None.

VI.   Other issues

When the Review Committee first met in person, we were struck by the similar reactions that we had all experienced regarding the self-study provided to us in advance of the review. Some features that are typically included in a self-study were missing; others were present, but in an obscure way that made it difficult to interpret the evidence provided. While we were able to supplement the self-study with materials prior to our visit and during the visit itself, we make the following recommendation for future external reviews, not only to facilitate the work of the reviewers in providing a useful review, but to provide a clearer picture to the Department itself of the work that it undertakes and the directions that it might pursue in future years.

The Department must be poised to produce a more critical, reflective, and useful self-study for future reviews *(short, medium, and long term)*

Determine the content and structure of data collection to improve the self-study evidence, both for future reviews, but even more important, for ongoing evaluation and reflexive planning. There are a number of ways that data might be collected to provide a snapshot of the Department's activities, strengths, and challenges. For example, succinct summaries of research productivity, supervisory roles, and teaching commitments, in tabular form, should be readily available. All faculty members should maintain a current CV developed according to the standardized UBC format.

EXTERNAL REVIEW
TERMS OF REFERENCE
Department of Curriculum & Pedagogy
2014

Purpose

To review the strength and balance of the Department of Curriculum & Pedagogy teaching, scholarly and professional activities, academic programs and service; to evaluate the Department's leadership and administration; to assess the department's standing nationally and internationally; and to advise on the future development of the department.

The Review Committee is expected to submit its report in confidence to the Dean of the Faculty of Education within four weeks of the visit. It is customary that the report will then be made available to the Head, the members of the department, the Provost and the Secretary of Senate, subject only to the normal restrictions or deletions imposed by University policies.

Terms of Reference

Without limiting its overall mandate, the Review Committee should give consideration to the following:

Scholarly and professional activities: To review and evaluate the quality, extent, range and balance of the scholarly and professional activities of the Department, identifying any activities that should be introduced, strengthened, or scaled down. The reviewers should give consideration to the scholarly impact, achievements and reputation of the faculty members in the Department as well as their ability to attract funding, awards, etc.

Undergraduate education and student learning: To review and evaluate the quality of curricula, pedagogy, organization, enrolment and effectiveness of the department's accredited and non-accredited undergraduate academic programs, taking account of current and future demands and available resources and teaching strength. The reviewers should consider the department's existing methods for evaluating the quality and strength of its teaching and programs and where possible, offer recommendations on innovation in quality assurance, including quantitative processes and benchmarks, for future evaluation purposes. The reviewers should also consider the diversity of the students, the level of advising and support provided to the students, the quality of their overall learning experience and assess any student concerns.

Graduate and postdoctoral education and training: To review and evaluate the quality and extent of graduate and postdoctoral education in the department. The reviewers should consider the department's existing methods for evaluating the quality and strength of its teaching and programs

and where possible, offer recommendations on innovation in quality assurance, including quantitative processes and benchmarks, for future evaluation purposes. The reviewers should also consider the recruitment strategies, diversity of students, average number of students per supervisor, times to completion, the quality of their overall learning experience, placement of grads, external funding, and impact of research from grads and postdocs and to assess any student concerns.

Faculty: To consider the diversity, strengths, areas of expertise, collaborations, demography and balance of the department's faculty; and to consider the environment provided to faculty, including aspects related to attracting and retaining faculty, workloads e.g. service and teaching loads, use of admin. credits (buyouts), use of sessionals; mentoring for leadership roles and career advancement.

Staff: To consider the effectiveness, productivity and balance of staff support, and the working environment provided to staff; and to assess staff concerns, if any.

Equity: To consider the department's approaches to educational and employment equity, and to provide advice on gender and diverse populations and issues for staff and faculty.

Interactions within the Department: To consider interactions within the Department, including faculty and staff morale, and communications between faculty, staff and students.

Interactions outside the Department: To review and evaluate the Department's interactions with other units within the University, particularly those in related disciplines, and with its external communities, including other post-secondary institutions, industry and the profession, as well as the Department's success in aboriginal and international engagement.

Governance, organization and administration: To review and evaluate the governance, organizational structure, leadership, diversity of leadership, opportunities for leadership development and administration of the Department, as well as the relevant support systems both within the Department and available to the Department.

Infrastructure and resources: To review and evaluate the physical and financial resources of the Department, including its space, teaching facilities, research facilities, equipment and financial base.

Recommendations from previous review: To assess the adequacy of implementation of the recommendations of the previous external review.

Future plans: To review and evaluate the Department's strategic plans for the future.

Other advice: To provide other advice, as appropriate, relative to the general purpose of this review.

Schedule

Prior to the visit, members of the Review Committee should review documentation relating to the Department that has been developed by the Head and Department and provided to the reviewers by the Dean's Office.

The visit extends over two full days and will include a tour of the Department, and a series of meetings with the Dean, Department Head, members of the Department and as well as a representative from the Faculty of Graduate and Post-doctoral studies, the Vice-Provost & Associate Vice President Academic Affairs and other relevant units in UBC.

The Review Committee's principal findings should be provided to the Dean in summary form at the end of the visit. A draft report should be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Education within four weeks after the end of the visit for review of factual information.

Post Site Visit *(amended October 31, 2014)*

- Once received, the confidential report will be sent to the Head/Director asking them to check the report for factual accuracy (factual errors would be considered as spelling mistakes, incorrect titles etc.). In addition, the Head/Director may also wish to include commentary if a perception exists that the review committee is in error on a matter raised in the report. The Head/Director will meet with the Dean for an initial discussion of the review committee's report. The corrections will be made to the report and sent back to the Department/School in pdf format.

- The Head/Director in consultation with their Department/School will formulate and submit a written response to the Dean within 4 weeks. The Head/Director will provide the Dean a strategic action plan for the implementation of the recommendations. As a means to continuing the work of the external academic review, a meeting between the Head/Director and the Dean should take place every 6 months to focus on the progress of the implementation of the action plan.

- Once the Department or School written response is received, the Dean will provide to the Vice Provost & Associate Vice President Academic Affairs a copy of the Review Report, the units response document, and the Dean's analysis of the findings and recommendations.

- The Review Committee members are sent the corrected report (as a PDF file).

- The report, the unit's response and the Dean(s) comments on the report/response/action plan should be appended to an annual report to the Provost Office on all reviews conducted within the faculty over this period of time, and will be responded to by the Provost or Vice Provost Academic, as appropriate.

APPENDIX B: Schedule of Meetings

Day 1, Monday, November 3rd, 2014

Date	Meeting Details	Location
7:30 – 8:15	Breakfast meeting – Reviewers only	Granville Island Hotel
8:45 – 9:30	Meeting with Blye Frank, Dean	Dean's Office - Room 2616 Scarfe Building 604-822-4145 (Uma, Reception)
9:45 – 10:15	Meeting with Peter Grimmett, Head	Scarfe Room 2201 604-822-5337 (Anna Ip, Assistant)
10:30 – 11:30	Meeting with EDCP Graduate Advisory Committee	Board Room, OGPR
11:45 – 12:45	Meeting with EDCP Undergraduate Advisory Committee	Scarfe 310
12:45 – 1:30	Working lunch – Reviewers only	*TBC*
1:30 – 2:30	Meeting with EDCP Faculty Members	Scarfe 310
2:45 – 3:45	Meeting with the Associate Deans	Board Room, OGPR
4:00 – 4:30	Meeting with Dean & VP – GPS	Board Room, OGPR 604-827-5547 (Lisa Pountney, Assistant)
4:30 – 5:30	Reviewers Debrief Day 1	Board Room, OGPR
6:00 - 8:30	Dinner with Dean, Head, and administrative staff	TBD

Day 2, Tuesday, November 4th, 2014

Date	Meeting Details	Location
9:30 - 10:00	Meeting with Hugh Brock, Interim VP Academic Affairs & AP Academic Innovation	Board Room, OGPR 604-822-5611 (Selina Fast, Assistant)
10:15 – 11:00	Meeting with EDCP Graduate Students	Scarfe 310
11:15 – 12:15	Meeting with EDCP Staff	Board Room, OGPR
12:15 – 1:15	*Working lunch* Sessionals, 12- month lecturers & seconded teachers	Scarfe 310
1:30 – 2:00	Meeting with Head, Peter Grimmett	Board Room, OGPR
2:00 – 4:00	Reviewers Only	Board Room, OGPR
4:00 – 4:30	Meeting with part-time students	Scarfe 310

Day 3, Wednesday, November 5th, 2014

Date	Meeting Details	Location
9:15 – 9:45	Meeting with Peter Grimmett, Head	Scarfe Room 2201 604-822-5337 (Anna Ip, Assistant)
10-00-11:00	Wrap-up Meeting with Blye Frank, Dean	Dean's Office - Room 2616 Scarfe Building 604-822-5757 (Elise)