

## **LLED Strategic Plan**

### **External Review Committee Recommendations**

1. As soon as possible, a strategic plan should be developed that outlines where the Department wishes to find itself in the future. A wish-list of new faculty positions should be reconsidered and embedded within this plan. In this process, it will be important to prioritize initiatives (e.g., the proposed reactivation of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership in Literacy and programs responding to the many invitations to participate in international programs) in relation to available resources.
2. The strategic plan needs to make clear how the Department sees itself functioning successfully as a single unit. As part of the strategic plan, the Department needs to decide where it will focus its resources, and conversely, where it may need to reduce activities to ensure that resources are not overstretched.
3. Dedicated office space and/or readily accessible gathering space for graduate students would facilitate collegial academic discourse, support and mentoring.
4. Faculty renewal is essential at the Assistant Professor level across all program areas in LLED; the need is urgent in the areas of Modern and Indigenous languages.
5. Logistical support (e.g., a stipend for graduate students to assist faculty with grant preparation) for faculty members to conceptualize and design their research proposals might stimulate a greater number of grant applications. Faculty members should also take greater advantage of the two grant facilitators in the Dean's Office.
6. Given the emphasis on research by the newly installed UBC President, it would be timely for the Department to determine the causes for the decline in external funding for research activity since 2012 and formulate a plan to increase external funding support. Mentoring of junior faculty members, along with other forms of support for all faculty members (e.g., seed money for proposal development) might be included in this plan. The excellent new hires indicate that the Department will return to its previous levels of external funding.
7. More information on impacts of faculty research, through the usual metrics and through narratives demonstrating their contributions to society, should be collected and shared widely (e.g., on the LLED website and with the VP Research and International Office).
8. Given that digital literacy is now embedded throughout literacy research and is integral to modern education, it would be timely to review the purpose of the Digital Literacy Centre and how it contributes to research and teaching across the disciplines.
9. Conversations about the contributions of all centres to faculty and graduate student research and to the goals and priorities of the Department are needed to guide allocation of space and resources in the new building.

10. The Department is to be commended for its involvement in the B.Ed. program. Indeed, conversations about LLED faculty workloads may need to turn in the direction of reducing faculty involvement in the B.Ed. program to some degree in order to ensure that course offerings meet student needs in the ALSED graduate program and to revise the LITR graduate course offerings in order to continue to attract students in the thesis-stream programs. An explanation and possible re-thinking of the relationship between “FTE calculations” and the number of graduate courses offered may also assist in achieving the optimal balance between undergraduate and graduate teaching throughout the Department.

11. The Department should re-examine the ALSED and LITR graduate programs to revitalize course offerings. In the process, the Department could consider the possibility of integrating the two programs in order to capitalize on the overlapping research, experience, interests, and expertise of faculty members and students in the two areas.

12. The widespread use of administrative buy-outs should be reconsidered when reviewing the practices for allocating workload. Perhaps some buy-outs could be simply included in the service component of faculty members’ workloads. This might enable faculty members to teach more graduate courses, particularly in the LITR program.

13. Consideration of the needs of graduate students, faculty members and sessional instructors should guide the assignment of teaching duties. This discussion should take place during the strategic planning process.

14. Recognition of graduate students’ achievements should extend beyond the winning of major awards, in keeping with the University’s desire to demonstrate the impact of research to society. This appears to be a strength of the Department that should be celebrated.

15. The Department should consider more closely aligning graduate student recruitment with the research interests of Department members. This would have a positive impact on research productivity.

16. Any further growth in the number of initiatives and students will require additional staff.

17. Workloads and expectations for the newly created tenure-track Instructor/Professor of Teaching rank need to be clarified. There is some confusion about what counts as “leadership” (e.g., there are questions about whether research is considered for the purposes of tenure and promotion)

18. The Department is fortunate to have many capable, experienced, and long-term sessional instructors, who feel very much a part of the Department. They bring real classroom experience and connect the Department with schools and institutes outside UBC. Elevated appreciation of their contributions (even as small as having their pictures

posted as course instructors on the Department webpage) would assist in ensuring their continued support and positive attitudes.

19. The Department should explore additional opportunities for collaboration with colleagues within the Department, and in other Departments and Faculties, including new innovative course offerings and research partnerships. The current SSHRC Partnership grant collaboration across the Faculty and in partnership with the BCTF, the Ministry of Education and the school districts could serve as a model for these new collaborative endeavours.

20. The Department could make greater use of the Department website for showcasing the many contributions Department members (faculty, sessionals and students) make to society – locally, nationally and globally.

21. Faculty members need to receive more information on the facilities that will be available to them in the new building. Transparent discussions are needed regarding space for centers and special programs such as drama. Consideration should be given to the need for graduate student space in the new building.

22. The distribution of Ritsumeikan costs and revenues should be re-examined.

23. Given that the need to clarify the roles of Departmental centres has reappeared in the 2014 external review, action on this recommendation should be taken.

24. The review committee commends this Department for its impressive scholarly accomplishments and recommends that the Department celebrate and build on its considerable strengths. It has been innovative, entrepreneurial and collaborative with local, national, and international initiatives in both teaching and program delivery, as well as in research and dissemination. Engaging in a strategic planning exercise should produce a renewed sense of direction and vigour, particularly as the process of faculty renewal continues over the next 5 years.

**LLED Strategic Plan 2014\_15**  
**Budget Proposal**

---

Item	Description	Projected Costs
UBC Golf Course One Day Retreat (approx. 30-35 people)	Half room, break out room, deposit	\$1000
	Breakfast, lunch, beverages	\$1000
Subtotal		<b>\$2000</b>
External Consultants Honoraria	Literacy group consultant	\$350
	TESL group consultant	\$350
Subtotal		<b>\$700</b>
GAA writing, research support (One per working group) (@ \$25/hr. x 12hrs)	\$300 x 5 Working Groups	\$1500
Subtotal		<b>\$1500</b>
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$4200</b>

## For discussion at the November 20 LLED meeting

### LLED Strategic Plan

#### Work groups and Timeline

The purpose of these work groups is to help us imagine LLED into the future. By using the External Reviewers' recommendations as a jumping-off point, the groups are asked to develop an action plan: a set of suggestions and possibilities for change within LLED that will result in greater collegiality, transparency, and equity in our working lives together, and greater currency and innovation in our program offerings. The self-study offers an analysis of recent and/or current perspectives on LLED, but the strategic plan that emerges from this exercise will guide our way towards a re-visioned LLED.

1. **Workload:** The mandate of this working group is large: to review workload allocation across the Department's teaching, service, and administrative activities; to develop fair and transparent procedures for course allocation and rotation; to address issues related to course "ownership"; to draft guidelines for fair and reasonable graduate supervision duties; to consider the relative workload weight of both standing and occasional administrative duties; to consider the workload for tenure-track and tenured professors and instructors in light of University expectations; to look into the possibility of creating more teaching opportunities for graduate students; to identify ways in which exemplary work can be acknowledged and celebrated. Also, to consider how our work is measured and assessed: for example, how is the evaluation of teaching (e.g., SCETs, peer observations, etc.) and supervision done? And how do requests for the many types of service work (internal and external to UBC) get included (e.g., T/P reviews, MS reviews, etc.)? Make sure there is an instructor on the committee. (Mary Bryson, Chair)
2. **Programs/courses:** This work will be done by the ALSED and LITR program teams. Again, the mandate is broad: to conduct an audit of current courses with an eye to deleting those that are out-of-date, revising and/or re-naming those that have evolved since their inception, and identifying new courses. In addition, the external reviewers offered this challenge: "the Department could consider the possibility of integrating the two programs in order to capitalize on the overlapping research, experience, interests, and expertise of faculty members and students in the two areas." What possibilities are there for creative overlap between the two program areas? The program teams are asked to identify the concentrated strengths in each program area that define LLED as different from similar units at other universities, and that represent the face that LLED should show to potential students and faculty members and to the wider community. Part of that process will entail a review of current LLED centres and, possibly, proposals for new centres of expertise. The vision of revised programs should be tied to hiring plans. Finally, explore the possibility of contacting alumni for insights on the kinds of coursework that would have helped them in the work they are currently doing. (Patsy Duff and Maureen Kendrick, Chairs)
3. **Graduate experience:** This group is charged with a full review of the LLED graduate experience, everything from governance and participation in LLED affairs, to the nature of the supervisory relationship. It will examine life as an LLED

graduate student, and propose ways to improve that experience. The mandate includes questions regarding recruitment (what would make LLED a desirable location for graduate study?) and funding, including opportunities to teach. Ensure M.Ed representation. (Ling Shi, Chair)

4. **Sustainable and ethical growth:** What are LLED's possibilities for growth? Where might we increase and improve our outreach into various communities? With whom are we currently collaborating (e.g., with which communities, departments, faculties, universities), and where might we develop new collaborations? Are there revenue sources we might tap into that would not compromise our principles? And, in fact, what are those principles? What guidelines and procedures might we develop to address the sort of issues we raised during recent discussions about international partnerships? What are the implications of growth for faculty and staff needs? Does LLED need new structural units (e.g., institutes, centres, programs) to support growth? (Bonny Norton, Chair)
  
5. **Writing group:** This group is charged with pulling the separate sections together into a coherent document; that is, creating a big picture of the next five-years of LLED's evolution by drawing on the work of the other groups and writing a strategic plan that will guide us as we move forward. This group's work will necessarily be delayed until suggestions and recommendations begin coming from the other groups, and will culminate with a written plan that goes forward to the Dean and Provost as the final LLED response to the self-study process. (Teresa Dobson, Chair; membership will be working group chairs, Head, Deputy Head)

## **Timeline**

Individual work groups will set their own intermediate timelines, and schedule meetings as needed, including open meetings if they feel it would be useful. The overall schedule of work will proceed as follows:

**December-February:** groups will analyze the current situation in their area of concern, consider alternative practices, compare with other units and institutions, consult with students/staff/faculty/community as needed, brainstorm possibilities, and otherwise research the issues facing us and the options available to us.

Brief updates at December and January Department meetings to minimize overlap in work between groups. Also, oversight by Writing Group to monitor development within groups and to avoid duplication.

**February 26:** Department meeting to hear progress reports from each working group.

**March:** groups will develop preliminary recommendations and action plans.

**March 19:** Department meeting to discuss penultimate drafts of action plans.

**April:** groups will revise action plans.

**April 23:** Full-day retreat.