

**Annual Core Theme Mission Fulfilment
Evaluation and Planning**

2019 Work Book


Core Theme	<i>Research</i>
Submitted by	<i>Research Committee of Senate</i>
Signature, Chair	 Mohamed Tawhid
Date	<i>October 4, 2019</i>

Table of Contents

Overview

Timeline for Submissions

Core Theme Research Mission Fulfilment Framework (2018)

1. Assessment of Core Theme in relation to Mission Fulfillment
 - A. Review of Previous Year
 - B. Summary
2. Planning for Next Year
 - A. Review of Objectives and Indicators
 - B. New Indicators
 - C. Emerging Indicators
 - D. Thresholds & Targets
 - E. Planning for Improvement

Overview

Annual review of the Core Themes in relation to Mission Fulfilment involves three steps:

- 1) Conduct an analysis of the data collected for each outcome.
- 2) Assess the value of each indicator in light of the Mission Fulfilment Threshold.
- 3) Plan services and programs related to the Core Theme for the following year.

Completed reports or “Work Books” are submitted to the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) annually on June 30. ALO compiles results from all four Core Theme Work Books into an institutional Mission Fulfilment Report outlining how successful TRU was in fulfilling its’ mission that year.

Timeline for Submissions

May 1 - June 30	Core Theme Teams or Standing Committee of Senate performs annual assessment of Mission Fulfilment and planning process.
June 30	Core Theme Work Book submitted to ALO. accreditation@tru.ca
July 1 - July 31	ALO compiles Core Theme Work Books into an institutional Mission Fulfilment Report.
August 1 – 31	Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) reviews annual institutional Mission Fulfilment Report.
September 1 – September 30	Broad distribution of institutional Mission Fulfilment Report through TRU’s collegial governance process. The report is brought forward by the Provost and Vice President Academic to APPC, Senate, PCOL, and the Board of Governors. The report is then posted publicly to the TRU website.

Core Theme Research Mission Fulfillment Framework (2018)

Objective	Outcome	Indicator	Rationale for Indicator	MF Threshold Ranges			Five Year Goal	Historical Values
				Achieved	Minimally Achieved	Not Achieved		
1.0 TRU will create a sustainable research culture	1.0 TRU faculty are competitive for external funding	1.1 Percentage of active tri-partite faculty holding external funding (contract and grant)	This indicator aligns with the Strategic Research Plan and is a standard indicator for research universities. It will create an important benchmark to assess against peer institutions	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	40%	2016: 25% 2017: 24% 2018: 28%
		1.2 Total dollar amount of tri-agency grants and external contracts (3-year rolling average)	This indicator aligns with the Strategic Research Plan and is a standard indicator for research universities. It will create an important benchmark to assess against peer institutions	\$600,000 or > increase	\$0 to \$600,000 increase	Decrease	\$4.5M (3-year rolling average adjusted: \$2.8M)	2015: \$1.1M 2016: \$1.7M 2017: \$2.3M (1.7) 2018: \$4.3M (2.8)
	2.0 TRU faculty create new knowledge	2.1 Number of peer-reviewed publications, scholarly works, exhibitions and other creative works per faculty member as a percentage of total tri-partite faculty (3-year rolling average)	This indicator aligns with the Strategic Research Plan and is a standard indicator for research universities. It will create an important benchmark to assess against peer institutions	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease		None. 2018 benchmark at 320
	3.0 TRU faculty and students disseminate new knowledge impactful to the communities we serve	3.1 Number of Community Citations Score, as measured by the total references in external media, annual reports, policy documents, newsletters and number of community held forums reporting research results and activities to participants, stakeholders and knowledge users by TRU faculty and community groups	This indicator is a roll-up on various community references to research at TRU. It measures the importance and interest of TRU research in the community and links to mission fulfillment. This indicator is under review with IPE.	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease		None. 2018 benchmark year.

1. Assessment of Core Theme in Relation to Mission Fulfilment

A. Review of Previous Year

Complete the following for each indicator in the Core Theme:

Current Value and Mission Fulfilment

- a. Gather information to determine the indicator value for the most recent period.
- b. Determine the change from the prior year and identify which of the mission fulfilment ranges applies (Achieved / Minimally Achieved / Not Achieved).

Table 1: Identification of Mission Fulfilment Range

Indicator # and descriptor	Prior Year Value	Current Value	Mission Fulfilment Range
<i>1.1 Percentage of active tri-partite faculty holding external funding (contract and grant)</i>	28%	34%	Achieved
<i>1.2 Total dollar amount of tri-agency grants and external contracts based on a 3-year rolling average.</i>	\$2.8M	\$3.3M	Minimally Achieved
<i>2.1 Number of peer-reviewed publications, scholarly works, exhibitions and other creative works per faculty member as a percentage of total tri-partite faculty (3 year rolling average)</i>	320/160 tri-partite faculty	Currently collecting data for 170 tri-partite faculty members	Unknown
<i>3.1 Number of Community Citations Score, as measured by the total of references in external media, annual reports, policy documents, newsletters and the number of community held forums reporting research results and activities to participants, stakeholders and knowledge users</i>	A survey instrument is under development	n/a	Unknown

Context of the Current Year Value

- c. State what was achieved.
- d. State how plans, services, or initiatives impact the progress of the indicator.
- e. Identify factors affecting progress.

Table 2: Context / Impact on Progress

Indicator #	Describe what was achieved	List plans, services or initiatives impacting progress; Identify factors positively or negatively affecting progress
1.1	The percentage of faculty with externally sponsored research increased by 6%	<p>The number of applications for external funding has remained consistent annually with important support from internal seed and grant accelerator funding.</p> <p>With the assistance of grants facilitation, peer review, information sessions, and workshops, TRU's faculty currently boast a 50% success rate for applications to grants and contracts.</p>
1.2	The total dollar amount of externally sponsored research decreased	<p>External funding values are highly susceptible to annual deviations (e.g., Industrial Research Chair funding). As a result, TRU decided, last year, to re-position this target as a 3-year rolling average in alignment with best practices used by the federal government's Tri-Agency funding organizations.</p> <p>Although the actual dollar amount is slightly lower in 2019, TRU's growth rate is on track to meet the 5-year goal of \$4.5M (on a 3-year rolling average). The 2017-19 average is \$3.3M in externally sponsored research, up from \$2.8M in the period 2016-18 (17% growth).</p> <p>TRU has developed longer-term structural opportunities for faculty by establishing the Xchange lab with the United Way, signing an MOU with the City of Kamloops, writing the MOU to create the Tri-University Coalition, and establishing the Interior Academic Health Science Coalition.</p>
2.1	There is currently no mechanism to determine an absolute value. In 2018, TRU benchmarked	TRU hosted a one-day workshop featuring Dr. Helen Sword on the habits of highly productive writers, followed by a presentation by Scott White (the editor of Conversation Canada).

	based on voluntary faculty submissions. We do not currently have the results for last year.	For a more complete assessment, we would need to access the publication and knowledge mobilization data already submitted by faculty in their Annual Professional Activity Reports.
3.1	TRU is currently preparing a survey instrument to share with partners.	

B. Summary

- a) Identify how successful TRU was in fulfilling its mission for the Core Theme in light of the values of the indicators and the definition of Mission Fulfilment.

Mission Fulfilment is defined as:

Mission fulfillment occurs when 70% of the indicators for each of the four Core Themes are in the Achieved or Minimally Achieved threshold ranges.

- b) Identify the successes of the Core Theme and the areas in need of improvement.

Table 3: Summary of Core Theme

How successful was TRU in achieving mission fulfilment for this Core Theme?	TRU was successful in meeting 50% of the indicators, but was unable to assess 50%. Without complete data, it's difficult to determine if mission achievement was met.
Identify successes	TRU was awarded its first NSERC Industrial Research Chair and Collaborative Research and Development grant. In addition, TRU obtained four new Discovery grants, two SSHRC Indigenous Connections grants and one Insight grant. Successfully renewed two BCIC Research Chairs. Received nearly \$1M in Canada Foundation for Innovation and BCKDF research infrastructure funding.
List areas in need of improvement	Access to matching funds for grants. Access to institutional data for the assessment of indicator 2.1 and the refinement of the Community Citations survey instrument for indicator 3.1.

2. Planning for the Next Year

A. Review of Objectives and Indicators

Objectives

- a. Review current objectives to confirm they are still in alignment with Core Theme and TRU's mission statement.
- b. If necessary, add or remove objectives to keep the Core Theme relevant to TRU's mission statement.

Table 4: Review of Objectives

Objective # and descriptor	Still relevant (Y/N)	If not, identify revisions and provide rationale for change
1. TRU will create a sustainable research culture.	Y	

Indicators

- a. Review the current indicators and rationales to confirm alignment with objective, Core Theme, and TRU's mission statement.
- b. Based on this review, establish if indicators need to be removed, and/or if new indicators need to be added to the Core Theme to track whether the outcomes associated with the objectives are being achieved. Follow the 'Introducing New Indicators / Removing Current Indicators' under Resource Information (below).

Resource Information

1. Introducing New Indicators / Removing Current Indicators

Periodically new indicators will need to be added or existing indicators removed when the focus of the Core Theme changes, data collection at the institution changes (e.g. a new survey is being used, or an existing survey has been discontinued), or new initiatives commence. When it is required please complete the following:

A. Identify the indicator(s), if any, to be added

Provide the rationale for the indicator, including description of how the indicator aligns with the Core Theme and mission.

B. Identify the indicator(s), if any, to be removed

1. Provide rationale as to why the indicator no longer aligns with mission and Core Theme.
2. Demonstrate how the objective previously tracked by the indicator is still being captured by the other indicators for the Core Theme.
3. Comment on potential gaps for how the core theme is measured, and in turn, how Mission Fulfilment is determined.

Table 5: Review of Indicators

Indicator #	Still relevant (Y/N)	If not, provide rationale
1.1	Y	
1.2	Y	
2.1	Y	
3.1	Y	

B. New Indicators

New Indicators refer to those indicators for which we already have three years of historical data and wish to replace or add to the list of current indicators. If selected, these indicators will be reported on during the 2019 reporting cycle. If you do not wish to add or replace indicators, leave Table 6 blank.

Table 6: New Indicators for 2019 Reporting Cycle

New Indicator	Rationale	MF Threshold Range			Five Year Goal	Historical Values
		Achieved	Minimally Achieved	Not Achieved		

C. Emerging Indicators

Given the changing nature of the institution, initiatives, and available data, consider if there are other indicators that would better measure the Core Theme objectives. Emerging indicators are those that may be beneficial for tracking in the future, however, historical data does not currently exist. Ideally, three years of historical values of the indicator should be available in order to make informed plans. It is beneficial to start to track the indicator value before it is used as an indicator for the Core Theme, as this will help develop historical information.

- A. Identify emerging indicators or concepts for indicators which could be of value for future measurement of the objectives of the Core Theme.
 - 1. Comment on data source, availability, and develop a plan to collect data for the indicator.
 - 2. When possible, begin compilation of indicator values, either by the Core Theme Team or the appropriate department (e.g. Integrated Planning and Effectiveness). This will form a basis for planning if/when the indicator is adopted for the Core Theme.

- B. Consider if qualitative indicators could be used

In the table below, identify any emerging indicators which could be used to track the objectives of the Core Theme in the future. If so, use the guidelines for 'Emerging Indicators' section under Resource Information (above).

Outcome	Emerging Indicator	Rationale	Data Source	Plan/ Programs	Resources
3.0	<i>Number of undergraduate student knowledge mobilization activities</i>	Outcome 3.0 references the dissemination activities of students. This indicator will provide evidence to support the implementation of General Education, student graduate outcomes, and the proposed research graduate credential.	# of presentations, posters and exhibitions at the UG Conference and PHP conference # of publications in the UG journal, knowledge makers journal, and PHP journal # of students featured in TRU stories and media		
New 4.0 <i>Undergraduate student engagement in research activities</i>	<i>Percentage of TRU courses that include Research-informed Learning (RiL)</i> <i>(RiL both in and out of the classroom: project-based work, field work, inquiry-led work, integration of research practice into the curriculum, etc.)</i>	For an open access research university like TRU, Research-informed Learning offers many benefits to students and faculty. We know that treating undergraduate students as co-researchers supports student engagement within and beyond the formal curriculum, furthering knowledge and understanding, creating lasting relationships between the mentor and mentee. RiL is also said to create a profound sense of belonging, providing students with a point of entry into an institutional or disciplinary research culture.	Data will be collected from faculties and programs via the development of the Research-informed Learning Inventory, which will identify the number of research-informed learning practices in curricular programming (Fall 2018).		0.5 increase to Graduate Studies and Student Research Coordinator position (currently funded @ 0.5 ongoing)
	<i>Number of users across Canada accessing the National Clearinghouse for Research and Resources on Undergraduate Research Training and RiL.</i>	Currently there is not a national presence or network for Canadian undergraduate research. This site, hosted by TRU, will include training modules for faculty and students, news and events, information about undergraduate research at Canadian universities, resources, etc.	Data will be collected in Fall 2018 and Winter 2019. Once the site is developed, we will be able to track the website traffic, which showcases TRU's leadership in undergraduate research.	TRU will lead the development of a national clearinghouse for research and resources on undergraduate research training and research-informed learning. Information will be gathered from, and in partnership, with Vancouver Island University and Bridgewater University, other post-secondary institutions, and the Council of Undergraduate Research (CUR). We will develop the expansion of student research training initiatives.	
	A) <i>GPA of first and second year students engaged in the Research Coach program.</i> B) <i>Retention rates of first and second year students engaged in the Research Coach program.</i> C) <i>Number of students participating in the Research Coach program.</i> D) <i>Number of students interacting with faculty while doing a research project.</i>	Undergraduate research has been identified as a High Impact Practice distinguished by the fostering of a key mentoring relationship between faculty and students. This enhanced introduction to discipline-based research and creative inquiry principles and practices is intended to complement the kind of research-based opportunities traditionally more available to students in the final years of their undergraduate degree programs. TRU currently has high attrition rates with first-year students in our open admissions programs: this pilot will support student retention.	Indicators will include tracking GPA scores and first-to-second-year retention rates. In addition, we will be working with IPE to create an undergraduate research survey.	Undergraduate research is identified as a High Impact Practice (HIP). This program will allow faculty to use the RiL approach to support first and second year student engagement in meaningful research opportunities. During the 2018/19 academic year, the four emerging indicators (A – D) will be measured to determine which is the most relevant for measuring achievement of the outcome.	

Table 7: Emerging Indicators

New Outcome	New Indicator	Rationale	Data Source
<p><i>TRU facilitates the creation, co-creation and translation of knowledge, resulting in new discoveries, products, processes and practices that will mutually benefit TRU and communities to lead positive environmental, cultural, social and economic change.</i></p>	<p><i>Qualitative Indicator: Cultural Maps of the knowledge building pathways including partnerships and learning outcomes which demonstrate:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Promoting technological and social innovation and social enterprise</i> <i>2. Germinating ideas and applied research opportunities</i> <i>3. Developing research relationships/partnerships with community partners</i> <i>4. Sharing research infrastructure and engagement spaces</i> <i>5. Enabling knowledge exchange</i> <i>6. Celebrating shared successes</i> 	<p>Using a qualitative approach such as cultural mapping will better demonstrate the richness of the data that quantitative methods cannot when measuring community impact</p>	<p>Cultural/Social Impact Maps (under development by Office of Research and Graduate Studies)</p>

Table 7: Emerging Indicators, year one data collection

Outcome	Emerging Indicator	Value
3.0	Number of undergraduate student knowledge mobilization activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32 papers by TRU students presented at PHP conference; 80 presentations, posters, and exhibitions at the UG Conference 4 papers by TRU students published in PHP's Dialogues: https://digitalcommons.library.tru.ca/phpdialogues/; 16 Knowledge Makers published; 7 students published in the UG Conference Proceedings 16 students featured in TRU research stories and media initiated by the research office
4.0 Undergraduate student engagement in research activities	Percentage of TRU courses that include Research informed Learning (RiL)	Data collection in progress Currently information collected from Nursing, Tourism and some SOBE faculty
	Number of users across Canada accessing the National Clearinghouse for Research and Resources on Undergraduate Research Training and RiL	Data collection in progress Website is still in development and is expected to be ready January 2020
	A) GPA of first and second year students engaged in the Research Coach program B) Retention rates of first and second year students engaged in the Research Coach program C) Number of students participating in the Research Coach program D) Number of students interacting with faculty while doing a research project	Data collection in progress The Research Coach program requires at least three years of data to begin to assess the indicators identified. At this time we can share three students from this program in the winter applied for a UREAP. We will continue to collect the data and report on it as it grows.

C. Thresholds & Targets

Review thresholds for Mission Fulfilment for each indicator to ensure relevancy

- The threshold is defined as the percentage change to the indicator (up or down), which would be considered meeting threshold expectations. See 'Thresholds for Mission Fulfilment' under Resource Information (below) for more information on setting these ranges. These will be the values used during the next year to evaluate Mission Fulfilment.
- If the ranges change, provide a rationale for the change.

Resource Information

2. Definitions and Thresholds for Mission Fulfilment

Each indicator has three threshold ranges:

Achieved

The indicator has increased/decreased by a fixed percentage or value in line with expectation of mission fulfilment.

Minimally Achieved

The percentage or value of the indicator is holding at, or close to the current level.

Not Achieved

The indicator value has decreased/increased by a fixed percentage or value.

Quantitative indicators are defined as a fixed percentage or value growth from the prior year with ranges set individually for each indicator.

Qualitative indicators include identification of components that measure the threshold identified and require the development of a rubric to assess each component.

Table 8: Indicator Threshold Ranges

Indicator #	Threshold Ranges			Revised Ranges (if applicable)			Rationale
	Achieved	Minimally Achieved	Not Achieved	Achieved	Minimally Achieved	Not Achieved	
1.1	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease				
1.2	\$600,000 or > increase	\$0 to \$600,000 increase	Decrease				
2.1				3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	Ranges are consistent with existing thresholds
3.1				3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	

Review the Five-Year Target

Five-year targets should be aspirational yet realistic. They should provide a concrete goal and motivation to improve services, programs, or experiences as a means to achieve outcome targets. These targets can be tied to goals related to institutional strategic plans where available.

Table 9: Five-Year Targets

Indicator #	5-Year Target	Relevant (Y/N)	If not, provide revised target and include rationale for change
1.1	40%	Y	
1.2	\$4.5M	Y	
2.1	n/a	Y	
3.1	n/a	Y	

D. Planning for Improvement

Based on the information you provided above, and taking into consideration new or revised outcomes and indicators, complete the following Mission Fulfilment Framework which will be used as the benchmark for the 2019 reporting cycle.

Table 10: Completed Mission Fulfilment Framework for 2019

Objective	Outcome	Indicator	Rationale for Indicator	MF Threshold Ranges			Five Year Goal	Historical Values
				Achieved	Minimally Achieved	Not Achieved		
1.0 TRU will create a sustainable research culture	1.0 TRU faculty are competitive for external funding	1.1 Percentage of active tri-partite faculty holding external funding (contract and grant)	This indicator aligns with the Strategic Research Plan and is a standard indicator for research universities. It will create an important benchmark to assess against peer institutions	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	40%	2016: 25% 2017: 24% 2018: 28% 2019: 34%
		1.2 Total dollar amount of tri-agency grants and external contracts (3-year rolling average)	This indicator aligns with the Strategic Research Plan and is a standard indicator for research universities. It will create an important benchmark to assess against peer institutions	\$600,000 or > increase	\$0 to \$600,000 increase	Decrease	\$4.5M (3-year rolling average)	2015: \$1.1M 2016: \$1.7M 2017: \$2.3M (1.7) 2018: \$4.3M (2.8) 2019: \$3.3M (3.3)
	2.0 TRU faculty create new knowledge	2.1 Number of peer-reviewed publications, scholarly works, exhibitions and other creative works per faculty member as a percentage of total tri-partite faculty (3-year rolling average)	This indicator aligns with the Strategic Research Plan and is a standard indicator for research universities. It will create an important benchmark to assess against peer institutions	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease		2018: 320
	3.0 TRU faculty and students disseminate new knowledge impactful to the communities we serve	3.1 Number of Community Citations Score, as measured by the total references in external media, annual reports, policy documents, newsletters and number of community held forums reporting research results and activities to participants, stakeholders and knowledge users by TRU faculty and community groups	This indicator is a roll-up on various community references to research at TRU. It measures the importance and interest of TRU research in the community and links to mission fulfilment.	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease		None.

Finally, determine the plans required to improve the performance of the indicators and achieve the objectives of the core theme.

Planning

Outline plans to continue to improve or maintain performance of the indicator at the:

- a) Institutional level
- b) Unit level

Consultation

Outline plans to consult with key stakeholders who are responsible for influencing the indicator to accomplish the objective.

Budget & Resources

Identify any budgetary and resource limitations/implications.

Table 11: Planning for Improvement

Indicator #	Plans at institutional level for improvement	Plans at unit level for improvement	Consultations required	Budgetary and resource limitations/impact
1.1	Implementation of the Strategic Review recommendations. Development of a new Strategic Research Plan.	Internal outreach (eg. New researcher orientation, workshops, events), prospecting, seed funds, facilitation, awards, and peer review. Exploration of new graduate programming.		0.43 FTE for enhanced research and graduate studies support (\$22K)
1.2	Implementation of the Strategic Review recommendations. Development of a new Strategic Research Plan.	Continued investment in the Interior Universities Research Coalition, visiting scholars and guest speakers (eg. Deb Zornes), collaboration opportunities through the Xchange Lab, development of the Interior Academic Health Science Coalition, increased advocacy at the Provincial and Federal levels. Invest in student research opportunities	Community consultations for the development of the Xchange Lab	

2.1	Implementation of the Strategic Review recommendations. Development of a new Strategic Research Plan.	Member of Conversation Canada. Establishment of the Xchange Lab gallery space.	Community consultations for the development of the Xchange Lab	
3.1	Implementation of the Strategic Review recommendations. Development of a new Strategic Research Plan.	Increased public engagement and student research involvement directed through the Xchange Lab. The MOU with the City of Kamloops will allow for additional access to community-based opportunities for research.	Community consultations for the development of the Xchange Lab	0.5 FTE to support additional public engagement, community-engaged research development, undergraduate research training, and knowledge mobilization activities (\$33K) \$16K Co-op student