



Annual Core Theme Mission Fulfilment Evaluation and Planning

Work Book

Core Theme	<i>Research</i>
Submitted by	<i>Research Committee of Senate</i>
Chair	Mohamed Tawhid
Date	July 9, 2021

Table of Contents

Overview	3
Timeline for Submissions	3
Research Mission Fulfilment Framework	4
Assess	10
Review of Previous Year	10
Analyze	11
Review of Objectives, Outcomes, and Indicators	13
New Indicators and Emerging Indicators	14
Levels of Achievement	15
Thank you!	17

Overview

Annual review of the core themes in relation to Mission Fulfilment involves four steps:

1. **Collect** data for each of the indicators.
2. **Assess** the level of achievement for each indicator.
3. **Analyze** results, considering contextual factors, and discuss implications relating to the success of the core theme.
4. **Report** results to TRU's governing bodies to inform divisional and unit planning across the institution.



Completed workbooks are submitted to the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) annually on June 30. ALO compiles findings into an Annual Institutional Mission Fulfilment Report that details how successful TRU was in fulfilling its mission that year.

Timeline for Submissions

April 1 - June 30	Standing Committees of Senate conduct annual assessment of Mission Fulfilment.
June 30	Core Theme Work Book submitted to ALO at ahoare@tru.ca
July 1 - July 31	ALO compiles Core Theme Work Books into an Annual Institutional Mission Fulfilment Report.
August 1 – 31	Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) reviews Annual Institutional Mission Fulfilment Report
September 1 – September 30	<p>Broad distribution of Annual Institutional Mission Fulfilment Report through TRU's collegial governance process.</p> <p>The report is brought forward by the Provost and Vice President Academic and Research to APPC, Senate, PCOL, and the Board of Governors. The report is then posted publicly to the TRU website.</p>

Research Mission Fulfilment Framework

Objective	Outcome	Indicator	MF Threshold Ranges			Five Year Goal	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)	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	40%	2017: 24% 2018: 28% 2019: 34% 2020: 33% 2021: 34%
		1.2 Total dollar amount of tri-agency grants and external contracts (3-year rolling average)	\$600,000 or > increase	\$0 to \$600,000 increase	Decrease	\$4.5M (3-year rolling average)	2017: \$2.3M (\$1.7M) 2018: \$4.3M (\$2.8M) 2019: \$3.3M (\$3.3M) 2020: \$4.3M (\$3.9M) 2021: \$6.3M (4.6M)
2.0 TRU faculty create new knowledge	2.1 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)	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	<i>Undefined</i>	2018: 320 2020: not available 2021: not available
3.0 TRU faculty and students disseminate new knowledge impactful to the communities we serve	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	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	<i>Undefined</i>	<i>No data to date.</i>
		3.2 Number of undergraduate student knowledge mobilization activities facilitated by the office of Research and Graduate Studies	> 5% increase	1 - 5% increase	0 or decrease	260 10% growth	2019: 155 2020: 237 2021: 75
4.0 Undergraduate student engagement in research activities	4.1 Undergraduate student engagement in research activities	4.1 Percentage of TRU courses that include Research informed Learning (Critical Thinking & Investigation ILO courses)	> 3% increase	1 - 2% increase	0 or decrease	80%	2016/17: 70.2% 2017/18: 69.2% 2018/19: 68.3% 2019/20: 73.5% 2020/21: 78.6%

5.0 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.

5.1 Cultural Maps of the knowledge building pathways including partnerships and learning outcomes which demonstrate:

- Promoting technological and social innovation and social enterprise
- Germinating ideas and applied research opportunities
- Developing research relationships/partnerships with community partners
- Sharing research infrastructure and engagement spaces
- Enabling knowledge exchange
- Celebrating shared successes

Community partnerships demonstrate a positive community impact and increasing depth and reach

Community partnerships demonstrate a positive impact and increasing engagement

Community partnerships have little to no impact or contribution to the learning and development

We will earn recognition as the most committed and innovative university in Canada for research and scholarship based on community partnerships

Cultural maps (see evidence and description below)

Indicator 5.1 Description and Evidence of Community Impact

On January, 27, 2021, a community panel composed of representatives from the United Way, Interior Health, Division of Family Practice and the City of Kamloops came together to share with students and TRU representatives their knowledge and perspectives. The intent of this panel was to hear directly from our community partners about their perspective, needs, and experiences in the research process to inform our student teams and the University what the community sees as relevant and useful in the context of community-engaged research. The following questions were asked so that we could learn from the community and their experiences.

1. With this question, we would like to understand what *benefits* you and/or your organization may experience or hope to experience through a research collaboration with TRU. With this in mind and from your perspective, how would you describe a *successful* research collaboration between TRU and your organization?
2. With this question, we would like to understand how a research collaboration between your organization and TRU *functioned*, or how it might operate if you haven't yet done such a collaboration. With this in mind and from your perspective, tell us about some of the elements that went into the operation of a *successful* community research project? If you didn't participate in a project yet, what do you think would contribute to the operation of a successful community research project?

A graphic recording of the panel completed by Marie Bartlett is shared below in Figure 1.



Figure 1

A panel discussion on Knowledge Translation and Mobilization was hosted on March 10, 2021 to aid in the development of the Canadian Undergraduate Research Network (CURN), an Openly Accessible Research Network – an online space intended to provide the tools and knowledge needed for students, faculty, and community to confidently engage in research.

The following questions were intended for the panelists: Will Garrett-Petts, AVP Research and Graduate Studies; Cheryl Gladu, Researcher-in-Residence; Danna Bach, Communications Officer; and Kathy Gaynor, University Librarian. The intent of this panel is to learn about the varying perspectives of knowledge translation and mobilization, key benefits, and mobilization tools.

i. Please first introduce yourself and your role that leads you to engage in knowledge translation and mobilization. From your perspective, how would you describe knowledge translation and mobilization?

ii. Considering your personal area of expertise and experiences, what do you believe are the key benefits of knowledge mobilization in your field, and can you link particular tools or modes of mobilization to these benefits? (i.e. publishing in academic journals → tenure)

A graphic recording of the panel completed by Marie Bartlett is shared below in Figure 2.

A presentation was given to the City of Kamloops Directors on Community-Engaged Research and the meeting was captured by Marie Bartlett in a graphic recording below (Figure 3). TRU continues to work with the City of Kamloops through the innovative approach of the Researcher-in-Residence model to further meet the needs of our community to become the leaders in community-engaged research and student training as outlined in the institutional strategic change goals.



Figure 3

Assess

Review of Previous Year

Complete a review for each indicator by considering: Current Value, Mission Fulfilment Range, and Contextual Factors. Gather information, in collaboration with ALO, Integrated Planning & Effectiveness (IPE), and relevant departments, to determine the indicator value for the most recent period. Determine the change from the prior year and identify which of the mission fulfilment ranges applies (i.e., *Achieved / Minimally Achieved / Not Achieved*).

Table 1: Identification of Mission Fulfilment Range

Indicator # and descriptor	Prior Year Value	Current Value	MF Range	Factors positively or negatively affecting progress
1.1 Percentage of active tri-partite faculty holding external funding (contract and grant)	33%	34%	Minimally Achieved	The number of tri-partite faculty has been relatively static at TRU during the last 5-year period. The loss of several faculty members holding external grants and contracts to other employment opportunities was higher than the number of newly hired faculty, which impacts the overall results. The current value saw little growth, despite the fact that the number of researchers applying for external funding actually increased by 13%. In addition, 23% more applications were submitted.
1.2 Total dollar amount of tri-agency grants and external contracts (3-year rolling average)	\$3.9M	\$4.6M	Achieved	The COVID-19 Pandemic provided for additional federal granting opportunities to address emerging health-related issues and a growth in non-Tri Agency (federal) funding sources. In 2020-21, TRU raised its success rate to 70% on externally funded grants and contracts.
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)	320	Unknown	Unknown	The university collects this information but, currently it is not available to support mission fulfilment planning and evaluation reporting.
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	No data to date.	No data to date	Unknown	The intent is to merge the Community Citations with the Cultural Mapping, using the cultural mapping sessions with community partners as an opportunity to gather relevant data.
3.2 Number of undergraduate student knowledge mobilization activities funded by the office of Research and Graduate Studies	237	75	Not achieved	Due to COVID, activities were moved to online and participation was lower than previous year. The following is a summary of activities in 2020/21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge Makers=14 students • Philosophy, History and Political Science Conference=6 student presentations • Undergraduate Research Conference=34 posters (downloaded 776 times by people in B.C., Canada and around the world)

Indicator # and descriptor	Prior Year Value	Current Value	MF Range	Factors positively or negatively affecting progress
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 Lightning Talks on the Big-Blue Button (68 people logged in to listen and ask questions), • Undergraduate stories featured in the media=6.
4.1 Percentage of TRU courses that include Research informed Learning (Critical Thinking & Investigation ILO courses)	73.5%	78.6%	Achieved	During the past two reporting cycles, TRU has seen an increase of 5% year-over-year. It will be difficult to maintain this growth rate.
5.1 Cultural Maps of the knowledge building pathways including partnerships and learning outcomes which demonstrate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting technological and social innovation and social enterprise • Germinating ideas and applied research opportunities • Developing research relationships/partnerships with community partners • Sharing research infrastructure and engagement spaces • Enabling knowledge exchange • Celebrating shared successes 		See description on page 5	Achieved	Due to the challenges with remote work and the unique approach to this methodology requiring face-to-face we were not able to complete the hand-drawn maps plus interviews in accord with the intended research design (a draw/talk protocol); however, TRU was able to successfully engage with research partners and community members, employing graphic facilitation and visual mapping to better understand the knowledge building pathways between TRU and the community

Analyze

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, as well as, strengths and opportunities for improvement.

Definition of Mission Fulfilment

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

Note: TRU acknowledges that not all indicators carry the same weight in terms of their impact on outcomes. The impact of indicators may become evident through this analysis, and may inform future decision-making, including the relevance of tracking certain indicators.

Table 2: Summary of Core Theme

How successful was TRU in achieving mission fulfilment for this core theme?
During the 2020/21 reporting cycle, 4 out of 5 indicators were achieved or minimally achieved, equating to 80% rate of mission fulfilment for the core theme Research.
Research has articulated seven indicators for measuring mission fulfilment; however, has historically had challenges capturing data that accurately reflects the quantity of research undertaken by faculty and students at TRU. Notably, TRU has not been able to report on indicator 2.1 (number of publications and scholarly works) and indicator 3.1 (community citation score) due to challenges collecting and/or accessing available data. Therefore, Research will continue to explore alternate measures, including working with the Library to identify TRU faculty publications held in available databases, and qualitative measures, to more

accurately reflect the depth, scope, and reach of Research at TRU. We also note that the required data is gathered annually via the faculty Annual Professional Activity Reports (APARs); and that a collaborative effort involving the Provost's Office, the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and the area deans would provide the requested tally of articles published and papers presented annually.

Identify strengths and successes

The 2020-21 year is characterized by the impact of the COVID pandemic. TRU's research enterprise was impacted by public health measures that eliminated most travel, closed facilities, and resulted in a shift to virtual service delivery. Despite these challenges, TRU continued to provide effective research services throughout the pandemic. Some of the key successes included:

- the highest growth of Mitacs funding in Canada (including a new researcher in residence working with the municipality);
- success in Canada Foundation for Innovation funding (including TRU's first Infrastructure Fund grant for \$2M);
- the renewal of four Canada Research Chairs and one new submission; and,
- a steady growth in contracts and agreements.

The success in Tri-Agency funding has resulted in a Research Support Fund now totaling \$737,000 to support the indirect costs of research, and a growth in Canada Graduate Scholarships.

The strength of TRU undergraduate research capacity was truly tested during the pandemic. TRU became national leaders—as shared in *Academica Top 10*—in providing research continuity for students during the pandemic. Students were supported to adapt their research, where needed, in order to provide research continuity and funding for students during these challenging times.

List opportunities and areas in need of improvement

The Interior Universities Research Coalition is proving to be a very successful partnership with the University of British Columbia—Okanagan and the University of Northern British Columbia. Last year, the coalition was able to secure \$150,000 in research funding from the Ministry of Health and that health research fund has been increased to \$300,000 in the new fiscal year. There are increasing opportunities to work with the Province through the Coalition, and this will be especially true with the arrival of the new Provincial Research Chair in Predictive Services in July 2021.

In addition, the arrival of a Researcher-in-Residence—funded by SSHRC, Mitacs and the City of Kamloops—has created opportunities to work more closely with the City of Kamloops and local not-for-profit groups—and to further animate the role of the XChange Lab (in collaboration with United Way).

All of these opportunities will continue to help build and enhance curricular and co-curricular research training opportunities for students with a focus on equitable access (view report [here](#)).

As TRU grows, the university needs to develop a consistent mechanism to provide matching funds required in support of larger-scale grants: toward that end, the Research Office has been approved to resume receiving contract overhead funds beginning in the 2021 year, with the proceeds divided equally among the Research Office, the home division/faculty, and the University. (For the last six years, all overhead funding has gone to the University, with no shared distribution model.)

The initial cultural mapping work—the collection of data involving 130 student research journey maps and 3 graphic facilitation sessions involving community partners—has yielded significant information useful for strategic planning purposes. For example, we have identified gaps between faculty assumptions regarding where students come in contact with research opportunities and the students' lived experience as documented in their research journey maps. Similarly, the community meetings and graphic facilitations have helped us distinguish between a short-term project focus and the community desire for longer-term systemic change. The initial results have been shared informally with stakeholder groups, and more formally

via 2 video productions, 2 conference presentations, 2 presentations to City Council, and 1 presentation to the Southern Interior Local Government Association.

Review of Objectives, Outcomes, and Indicators

Review current objectives and outcomes to confirm alignment with core theme and TRU's mission statement. If necessary, add or remove objectives and/or outcomes to keep the core theme relevant to TRU's mission statement.

Table 3: Review of Objectives and Outcomes

Objective and Outcomes	Still relevant (Y/N)	If not, identify revisions and provide rationale for change
Objective 1.0 TRU will create a sustainable research culture	Y	
Outcome 1.0 TRU faculty are competitive for external funding	Y	
Outcome 2.0 TRU faculty create new knowledge	Y	This outcome has been challenging to measure without access to data.
Outcome 3.0 TRU faculty and students disseminate new knowledge impactful to the communities we serve	Y	This outcome has been challenging to measure without access to data.
Outcome 4.0 Undergraduate student engagement in research activities	Y	Some undergraduate research activities were limited and some on hold due to institutional challenges with COVID
Outcome 5.0 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.	Y	Qualitative data for this objective will be gathered using cultural mapping. Due to the challenges with remote work and the unique approach to this methodology requiring a face-to-face talk/draw protocol, we were not able to complete the maps following the intended research design; however, TRU was able to successfully engage with research partners and community members to better understand and graphically represent the knowledge-building pathways between TRU and the community.

Review the current indicators and rationales to confirm alignment with TRU's mission, the core theme, objectives, and outcomes. Determine if indicators need to be removed, revised, and/or if new indicators are required to track if the outcomes associated with the objectives are being achieved.

Table 4: Review of Indicators

Indicator #	Still relevant (Y/N)	If not, provide rationale
1.1 Percentage of active tri-partite faculty holding external funding (contract and grant)	N	This is not an area of effective control, there are too many variables impacting results.
1.2 Total dollar amount of tri-agency grants and external contracts (3-year rolling average)	Y	
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)	Y	

Indicator #	Still relevant (Y/N)	If not, provide rationale
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	Y	The intent is to merge the Community Citations with the Cultural Mapping, using the cultural mapping sessions with community partners as an opportunity to gather relevant data.
3.2 Number of undergraduate student knowledge mobilization activities facilitated by the office of Research and Graduate Studies	Y	
4.2 Percentage of TRU courses that include Research informed Learning (Critical Thinking & Investigation ILO courses)	Y	
5.1 Cultural Maps of the knowledge building pathways including partnerships and learning outcomes which demonstrate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting technological and social innovation and social enterprise • Germinating ideas and applied research opportunities • Developing research relationships/partnerships with community partners • Sharing research infrastructure and engagement spaces • Enabling knowledge exchange • Celebrating shared successes 	Y	

New Indicators and Emerging Indicators

Consider if TRU should adopt new indicators for measuring Student Success based on emerging trends and patterns within the external and internal environment.

New Indicators

Refer to indicators for which TRU has three years of historical data and be added or replace a current indicator.

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 may be beneficial for tracking in the future, however, historical data does not currently exist. Ideally, three years of historical values 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.

Finally, consider if a qualitative performance indicator would be beneficial. "Although quantitative indicators show trends and uncover interesting questions, they cannot by themselves provide explanations or permit conclusions to be drawn. Additional research will always be required to

diagnose the causes of problems and suggest solutions” (Canadian Education Statistics Council, 2006, p.x).

Table 5: New and/or Emerging Indicators

Indicator	Rationale and Data Source	MF Threshold Range			Five Year Goal	Historical Values	New or Emerging
		Achieved	Minimally Achieved	Not Achieved			
4.2 Number of users across Canada accessing the National Clearinghouse for Research and Resources on Undergraduate Research Training and RiL	Development of the National Clearinghouse for Research and Resources on Undergraduate Research Training and RiL is still in progress as we work in partnership with Open Learning and students as co-creators. The goal is to launch the site in September 2020 and will be able to report users in the Spring of 2021.	<i>Undefined</i>	<i>Undefined</i>	<i>Undefined</i>	As an open education resource, the goal would be to track this from year 1 – locally to year 2- regionally and build into international access by year 5.	<i>No data to date.</i>	Emerging
4.3 Percentage of students participating in undergraduate research programs that identify as but no limited to women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, members of visible minority/racialized groups, and members of LGBTQ2+ communities.	To address access to undergraduate research through an EDI lens (currently reviewing UR programs and developing a framework to capture EDI through student undergraduate research programs). New indicator to report Spring 2021.	<i>Undefined</i>	<i>Undefined</i>	<i>Undefined</i>	In order to identify a five-year goal, it will be important to establish baseline data for year 1 while working with institutional EDI committee(s). The baseline will then help to set targets for years 2 – 5.	<i>The data on hand is tied to student participation in the Indigenous undergraduate research learning community, the Knowledge Makers. This program involves 18 – 22 students per year..</i>	Emerging

Levels of Achievement

In your review of the annual mission fulfilment threshold ranges, consider what is acceptable (or not) on an **annual** basis. For example, ask yourselves:

Achieved

What does achievement look like? For example:

- an increase in retention rate of 2%; or, perhaps, 5%
- an increase in Indigenous students’ sense of belonging, as evidenced by a sampling of Indigenous students’ narratives

Minimally Achieved

What would be considered maintaining the status quo? For example:

- a 0% increase in intercultural activities delivered; or, perhaps, a range of -1 to +1%
- little change in students' ability to navigate university processes (e.g., admissions, advising, degree progression, etc.), as evidenced by a representative sample of students' journey maps.

Not Achieved

What would be considered problematic? For example,

- a decrease in tri-agency research dollars awarded by 2%; or, perhaps, 5%
- a decrease in the level of satisfaction with student support services, as evidenced by qualitative student responses to the NSSE survey.

Review the existing threshold ranges and determine if any changes need to be made. If so, provide a rationale.

Table 6: Indicator Threshold Ranges

Indicator #	Threshold Ranges			Rationale for Change (if applicable)
	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	
3.1	3% or > increase	-1 to 3% change	-1% or > decrease	
3.2	> 5% increase	1 - 5 % increase	0 or decrease	
4.1	> 3% increase	1 - 2 % increase	0 or decrease	
5.1	Community partnerships demonstrate a positive community impact and increasing depth and reach	Community partnerships demonstrate a positive impact and increasing engagement	Community partnerships have little to no impact or contribution to the learning and development	

Review the Five-Year Target (2020 - 2025)

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 7: Five-Year Targets

Indicator #	5-Year Target	Relevant (Y/N)	If not, provide revised target and include rationale for change
1.1	40%	N	This is not an area of effective control, there are too many variables impacting results.
1.2	\$4.5M (3-year rolling average)	N	TRU was successful in meeting and surpassing the 5-year target of \$4.5M in external funding on a three-year rolling average. The new target of increasing externally sponsored research by \$600,000 annually will bring TRU to a rolling 3-year average of \$9M by 2026.

2.1	<i>Undefined</i>	N	Because TRU has not been able to collect historical values for this indicator, it is difficult to set a 5-year goal.
3.1	<i>Undefined</i>	N	Because TRU has not been able to collect historical values for this indicator, it is difficult to set a 5-year goal.
3.2	10% growth (260)	Y	
4.1	80%	Y	
5.1	We will earn recognition as the most committed and innovative university in Canada for community-engaged research and scholarship based on community partnerships	Y	

Thank you!

Determining indicators and reporting on Mission Fulfilment is an important task. Your work keeps the University focused on its mission.

To send feedback on the process, please contact TRU's Accreditation Liaison Officer, Alana Hoare at ahoare@tru.ca.