

The University of British Columbia

EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE FACULTY OF FORESTRY

Report of the Review Committee

Professor Lisa Graumlich
Dean of the College of the Environment
University of Washington

Professor Patricia Layton
Director of the Wood Utilization and Design Institute
Clemson University

Professor Chad Oliver
Director of the Global Institute of Sustainable Forestry
Yale University

December 2015

Table of Contents

PHYSICAL LOGISTICS OF THE REVIEW	3
ORGANIZATION OF REPORT	3
1. GOVERNANCE, ORGANIZATION, AND ADMINISTRATION:	4
RECOMMENDATIONS:	6
2. INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES:	6
RECOMMENDATIONS:	8
3. INTERACTIONS AND SERVICE OUTSIDE THE FACULTY:	8
RECOMMENDATIONS:	11
4. ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT:	12
RECOMMENDATION:	12
5. ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURE:	12
RECOMMENDATIONS:	13
6. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND TEACHING:	13
RECOMMENDATIONS:	14
7. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES	14
RECOMMENDATIONS:	15
CONCLUSION	15
RECOMMENDATIONS:	15
APPENDICES	17
APPENDIX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE FACULTY OF FORESTRY 2015

Purpose: To review the strength and balance of the Faculty’s teaching, scholarly activities, professional activities, academic programs, and service; to evaluate the Faculty’s leadership and administration; to assess the Faculty’s standing nationally and internationally; and to advise on the future development of the Faculty.

Physical Logistics of the Review

This report is based on pre-visit information sent to the committee, information provided during the site visit, information that the committee gained from the internet and elsewhere, and post-visit discussions among committee members. Detailed information given before and during the site visit is listed in Appendix I. The Terms of Reference, given before the site visit, contained nine areas of consideration, but emphasized that these should not limit the committee’s overall mandate:

1. Scholarly Activities
2. Professional Activities
3. Academic Programs and Teaching
4. Aboriginal Engagement
5. Governance, Organization, and Administration
6. Interactions and Service Outside the Faculty
7. Infrastructure and Resources
8. Environment and Culture
9. Other Advice

The initial description of these terms is in the Appendix. A site visit was undertaken from November 1-4, 2015.

Organization of Report

We first presumed an “ideal” university that is a keeper and extender of knowledge. Knowledge is kept and extended by the faculty through teaching (undergraduates and

graduates), research, and interactions with students and other faculty and extended through oral and written learned papers and teaching (undergraduate, graduate, mid-career, professional activities, public meetings). The faculty is responsible to the people of the region for providing the best and most objective knowledge and opportunities. The students and public are “clients.” The faculty is the greatest asset to a university, the staff’s role is to help faculty realize their potential, and the role of the Dean’s office is to organize and administer in way to ensure that everyone is best used and that everyone understands and performs their function well.

We recognize this ideal is compromised by expediencies of funding, personalities, government mandates, and other considerations; however, our report uses the “ideal” metric to determine if the Faculty of Forestry (FoF) and each subgroup is advancing this ideal.

This report addresses all subjects in the Terms of Reference, but in a different order than listed above. The order addressed is shown in the Table of Contents, above. Throughout this report, the degree of concern about the topics we raised varied; our expression “only when asked” indicates this topic was probably not foremost in our discussants’ minds.

1. Governance, Organization, and Administration:

Based on our many discussions and the helpful Figure 2 (pg. 14, “Faculty of Forestry: Self Study”), we noted the following. Although already well known, the Faculty of Forestry’s standing has been continued, enhanced, and taken in new directions by Dean Innes (also discussed under “international activities, below). Other Deans and higher administrators within the UBC and at national and international levels respect him for his leadership within the faculty. His international visibility at the World Forestry Congress and at the International Union of Forest Research Organizations, as well as his activities in Asia and the Pacific Rim, have shown his leadership and reflect positively on the UBC.

Dean Innes’ and the Faculty’s movement towards accepting foreign students shows strong strategic and tactical leadership. Strategically, it is creating a cadre of international forestry alumni who are loyal to the University of British Columbia—and British Columbia in general. Given the strong role of forest resources in British Columbia’s economy and the surplus of wood beyond its own needs, this is a laudable move for the good of the entire province. Tactically, the international students compensate for a FoF funding disadvantage within UBC created by the “tyranny of small numbers.” Although forestry generates many environmental services and secondary employment, relatively few people actually need to be trained in forestry; and consequently the FoF is one of the smaller Faculties at UBC; but the UBC funding formula is based on the number of students enrolled in a program. UBC FoF is extremely

important for its research, outreach, authority, and quality of students, but enrolments are relatively small. The international students through their numbers and higher tuition rates thus help supplement (but not replace) the relatively small number of domestic students. Furthermore, the large infrastructure of the FoF is better utilized by the addition of the foreign students.

At the same time, because of recent growth in enrollment, expanded class sizes are creating inconveniences in teaching that will need to be addressed. There seems to be a shortage of large classrooms; and new teaching methods will need to be developed: e.g., large lectures by faculty and breakout discussions led by graduate teaching fellows; or the creation of on-line courses. The use of graduate teaching fellows may alleviate a need to find financial support for graduate students nearing thesis completion. To their credit, the faculty recognize these inconveniences but accept them as “something to deal with,” rather than objecting to the innovations.

A second consequence of the “tyranny of small numbers” is the high acceptance to application ratio of undergraduates into the FoF. This is partly attributable to self-selection by people who want to work professionally in the woods; many of the applicants are apparently from rural communities with excellent field skills but less versed in urban academia. Also, the admissions office advises many students not to apply if they appear incapable of being admitted; this may be doing the applicants a service, but it is one that is counterproductive to the FoF ranking on campus, since it distorts the apparent admission averages. This practice needs to be explained to the UBC administration if the Faculty is not to be penalized.

The organization of the FoF is clear and straightforward, and we heard no concerns or confusion about who-reports-to-whom. The high numbers of staff are consistent with many universities where the amount of administrative reporting is increasing. The concentration of staff within the Dean’s office is appropriate, provided the staff take over the many budget, reimbursement, ordering, and other administrative functions often performed by the faculty—and do not simply serve the Dean. The morale of the staff is high. They acknowledge that they are a “service” group, and show great loyalty to the Dean and the Faculty.

The FoF building offices were organized to avoid faculty/student “camps” by concentrating faculty in one section (to allow them to interact) and graduate students in another. This pattern still prevails and is laudable; however some graduate students expressed the view that interactions among graduate students may not be occurring as readily as had been hoped. We heard some concerns about lack of space for graduate students, including social space, but we recognize that the Faculty is attempting to make the best use of the space that is available.

Dean Innes has made many efforts to be transparent and have his faculty reach consensus before a major decision is made. Although there were suggestions that at times he was too cautious, we encourage his continuing this approach. Dean Innes also meets with faculty in their offices and has annual budget meetings with the faculty as well as providing them with spreadsheets of the budget.

Only when asked, many faculty stated they did not understand the budget and other resource-related administrative decisions. It is possible that some Department Heads are not communicating budgetary matters clearly and the faculty are not aware of—or do not remember—meetings where these issues are discussed. We believe that organizational and administrative decisions would be better understood and accepted were the faculty better informed about the Faculty's finances.

One budgetary concern we heard several times is that that dependence on tuition flowing from the relatively large number of students from Asia could leave the Faculty exposed. Diversifying the foreign student population could mitigate this risk, and the possibility of expanding overseas recruitment should be further examined.

Recommendations:

- 1. Diversify the countries of origin for International Students to reduce risks of lack of students if one country should curtail the ability of students to travel abroad.**
- 2. Look at new teaching methods including large lectures with graduate student-led discussion sessions and/or on-line lectures for some classes.**
- 3. Evaluate scheduling to optimize use of classrooms and labs during more hours of the day.**
- 4. Understand the “accounting” of applications versus acceptance rates in the University and develop a policy and communication method to allow the University to understand the FoF model.**
- 5. Develop several ways of communications, including “listening sessions,” so that faculty, staff and students can better understand the operations and management of the FoF.**

2. Infrastructure and Resources:

The UBC has an excellent campus, and FoF is well placed within it. It would be appropriate for Applied Science and FoF to work together on many issues.

The organization and support of the units within the Faculty are potentially excellent for faculty and students; and more new faculty are being hired, ensuring a broad range of faculty

age and experience is maintained. UBC and the FoF provide some training/coaching for faculty entering administrative positions, which is essential for the FoF's smooth running.

The FoF has two excellent forest field facilities, one of which is close to campus. This is well maintained, staffed, financed, used, and appreciated. There are faculty who are committed to teaching at the field camps. We encourage this commitment to continue as older faculty retire.

There is apparently a need for more and larger lecture halls to accord with new paradigms in teaching. UBC has recently introduced a Professor of Teaching stream, and there is some discussion of its applicability in the FoF to tenured faculty who are primarily focused on teaching. This is an interesting concept, but a challenge will be to avoid the danger of minimizing the importance of research as these faculty members reach senior levels.

When asked, the faculty wanted more FoF support for two things:

1. Funding for a fourth year for PhD students, to help them finish sooner. This would help reduce the long time (by UBC standards, but not by those of other North American universities) for a student to complete a PhD. Perhaps expanding the use of the new teaching styles, along with more TA's, could alleviate this problem.
2. Funding for the maintenance of analytic facilities. There seems to be confusion over whether faculty are expected to use their own reserve funds for maintenance or whether the FoF pays for this maintenance. This highlighted the fact that communication about critical resource issues is an important step that needs to be more thoroughly addressed by the Faculty administration.

Historically, families that became wealthy in the timber business provided funding for many buildings at UBC. It is uncertain if such wealth still exists. Development (fund raising) efforts could be expanded by adding more staff and raising the fund-raising expectations. In addition, the development staff could work closely with the Assistant Dean of Communications, to develop a more targeted messaging framework for the FoF.

The FoF collaborated with the Faculty of Applied Sciences and the Faculty of Science on separate proposals for consideration as UBC's sole submission to CFREF. Amidst stiff competition from other research groups, both joint proposals with FoF were in the final four. The Associate Vice President for Research commented that the UBC administration remains committed to working with the FoF/FAS team to seek a large external grant to fund the collaborative effort. The FoF should persevere/continue/push to be part of it.

There are real opportunities to expand work with First Nations. The First Nations seem increasingly receptive and important, especially in light of some recent Supreme Court decisions. (See section 4 below.)

The media office is good at keeping Forestry faculty “in the news” by maintaining close personal relationships with British Columbia news media. However, the issue of whether the *Branchlines* magazine needs to be changed (or supplemented) with information targeted to specific audiences needs to be addressed. This will be discussed further in #3, “Interactions and Service Outside the Faculty.”

Recommendations:

- 1. Continue to encourage and support the use of the Experimental Forests as primary classrooms and teaching tools for the programs. This may include working with the University to develop cost effective transportation programs and use of the forest as classrooms for other faculties and programs within the University.**
- 2. Perhaps by use of a space audit, develop and present needs for classrooms and labs for the FoF.**
- 3. Evaluate alternative funding models for graduate students including fellowships (funded by new development efforts) and teaching assistantships and their allocation.**
- 4. Communicate how “indirect returns” to the FoF are allocated to all.**
- 5. Develop a policy on responsibility for equipment maintenance (and use of that equipment) and have clear written “contracts” for equipment that may fall outside of this policy.**
- 6. Within the strategic plan, increase targeted funding goals for development to meet some of the recommendations included in the report.**
- 7. Reengage faculty and senior leadership to work with the VP for Research to find funding options for the CFREF application that did not get supported.**

3. Interactions and Service Outside the Faculty:

The FoF has many connections and activities outside the Faculty, some of which can be strengthened to the FoF’s advantage. These will be discussed in separate sections.

Greater University:

At the review committee’s meeting with other Deans, there was universal respect for Dean Innes and an appreciation of his forthrightness. There was some suggestion that Forestry tended to “go it alone,” and that it might be more proactive in working collaboratively with the other Faculties. Such a perception might be due to differing personalities among the Deans, or simply because of the traditionally pioneering, self-reliant nature of forestry. For its part,

Forestry seems to feel that it is not always included in major decisions affecting the Vancouver campus.

Greater collaboration and inclusiveness could be accomplished in two ways:

1. The Provost and Deans could make a greater effort to ensure that the FoF is always included in appropriate decisions;
2. Dean Innes should actively seek to develop cooperative relationships with other Faculties, even if it seems that an activity might be better done by the FoF alone.

Three emerging opportunities that are UBC targets of interest are presenting themselves for the FoF at present:

1. The bioproducts field, including mass timber (e.g., cross laminated timber and others, as evidenced in construction on the UBC campus);
2. The First Nations and other indigenous issues noted above;
3. The biodiversity field, already being developed by the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Land & Food Systems.

The Provost and Dean should work hard to ensure that the FoF has a large hand in these.

Alumni:

Alumni did not attend the meeting that was scheduled for them to speak to the review committee. A letter provide by one Forestry alumna spoke very favourably about the quality of instruction in the Faculty, and the usefulness of the courses she took by way of preparation for her subsequent career in the industry. She suggested that it would have been useful to have had more attention paid to writing skills, critical to advancement in the profession.

We note that *BranchLines* is distributed to the alumni. We also note that the Assistant Dean for Development and the Dean's office hold several alumni events during the year and that target goals for fundraising and meetings with alumni were met based on goals established in 2008. New, more ambitious targets should be established, and perhaps an additional development officer appointed. Other communications options with alumni are ongoing.

Forest Industry:

The relationship of the larger forest industry to UBC seems unusual to an outsider—but typical of university/industry relations in many other places in North America. That is, rather

than treating the FoF at UBC as a resource and think tank, the industry tend to act as if they are the “thought leaders” in forestry and expect the FoF to follow. At our meeting with representatives of government and industry, we learned that UBC forestry seems inward looking and not especially interested in maintaining close relations with outside agencies (an opinion later disputed by the Dean). Other comments included the following:

1. One comment was that UBC should not be focusing on the environment and conservation. At the same time, a rather contradictory concern was expressed that the public still views the forestry industry as the “bad guys.”
2. Given their focus on the BC economy, neither government nor industry seems to understand why the FoF is engaging so heavily with overseas students. This may have been because they do not recognize that the FoF funding formula is based on student numbers. They seem to think that the focus on foreign students means a reduction in graduating domestic foresters from UBC, rather than an addition to the domestic complement. This view also seems to ignore the fact that recruitment of international students is paving the way for more foreign commercial engagement with British Columbia forest products.
3. Neither government nor industry was very complimentary about UBC Forestry graduates; one said they do not hire from UBC because of a lack of field skills.
4. The industry wished that the FoF had a stronger policy and economics group, which they felt would help them in forest planning and other efforts.

Despite the reservations expressed by industry, we believe that the role of the FoF is to provide an academic resource for the forest sector, of which industry is only a part. Dean Innes has said he has reached out to this sector, but has had little engagement at meetings he has organized.

We suggest a three-pronged approach:

1. The FoF should serve all sectors of forestry, including the forest industry. However, the FoF needs to demonstrate to Provincial legislators that industry is not the only player in the forest sector. Consequently, the FoF should reach out to the Provincial government and its foresters, the First Nations, tourism, and others interested in the British Columbia forests.
2. The FoF should work harder to connect with the forest industry, perhaps through the appointment of an associate dean charged with improving external relations.

3. The FoF should continue to work with industry in several ways:
 - i. Work on the “mass timber” (cross-laminated and other) technologies;
 - ii. Build bridges with industry through FPInnovations’s relationships and capabilities. FPInnovations (a public/private group funded by both government and industry) has a group of researchers on the UBC campus in Vancouver as well as in other locations in Canada and coming soon to the U.S. By building collaborative relationships with this group, FoF may be able develop and fund more research.
 - iii. Work with Forest Innovation Investment Ltd. This group is devoted to increasing trade outside of Canada. With FoF’s relationships in Asia and its now growing number of alumni in those areas, there may be natural synergies that can promote and develop the missions of both organizations. This is especially true in the area of wood science.

Provincial forestry, general public, emerging resources sectors, tourism: The UBC FoF needs to foster relations directly with these sectors independent of the forest industry.

Aboriginal communities: This stakeholder group is emerging in importance and is discussed in the next section.

Recommendations:

1. **The Provost and Deans could make a greater effort to ensure that the FoF is always included in appropriate decisions.**
2. **Dean Innes should actively seek to develop cooperative relationships with other Faculties, even if it seems that the FoF alone might produce a better result.**
3. **The Faculty should engage more in the bioproducts field, including mass timber (e.g., cross laminated timber and others, as evidenced in construction on the UBC campus).**
4. **The Faculty should increase involvement in First Nations and other indigenous issues as noted elsewhere in this report.**
5. **There should be more involvement by the FoF in the biodiversity field, already being developed by the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Land & Food Systems.**
6. **The FoF Faculty should develop a strategic plan for communications.**
7. **The FoF Faculty should develop a new model for industry relations at various levels. This would include identifying lead and target communication messages, including stories about the outstanding graduates produced by the UBC Faculty of Forestry.**

4. Aboriginal Engagement:

At a meeting with representatives of indigenous members of the UBC community, we learned that the UBC FoF is already engaged with First Nations, including having a well-articulated set of institutional arrangements that facilitate transfer from BC's community colleges. In a period of reconciliation following historical injustices, First Nations view this relationship positively. A recent Supreme Court decision has given First Nations new authority over resource extraction in their territories, and understandably the indigenous community would like to see more focus in both teaching and research on indigenous issues—including title rights.

In addition to technical skills, First Nations communities feel a strong need for a more culturally sensitive perspective focusing on protection of, and trust in, traditional knowledge. This focus would include both research and teaching.

From the point of view of the UBC FoF:

1. The FoF may find that the First Nations/Aboriginal groups are an increasingly strong part of the forestry sector to work with.
2. In addition, a culturally aware perspective would give the UBC FoF graduates an advantage in international forestry, where many different perspectives are present.
3. The culturally aware perspective may be taught by increasing the representation of anthropology/sociology faculty in the FoF, or by partnering with other faculties at UBC.

Recommendation:

- 1. Become the leader of UBC's team working in the area of Indigenous engagement.**

5. Environment and Culture:

By appearances and their own assessment the faculty are, in general, productive, engaged, supportive, professional, and collaborative. We did not notice or hear of any polarized "camps" or "cliques"; if there were some, no one felt they were important enough to bring up. Some of the faculty did not necessarily feel engaged with the Dean's office or broader perspectives of the FoF, but this was primarily by their own choice rather than any feeling of alienation.

When at our social gathering with faculty and staff, everyone seemed to get along well, with no “dichotomy” of faculty and staff and no “fortress Dean” mentality. A greater promotion of faculty seminars and “mixers” was suggested to enable the faculty to understand better what their colleagues are doing. Include graduate students into such opportunities as appropriate. Some form of annual report of scholarly and professional activities, perhaps in conjunction with faculty-wide colloquia, may bring out the best in the faculty and help both the faculty and Dean appreciate each others’ perspectives. Dean Innes acknowledged that each faculty member has individual strengths and weaknesses and so tries to organize them to their strengths.

The FoF should be commended for their recent hires, which have greatly expanded the gender diversity of the faculty. The female faculty members did not report any discrimination or inappropriate treatment. The junior faculty felt very well supported and included, as will be further discussed below. The faculty have very diverse international backgrounds, which is an asset to both teaching and research. Faculty scholarship is productive, though we noticed that quite a few annual leaves have been taken in the Vancouver, B.C. area. This is sometimes appropriate when writing a book; sometimes necessary with working spouses and children in school; but we suggest that faculty be encouraged to travel more widely when this is feasible.

Recommendations:

- 1. Cross fertilization of ideas within the FoF is key – find several methods of doing this, as one is not usually enough.**
- 2. Faculty should be encouraged to travel more and be ambassadors for the FoF when they do.**

6. Academic Programs and Teaching:

Most teaching is done by tenured (or tenure-track) faculty, rather than being assigned to temporary, adjunct instructors. This teaching by the tenured faculty—the top intellectuals in their field—is important and shows an appreciation of the role of scholarship in teaching by the administration. Such recognition of scholarship needs to be kept strong as the FoF moves toward larger classes, tenured teaching faculty, and outreach programs. We understand that Dean Innes has emphasized the need for all faculty to be involved in the Faculty’s teaching programs. This is important, as it exposes students to a variety of teaching styles and helps them to recognize the value of different approaches in the classroom.

There is an excellent balance between applied and fundamental science faculty, and between faculty of different ages. This balance serves the faculty and students well. The FoF is proactively hiring to retain balance and representation among key forestry sub disciplines. We

do suggest that “curriculum mapping” be undertaken, so that core learning goals are defined and courses are structured to provide students with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to pursue professional work or subsequent research in forestry.

The Faculty has commendably high standards with regard to students’ communication skills. The emphasis on professional writing and presentation is very good. At the same time, both faculty and graduate students would like more help in statistics and in proposal organization. The large number of international students poses something of a problem in the area of language proficiency, not only because of problems encountered in written assignments but also the potential hazards in fieldwork conducted in English. We were relieved to learn that there is a requirement at the field camp that early safety instructions be given in both English and Mandarin.

The five curricula seem appropriate. The professional forestry and forest conservation programs are a good balance. It is good that the wood products curriculum and faculty have been maintained; this is an area of re-emerging importance. The addition of an Urban Forestry Program is important, both in its own right and for the students from abroad who may find it more relevant to their needs, as well as more comprehensible. It is appropriate to have a forest science program as well, although not as the main thrust of the FoF.

The faculty is to be applauded on their initiative in developing mid-career Master’s degrees; however, these need to be structured so they use faculty time and FoF resources effectively. They need careful grooming and support, so that they become revenue generators rather than an extra burden on the Faculty’s resources.

Recommendations:

- 1. Undertake curriculum mapping for each program.**
- 2. Develop dialogues with employers about their needs for employee skills in each program.**
- 3. Ensure that there is adequate training in oral and written communication for all students.**
- 4. Each professional Master’s program should have a strategic plan with a business plan for revenue generation, for which they should be held accountable.**

7. Scholarly Activities

Over the past decade the Faculty of Forestry has produced and maintained significant scholarly work in most areas as evidenced by a review of their CV’s, awards, and other materials. Most members of the Faculty are involved in excellent research. Many are active at all levels in their profession, both nationally and internationally. While grants are down

compared to several years ago, this may in part due to changes in government funding priorities and the maturing of some areas of research.

The Faculty has a good reputation at home and abroad, and its high standing is reflected by Dean Innes previously having been Vice President for Policy of the International Union of Forest Research Organizations.

Recommendations:

- 1. Continue the excellent scholarly activity performance that the Faculty has produced to date.**
- 2. Partner with other university Faculties for new areas of grants and scholarship.**

CONCLUSION

UBC's Faculty of Forestry is a strong, well-led, forward-looking Faculty with a distinguished history and great potential. To realize that potential, the Faculty must be prepared for change and growth. The committee feels that this is a critical time in the FoF and the University. We recommend that a revised strategic plan be developed that includes goals and strategies for marketing, communications, and development. This does not necessarily mean a brand new plan (different from the beautifully printed document provided to the review committee) but a working plan with action steps and timelines that brings the FoF together in a concerted effort to show how the Faculty intends to accomplish its goals (links to University priorities should be highlighted), work with others to accomplish these goals, and communicate with multiple audiences about what it accomplishes.

General recommendations:

- 1. A revised strategic plan should be developed that includes goals and strategies for academic programs, research, marketing, communications, and development.**
- 2. This plan should include action steps and timelines that bring the FoF together in a concerted effort to show how the Faculty intends to accomplish its goals (links to University priorities should be highlighted).**
- 3. Where appropriate, work with other Faculties to accomplish these goals.**
- 4. Communicate with multiple audiences in multiple ways about the Faculty's accomplishments.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Graumlich
Patricia Layton

Chad Oliver

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Purpose: To review the strength and balance of the Faculty's teaching, scholarly activities, professional activities, academic programs, and service; to evaluate the Faculty's leadership and administration; to assess the Faculty's standing nationally and internationally; and to advise on the future development of the Faculty.

Terms of reference: Without limiting its overall mandate, the Review Team should give consideration to the following:

1. **Scholarly Activities:** To review and evaluate the quality, extent, range, and balance of the scholarly activities of the Faculty, including the achievement and status of scholars within the Faculty, their leadership within the scholarly communities, and the quality of their performance in relation to the achievements of their counterparts in comparable Faculties nationally and internationally.
2. **Professional Activities:** To review and evaluate the quality, extent, range, and balance of the professional activities of the Faculty, including the achievement and status of faculty and staff members, their leadership within the professional communities, and the quality of their performance in relation to the achievements of their counterparts in comparable Faculties nationally and internationally
3. **Academic Programs and Teaching:** To review and evaluate the quality, format, organization, and enrolment of the Faculty's academic programs and teaching strength, including its continuing education and professional programs. The reviewers should draw on the reports of the four evaluation teams that reviewed the individual undergraduate programs in spring 2015. Within the graduate programs generally the reviewers are asked to consider the quality of mentorship, the effectiveness of interdisciplinary programs, and the degree of financial support available to graduate students. For professional programs the reviewers are also asked to consider the quality of the programs, including their management and instruction, and their fit and impact on the overall curriculum offerings, particularly other graduate courses and programs in the Faculty. In all programs reviewers should consider indicators of student success in career preparation, employment opportunities, time-to-completion, and placement.
4. **Aboriginal Engagement:** To review the extent to which the Faculty has engaged with Aboriginal forest-based communities, both domestically and internationally, and how in particular its Aboriginal alumni are succeeding in the workplace. The reviewers are

requested to pay particular attention to experiential learning opportunities, not only for Aboriginal students, but also for non-Aboriginal students within Aboriginal contexts.

5. **Governance, Organization, and Administration:** To review and evaluate the governance, organizational structure, leadership, and administration of the Faculty, including opportunities for diversity in leadership and shared governance as well as relevant support systems both within the Faculty and available to the Faculty. The reviewers should consider the degrees to which governance is transparent, flexible, and accessible to all members of the Faculty.
6. **Interactions and Service Outside the Faculty:** To review and evaluate the Faculty's interactions with other units within the University, particularly those in related disciplines, and with its external communities, including alumni, professional organizations, government agencies, other institutions offering similar educational programs, and the greater public community, both domestically and internationally.
7. **Infrastructure and Resources:** To review and evaluate the physical and financial resources of the Faculty, including its financial base (i.e., levels of university funding, tuition revenue, and donor support), research support, facilities for teaching and research, equipment, and space.
8. **Environment and Culture:** To consider and assess the working and educational environment, morale, and institutional culture of the Faculty as made up by its faculty members (including adjunct professors, sessional instructors, and lecturers), staff, and students. The reviewers should give particular attention to the Faculty's performance relative to the University's employment and education equity policies. They should consider the Faculty's responses to the increasingly diverse nature of student, faculty, and staff populations.
9. **Other Advice:** To provide other advice as appropriate to the general purposes of this review.