ALT-2040 Fund Program
Terms of Reference of the Review Committee

Purpose of the Review

To review the purpose and goals of the Aspire-2040 Learning Transformations (ALT-2040) Fund program; to evaluate fund administration operations and process; to explore the dissemination and impact of ALT-2040 funded projects; and to advise on the future development of the program.

Background Material

- The University's goals and objectives as outlined in its Strategic Plan, the Okanagan Outlook 2040 and ASPIRE process
- ALT-2040 Program Overview

Terms of Reference

Without limiting its overall mandate, the Review Committee should consider the following:

Purpose and Goals

1. **Alignment to UBC (institutional) and UBC Okanagan (campus) strategic priorities**: Does the fund align with current institutional priorities? What parameters are used to avoid overlap with other funding calls or initiatives? How does the fund serve to advance *emerging* priorities and/or priorities *specifically emphasized by UBC Okanagan* (e.g.: generative artificial intelligence, experiential education, student retention, student affordability, etc.)?

2. **Equity, inclusion, accessibility, and Indigeneity**: To what extent does the fund contribute to the university's mission to advance principles of equity, diversity, inclusion, and anti-racism? To what extent does the fund contribute to the university's goals of decolonizing and Indigenizing curriculum? How are relevant groups engaged to inform this approach?

3. **Innovation and transformation in learning:** Do the positioning of the fund and stated focus areas resonate with current trends relative to transformational learning? Is the program structure attractive to the right people and conducive to delivering results?

Operations and Process

4. **Engagement and consultation**: How are faculty, staff, and students engaged to inform the priorities, administration, distribution and overall structure of the fund? How is program feedback solicited, considered, and incorporated into future offerings?

5. **Capacity and readiness**: How has the readiness of the campus (e.g.: expertise, resourcing, and capacity of campus partners) been considered to ensure support of funded initiatives?

6. **Fund administration**: Is the nature of support provided to applicants and award recipients appropriate? Is the application process efficient, reasonable, and user-friendly? Are eligibility requirements and application cycle appropriate?

7. **Accountability**: What processes are in place to ensure accountability? Are results of funded initiatives reported in a timely and accessible manner? Are processes in place to allow for efficient reporting and follow-up by fund administrators? Is the adjudication process clear and transparent?

Dissemination and Impact

8. **Sustainability:** How is long-term sustainment of funded projects ensured? Is the fund sufficiently flexible and adaptable to account for rapid change in the campus, university, and higher education landscape?

9. **Distribution and Representation:** Do projects represent diverse disciplinary perspectives and faculty/student backgrounds? Is there evidence of multi- and interdisciplinarity outcomes? Is fund distribution reasonably representative of the overall campus profile with respect to number and size of Faculties and Schools?

10. **Evaluation of impact**: How are the results of the funded opportunities evaluated and shared? How do the results of evaluation efforts inform fund structure, administration, and priorities?