SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Office of the Associate Vice-President, Academic

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate

FROM: B. Krane
Associate VP, Academic and
Chair, SFU Surrey Long Term
Planning Committee

RE: SFU Surrey Long Term Planning
Committee Discussion Paper

DATE: February 13, 2003

On behalf of the SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee, I would like to submit the attached discussion paper for Senate's consideration and advice. It provides a series of *preliminary* recommendations regarding the future development, academic programming and pedagogy of the SFU Surrey campus. It should be noted that there are elements of the discussion paper, which have emerged from the Surrey Long Term Planning process, that have wider university application than Surrey alone, such as some of those found in Section 5.

The SSLTPC will use the advice it receives from Senate and from other consultations (see the schedule attached) to determine the specific recommendations which will be incorporated into its *final report* for consideration by Senate at its May meeting.

Thank you.

encl.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

February 3, 2003

To Members of the SFU Community:

During the Fall 2002 semester, the SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee and its three subcommittees (Academic Programming, Campus Development and Pedagogy) met intensively to develop a series of preliminary recommendations on the future of the SFU Surrey campus and its programs. The preliminary recommendations of the Committee are presented in the attached discussion paper.

During the month of February and early March a series of consultation sessions with various SFU committees and stakeholders, as well as three open forums have been scheduled (see attached). The Committee would like to have your input and comments on these recommendations. Your feedback will help to shape a subsequent report containing the Committee's final recommendations, which it is required to produce for Senate in May, 2003.

As you read through the discussion paper, the Committee would particularly like to receive feedback on the following questions:

1. What size do you think the SFU Surrey campus should be in relation to the Burnaby and Harbour Centre campuses?

2. Should the SFU Surrey campus have a particular theme or focus to its programs or should it become a comprehensive campus with a wide array of academic programs?

3. Are there any specific academic programs (undergraduate and/or graduate) that you think should be located at the SFU Surrey campus?

4. Do you support the idea of developing first year cohort programs (similar to the Semester in Dialogue Program at Harbour Centre and the existing TechOne program at SFU Surrey) at SFU Surrey?

5. Do you support the suggestion to develop a strategic plan for developing pedagogical practices and technology tools in teaching and learning at SFU?

We hope to see you at one of the upcoming meetings or forums so that we can have an opportunity to hear your thoughts about the future directions for the SFU Surrey campus. If you are unable to attend any of the sessions, please feel free to provide your comments in writing to either Laurie Summers (lsummers@sfu.ca) or myself (krane@sfu.ca).

Thank you.

Bill Krane, Associate VP Academic

Surrey Long Term Planning Process
Consultations

Senate Graduate Studies Committee
Monday, February 10th
2:00 pm – 2:30 pm, room 4100 AQ (in the vicinity of the Math Dept)

Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
Tuesday, February 11th
3:00 pm – 4:00 pm, room 3107 MBC (Registrar's Office)

Surrey Forum – Student Session
Wednesday, February 12th
11:45 am – 12:45 pm, SFU Surrey Campus in the "Pool" area

Surrey Forum – Faculty/Staff Session
Wednesday, February 12th
1:00 pm – 2:30 pm, SFU Surrey Campus, "The Bridge" conference room

Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning
Monday, February 17th
12:30 – 1:15 pm, room 3107 MBC (Registrar's Office)

VPs and Deans
Wednesday, February 19th
8:00 am – 9:00 am, room 7200 Library

Burnaby Forum
Tuesday, February 25th
3:00 – 4:00 pm, Thompson Room, Diamond University Club

Administrators/Chairs and Directors
Thursday, February 27th
9:15 am – 10:15 am, room 126 Halpern Centre

School of Computing Science
Thursday, February 27th
2:30 pm – 3:30 pm

Senate
Monday, March 3rd
7:00 pm

SCUP
Wednesday, March 5th
2:00 pm – 3:00pm, room 3171 Strand Hall

SFU Surrey Advisory Board
Date: TBA

February 3, 2003

SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee

DISCUSSION PAPER

Chair: Bill Krane, Associate Vice-President, Academic

Members: Rob Cameron, Applied Sciences
Martin Laba, Applied Sciences
Roger Blackman, Arts
Maureen Fizzell, Business
Phil Winne, Education
Colin Jones, Science
Ann Cowan, Executive Director, Harbour Centre
Colin Yerbury, Dean, Continuing Studies
Lynn Copeland, University Librarian
Tom Calvert, SFU Surrey Program Director
Laurie Summers, Director, Academic Planning
Brett Ziegler, SFU Undergraduate Student
Ted Hamilton, SFU Graduate Student

SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee

DISCUSSION PAPER

Table of Contents

SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee
Discussion Paper

1. <u>Mandate of the Committee</u>

The SFU Surrey Long Term Planning Committee (SSLTPC) was created by a motion of Senate at its March 4, 2002 meeting. The committee was tasked to provide a long-term academic plan for SFU Surrey and was asked to consider the following specific issues:

- Identify program synergies between TechBC and SFU program offerings taking into consideration the work of the Short-term Academic Planning Committee;
- Provide recommendations on the integration of TechBC and SFU program offerings, academic policies and infrastructure taking into consideration the recommendations of the Short-term Academic Planning Committee;
- Develop a strategic plan and timelines for future program offerings at SFU and related research offerings at Surrey;
- Propose a long-term operational and administrative structure for SFU at Surrey;
- Evaluate the use of alternative pedagogical tools and methods.

Three key focus areas were identified for the long term planning process: Academic Programming, Campus Development, and Pedagogy. Subsequently, three subcommittees were formed and asked to produce internal discussion papers during the Fall 2002 term. Through their research as well as consultation and discussion with various members of the university community, the three subcommittees have provided the basis for this discussion paper. Their draft reports and other committee-related information are available at: http://www.sfu.ca/vpacademic/sfusurreyplanning.

Due to the preliminary nature of the recommendations of this discussion paper, a strategic plan and timelines for future program and research offerings are not included. It is expected that the final report of the Committee (due in April, 2003) will contain this information as well as specific recommendations. During February and early March, 2003, the SSLTPC will undertake an extensive consultation with members of the university community as well as the external stakeholders. The SSLTPC will take into account the comments and suggestions it receives and then submit its final report to SCUP by April 2003 with the expectation that this report will subsequently go forward to Senate in May, 2003.

2. <u>Introduction</u>

SFU Surrey presents an extraordinary opportunity to identify, for current and future programs, a set of driving principles and values that can extend SFU renown for programmatic distinctiveness in both design and method of approach. Five principles were identified as key to this achievement:

- An interdisciplinary approach to programming;

- Integration;
- Programmatic innovation;
- Ongoing programmatic interaction supported by administrative flexibility;
- A transition from a thematic to a multi-faceted approach to programming and campus development.

During this initial planning process three overlapping but distinct questions have emerged, namely, what should we do now and in the future with a) the Surrey students, b) the Surrey programs, and c) the Surrey campus? The options are clearly constrained by the fact that there are existing students, programs and a campus, but we are not limited to the status quo.

The chief recommendation of the SSLTPC is that SFU should have a continuing presence in Surrey and that we should build upon the legacy of the Technical University of BC by offering high quality programs that are sustainable, relevant and integrated with the overall vision and mission of SFU.

This discussion paper is based on the assumption that SFU will continue to have a campus in Surrey. There are many planning variables that are not yet fixed or determined. During this early stage of collective deliberations, it is crucial to build avenues for change, and mechanisms to facilitate change.

The Surrey initiative represents a major event in the history and progress of Simon Fraser University. There is enormous potential to build new programs, research opportunities and pedagogical approaches and to engage in community development and enhancement. Our approach in this initiative should be open and imaginative. The overarching message of this discussion paper is to proceed with focus and energy to realize the rich potential of a Simon Fraser University campus in Surrey.

3. Academic Programming

The domain of academic programming is typically broad and complex in nature. It must be defined by principles which give substance and direction to the numerous and varied tasks involved in program development. Four programmatic principles are identified as key to this achievement. SFU Surrey programs should be:

- interdisciplinary
- integrated
- innovative
- interactive

Each of these principles requires commitments and concomitant tasks from the university community—administrators, faculty, staff, and students alike—to create programs that nurture and facilitate intellectual breadth and invention, creative and critical thinking, and problem-solving capacities that arise out of a lively, interdisciplinary, integrated, and ambitious program design. Through application of these principles, we should develop

the current technologically-oriented Surrey campus into one that offers a broad spectrum of academic offerings that will serve the needs of local, provincial, national and international students.

Recommendations

Eight recommendations are made for advancing the project of effective and enduring program development:

3.1   The current program at SFU Surrey should be converted to a School in the Faculty of Applied Sciences.

To date, the Faculty of Applied Sciences (FAS) has served as the administrative home for the SFU Surrey program, and its Program Director sits as a member of the FAS Executive. From the moment of its integration into SFU, the program at SFU Surrey has modeled its governance policies and administrative structures on units in the FAS, and has continued to define its curriculum through the administration of the FAS. As well, the program at SFU Surrey has paid keen attention to possible interactions and collaborations within the Faculty. In practice, the FAS has been given the role of interim "host Faculty", and this has allowed it the opportunity to develop programmatic linkages with SFU Surrey faculty and students.

The SFU Surrey faculty members have presented a compelling case for a permanent placement into the FAS with continuing faculty appointments. The working and proposed name of the School, the strong professional and applied dimensions to the program, the vision statement, the degree designation and aspirations of the program all point to the FAS as the most appropriate placement.

The diversity of the FAS which includes the Schools of Communication, Computing Science, Engineering Science, Kinesiology, and Resource and Environmental Management and the range of degrees offered in the FAS, provide an appropriate, highly interdisciplinary academic and administrative environment within which the program (and eventual School) at SFU Surrey can flourish. In particular, the inclusion of science and arts/social science research and teaching within the FAS make it the most beneficial structure for the administration of the programs currently at SFU Surrey.

There is an important point to make with regard to the proposed graduate program and the issue of placement/structure/governance. Graduate programs at SFU are usually associated with departments that also offer undergraduate programs with faculty who teach in both programs. Although there are a few stand-alone graduate programs, the first graduate program at Surrey should be associated with a *bona fide* academic unit whose faculty members are located at the Surrey campus and who also teach undergraduate programs. For this reason, the development of graduate programs at Surrey should be linked to decisions about undergraduate programs and to the establishment of a School at Surrey in the FAS.

3.2   The interactive arts and information technology areas of study should be regarded as inextricable, and together define a unique, integrated, and innovative School and program opportunity for SFU.

Although it is recognized that program planning at SFU Surrey might produce two streams or areas of concentration within a new School, the inextricable relationship between IA and IT is definitive of the program, and widely recognized as an important source of its highly innovative and distinctive approach to curriculum design and development, and to pedagogy. The foundation upon which the program of the previous TechBC was built, and the vision articulated for the future of the program at SFU Surrey, are vital and productive connections between IA and IT at all levels of research and teaching. SFU is fortunate to have the opportunity to utilize the existing opportunities and strengths that exist with the faculty and these programs and to continue to explore and build upon these areas of teaching and research.

3.3   A vigorous project of interactions and collaborations should proceed on the basis of identified synergies between the current program at SFU Surrey and other units and faculties across the university.

The preliminary list of programs and program areas below identifies potential areas for interaction and collaboration. Members of the SFU community are encouraged to submit their own ideas in this area to the Committee for consideration.

Faculty of Arts

School for Contemporary Arts – The Interactive Arts Program at SFU Surrey provides particularly rich opportunities for interaction with Contemporary Arts. The programs have met formally and informally to articulate and map areas for collaborative teaching and research. These areas include choreography, interactive systems, photography, research and presentation of large-scale performances and productions, film narrative studies, technology and the arts, and others.

Department of Geography – Their expertise in geographical information systems provides a natural linkage with existing Surrey programs, and the Certificate in Spatial Information Systems will doubtless be of interest to Surrey students.

Faculty of Applied Sciences – Potential synergies could be realized between the programs at SFU Surrey, the School of Communication, the School of Computing Science, and possibly other units in a number of areas, including: new media/digital media, multimedia, telecommunication policy, human-computer interaction, social user interface, digital literacy, interface design, computer-mediated communication, technology and society, collaborative learning systems, online learning, visual and interactive media.

Faculty of Science – From a research perspective, opportunities for collaboration with SFU Surrey have been identified for faculty and graduate students in the Department of

Molecular Biology and Biochemistry (MBB); in particular, the range of expertise in Informatics at SFU Surrey offers promising research interactions with MBB. A possible joint major or other forms of linkage and collaborative teaching and research among the IT/IA program at Surrey, Computing Science, and MBB has been proposed for consideration.

Faculty of Education – The Faculty of Education's four program areas—Graduate, Field, Professional, and Undergraduate demonstrate rich possibilities for productive interaction in the theoretical and practical dimensions of teaching, curriculum design and delivery, technology and educational innovation, and other areas of educational research.

Learning and Instructional Development Centre (LIDC) – There is a solid foundation to build collaborative initiatives between the LIDC and the current program at SFU Surrey. The Director of LIDC has proposed bringing together the work of LIDC in the area of pedagogical training and practice (particularly online and multimedia applications) with the innovative online design and delivery approaches in teaching at SFU Surrey.

3.4   New program development at SFU Surrey should move forward with a cohort program of integrated studies that facilitates the movement of students among disciplines and programs, and among the university campuses.

The TechOne curriculum of the former Technical University of British Columbia was an integrated, cohort-based foundation year bringing together students with interests in Interactive Arts, Information Technology and Management and Technology. In particular, this program emphasized collaborative learning and the appropriate use of on-line technologies. There appears to be clear support emerging from members of SFU faculty to continue a TechOne type program or some other version of a cohort program that could be used to stream students into Arts, Business and Science programs at SFU.

A semester cohort program is typically a one-semester package of courses offered to students on a cohort basis. Five 3-credit courses may be involved. In a multi-campus SFU, a semester cohort program could provide an opportunity to bring students from their home campus for a semester to participate in a program associated with another campus. Semester cohort programs could be used as mechanisms for broadening exposure for a number of disciplines for SFU students. The opportunities for a semester cohort program at SFU Surrey are numerous. For example, courses from across a number of faculties could be integrated, with IT/IA/technology studies serving as a programmatic fulcrum. Semester cohort programs have the advantage for students of minimizing inter-campus travel.

3.5 **New programs for the SFU Surrey campus should be explored, planned and pursued. These programs can be either "transplanted" from other areas of the university or newly created.**

The following list of programs is intended to offer directions and proposals for program development at the SFU Surrey campus in addition to the current programs in Interactive Arts and Information Technology. Members of the SFU community are encouraged to submit their own ideas in this area to the Committee for consideration.

Faculty of Arts
There is a strong sense that entry-level programs of a general nature would be in particularly high demand as the Surrey campus develops, and that liberal arts must be an essential component in such offerings. The Faculty of Arts has expressed a strong interest in providing course offerings designed to achieve a comprehensive academic program at the Surrey campus.

In addition, SFU has an exciting opportunity to design a Bachelor of Applied Arts for delivery to students in its Surrey campus. The program would be targeted at individuals who require specific knowledge bases and skills to prepare them for direct entry into the job market. While current BA programs do this they are also designed to prepare students for graduate training. The difference therefore and emphasis in the BAA is upon practical applications of knowledge to real world problems.

The first three semesters of the degree would commit students to a core curriculum by establishing core competencies in communication/writing skills, analytic/critical thinking skills and liberal arts and science courses. The remaining semesters would be devoted to one of a number of streams each of which would be supported by a number of electives. An important component in this educational process would be required co-op and/or community service training. Possible streams (which may be offered in conjunction with the college system) would include the following:

- Application of GIS and other imaging technology;
- Urban design and planning;
- Criminology/policing/forensics;
- Gerontology/health care
- Community development

Faculty of Business Administration
The Faculty is clear and emphatic in its support of the development of Business and Technology courses for SFU Surrey. This does not mean that the Faculty wishes to reprise the previous TechBC Management and Technology section of the program, but rather to build new programmatic areas at Surrey that would elaborate and enhance the current IA and IT offerings. It is the intent of Business to develop a complete BBA degree program at Surrey with a concentration in Management of Technology using the technology pedagogy already in place in the IA and IT programs. The new MOT program will interact with the IA and IT programs by offering courses of interest to IA and IT

students and by having its students sample courses in the IA and IT programs. If such an initiative were undertaken, the program would be staffed by Faculty of Business Administration faculty members and would operate under a different model from that followed by the Faculty of Applied Sciences at the Surrey campus.

Faculty of Education
Opportunities in local academic programming at SFU Surrey have been identified in the four program areas of the Faculty of Education—Graduate, Field, Professional, and Undergraduate. The Graduate programs area offers a wide array of graduate-level programming leading to M.Ed., M.A., Ph.D., and Ed.D.; and the Field programs area has many and varied programs that lead to a Graduate Diploma.

The Professional Development Programs Group (PDP) has a long and fruitful experience in locating groupings of teacher education students and faculty associates in community settings beyond the Burnaby campus. At present, one grouping is already located in Surrey and, given the projected growth in the Surrey School district, the Faculty of Education is eager to explore with the Surrey district further collaborations that could call SFU Surrey home. As well, certain components of the Undergraduate Programs in Education (courses and minors, and several Certificates and Post Baccalaureate Diplomas) could be located at SFU Surrey.

Health Programs
The SSLTPC recognized that Surrey and the Surrey campus are important and extremely promising contexts for research opportunities for the Institute for Health Research and Education (IHRE) at SFU. The Institute's emphasis on community contributions, and developing research collaborations that bridge biomedical, health systems, health services, and population health research sectors is eminently well suited to, and would benefit considerably from the Surrey location. Certainly the very substantial health sector in Surrey offers attractive opportunities for applied health research.

3.6   Adopt the trimester system for the current programs at SFU Surrey for the benefit of new program development and Co-operative Education planning at SFU Surrey.

Coordination of the programs at SFU Surrey with the SFU trimester system is essential to a successful Co-op program. The module system of the former TechBC and the trimester system do not mesh for the purposes of Co-op, and this incongruity is an obstacle to Co-op development and placement opportunities.

3.7   Identify opportunities for credit and non-credit courses and programs at SFU Surrey in terms of both academic and community needs.

The credit and community outreach activities offered through Continuing Studies at the Surrey campus will both relate to the University's academic programs located at that campus, and also reflect the needs, interests and diversity of the local Surrey/Fraser Valley population. As well, Continuing Studies could provide departmental services at

the Surrey Campus to Harbour Centre and Burnaby campus faculty who are not based in Surrey but teach there.

3.8 Begin the formal implementation of the academic programs at SFU Surrey in the Fall of 2004.

The program for the 2004 cohort would be based on the foundation of the 2003 cohort. The 2003 cohort program is under active development at the moment in the Faculty of Applied Sciences, and should be completed shortly. This development proposes a transformation of the IA/IT program content for wide compatibility with related SFU programs. This proposal calls for an integrated "TECH 1/MEDIA 1/DESIGN 1" (working titles) program that offers a general foundation year for IA, IT, and other related programs at SFU. It is important to note that the proposed development provides for increased interplay between the IA and IT components of the current program while, at the same time, facilitating greater programmatic interaction with other related disciplines in the university - all within the context of a new School in the Faculty of Applied Sciences.

The program proposals being considered for 2003 include a revision to the graduate program for SFU Surrey and a recent initiative related to the "Development of the IA and IT Degree Programs" (undergraduate). Both are moving expeditiously through the various University review and approval processes. The work described here offers assurance to the SFU community that the process for the 2004 cohort is well underway. Indeed, this cohort program will be substantially based on the (soon-to-be-completed) 2003 program.

4. Campus Development

There are some key considerations that can be extrapolated from the existing campus model at SFU Surrey. These include the importance of capitalizing on the significant investments in people, programs, and facilities as well as extensive planning and input from the academic and business communities that worked with TechBC. SFU can benefit from the goodwill that has been created with the Ministry, the City of Surrey, and other stakeholders and enhanced by the smooth transition process. To underestimate the value of this prior investment and goodwill could result in a lost opportunity. As well, there may be short and medium term risks involved leading to the loss of highly qualified faculty and staff and operational methodologies that are part of the current SFU Surrey model.

Research was carried out comparing various campus development models found within ten different institutions across the following variables:

- Size and phasing of growth
- Stated mission
- Type of model
- Structure

- Nature of programs
- Student services
- External links and relationships

What stands out in the analysis is the wide range of growth patterns and approaches to campus development. In some cases, multiple campuses are closely situated within an urban core, and in other examples, the campuses are relatively isolated and serve different regions. There are also varying levels of autonomy with some campuses having their own Senate and others not having a Dean or faculty administration on site. In almost all cases, the newly developed campus has evolved towards distinctive programs and a niche identity allowing it to be clearly differentiated from the original campus and minimizing duplicate offerings. Key lessons from the investigation of campus development models include the importance of initially establishing a number of flagship programs which are known for their high quality and being integrated with the academic activities of the Burnaby campus.

To a large extent, the academic vision and the governance structures of the Surrey campus will be dependent on what kinds of offerings will ultimately be available at that location. It will be particularly important for the development and evolution of this campus to have a focused vision and mandate that on the one hand will help shape its identity and guide its development but on the other will ensure that its direction is congruent with the continued growth and opportunities of the University overall.

Recommendations

4.1 **A focused vision and mandate for the SFU Surrey campus should be articulated that will help shape its identity and be consistent with SFU's values and commitments. It is recommended that an initial positioning statement be adopted for the SFU Surrey campus with the aim that this would lead to the development of a final vision statement for the campus.**

The initial positioning statement should consider the following:

- SFU Surrey should be positioned as a first rate university campus equipped with up to date technological and building infrastructure and located in the growing and diverse economy of BC's Fraser Valley.

- Credit and non-credit academic programming at the SFU Surrey campus should complement SFU's strengths in liberal arts and sciences by developing a core offering of innovative interdisciplinary and professional programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

- The following positioning themes should be reinforced through strategy, investment, and delivery of commitments:
    - nationally and internationally respected research-based programs
    - innovator in undergraduate teaching and e-learning practice

- centre of excellence in student-centered services
- collaborative and connected to its community

- The new campus should continue SFU's legacy of innovation in higher education and complement and leverage the programs and resources of the Burnaby and Harbour Centre campuses while creating a distinctive identity for SFU Surrey.

- SFU Surrey should be guided by SFU's Statement of Values and Commitments and develop and expand innovative interdisciplinary and professional programs and creative community outreach and partnership as well as champion the value of curiosity driven, basic research in expanding the foundations of knowledge.

- There should be a strong focus on building community relationship mechanisms and services such as an external advisory committee, co-op programs, Continuing Studies programs, collaboration with other educational institutions in the Fraser Valley, and industrial liaison to enable the University to meet the needs of the community.

- The small but growing size of the student population at SFU Surrey, the technology infrastructure, the expertise and service orientation of existing staff, and the location in a commercial venue should be viewed as a major opportunity for SFU to innovate in instructional approaches and student services that can be expanded to other SFU campuses in a staged approach.

4.2 Three possible campus development scenarios are recommended for consideration including:

Zero Growth Campus at the existing site – This scenario involves renegotiating the lease at the existing facility or another Surrey "store front" location, on the assumption that access will be capped near the 860 FTE threshold set out in the three year agreement and there will be no growth beyond 2004-05.

Targeted Campus on an Expanded Site – This option involves negotiating lease and tenant improvements on the existing site with a first phase of approximately 175,000 sq ft, and a right-of-first-refusal on expanding into additional space.

Campus on a Newly Built Site – This scenario would involve negotiating the development of a "green field" site in Surrey to construct a new campus. There will be costs involved with obtaining land and creating a new campus. Typically, the government prefers to provide land that it already owns.

It should be noted that in the current provincial context, the second option would most likely be the most advantageous one for SFU.

4.3   Any campus planning exercise needs to take into consideration the following specific recommendations related to further campus development at SFU Surrey:

- A facilities plan should be driven by an academic plan, not the reverse. Once the academic plan for SFU Surrey has been defined and agreed upon, then a facilities plan can be designed within the context of serving the academic plan.

- It should be recognized that at the end of the next academic year, further growth in student numbers will be constrained and that current leases expire in August 2003 (an extension up to two years is possible).

- It should also be recognized that expansion at SFU Surrey will be required in 2003/04 and 2004/05 to accommodate the funded FTE growth target. If growth is assumed, there are two main options:

  a. expand at existing location (assumes the landlord is prepared to negotiate a lease extension beyond August 2005)
  b. move to a new location (preparation time will be required for occupancy in fall 2005; Fall 2004 is not enough time)

- It should be recognized that it would take a minimum of twelve months and realistically about eighteen months to make facilities in an alternative location available for an expanded campus.

- No matter what scenario, it is recommended that we never eliminate the opportunity to own our campus.

Issues to consider for any campus development model include:

- *Pedagogical model options* have both a big range and implications for the other parameters (range includes varying degrees of emphasis on classroom, labs, educational technology, distance modes, needs of different disciplines).

- *Space standard* (how much space to provide per student FTE): 170 sq. ft. is the standard in a conventional university and is an average that takes into consideration differences across disciplines. Relative to current enrollments, leased premises in the transition space at the Surrey Place Mall provide 143 sq. ft. per FTE. This less than standard space allocation is possible because the particular program delivery and open office planning models used in the current facility.

- *Expectations of faculty* will also affect space requirements (i.e. ratio of faculty per student, number of faculty offices, amount of research space).

- *Provision of student services* (gym, cafeteria, library, parking, health/counseling, etc.) also help determine which campus model will be used and how much space will be required.

- *Lease rate* (cost per sq. ft.) will not be known until it is actually negotiated.

- *A growth rate* of 20% is assumed to be reasonable, but realistically it will also depend on policy around the access challenge.

4.4   Governance, administrative, policy and procedural frameworks of the SFU Surrey campus should be organized in accordance with existing SFU structures and subject to the authority of the SFU Senate and Board of Governors.

- The Surrey campus should have representation on SFU committees as appropriate and necessary.

- The Surrey campus may wish to have some advisory councils or committees to be used to develop programs or offerings specific to the Campus. However, any formal reviews or approvals of any proposals that were developed would have to be sent through the regular University governance channels.

- The current position of Campus Director, someone who oversees the day-to-day operations of the campus, its programs and its continued development, should be continued. As the campus expands, this position may need to be advanced to the level of Associate VP, similar to Harbour Centre.

- The Surrey campus should operate in accordance with the same core services and structures as the Burnaby and Harbour Centre campuses with the expectation that as it expands, there would be the need to potentially have "branch" offices available on site for the convenience of faculty, staff and students. There may be the need for some campus specific services or methods of operation in order for SFU Surrey to adapt to or fit in with its eventual location and mandate

- The Surrey Campus should look at obtaining services such as Health Services, Reprographics, Food Services, Central Stores/Purchasing and Athletics/Recreational Services perhaps through existing businesses or services already in place in the community.

- A financial model should be developed early in the campus development process, which is shaped by the types of programming and services envisioned for the campus, the type and amount of space the campus will have at its disposal, its physical location within the community, and the extent and success of fundraising initiatives.

5. <u>Pedagogy</u>

The recommendations put forward in relation to pedagogy are not meant to be specific to the Surrey Campus. The Committee felt that a discussion around pedagogy was critical to the planning process given the technology-oriented nature of the current Surrey programs. However, any actions taken with respect to the recommendations outlined below will need to be collective ones that support pedagogy across all campuses of SFU and sustain the strategic vision of the University.

Models of pedagogy identify and arrange factors which are theorized to affect how learners learn and, thus, what they achieve. There is no universally accepted model of pedagogy, nor is there a full agreement about factors required in models of pedagogy. Five elements common to most models of pedagogy are: goals, curriculum, features intended to guide learning (i.e. instructional design), assessment of students' progress and achievements, and learners' individual differences.

There is scant data about pedagogies in practice or the effects of technological supports for teaching and learning at SFU-Burnaby or SFU Harbour Centre. Technologies used in varying degrees include email, conferencing systems, LON-CAPA, and an enterprise-level course management system, WebCT and First Class.

At SFU Surrey, there are distinct models of pedagogy (delivery models) in practice in the context of 5-week "courses" (modules), each of which is extensively entwined with technological tools. The models and tools are perceived to be useful but not flexible enough. The Surrey course management system is adequate for the near future but likely must be replaced or significantly revamped if adopted for the longer term. A majority committee opinion is that 5-week modules have more disadvantages than advantages although they can be useful in particular situations. In some instances, technology tools increase faculty workload.

Promoting sound pedagogical practices and guiding faculty and students in using technology tools in teaching and learning are, in slightly different ways, goals pursued by the Centre for Distance Education (CDE), the eLearning Innovation Centre (eLINC), and the Learning and Instructional Development Centre (LIDC). All three units are perceived to be effective. Except for SFU Surrey, where all modules are jointly developed by faculty in consultation with eLINC staff, the university community should make more extensive use of these services.

However technologically supported pedagogy may evolve, four factors will return value to the university community: knowledge resources regarding effective pedagogy and appropriate support by technologies, technology resources (infrastructure), effective articulation with the student information management system (SIMS), and sound fiscal planning and management.

Five recommendations are made for advancing pedagogy and making effective use of technologies to support that objective:

Recommendations

5.1 Revise the Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)

Terms of reference for SCUTL should include responsibility to:

- develop and update guidelines for prudent use of educational technologies with reference to overarching requirements and constraints.

- recommend priorities for the central allocation of resources to implement, manage, and improve technologies used in university teaching and learning.

Within the broad array of issues under SCUTL's purview, the following areas are particularly important wherein policy needs to be modified or developed in adopting, monitoring, managing, and staying at the leading edge in using educational technologies effectively:

- vision about the roles of educational technologies in teaching and learning;

- a system of incentives so that university faculty will invest effort in learning about and using educationally effective technologies;

- support systems and resources (e.g., training, online manuals) for faculty, staff, members of TSSU, and students who use educational technologies in teaching and learning;

- gathering and examining data on the extent to which teaching and learning with educational technologies are effective and fiscally appropriate;

- copyright, digital rights, and intellectual property in the area of elearning;

- articulation across campuses and among the various units responsible for pedagogy support;

- articulation of pedagogical support services with Academic Computing Services which is responsible for infrastructure underlying technology-enhanced teaching and learning.

5.2 Develop synergies and coordinate activities among the Centre for Distance Education, the eLearning Innovation Centre, and the Learning and Instructional Development Centre.

Each of these units has extensive experience with pedagogical models and educational technologies, and each has substantial infrastructure that supports its respective mission. These talents and resources should be brought together to increase their unique and joint contributions to improving pedagogy across the university. As a first step, a committee

should be struck to identify and propose methods for (a) capitalizing on potential synergies among these units and (b) coordinating their activities.

5.3   Form an Advanced Learning Technologies Institute (ALTI).

The university has too little valid data on the effectiveness and properties of technology-enhanced pedagogies that are or might be practiced at SFU, and the research literature in this area is both unsatisfactory and burgeoning. This lacuna is an opportunity for SFU. By establishing an Advanced Learning Technologies Institute, the university can meet its needs in this area and simultaneously achieve premier position in research on technology-supported pedagogy.

The mission of the ALTI should be to frame, seek funding for, carry out, and disseminate research on technology-supported pedagogy. In addition to base budget staff of a Director and at least one research associate, ALTI should stimulate collaboration among researchers across the SFU campuses who investigate features, effects, and individual and societal consequences of technology-supported pedagogy.

One high priority project for ALTI should be to catalog technology-supplemented pedagogical practices in use throughout the university. Concomitantly, it should plan and carry out evaluations of current technology-supplemented pedagogical practices with respect to educational effectiveness and properties such as fiscal efficiencies, student completion rates, transfer of skills from campus to career settings (e.g., co-op), and so forth.

An equally high priority goal for ALTI should be to develop a protocol by which participants throughout the cycle of technology-supplemented teaching and learning can and will be interested to participate in a "living laboratory." Foci for projects in this context should range widely, for instance, spanning formative evaluations of software systems, experiments on learning, studies of factors affecting access to educational opportunities, the ecology of teaching and learning in the context of the living laboratory, faculty development, and changes to the roles of teaching assistants in technology-supplemented courses.

In addition to these matters, ALTI should seek to strengthen SFU's links with national organizations (e.g., COHERE) and scholarly communities researching learning technologies.

5.4   Develop a process for identifying personal computing system packages for faculty and students.

Considerable costs—financial, attitudinal, and educational—accrue to the university and to users as a result of heterogeneity in software and hardware systems. At the same time, tailored systems must be acknowledged as representing part of what it means to be on the forefront of a field. This tension must be turned to advantage rather than being allowed to constantly erode material progress and community attitude.

In this context, it is prudent to identify a small number of recommended standard computing packages for the university's personnel. Correspondingly, a sound financial plan needs to be created so that existing and new faculty and all students entering the university, new and transferring, can purchase or lease a recommended computing systems package. A package in this model is a configured set of hardware platform, operating system, and a basic toolkit of software applications including, for example: email, word processing, presentation, computational (e.g., spreadsheet, statistics), calendar and personal information management. In selecting components for packages, attention must be paid to these factors:

- Packages must satisfy multiple disciplines, acknowledging that, for example, Education, Engineering and English will have different needs;

- Packages must use interoperable protocols and formats that allow data to be shared across systems for teaching and learning, SIMS, and university-wide bedrock infrastructure;

- Packages must have significant economic advantage;

- The architecture of each package must provide for extensibility or "add ons" at minimal investment so that tailored solutions can be accommodated and promising innovations can be explored;

- Backward compatibility must be, in so far as possible, insured.

Computing technologies change rapidly. Therefore, to maintain a first rank position in educational uses of computing technologies, packages will need to be regularly reviewed.

5.5 Develop a protocol for choosing a course management system or a coordinated set of tools for managing e-learning.

Course management systems are designed to handle a very wide range of tasks relating to technology-supplemented teaching and learning. Because of their complexity, these systems are expensive, can require considerable training to use effectively, and can require considerable resources to maintain. Building on a variety of previous efforts, SFU should establish a process for reviewing and making choices about these systems. A great deal can be learned by thoroughly examining choices, systems, and consequences in the context of SFU-Surrey's development of its own course management system, dubbed CMS.

The process that is developed to select a course management system (or a set of discrete tools that can be effectively coordinated to form the equivalent of a course management system) must satisfy at least three requirements.

- The process must lead to selecting a fiscally viable system or set of tools;

- Scalability and interoperability with other systems, particularly SIMS, must be assured;

- Neither the course management system chosen nor the process for selecting it should curtail research and innovation in pedagogy.