SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Senate Committee on University Priorities
Memorandum

TO: Senate

FROM: John Waterhouse
Chair, SCUP
Vice-President, Academic

RE: Faculty Structure Task Force
Final Report (SCUP 08-04)

DATE: February 13, 2008

At its February 13, 2008 meeting SCUP reviewed and discussed the Final Report of the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure, "Removing Barriers: A Design for the Future of Simon Fraser University". SCUP voted to forward the Final Report to Senate for information and discussion.

SCUP will bring forward specific motions at a subsequent meeting, informed by discussion at Senate.

encl.

c: S. Roppel

"REMOVING BARRIERS: A DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE OF SFU"
FINAL REPORT
Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure

Presented to the University Community
February 11, 2008

From the members of the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure:

Paul Budra, Department of English
Jonathan Chu, Undergraduate Student Representative
Charmaine Dean, Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science
Jane Friesen, Department of Economics
Frank Gobas, School of Resource & Environmental Management
Craig Janes, Faculty of Health Sciences
Robert Krider, Faculty of Business Administration
Jack Martin, Faculty of Education
Sue Roppel, Special Project Advisor to the Vice President, Academic
Van Truong, Graduate Student Representative
John Waterhouse, Vice-President, Academic (Task Force Chair)

Acknowledgements

The Task Force wishes to take this opportunity to sincerely recognize the exceptional efforts of those individuals who served on the Academic Structure Working Groups without whose expertise, time, and careful deliberations, this report would not have been possible. We also wish to whole-heartedly thank those members of the University community who provided presentations, facilitated sessions or attended the full-day Interdisciplinarity Charette Day. The identification of barriers and creative insights into solutions formed a fundamentally important framework for the recommendations we have developed with regard to enhancing interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University. Similarly, we owe a special thank you to Dr. Jock Munro who assumed the role of facilitator for the development of a vision for an environmental initiative at Simon Fraser University. We also recognize and thank those individuals who participated in the full day Environmental Visioning Workshop, who have proactively engaged with the extended processes around the environmental initiative, and who have developed proposals and alerted us to initiatives elsewhere in this important area.

Equally important, we are indebted to all members of the University community who have so thoughtfully and fully engaged with us in the design of the future of Simon Fraser University. Your presence and insights offered at Working Group meetings, Open Forums, consultation processes, and written feedback have been extremely useful and directing. This report and the recommendations contained within it could not have arisen without your active engagement.

Finally, and by no means least, the Task Force wishes to sincerely thank Ms. Sharon Eng who served as Secretary to the Task Force, and Ms. Gwen English who was responsible for the development and maintenance of the Task Force's website.

Table of Contents

Appendices

VOLUME I – INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Setting the Stage

In 1965, Simon Fraser University opened its doors to its first students, faculty, and staff. Since those beginnings only slightly more than 40 years ago, Simon Fraser University has grown into an internationally recognized, comprehensive research institution with about 30 Departments and Schools, six Faculties, more than 18,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate students and 3,000 FTE graduate students, a faculty complement of approximately 900 FTE, and a staff complement of approximately 2,000 FTE.

The growth of the University has been extraordinary over the past decade alone, and we have witnessed dramatic changes in the range and scope of academic activities within the University including the expansion of our activities to span four campuses[1]. We have also experienced significant changes in the external social, political, demographic, fiscal and intellectual contexts. During these changes we have, consistent with our legacy, kept our eye on the future to ensure that we are able to make meaningful contributions to society and the world in which we live through our research, teaching and outreach.

It is in the context of these forces that in October 2005, the Vice President, Academic created a Faculty Structure Task Force (hereinafter referred to as the Phase 1 Task Force) to examine the question:

> *Is Simon Fraser University's current academic structure one that best reflects our qualities and strengths and one that will enable us to most effectively and visibly advance our strategic goals?*

Notably, this review did not occur within a context of financial crisis, crisis of reputation, or crisis of vision, often typical of restructuring exercises at other academic institutions.

After a year of detailed study and review, the Phase 1 Task Force had the following conclusion:

> *"We believe it essential that Simon Fraser University preserve the foundations upon which it has been built. Any changes to Faculty structure therefore must preserve six pillars: strong core disciplines, a comprehensive liberal arts and science education, interdisciplinarity, integration with our many communities, excellence in educational programming and research, and an international reputation for innovation. ... [Nonetheless, as we imagine the future,] the University should consider and thoroughly examine the potential of alternative academic configurations, structures and/or systems of support" (p. 2, Final Report, FSTF).*

---

[1] Campuses include Burnaby Mountain campus, Surrey campus, Vancouver campus (which includes Harbour Centre, the Wosk Centre for Dialogue, the Segal Graduate School of Business, and the various Contemporary Arts studio facilities in the downtown eastside) and the Kamloops campus. We also have a presence at the Great Northern Way Campus, but due to the joint institutional nature of this development we have not claimed it as an SFU campus in this report.

We note that the call to proceed with an examination of the University's structure was not one marked by an air of caution or conservatism. Rather, it was a call with a commitment to create the best University possible for the future and to unbridle the spirit of ingenuity and imagination that is resident throughout the University community.

> *With [our] foundations in place and kept intact, the Faculty Structure Task Force believes that where change is required, we must not hesitate and we must be prepared to be bold. We must direct ourselves to creatively imagine, design and build our future: to embrace change as opportunity; and, to construct an academic structure that will ensure that in all areas of the University, we can realize our goal to be the best comprehensive research university in Canada. (p.2, Final Report, FSTF)*

And thus, on the basis of the Phase 1 Task Force findings, Senate approved the establishment of a Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure in November 2006. The mandate of this second phase was threefold:

1. *Consider and evaluate proposals from the University community as well as those developed by the Phase 2 Task Force itself, and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend to Senate an overall academic unit configuration for Simon Fraser University;*

2. *Consider and evaluate the coherence, roles, responsibilities, functions, administrative requirements, costs, and terminology of the structural building blocks employed at Simon Fraser University (i.e. programs, schools, departments, centres, and institutes) and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend to Senate a strategy that will provide definitional clarity, administrative effectiveness, and appropriate differentiation among these structures; and,*

3. *Consider and evaluate the University's effectiveness in incubating, facilitating, and supporting interdisciplinary research and programming and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend structural and/or policy changes that will enhance interdisciplinary innovation in the future.*

Senate also approved from the Phase 1 Task Force Final Report, eight principles and a procedural framework to guide the Phase 2 Task Force in its work. The principles and procedural framework are captured as Appendix A and B, respectively, to this report.

Designing SFU for 2025

The Phase 1 Task Force conducted its initial assessment of whether Simon Fraser University should further delve into issues of academic structure and interdisciplinarity in view of what the University should strive to be by the year 2025. Their vision is presented as Appendix C. Their vision of 2025, and the four qualities we will define below as emblematic of that vision, was premised in large part in consideration of a number of critically important transformations in the external and internal context of Simon Fraser University. While we do not wish to reiterate all of

those arguments, there are several that are so important to the future of Simon Fraser University that we felt they should be highlighted again here.

First, historically Simon Fraser University has operated primarily within an environment where the demand for university spaces exceeded supply. As the University witnessed recently, this trend is radically changing. Within the next decade, the age 18-21 population of British Columbia (one of our traditionally primary enrolment populations) will decline by 3.6%. Further, it is predicted that BC Grade 12 Enrolment will flat-line over the period 2004-2014. In combination with an increasingly diversified post-secondary education system in British Columbia and the likely extension of degree certification within some areas of the BC College sector, it will be increasingly necessary for Simon Fraser University to compete for undergraduate enrolments. We must ensure that the University is clearly recognized for its strengths, its unique attributes and core commitments and the quality of its teaching and its research. Simon Fraser University must also emerge as offering a distinct and unparalleled undergraduate education.

While these population projections are of serious concern, a more optimistic picture emerges for other population profiles. For example, the age 25-29 population of British Columbia will actually grow by 21% during the 2004-2014 period, and immigration continues to outpace domestic population growth. Further, the provincial demographic data is not uniform by region, and we expect that Surrey will continue to see 18-21 population growth. Notwithstanding regional variation in the 18-21 age profile, it is clear that there will be an increasing need for several areas of university education: postgraduate education at the master, and doctoral level, recertification programming for the qualified immigrant population seeking domestic qualification, and innumerable new demands for lifelong learning opportunities.

Second, the University's financial composite has changed dramatically since 2000 alone. While historically supported primarily from the Provincial Government, this revenue source to the University has dropped dramatically as a proportion of overall operating funding: from 69.2% in 2000/01 to 53.9% in 2004/05. To continue to sustain high quality educational programming and excellent research facilities the University has had to diversity its funding strategy. Such diversification will be increasingly important in the future. This means that we must continue to expand our reputation for research and teaching excellence nationally and internationally. We must ensure that we are able to attract the best students from around the world, and that the overall vision, direction, and reputation of the University is seen as attractive to potential financial benefactors. We echo the sentiments though of the first phase Task Force that while doing so we must "remain absolutely and fundamentally committed to the intellectual autonomy of the University, to preserving the liberty of our institution, to honoring our core commitments, and to fundamentally preserving the raison d'etre of a University to engage in knowledge conceived within a framework of inquiry, explanation, and discovery of phenomena." (p. 6, Final Report, FSTF)

In addition to the two external contextual frameworks drawn from the first phase Task Force, there have been several additional developments in the external environment that are noteworthy.

First, the British Columbia Provincial Government continues to expand access to post-secondary

education. Simon Fraser University must ensure that all of its programs are seen as a first choice for outstanding undergraduate and graduate students. The University has demonstrated its commitment historically, and through recent initiatives, to offer an unparalleled educational experience for students. At the undergraduate level, initiatives such as the Student Learning Commons, the undergraduate curriculum initiative (W-Q-B), the cohort approach to learning at the Surrey campus and in first year programming (Explorations, TechOne, and Science One), our innovations in pedagogical delivery as exemplified by the Semester in Dialogue, the dual joint-degree program in Computing Science, and proposed international experiential programs in Business Administration and Arts and Social Sciences, are all exemplary of this commitment. Further, our trimester operations, tutorial system, and flexible programming structures all signify our commitment to a unique undergraduate educational experience. At the graduate level, Simon Fraser University has established a strong record of excellence in disciplinary and interdisciplinary studies across the University. Our outstanding researchers, world-class Chairs, and research success as demonstrated by research council and other support, all provide a top-level graduate learning environment. We recognize these successes, but also believe that we can do more. The Task Force proposes additional structures and initiatives in this report that we believe will build on the past successes of Simon Fraser University and will ensure that we offer one of the best educational experiences and learning environments for undergraduate and graduate students in the country, attracting the highest quality students from around the world.

Second, the "Campus 2020" report (April 2007) by Jeff Plant, QC and Special Advisor to the BC Provincial Government, noted that academic excellence must be the cornerstone of the province's post-secondary educational strategy: "Our research-intensive institutions must continue to be the key incubators of the innovation needed to address our most pressing social and environmental challenges and to develop a strong economy. They must also be places of teaching excellence, and they must be destinations of choice for the best and brightest students from across the province and around the world." (Campus 2020, p. 4) The imperative of serving as an incubator of innovation as we address pressing social and environmental challenges is an important motivational underpinning for the ultimate recommendations found within this Phase 2 Task Force report. The Task Force believes that the additions we offer to structural building blocks to enable incubation and adaptability, the areas of new focus for the University that we recommend through alignment of academic units and new program creation, and the multifaceted strategy we suggest for interdisciplinarity, will help Simon Fraser University play a fundamental role as an incubator of innovation and as a place for addressing pressing social and environmental challenges in our changing world.

A third recent contextual change is the appearance of a new tiering of the Canadian University system. Universities that consider themselves to be Tier 1 are typically those research-intensive institutions with medical schools. However, recently the University of Waterloo has become part of the Tier 1 league. We are concerned that the tiering of Canadian Universities may have a direct impact on the way in which universities generally are able to participate in, and exert influence upon, provincial, national and, potentially even, international research agendas. We must ensure that Simon Fraser University is widely recognized nationally and internationally as a Tier 1 University should the tiering that appears to be on the horizon actually take hold within the Canadian post-secondary context. As a consequence, we believe that it is imperative for Simon Fraser University's research excellence to be better profiled and better facilitated,

especially in the most pressing areas of societal need such as health and the environment. Further, as the future of research success is comprehensively intertwined with excellence in graduate education, we believe we should look for opportunities to significantly expand our graduate offerings and more effectively involve graduate students in our research activities.

A fourth contextual change that deserves noting is the increasing profile and attention to issues of environmental concern. The awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize in November 2007 to a group including Al Gore for drawing attention to issues of global warming and climate change is illustrative of the level of societal importance and the inescapable conclusion that the world must become urgently proactive in discovering and studying solutions to environmental problems. It did not go unnoticed by the Task Force that within a day of the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize, universities across Canada rushed to report in local and national newspapers the members of their faculty who have been actively involved in the various national and international global climate change programs and related initiatives.

A fifth recent development in the external environment is the noticeable move by universities and funding agencies internationally over the past 5-10 years to integrate knowledge communities in an effort to enhance knowledge creation and address socially relevant global issues. The transformation of the Canadian Medical Council into the interdisciplinary Canadian Institutes for Health Research, the United States National Research Council's 2001 study and identification of the eight "Grand Challenges" confronting the large Environmental Observatories, the multi-billion dollar initiative by Stanford University to develop four multidisciplinary initiatives[2], the blossoming of a literature, and perhaps the appearance of a nascent field of study in interdisciplinary pedagogy, is in evidence.

Within the Canadian University sector, there are signs of response. As examples, we have seen in 2007 alone the creation of a semi-virtual College of Interdisciplinarity at the University of British Columbia, and the development of three new virtual Interdisciplinary Schools at the University of Saskatchewan. We have also seen an increase in program funding envelopes with criteria seeking demonstration of interdisciplinary research teams. All of these are testament to the changing intellectual context. And while some skeptics may view these developments as the trend of the "00s", the President of Stanford University, Dr. John Hennessy, has argued[3] that the transformation of knowledge and understanding by multidisciplinarity will be as revolutionizing as technology has been over the past two decades. The Task Force believes that there is compelling evidence to support his prediction.

Sixth, the Task Force has observed a significant shift in the positioning of major United States institutions towards expanded engagement, connectivity, and efforts to be relevant to communities and individuals around the world. It is apparent that the major US Universities are looking outwards and are taking their obligation to be socially responsible to a scale, and in ways, previously unimagined.

---

[2] The initiatives are: (1) The Initiative on Human Health, (2) The Initiative on the Environment and Sustainability, (3) The International Initiative and (4) The Arts Initiative: Engaging the Arts and Creativity (see website for further details http://multi.stanford.edu/initiatives/).

[3] This was a report of his words by Dr. Roberta Katz, Associate Vice President for Strategic Planning, Stanford University.

Seventh, and finally, we have noticed significant initiatives in the resuscitation of the arts and culture as a key role for, and responsibility of, universities. An example of the revival in arts and culture is evidenced by Stanford University, who, in response to demand by external donors and friends of the University, have set as one of their four multidisciplinary initiatives, "The Arts Initiative: Engaging the Arts and Creativity". This initiative was commenced in 2006. Coordinated through the Stanford Institute for Creativity and the Arts, the Institute has been mandated to "act as the nerve center for the development of new undergraduate arts programs, hosting artists in residence, administering new multidisciplinary graduate degree programs, awarding grants for multidisciplinary arts research and teaching, incubating collaborative performances and exhibitions and providing centralized communication". (Stanford website http://multi.stanford.edu/initiatives/)

Within the context of the above observations, the more detailed internal and external context framework provided in the Final Report of the Phase 1 Task Force, the analysis and recommendations of the five Academic Structure Working Groups, and the feedback received from the University community, the Phase 2 Task Force has concluded that we must design Simon Fraser University for 2025 so that it can be described by four key qualities. We note that many of these attributes are currently in evidence in various areas of the University. We recognize these strengths and aim to build upon them.

(1) Faculty members will see Simon Fraser University as a place where they can effectively pursue disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge discovery, application, and practice of their art; where they can easily share their discoveries, applications and arts with colleagues and communities; where they are able to identify and engage with colleagues with whom they wish to collaborate; where their energy and creativity for programmatic and research innovation will find incubation, support and development; and where this environment will lead to the attraction and retention of a world-class academic complement.

(2) Graduate students will see Simon Fraser University as a place where they are afforded an expanded range of outstanding programmatic options; where there is a diverse range of opportunities for disciplinary and interdisciplinary courses of study; where they are intimately connected with the research agenda and activities of the University; and where this combination will continue our success in recruiting superb students interested in pursuing advanced exploration of disciplines and interdisciplines.

(3) The design of our undergraduate programs will be recognizably distinct and of exceptional quality providing students with life-changing experiences, a wide range of opportunities to study within, and at the intersections of, disciplines, and which, therefore, will continue to attract students of the highest caliber from local, national and international origins.

(4) Our communities, both locally and internationally, will see Simon Fraser University as a place where we fulfill our social responsibility to provide learning opportunities to all members of society through a comprehensive collection of programming that spans non-

credit and credit learning; where we actively pursue and contribute to understanding and knowledge development concerning the social and environmental problems of the world; and where we provide our students with opportunities to learn with others and participate in initiatives in communities around the world.

As we develop our recommendations, we will strive to build upon our existing strengths and accomplishments and ensure that, throughout Simon Fraser University, these qualities are showcased.

Structure of Our Report

Given the significant ground to be covered over the course of our threefold mandate, the Task Force has decided to organized our report into volumes. These are necessarily interrelated, but can also stand as topic focused sub-reports.

Volume II – Major Structural Change: This volume provides the core recommendations of the Task Force with regard to changes in the academic structure - the creation of three new Faculties, the disbanding of the Faculty of Applied Sciences, the creation of a new College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning, and a proposal for the development of a Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship.

Volume III – Interdisciplinarity: In this volume, the Task Force identifies the successes of Simon Fraser University to date in supporting interdisciplinarity, highlights existing barriers to effective pursuit of interdisciplinary teaching and research, and lays out a multifaceted strategy for improved facilitation, nurturing and incubation of interdisciplinary initiatives.

Volume IV – Programs, Processes and Other Activities: This volume presents the Task Force's recommendations related to specific programs such as a new IT/ICT Program, TechOne, the Cognitive Science Program, a Foreign Language Studies Program, and consolidation of Publishing programs and initiatives. In addition, this volume recommends the creation of several process reviews designed to enhance the student experience. Finally, Volume IV speaks to several issues raised by various areas of the University community in submissions to the Task Force.

Volume V – Academic Structural Elements: Notable in this volume is the definition and conceptualization of a new entity – the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning – and a sub-category of structure, the College Program. Also of critical importance in this Volume is a re-conceptualization of the Centres and Institutes R40.01 policy envisioned.

Volume VI – Implementation: This final volume of our report speaks to issues of implementation, costs analysis, impact on individuals, and administrative process.

"REMOVING BARRIERS: A DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE OF SFU"
FINAL REPORT

VOLUME II – MAJOR STRUCTURAL CHANGE

Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure

Presented to the University Community
February 11, 2008

VOLUME II – MAJOR STRUCTURAL CHANGE

Process Overview

In January 2007, the Task Force issued a call for proposals regarding the academic structural configuration of the University. This call produced 25 proposals from a broad cross-section of the University (see Appendix D for a list of submissions). Given the number of proposals received and the need for detailed investigation and evaluation of each, the Task Force created five Academic Structure Working Groups (see Appendix E for the Working Group composition and submission assignment). Each Working Group was chaired by a member of the Task Force and augmented with several faculty members from the University community who had cognate interests in the proposals being considered but who were not from any of the units identified in the proposals. A student representative, either graduate or undergraduate, was also a member of each Working Group.

The Working Groups engaged in extensive consultation with the units and individuals from which proposals were submitted and met with interested members of the University community who wished to discuss proposals with the Working Groups. Working Group 3 which considered proposals from the broad areas of environment, development and sustainability, also held an Open Forum on the Environment for all interested members of the University community. In total, more than 260 members of the University community were consulted as part of the Working Groups' activities. In June 2007, each Working Group submitted a report to the Task Force containing their assessment of the submissions and their recommendations. These reports are available for review on the Task Force website.

Upon receipt of the Working Group reports, the Task Force held five Open Forums - one on each of the Working Group reports. In total, approximately 225 members of the University community interacted with the Task Force and provided their views and insights on the recommendations and contents of the Working Group reports. A summary of feedback received at the five Open Forums is available for review on the Task Force website. In addition, all written feedback to the Task Force is available on our site.

Three exceptions to the general support of the Working Group directions are noteworthy:

(1) Health

In essence, Working Group 2, which dealt with proposals around the area of health, recommended the realignment of Kinesiology to the Faculty of Science, and the creation of a Collaborative Health Research Institute to stimulate the development of increased collaboration and communication between the Faculty of Health Sciences and other individuals and units engaged in health research and teaching across the University. Initially, in response to this report, the School of Kinesiology reiterated their interest in joining the Faculty of Health Sciences as an intact unit. As understanding of orientations, philosophical underpinnings, and worldviews evolved between members of the Faculty of Health Sciences and School of Kinesiology, the School of Kinesiology subsequently determined for a number of reasons outlined in Volume II, that realignment to the Faculty of Science would prove a

better environment for them. Additionally, there was little interest by anyone in the creation of a broad Collaborative Health Research Institute.

(2) College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning

There has been mixed support for this initiative. We believe the majority of concerns can be classified into one of four issues: the significant new direction for the University that this proposal represents and our collective conservative inclinations to proceed cautiously and with known entities; the uncertainty over what is envisioned for the academic oversight of credit programming within the College; concerns about whether this represents a de-facto expansion of the portfolio of Continuing Studies; and, concerns about the ways in which this structure may be perceived to overlap or potentially duplicate activities that are occurring within other academic areas of the University. Further, while there is evidence of strong support in some quarters for an experiential credit component for undergraduate education, there are a number of unanswered questions as to how this would intersect with the W.Q.B initiative, what its impact might be on degree completion timeframes, and the view that this might be the creation of unnecessary administrative bureaucracy for activities that could be diffusely accommodated within existing academic units, elements of which already exist or are being developed.

(3) Language Training

The recommendation by Working Group 5 to reposition the Language Training Institute outside of the Department of Linguistics has received general support from the majority of the members of the Language Training Institute but we understand there is a desire for continued connection with the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. The Dean's office of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences does not support any change to the positioning of the Language Training Institute. The Working Group proposal to relocate this unit into the new College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning has received opposition. We believe that the primary reasons for this opposition are fourfold: (1) there are resource implications for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences attributed to the Language Training Institute; (2) some view the Language Training Institute as intimately connected with the research being conducted in the Department of Linguistics in areas of language pedagogy, language learning, and language and culture; (3) the Working Group report may not have clearly outlined the view of its members that they did not see area-based language learning (such as French, Ancient Greek, etc.) moving to the College which raised concerns by the area-based disciplines; and, (4) there appears to be misunderstanding about what the vision for the College is, which we believe is leading to some false assumptions about the academic quality and interconnection of its activities with disciplines across the University.

The issues and concerns identified above will each be addressed in the corresponding subsection later in this Volume.

In consideration of the content of the Working Group reports and the feedback and issues raised through the consultation process, the Task Force initiated several follow up processes as follows:

- The Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science were asked to provide the Task Force with further input as to what the unique arguments were for a combination of their two units, what collaborative initiatives they envisioned in the future, the distinctiveness of their plans within the Canadian context, and the implications for their proposal on the Network Support Group.
- The Task Force requested that the Schools of Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts and Technology, and the Master of Publishing Program each provide the Task Force with their unit's view as to the proposal from Working Group 4 for the creation of a new Faculty that would be comprised of their units.
- The Task Force also initiated an independently-led visioning process on a potential initiative in the environment for Simon Fraser University. Dr. Jock Munro, professor emeritus of Simon Fraser University, was appointed to this role. Dr. Munro prepared a draft discussion paper, held an Environmental Visioning Workshop with 16 faculty members, and hosted an Open Forum on the Environment on November 1, 2007 as part of his activities as facilitator. Dr. Munro's final report was submitted to the Task Force on November 6, 2007.
- The Task Force explored with each of the stakeholders in the TechOne program possible location of that program should the Task Force recommend the creation of new Faculties that would position the units that the TechOne serves in multiple Faculties.
- The Task Force sought a response from each of the units that submitted a proposal to the Task Force in the area of the environment for their feedback on a proposal by the Task Force for the establishment of a new Faculty in the environment and the nature of a planning blueprint to be developed by an Environment Planning Committee.

The Task Force released its Discussion Document (a previous version of this report) on December 17, 2007. Since that time we have held four Open Forums and received a variety of written and verbal responses. In total, more than 125 members of the University community joined us in person, or on-line, in the Open Forum consultation process. We have also received a response from the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association that was based on a member's survey, although we have not been advised of the number of individuals the feedback contained in the report may represent. In addition to public consultation processes, the Task Force also held discussions on the report with the Senate Committee on University Priorities, as well as the Academic Chairs/Directors meeting group, and the Deans and Vice Presidents.

Generally, the Task Force is of the view that the major brushstrokes of its recommendations were supported and well received by the University community. Notwithstanding a generally positive reception, there were several areas of the report that attracted considerable discussion and important issues and concerns were raised. We summarize the major areas as follows:

- There was confusion as to the nature of the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning and a need for clearer presentation and rationale for the choice of terminology, the conception of "experiential" learning, and the interface with other areas of the University.
- There was concern about the relocation of foreign language training to the College.

- There was a concern about the geographic challenges of a multi-campus reality, particularly in the context of the recommendation for a new Faculty of Communication, Contemporary Arts and Design.
- There was concern about the long-term positioning of the TechOne program although there is not consensus about where its future home should be.
- There was concern about the recommendation to have the Network Support Group reviewed by the Chief Information Officer of the University and a call for it to be located in the proposed new Faculty of Engineering and Computing.
- The proposed new Environment Faculty was not seen as sufficiently inclusive of potential collaborators, contributors, or relocating faculty members from the Faculty of Science.
- Despite support for the general thrust of the revisions to the Centres and Institutes policy, some colleagues felt that the conceptualization was overly complex and would add administrative burden as a consequence.
- A concern was raised that the multifaceted interdisciplinarity strategy was insufficiently resourced.
- An overarching concern was expressed for the current budgetary environment of the University and how new strategic directions fit within this context.

In addition to the feedback above, the Task Force received a series of suggestions for improving the report, including suggestions for specific changes. These have all been carefully considered, and many of them have informed revisions to the report.

Major Structural Recommendations of the Task Force

Overview

Although the rest of this volume will provide full discussion of our recommendations, we thought it might be helpful to the reader to have an overall vision of the changes we propose in relation to the University's academic structure. The major changes that are being recommended by the Task Force are as follows:

- the elimination of the existing Faculty of Applied Sciences

- the creation of three new Faculties:
    o Faculty of Communication, Art and Design (name to be determined) consisting of the Schools of Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts & Technology and the Master of Publishing Program
    o Faculty of Engineering and Computing, comprised of the Schools of Engineering Science and Computing Science
    o Faculty of Environment and Sustainability (name to be determined)[4] initially comprised of the School of Resource and Environmental Management, the

---

[4] The new Faculty will have to be identified through a collaborative naming process. The term "Sustainability" is important to the Centre for Sustainable Development and to the Graduate Certificate Program in Development

Department of Geography, the Environmental Science Program restructured into a new Department of Environmental Sciences, the Centre for Sustainable Community Development, and the Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies.

- the realignment of the School of Kinesiology to the Faculty of Science

- the establishment of a College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning comprised of two divisions:
  o Experiential Learning Division initially including an amalgamated Semester in Dialogue and the Centre for Dialogue
  o Lifelong Learning Division comprised of the existing Continuing Studies activities, and Distance Education

- the future development of an Institute for Advanced Scholarship

A series of other recommendations appear within the detailed discussion that follows this summary. A summary list of all recommendations of the Task Force is provided as Appendix F.

New Faculties

Faculty of Engineering and Computing

The original submissions of the Schools of Engineering Science and Computing Science called for the creation of a new Faculty comprised of their two units. In its examination of issues, Working Group 1 created a list of six potential structural configurations that might effectively house these units. (WG 1 report, p. 9) Four critical issues needed to be answered: (1) To what extent does the vision for the future of the University wish to strategically highlight Computing and Engineering?; (2) Should Simon Fraser University integrate a more comprehensive notion of computational sciences through the inclusion of departments such as Mathematics and Statistics & Actuarial Science?; (3) What is the likelihood of success and distinctiveness of a Faculty comprised of the Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science within a national context?; and, (4) What is distinct about their arguments within the internal SFU context? We have the overriding fifth question that we must assess for all proposals: that being, how would a

---

Studies. Resource and Environmental Management would like a name that is communicative of the interdisciplinary vision of the Faculty and the plans for integrating environmental research and teaching across the arts, humanities, and social, applied, and natural sciences. The Department of Geography clearly prefers the straightforward name Faculty of Environment. During the activities of Working Group 3 and the Task Force, we considered various names for the new Faculty. To some the term, "Faculty of Environment" conveys a historic conceptualization of study in the environment that existed during the 1970s. To others, the term sustainability potentially communicates a passing trend and a framework of activism that is not seen as suitable for a permanent structural entity within the University. The Task Force view is that the term must be chosen so as to communicate effectively to the external community that the initiative in the environment at Simon Fraser University is built upon a vision of integration across the disciplines, that deals with problem-centered topics, and which speaks to a broadly conceived scope of activity. For reference throughout the remainder of the report we will simply call the new Faculty the "Environment Faculty" so as to demonstrate no position on the name by the Task Force.

new Faculty of Engineering and Computing help Simon Fraser University exemplify the four qualities that we wish to define ourselves by in 2025?

Simon Fraser University's School of Engineering Science was created in 1983 as a unique, elite, and atypical, engineering programming, offering distinctive programming from other British Columbia universities. The School's high technology focus with programming options focused on such advanced technologies as microelectronics, robotics, mechatronics, biomedical engineering, multimedia, systems, and telecommunications, set it apart from other Engineering programs across the nation. Other Engineering programs and Faculties across the country generally offer a larger spectrum of traditional engineering disciplines such as mechanical, civil, chemical, materials and aeronautical engineering. Our distinctiveness has enabled Simon Fraser University's School of Engineering Science to retain a fairly high stature nationally despite its generally smaller size and less diverse breadth of traditional engineering programming.

The distinctiveness of Simon Fraser University's Engineering Science School also situates it for alignment with our School of Computing Science which has at its core a technology and computational focus to its programming. Research and teaching specialization in the School of Computing Science includes areas such as graphics and usability, computer vision, and autonomous robots, as well as cross-disciplinary fields such as medical computing, bioinformatics, computational linguistics, and computer-based music.

Given the generally traditional foci of Engineering units at other Canadian institutions, relatively few institutions have such a complementary program relationship between their Computing and Engineering programming as in evident at Simon Fraser University. Those leading U.S. institutions that share this feature of complementarity – such as MIT, Stanford, Berkeley, Harvard, and Northwestern – all have both Computing and Engineering within a Faculty or College of Engineering.

This interconnectedness between Computing Science and Engineering Science is in evidence in new program initiatives such as the Mechatronics Systems Engineering (MSE) Program. The launch of the program has exceeded high expectations in the areas of student demand and the ability to attract outstanding students. In the first year of the program's operations (commencing September 2007), the MSE Program attracted nearly double the anticipated enrolments, with 71 students enrolled for Fall 2007.

Given the technological and computational focus of both of the Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science, the Task Force considered the option of placing Computing Science and Engineering Science in closer proximity to the Department of Mathematics. This could be accomplished either by moving the Schools of Engineering Science and Computing Science to the Faculty of Science or by the realignment of Mathematics to a new Faculty structure comprised of the three units. The most comprehensive set of multidisciplinary collaborations both in research and teaching for the School of Computing Science actually exists with the Department of Mathematics. We note that this strong collaborative environment is effectively managed across Faculty boundaries and thus, we do not see Faculty boundary divisions as an obstacle that requires redress by us. Importantly, the Department of Mathematics has equally, if not stronger, interconnections with the Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science and thus

any re-conceptualization of the location of Mathematics would by necessity require the realignment of Statistics and Actuarial Science as well. Notably, both departments are thriving within the Faculty of Science and are contributing significantly to the overall profile and strength of that Faculty and to the goals of Simon Fraser University for the year 2025 with regard to the nature of the faculty complement, undergraduate and graduate student experience, and outreach and engagement with our communities. As a consequence, we do not believe any structural proposal that would potentially jeopardize this success, is warranted or justified. We would also note that the preeminent example of the combination of Computing and Mathematics occurred at the University of Waterloo some forty years ago. It has led, by all accounts, to exceptional success for the institution. It is not clear, however, that the opportunities that presented themselves forty years ago, are necessarily still in place today, and therefore a move in the direction of bringing these disciplines together in a structural way may have had its moment in history.

The successful nature of the collaborative relationship between Computing Science and Mathematics is also found in collaborations between Engineering Science and other areas of the University, such as Kinesiology in the joint Biomedical Engineering program, and the joint degree program offered between the School of Engineering Science and the Department of Physics. We note the clear articulation by Computing Science and Engineering Science's vision for stimulating both core and interdisciplinary development in the future:

> "...Interdisciplinary programs with units outside [a new faculty] will remain important, and the new faculty will strongly support creation and expansion of such activities while preserving, advancing, and promoting the traditional engineering and technology programs. A prerequisite to successful interdisciplinary programs is strong core disciplines. We envision that the new proposed faculty will nurture and expand the core disciplines in CS and ES while fostering a culture that supports interdisciplinary work through forging strong links with other faculties in the University. For example, by applying engineering and computing technologies to problems in medicine and health related areas, biology, and the environment; establishing stronger ties to Business, Arts and Social Sciences; fostering the emerging nanotechnology revolution with the Faculty of Science; and promotion of the power of information technology through the University." (page 2, joint submission to the Task Force, October 24, 2007)

A recent report produced by the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), the Association of Information Systems (AIS), and the Computer Society of the Institute of Electronics and Electrical Engineers (IEEE-CS), entitled "Computing Curricula 2005" reviews five closely related disciplines: Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Information Technology, Information Systems, and Software Engineering, and provides recommendations on the future of these fields. The foci identified by the School of Computing Science and the School of Engineering Science in the areas of Computer Engineering and Information Systems, as well as the new emergent areas of biomedical engineering, mechatronics, telecommunications and information technology are among those highlighted by the "Computing Curricula 2005" report as critical areas in the future of the disciplines. As a consequence, keeping the partnership and relationship between Computing Science and Engineering Science together would help to

position Simon Fraser University to assume a leadership role in these emerging areas of their disciplines.

The School of Computing Science boasts one of the largest graduate student complements in the University. It is imperative as we strive to expand our research profile and activity that we support the interconnection and fostering of research excellence through the contributions of our graduate student programming. We must, therefore, ensure that an area that is able to contribute significantly to these objectives of the University is well supported within the structural configuration of the University. The Task Force understands from the School of Computing Science that the increased attention and visibility that will be achieved through its establishment as one of two core members in a Faculty of Engineering and Computing will reaffirm the University's excellence in graduate education in this area and should result in the continued attractiveness and recruitment success by Computing Science.

The School of Engineering Science seeks to expand its graduate programming. With Engineering units at 36 other Canadian universities showcased in stand-alone Faculties bearing that name, the Simon Fraser School of Engineering Science believes that the visibility brought to their discipline by a new Faculty is a critical component to future recruitment success of graduate students. It is argued that outstanding graduate students look to study at institutions that have clearly defined, highly profiled, and focused attention on the discipline. Further, in combination with the compatibility to graduate programming in Computing Science, it is believed that student recruitment initiatives can be effectively planned and marshaled in collaborative, cost effective ways between the two disciplines. With heightened profile and visibility for the Faculty of Engineering and Computing, the School of Engineering Science also believes this will lead to increased success in research grant competitions and a shift towards increased faculty engagement with graduate student supervision and collaborative research projects.

This draws us to the question as to whether the University seeks to highlight and profile Computing Science and Engineering Science as a strategic area of focus within the organizational structure of the University and in our communication of dominant strengths to the external community. With a current combined complement of over 70 faculty members, an ongoing program of expansion initiated through the provincial government Doubling the Opportunity (DTO) initiative for computing and engineering programming, a positive reversal to recent enrolment declines, the continued witness of technological and computational transformation of society, and the potential for Simon Fraser University to lead innovative disciplinary and interdisciplinary graduate and undergraduate programming innovation and expansion within North America, we conclude that the units of Computing Science and Engineering Science offer a compelling case for distinction within the overall academic organization of the University.

> **Recommendation 1: That a Faculty of Engineering and Computing be established.**

Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Communication, and Design (name to be determined)

Working Group 4 provided a comprehensive assessment and rationale of the reasons in support of creating a new Faculty comprised of the Schools of Communication, Contemporary Arts, and Interactive Arts and Technology. In addition, the report provided recommendations with regard to the Master of Publishing Program. We note that the Working Group proposed the working name of a new "Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Communication and Design" but this name does not have the support of the various constituent units and they would prefer to engage in a process to name the Faculty if approved.

The Task Force found the Working Group's portrayal and articulation of the reasons for joining together Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts and Technology, and the Master of Publishing Program into a new Faculty compelling:

> *"The creation of a Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Communication and Design is intellectually and socially appropriate and timely. Significant innovations in technology and media historically have exerted tremendous influence on human societies and cultures, and have created new possibilities for communication, self and other understanding and expression, and interaction with the biophysical world. Applications of new technologies and media permeate every facet of contemporary life, and have enabled forms of communication, art, and design that are significantly restructuring our forms of life, understanding, and agency. The scholarly study of such applications and their socio-cultural, psychological, and aesthetic impact, including ways of representing critically and expressively the nature of this impact on the human condition, is necessarily interdisciplinary. It is this scholarly impulse that is shared widely amongst members of faculty in the Schools of Contemporary Arts, Communication, and Interactive Arts and Technology, and which provides a foundation for a wide range of applied and basic research centered on our use of new technology and media, and the ways in which we are affected and altered by this use." (WG 4 Report, p. 13)*

The Task Force further endorses the view by Working Group 4 that there are unique opportunities and contextual factors for each of the units that support their enhanced profiling and the commitment by the University to articulate them as part of its strategic strength to the external community. With the world's attention on Vancouver for the 2010 Olympics and a new venue in the downtown Eastside of Vancouver, the School for the Contemporary Arts at its new Woodward's site in 2009 can help realize President Stevenson's vision for Simon Fraser University as an international destination for arts and culture, and as a flagship for multifaceted and diverse social interaction within an urban community. Further, the Task Force believes that the University has a social responsibility to preserve and promote the arts and art-making as a societally important activity.

The School of Communication attracts one of the largest departmental undergraduate student complements in the University and it has established a prominent national reputation for excellence. Further its undergraduate student enrolment has increased by over 25% in the last five years alone. Notwithstanding this success, there will be several recruitment challenges for the School of Communication in the future. Undergraduate communications programs are

dramatically expanding within the British Columbia University College system at institutions such as Malaspina, Kwantlen, and Capilano. While there are currently restrictions on these programs enabling them to offer only two years of study in communications, it is anticipated that there will be a move toward full baccalaureate offerings within the BC College System in the not-too-distant future. Further, increased competition is in evidence from the emergence of new initiatives in communications programming and research at universities such as Ryerson, York and the University of Calgary. As the Working Group 4 noted, "The University that will rise to lead the nation will be one that is (a) clearly distinctive from competitors, (b) provides students with an exceptional learning experience, and (c) builds interdisciplinary understanding upon core disciplinary strength. It is a critical moment and opportunity for the future of Simon Fraser University's School of Communication." (WG 4 Report, p. 18)

The Task Force believes that positioning the School of Communication as one of four signature units within a new Faculty of intellectually cognate areas who share a philosophical commitment to interdisciplinarity, experiential, integrative and imaginative learning environments and who are energized by the potential of their combination to develop new undergraduate and graduate programming areas and to play an enhanced role in representing the strategic strengths of the University, will enable it to successfully seize the opportunity that is before it.

Created in 2003, the School of Interactive Arts and Technology has become one of the leaders in Canada in a field where art, technology, and design converge. Since 2003, a number of institutions have emerged on the stage to share the prominence of this integrated trilogy. While we believe that Simon Fraser University's School remains a leader, we also feel it critical that its development be nurtured, and its maturity facilitated, so as to assure its leadership position for the future. This requires, in our view, the positioning of the School within an environment that is defined by its shared philosophical orientation to the value of art, design and technology; to the commitment to interdisciplinarity and pedagogical innovation; to the recognized contributions of art and art making, natural and applied science, and theoretical and epistemological research. While the School has endeavored to create an environment of internal balance among its elements, it is equally critical to the School to have external balance in its neighboring community of units. The addition of the School of the Contemporary Arts into the new Faculty will provide important connectivity to art and design elements within SIAT. There is, however, a perceived gap by the technology area to have lost some of its external balance by the removal of the Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science. It will be critical to develop "expressways" (to quote the Director of SIAT) between the two Faculties, and the proposed new collaborative programming in the IT/ICT area (see Volume IV) should be expeditiously developed and based at the Surrey campus.

The Master of Publishing Program has earned a national reputation as a leader in the publishing industry in Canada. Its unique approach to professional programming, its quality, and its head-start in the field, have contributed to significant success. Should the Publishing activities of the University be consolidated under a single umbrella hosted by the Publishing Program – including the Master of Publishing Program, the Undergraduate Minor in Publishing, and the Writing and Publishing Program in Continuing Studies - we believe this would lead to a more expansive and potentially greater presence for Publishing Studies at Simon Fraser University in the future. We explore program amalgamation in Volume IV of this report.

Opportunities for inter-unit collaboration by the Schools of Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts and Technology and the Publishing Program, would be prevalent within a new Faculty. Examples of potential programs include Screen Studies; Technology and Society; Citizenship and Democracy in a Globalizing World; Global Media and Communication; Information Technology; Publishing and Technology[5]; and Sport, Commerce, Culture and Community, to name just a few.

Taken together, the Task Force believes that there is a clear and defensible rationale and an energizing and exciting opportunity for the University community should Senate approve the Task Force's recommendation for the creation of a new Faculty comprised of the School of Communication, the School for the Contemporary Arts, the School of Interactive Arts and Technology, and the Master of Publishing Program.

Importantly we note that there is almost total unanimity[6] within all four of the units that a new Faculty comprised of their units would provide an excellent academic environment for their success as researchers and educators.

> *Recommendation 2: That a new Faculty (name to be determined) comprised of the School of Communication, the School for the Contemporary Arts, the School of Interactive Arts and Technology and the Master of Publishing Program be established.*

Environment Faculty

The environment has emerged as a dominant global issue that permeates our society at all levels. Environmental concerns will increasingly influence the way people live on the planet and shape global aspirations for improving human wellbeing and health. The University is uniquely positioned to contribute to the global environmental challenge. This is because of its key role in education and research as well as its inherent quality of universality which puts the university in the unique position of housing expertise in the many areas of sciences and humanities relevant to addressing environmental problems. Furthermore, universities recognize that to remain relevant and receive broad support from all aspects of society, it is important to respond to the need for engagement in the area of the environment.

The National Research Council of the United States in 2001 published a report entitled the "Grand Challenges in Environmental Sciences". This report sought to identify a limited number of "major scientific tasks that are compelling for both intellectual and practical reasons, [and] that offer potential for major breakthroughs on the basis of recent developments in science and technology". (Grand Challenges, p.2) The eight grand challenges identified were: biogeochemical cycles, biological diversity and ecosystem functioning, climate variability,

---

[5] This labeling by the Working Group is intended as a representation of potential collaborations that would explore the evolving technology in the publishing industry. It is not a term originating from the Master of Publishing Program.

[6] Voting results on motions to participate in a new Faculty resulted in only three (3) faculty members from all Schools not supporting a motion for inclusion and two (2) faculty members abstaining from the vote.

hydrologic forecasting, infectious disease and the environment, institutions and resource use, land-use dynamics, and reinventing the use of materials. In the report, the National Research Council described the complexity of solving environmental problems:

"Perhaps even more challenging for science is that the outcomes of interest within each grand challenge depend simultaneously on change in more than one driving variable. The grand challenges require problem-oriented science that can integrate physical, biological, chemical, and human systems well enough to predict the response of critical regions or phenomena to multiple causal variables, sometimes referred to as multiple stresses. Understanding the interactions of these systems is imperative, because the many environmental factors now undergoing change make it difficult to assess the impact of any single change in the Earth system (particularly changes in human activities), and thus it is difficult to assess the outcomes of specific mitigation and adaptation strategies.

Understanding how environmental and human outcomes are affected by multiple driving variables lies beyond the capacity of any single environmental science discipline. Studies focused on single causal variables are typically inadequate and potentially misleading. As emphasized throughout this report, the needed understanding will require true integration of the social sciences and engineering, as well as various disciplines within the natural sciences, around common research problems." (Grand Challenges, p.71)

The "Grand Challenges" report was followed in September 2007 by a report titled "Rising to the Challenge: Integrating Social Science into the Natural Science Foundation Environmental Observatories" by Resources for the Future. It provided a series of recommendations to the national funding organizations of the United States for how to effectively design integrative research projects and transform, through participation by the social sciences, the well established environmental observatories which collect only natural science data.

In 2005, the United Nations declared 2005-2014 to be the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. This has been followed by three major new higher education initiatives in the United States: the Higher Education Associations Sustainability Consortium (HEASC), the Disciplinary Associations Network for Sustainability (DANS), and the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE)[7]. These organizations have spearheaded numerous initiatives to expand sustainability programming throughout the post-secondary education system in the United States. Also noteworthy is the recognition that environmental education needed to become a fundamental component of K-12 education. As a consequence, there have been a series of State level initiatives introducing sustainability education components into the K-12 curriculum. These have often been coordinated with universities and colleges to offer increased teacher training in sustainable development and environmental science at the master's level.

More locally, there have been two recent significant activities by government with regard to environment and sustainability initiatives. In November 2007, Mr. Godfrey, the Liberal Environmental Caucus Chair, introduced into the House of Commons a National Sustainable

---

[7] See Science article for an overview of the focus and work of these initiatives.

Development Act (C-474). Notably this Act was developed within Simon Fraser University's School of Resource and Environmental Management. Secondly, the British Columbia Provincial Government recently declared that the focus of the 2008 provincial budget will be one designed around priority environmental initiatives. The governments funding priorities are being developed on the basis of significant citizenry input (including household surveys, public consultations, and open discussion tables) and this confirms the view of the Task Force that Simon Fraser University has a critical role to play not only in addressing and researching global environmental issues but also in providing local citizens and students with comprehensive environmental understanding and education.

In response to the global environmental crisis and the actions of governments, organizations, and professional councils, North America universities are restructuring, refocusing, and re-visioning, their focus on environmental research and teaching. The range of responses is instructive. In the United States, there has been an increasing occurrence of pan-university, multidisciplinary environmental initiatives led by the large institutions such as Harvard, Stanford, and Columbia. These are often of an initiative-style model built upon dispersed disciplinary Departments, Faculties, and even Colleges, which form the coordinating nexus of a number of Institutes, Centres and programs. Typically they are topic-centered and multidisciplinary in approach and have the benefit of extraordinary levels of funding. In contrast, the Canadian University system until recently has been predominantly characterized by Faculties of Environment, Departments of Environmental Science or Departments of Environmental Studies with a clear divide between the social and natural sciences. Within the past five years, there have been three initiatives that have caught the attention of the Working Group and the Task Force. These are the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth and Resources at the University of Manitoba, the Centre for Environment at the University of Toronto, and the new Interdisciplinary School of Environment and Sustainability at the University of Saskatchewan. Each, in their own way, seeks to support a more interdisciplinary and expansive conceptualization of environment spanning the social sciences and natural sciences. The move of universities towards interdisciplinary collaboration has not gone unnoticed. In a recent article, "A Threat So Big: Academics Try Collaboration", in the New York Times (December 25, 2007), Jeff Toppin cited just a few of the major institutions such as Duke University, Arizona State University, University of California, Berkley, Rochester Institutes of Technology, Yale, and others, which all have recently developed multidisciplinary initiatives around environmental topics. Interestingly, almost all have included the word "Sustainability" in their initiative's title. Also interesting is the significant external funding these initiatives have attracted and the way in which many of these initiatives involve collaboration with non-academic community and corporate partners.

Dr. Munro has pointed out in his report, that student undergraduate enrolment in environmental courses at Simon Fraser University has been relatively stable, and thus as overall enrolment of the University has grown, this has represented a declining proportion of our educational activity. It is unlikely that there is a lack of student interest in, or demand for, environmental programming. It may be, though, as one student described at an Open Forum, that there is such lack of clarity and direction in environmental programming at Simon Fraser University that they are studying it in spite of the obstacles that exist. Several trends point to a positive student demand scenario in the future. First, the heightened attention to environmental issues in the public is increasing prospective student awareness to the importance of research and education in

the solution to the world's environmental problems. Second, the "graying of the green generation" and the accompanying recognition that activism needs to be accompanied by scientific research is leading to an increasing need for trained environmental managers and researchers. Third, the interrelated nature of environmental problems has led to a call for a new type of research and education, one focused on the integration of disciplinary approaches to discovery and knowledge development. Fourth, movements to increase environmental education within the K-12 system within North American will lead to increased awareness about the areas of potential study and career paths available to students who pursue advanced study in the environment. Finally, a recent poll of high school counselors by Simon Fraser University resulted in 80 of 110 indicating that there would be a very positive response by prospective students to the opportunity to study in an Environment Faculty at Simon Fraser University.

From the Task Force perspective, the area of the environment is likely to be one of the most attractive areas for external fundraising. Over the past few years, the newspapers have reported a number of multi-million dollar donations to universities who are seeking to expand or reshape their environmental research and educational programming. Situated in one of the most resource intensive provinces of Canada, we believe there will be a positive response from provincial organizations, individuals, and the provincial government to invest in a new Environment Faculty. At the granting council level we have already witnessed significant new ventures by the National Research Council of the United States to identify high funding priorities from the "Grand Challenges" to the environment, and we have seen these require not only balanced integrated teams from the social and natural sciences, but also significant components for graduate and undergraduate education initiatives as part of the research proposals. Locally, we believe there is in the works at the provincial government the design of a graduate enrolment funding pool dedicated to environmental enrolments. These are likely only the beginning of a growing commitment by provincial, national, and international governments, agencies, individuals and organizations to seek to support the advancement of knowledge in searching for solutions to the environmental problems that plague our communities and our planet.

The field of the environment is clearly a high priority for the University, featuring in the President's Agenda, the Strategic Research Plan, and in the award of eight Canada Research Chairs (three of whom are in area of Climate Change), a B.C. Leading Edge Endowment Fund Chair, and a Chair in Coastal Studies. We have an internationally recognized School of Resource and Environmental Management, strength in environmental research and teaching across campus, and a developing nexus of researchers in environmental health and in the areas of sustainable development and urban studies. As Dr. Jock Munro noted in his Facilitator's report, there are in fact 23 departments at Simon Fraser University with at least one environmental course and over 70 faculty members with identifiable environmental interests. Further, there are currently 11 Centres or Institutes dedicated to an area of the environment. Finally, Simon Fraser University is a signatory to the Talloires Declaration on university sustainability, a leading member of the Adaptation to Climate Change Team (ACT) led by the Public Policy Program, and a member since 1992 of the China Council for International Development and Cooperation (CCICED) which is designed to promote cooperation and exchange between China and the international community in the field of environment and development. Despite these many and varied activities, we have not achieved a significantly high profile nationally or internationally

for Simon Fraser University as a whole in relation to sustainable development or the environment.

Perhaps because of the expansive and dispersed interests in the areas of environment, sustainability, and development at Simon Fraser University, it is not surprising that we have struggled to identify a clear and coherent thematic vision for a new initiative. As the examination and consultation processes have unfolded through the work of Working Group 3, the environment facilitator, Dr. Jock Munro, and processes of the Task Force itself, we have heard many views as to how best to proceed. These have ranged from "proceed cautiously and grow slowly" to "go big or go home". They have ranged from unit-based clustering to individual-based reconfiguration to all new appointments. Moreover, the views have ranged from discipline-based approaches to solely integrated interdisciplinary programming.

Despite the variety of views presented, a series of shared, underlying pillars exist that the Task Force believes forms a foundation and a vision for a new Environment Faculty.

- The Faculty will result in the emergence of strong interdisciplinary research and programming occurring in the presence of strong and dynamic disciplines.
- The Faculty will develop new integrative programming bringing together the arts, humanities, social, natural and applied sciences around problem-centered topics at both the graduate and undergraduate level.
- The Faculty will be a model for collaborative engagement of faculty members in research and programming initiatives across the University.
- The Faculty will be inclusive by design.
- The Faculty will be a model of programming innovation offering cohort-based degree programs, capstone "big environmental issues" courses, first year interdisciplinary courses, non-degree cohort based seminar program on the "big issues" (perhaps one course per year) leading to a supplementary environmental designation for non-environment majors, environmental literacy courses, and non-credit and certificate programming for the external community.
- The Faculty will contribute actively to Simon Fraser University's engagement with its community, seeking to actively participate in policy debates, citizen education, and hosting forums, speaker's series and other forms of outreach to the community.
- The Faculty will develop significant international programming partnerships with countries around the world, thus forming a pivotal part of Simon Fraser University's international agenda. Such programming will provide students with unparalleled educational and research opportunities to study issues of development, sustainability and environment within international settings. Joint programming, field schools, international exchange programs, dual degree programs, are a few examples of the types of partnerships that can be imagined.

Given the diverse types of structural elements – Departments, Independent Programs, integrative curriculum programs, and perhaps other types of curriculum initiatives in the future, the structuring of interrelationships is critical. We do not envision a Faculty that will be dominated by departments with only peripheral activity in integrated interdisciplinary programming around problem-centered issues. We envision instead a system of equally important elements – strong

disciplinary and interdisciplinary units - contributing to the overall definition and distinctiveness of an Environment Faculty at Simon Fraser University. To ensure that this objective is met, we envision that the Chair/Director of each department and interdisciplinary program would have an equal voice and vote in the activities of the Faculty and would sit as equal members of a Deans Advisory Committee. The Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Committee would initially develop the blueprint for new integrative programming, the faculty complement growth associated with this plan would be directed to the new programs. Long-term decisions on growth, strategic direction, and budgetary allocation would be a matter of determination by the Dean acting in collaboration and with the advice of his/her advisory council.

The Faculty itself would be comprised of core departments plus interdisciplinary programming of various types. New Interdisciplinary Programs will be developed by the Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Committee as per the Task Force Proposal. Additionally, there will likely be some Research or Research and Teaching Centres interested in joining the Faculty.

We believe that subsequent to the approval for the creation of an Environment Faculty, it will be advisable to develop a constitution that will affirm the principles of collaborative development of the future of the Faculty and identify processes and structures that will deal with the nuances of the creation of a Faculty with such a diversity of membership.

The most critical gap at present in the understanding of the Task Force is the thematic foci that we envision as a critical component to the multi-dimensional vision of the Environment Faculty. While there have been various suggestions put forth to the Task Force, the Working Group, and the Facilitator, these have not yet been sufficiently explored, discussed, or advanced as a set of core new directions for the Faculty. As example of what has been mentioned, we offer a few, though we note that these are not recommendations by the Task Force. They may, however, serve as points of discussion for the future.

Sample topics include:
- Climate Change / The Science of Global Change
- Global Health and Environment
- Watersheds, Oceans and Fisheries
- Regional and Global Change Impacts and Responses
- Earth Systems, Environmental Change, and Society
- Sustainability and Urbanization
- Strategies for Sustainability Leadership
- Land-Use, Environmental Change, and Sustainability
- Sustainability, Conservation, and Society
- Industrialization, Sustainability and Environmental Policy
- Power and the Urban Environment
- Ethnicity, First Nations Studies and Traditional Ecological Knowledge
- The Social Environment
- Geospatial Technologies and GIS
- Biodiversity and Biological Conservation

Dr. Jock Munro's report concluded that "most of the opinion in the consultation process supported the creation of an Environment Faculty…". He identified "four particular issues that would need to be addresses as a part of a decision to proceed in this way:

(1) Agreement on a vision statement that set out the scope and purposes of the Faculty
(2) Decisions on whether any existing units should immediately be transferred to the Faculty
(3) Undertakings to review all existing environmental programs and undertake planning for new programs
(4) Agreement on mechanisms to encourage effective participation by faculty members and students in the work of the new Faculty." (p. 26)

The Task Force believes that the vision identified earlier in this section is a vision agreed to by members of the University community interested in creating a new Environment Faculty. With regard to issues 2 and 3 above, the Task Force proposed a multidimensional vision of a new Environment Faculty to those units who originally submitted proposals to the Task Force which called for their participation as units within the new Faculty as well as an inclusive process involving faculty from within and outside the new Faculty in the development of new integrative problem-centered programming based on the strengths of existing Simon Fraser University faculty members. We have received strong support from the Department of Geography, the School for Resource and Environmental Management, the Environmental Science Program, the Centre for Sustainable Community Development, and the Graduate Certificate Program in Development. The Urban Studies program was not prepared to support the proposal from the Task Force in its current form. Concerns were expressed with regard to the asymmetrical nature of units in the proposed new Faculty. To offset these concerns, Urban Studies sought to limit the future growth of the Department of Geography to qualitative, not quantitative, growth only. The Task Force was not prepared to recommend this limitation, believing that unit growth should be determined on the basis of student demand and strategic decision making by the Vice-President, Academic. As a consequence, we understand that the Urban Studies Program will not seek to be one of the founding units for a new Environment Faculty.

We hope, however, that Urban Studies, as other areas in the University with interests in environment, development and sustainability, will seek to engage and collaborate with the new Faculty as it develops new integrative interdisciplinary programming. We are also hopeful that those members of the Urban Studies Steering Committee who voted[8] in favor of joining the new Faculty would serve as key bridges between Urban Studies and the new Faculty so that the new Faculty will benefit from the expertise and insights that Urban Studies has to offer in broadly conceived research and teaching in the environment.

We have heard concerns that without the identification of specific thematic foci, and based on the original founding units identified, it is not clear where some members of the University, particularly natural scientists, might contribute and collaborate in the new Faculty as there is no clearly identifiable academic unit to which they might seek full, joint, or temporary appointment. The Task Force believes strongly that for an initiative in the Environment to be successful it must have strong participation and representation by the natural, applied, and social sciences, as

---

[8] Voting results were 3 in favour, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.

well as public policy, humanities, health, education, and business. In consideration of the feedback received, the Task Force has reconsidered the way in which we had imagined the Environmental Science program to develop. We continue to believe that it should be established as an independent program within the new Faculty. We can see, however, ways in which this program might be developed further into graduate level programming and ways in which other related programs could be developed based on existing expertise of other scientists. As a consequence we believe that we should be less constraining in our conceptualization and rather than establishing a house for the existing undergraduate environmental science program alone, we should instead establish a structure that would enable that program to develop and to attract other scientists in the development of cognate environmental science type programs. In conclusion, therefore, we recommend that a Department of Environmental Science be established within the new Faculty, the founding constituent program of which will be the existing undergraduate environmental science program.

The Task Force believes that its vision of the new Faculty outlined above and the recommendations we make elsewhere in this report for changes to policies will considerably enhance and facilitate the engagement of faculty members in other disciplines in the research and programming initiatives of the new Faculty. So important is the involvement of other areas of the University and our inclusive view for new integrative programming that the Task Force believes it critical that a Faculty Interdisciplinary Programming Committee (FIPC) be established to develop a blueprint for the future integrative programming of the Environment Faculty. The FIPC would be comprised of a relatively small number of faculty members (appointed by the Vice President, Academic) from within and external to the new Faculty, each of whom would have an equal voice and vote in all matters of the Committee.

The FIPC would have the mandate to develop a blueprint for new integrated programming at the graduate and undergraduate level based on the following principles:

- develop undergraduate programming of an integrative character (bringing together humanities, applied, social and natural sciences) around problem-centered thematic areas
- develop graduate programming of an integrative character (bringing together humanities, applied, social and natural sciences) likely around problem-centered thematic areas
- continue to offer graduate and undergraduate programs that are currently offered in the constituent units
- advance the research agenda and research capacity of the University
- have a policy outreach and community engagement role
- develop its plan built upon a framework of existing expertise at SFU

Further, the Task Force believes that while it will be important in developing a blueprint for integrative programming that builds on existing strengths and expertise across the University, there will be a need for the deployment of net new faculty positions to ensure the successful launch of the new Faculty. In this spirit, the Task Force therefore recommends that the FIPC blueprint also speak to the way in which up to 6-8 new faculty FTEs would be deployed to:

- ensure collaboration among members of the University community outside of the Environment Faculty
- ensure that undergraduate programming will intersect with, share, and seek opportunities to streamline new programming with that offered outside of the Faculty
- ensure that graduate programming will intersect with, or share, programming and graduate supervisory expertise outside of the Faculty
- lead to enrolment demand in the integrative areas based on comparative competition analysis
- provide for a variety of ways in which faculty members external to the Environment Faculty will be able to be involved and contribute to the new programming (either through joint appointments, secondments, or realignments, or new hiring requirements)

It is noteworthy that the vision for the new Environment Faculty, as are many other recommendations in our report, is intimately dependent upon the realization of the vision of other areas of our mandate. Critical to the full vision of this new Faculty is the achievement of our recommendations related to a multidimensional strategy for supporting interdisciplinarity. Paramount here is the adoption of policy recommendations that will significantly enhance faculty members' abilities to engage, collaborate, and participate in the activities of other academic areas of the university through more flexible appointment categories, improved evaluation strategies for interdisciplinary research and teaching, and an Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration that is mandated to remove barriers, facilitate collaboration, and connect researchers and educators seeking to cross disciplinary lines.

Recommendation 3 – That an Environment Faculty (name to be determined) be established with the following founding units and programs:
- *Environmental Science Program as a new Department of Environmental Science*
- *Department of Geography*
- *School of Resource and Environmental Management*
- *Centre for Sustainable Community Development*
- *Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies*

Recommendation 4 – That a Faculty Interdisciplinary Programming Committee (FIPC) be established with the membership, principles, and blueprint development requirements as outlined in this report and further that this blueprint be presented to Senate[9] for approval by April 2009.

---

[9] Here and elsewhere in this report we will make recommendations that particular processes be considered by Senate. We use the term "Senate" to represent the full process of review and consideration that leads to Senate approval. In no way do we wish to convey any alteration to the standard processes of consideration of approval that exist within the University.

We note that while the Task Force calls for a commitment by the University to provide, as part of its initial establishment, 6-8 new FTE faculty positions to the Environment Faculty (conditional upon approval by Senate of the blueprint and provided over a 3 year time horizon). If the blueprint planning process identifies a need over the long-term for additional positions, these would have to be acquired through either the internal annual budgetary process applicable to all other academic areas of the University, or through the attainment of external fundraising activities.

We also recommend that given the asymmetry in unit size, the constitution of the Faculty and the policy concerning the selection of the Dean will need to be constructed to ensure fair representation and meaningful engagement of each unit in the Faculty regardless of the size of academic complement. It is also critical that faculty complement growth associated with the Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Committee blueprint be directed to new interdisciplinary programming.

Health

In its original submission to the Task Force, the School of Kinesiology favored being relocated into the Faculty of Health Sciences. The arguments for doing so have merit. The most compelling argument is the opportunity for Simon Fraser University to realize, through the inclusion of Kinesiology within the Faculty of Health Sciences, an immediately expanded profile in Health. As we examined the possibility of the realignment of the School of Kinesiology into the Faculty of Health Sciences we found, however, that there were also countervailing reasons that questioned the viability of that structural change. The most important of these are: the desire by both units to retain their current organizational structure (departmentalization and non-departmentalization) which they equally see as being integral to their orientation and approach to programming; the considerably varied conceptualization of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity and the manifestation of these views in undergraduate and graduate programming; and, the stage of development of programming within the Faculty of Health Sciences which must be continued to effectively realize the cross-sectoral approach that integrates cellular to community perspectives and knowledge approaches in health research and teaching

Our understanding has led us to two major observations:

First, we believe that it is imperative that Simon Fraser University have, and be perceived to have, a major presence in health-related teaching and research. Our vision, and one that we believe is widely shared by the University community, is that our profile and presence in Health must be expanded and deepened over the next five years. We have concluded, however, that Health at Simon Fraser University will, and should continue to be, located in more than a single academic unit. There are health researchers working within the vast majority of disciplines in the University. Among these are Women's Studies, Sociology & Anthropology, Psychology, History, Political Science, Public Policy, Gerontology, Economics, Kinesiology, Biological Sciences, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Chemistry, Statistics & Actuarial Science, Mathematics, Interactive Arts & Technology, Business Administration, Education and more. As a consequence, our recommendations will be directed towards profiling and deepening health

research and teaching across the institution both within the disciplines and within initiatives that help us to realize our goals with respect to interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary collaboration.

Second, we have come to realize that there are two very different orientations towards health programming and research between the School of Kinesiology and the Faculty of Health Sciences. This distinctiveness and diversity are viewed by the Task Force as two of Simon Fraser University's considerable strengths. On the one hand, we have the School of Kinesiology, with its internationally renowned and accredited discipline-based undergraduate program. On the other hand, we have the Faculty of Health Sciences with its emerging integrated interdisciplinary programs in population and public health and infectious disease that are becoming recognized internationally for their unique approach to cross-sectoral health teaching and research. Both units strongly contribute to defining Simon Fraser University's reputation and profile in health research and teaching in Canada. The Task Force believes it essential that these two types of contributions are retained.

In examining all of these factors, the Task Force has concluded that to best realize the School of Kinesiology and the University's ambitions, the School of Kinesiology should be relocated to the Faculty of Science. We believe this for a number of reasons, including: (a) Kinesiology's orientation, and perspective is akin to those held by other science disciplines; (b) Kinesiology's highly reputed undergraduate program has significant science course content (a total of 34 credits), higher than content from any other area; (c) opportunities for research and teaching collaboration are plentiful and established within the Faculty of Science, particularly with Molecular Biology and Biochemistry and Biological Sciences; and finally, (d) we believe that the Faculty of Science is a proven stable and productive environment for research and teaching excellence within the disciplines. These views have led us to conclude that the Faculty of Science will prove to be a hospitable and supportive home for the School of Kinesiology. It is our strong preference that the Faculty of Science provide the School of Kinesiology with incentives to collaborate with the Faculty of Health Science, as with other disciplines, in the future.

Before setting out our recommendations, the Task Force believes it important to clearly articulate what our goals are for health research and teaching at Simon Fraser University generally. We identify these as follows:

Goals:
(1) That the vision for health research and teaching at Simon Fraser University be bold, and that it be deepened and expanded.
(2) That we continue to recognize the benefits of multiple perspectives and orientations to the study of health and that we recognize that contributions will be made within many disciplines and through the integration of the natural, applied and social sciences by means of problem-centered themes. We will find these across all areas of the University.
(3) That despite our diverse areas of activity in health, we retain as our utmost priority coherence and clarity in educational programming and the need for making significant contributions to society and the world through our research and discovery.

(4) That while health research and programming will exist in diverse areas across the University, Simon Fraser University must speak with a strong and single voice to the external community.

> **Recommendation 5: That the School of Kinesiology be relocated to the Faculty of Science.**

> **Recommendation 6: That units active in health research and programming pursue the development of new collaborative initiatives.**

> **Recommendation 7: That a "SFU Health Network" be established.**

The "SFU Health Network" would be developed and managed by the Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration. The purpose of the Network would be multi-faceted:

- It would be proactive in stimulating knowledge of, and opportunities for, collaboration among health researchers across the University through the development of communication vehicles (i.e. databases, newsletters, colloquium series, semi-annual events, a dedicated "Research Matters" issue on health at SFU, etc).
- It would present a single portal to the University for health education and research, serving both as a directory to potential students for health programming across the University, as well as providing a clear picture of the extent to which Simon Fraser University is engaged in health related research and teaching.

Faculty of Applied Sciences

It follows from the above recommendations for the creation of new Faculties, that the Task Force believes the Faculty of Applied Sciences should be disbanded.

> **Recommendation 8: That the Faculty of Applied Sciences be disbanded.**

College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning

Working Group 5 noted in their report that:

> *"The University's commitment to internationalization, its geographical positioning with strong ties to the Pacific Rim and East Asia, its reputation for community engagement, outreach and global participation, its strength in interdisciplinarity both in research and undergraduate education, and its history of distinctive learning environments, flexibility and service to diverse populations, provides an unparalleled backdrop upon which to develop structures and initiatives that are designed for the betterment of students as citizens in the world."*

The Working Group further wrote that we need to:

> *"... establish Simon Fraser University as a place where students obtain an outstanding education, enriched by opportunities to engage and experience their world as preparation for their role in it."* (page 3, Working Group 5 report)

The Task Force agrees with the opportunity and need identified by Working Group 5. Our vision of Simon Fraser University for 2025, combined with changes to the demographic profile of students and an exceedingly competitive recruitment environment in the future, demands from us that undergraduate students have an unparalleled and multifaceted learning experience. The education provided through our disciplinary structures in the core areas of arts and humanities, natural, applied and social sciences, health, and in our professional areas of education and business administration, is critical and students are well served by the outstanding complement of faculty who populate these areas. The Task Force believes, however, that there are three ways in which the University can importantly build upon, complement and supplement the discipline based learning experience of students. First, we believe that the improved structures in support of interdisciplinarity and the new capacities that are provided to our research centres and institutes will provide the mechanisms for the generation of exciting new credit courses that stem directly from the leading edge interdisciplinary research being undertaken. Second, we believe that there is an equally exciting opportunity to further enrich the student learning environment by developing a comprehensive and unmatched network of educational opportunities defined by an experiential component. Third, we believe that Continuing Studies as currently exists should be reconceived as a more integral extension of the disciplines of the University and positioned to respond to the demographic changes that are before us.

The Task Force has chosen to develop a multifaceted strategy to deal with interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University. It is our view that the three remaining areas – ***experiential learning, community engagement and lifelong learning*** can form the cornerstones of a new "College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning".

Why create a College?. In part the answer is one of pragmatics. We are trying to signal the creation of a new structural mechanism that will cross-lattice, and interweave with the disciplinary pillars of the institution. In its mandate and raison d'etre, the "college" is both an extension of the academic disciplines into our communities through our lifelong learning programming, distance education activities, and distinct populations service, and it aims to be a complement to our disciplines by providing a home for supplementary interdisciplinary and experiential academic programming. From a nomenclature perspective, our academic structure already defines programs, departments, schools, centres and institutes. We needed to find a term that would depict the academic mandate of the cross-latticing entity while simultaneously not confounding it with our existing structures.

During the first phase of the academic restructuring exercise, the Faculty Structure Task Force conducted a review of the use of structural elements elsewhere and presented the following summary:

"Colleges have been used both as independent institutional descriptors (in place of the term University in some countries) or as part of a post-secondary educational system that uses both Colleges and Universities to distinguish the primarily educational institutions from those with a research mandate. The English system and its colonial offshoots are somewhat different; that is, the University has several colleges within itself, and they all perform both research and pedagogical functions. They are, rather, known for certain specializations and, perhaps more importantly in England, for the history of membership—which may be limited to women, religious orientations, levels of class differentiation, and so forth. The College structure has also become increasingly used within a University structure in Canada, to represent differing geographical presences (i.e. multiple campus environments), to identify a category of residential affiliation experience such as a Catholic College or Women's College or to organize and differentiate undergraduate and graduate education." (p. 12, FSTF)

Since the time the Phase 1 report was written in July 2006, the University of British Columbia established a College for Interdisciplinary Studies in January 2007. Its mandate demonstrates that it has been created in many ways as a parallel structure to the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning that we are envisioning for Simon Fraser University.

"The mandate of the College [of Interdisciplinary Studies] will be to facilitate and support interdisciplinarity campus-wide, and as part of that mandate, to serve as a place for the creation, development, and dissemination of new and important scholarly activities which advance the interests of UBC as a whole according to its Trek 2010 strategic vision."

While the UBC "College" is focused on interdisciplinary research, it shares with the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning a university-wide function, a home for academic activity, a role in the supporting, creating and developing new scholarly activity, and in being intimately tied to the overall strategic vision of the University and the experience for students.

Given the compatibility of our goals with both local and international university systems, we believe that describing our proposed new initiative as a College is a reasonable, defensible, and appropriate structural term to be added to Simon Fraser University.

The College would be comprised of two divisions – the Experiential Learning Division and the Lifelong Learning Division.

The Experiential Learning Division would have the following responsibilities:

- develop, incubate, nourish and house credit (but not degree granting) programming of an interdisciplinary, cross-Faculty character within College Programs[10];
- develop a portal to showcase experiential programming and learning opportunities across the University;

---

[10] See Volume V – Structural Elements – for a detailed discussion of a College Program.

- serve as a reference, resource, and support centre for members of the University community seeking to develop new experiential programming; and,
- coordinate experiential credit administration and adjudication processes in the future

The Lifelong Learning Division would have the following responsibilities:

- develop programs that provide opportunities for coherent pathways between non-credit and credit learning; and,
- house continuing studies, distance education, and diverse population outreach activities.

The Task Force believes that the creation of the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning will effectively profile and 'brand' Simon Fraser University as a unique place that institutionalizes its commitment to excellence in student learning experience.

Over time, the College will house a diverse array of supplemental pan-university programs such as interdisciplinary capstone programs, integrative thematic semesters or summer workshops, interdisciplinary graduate certificate programs, etc. While we can imagine that there may be first year programming in the future (such as a university-wide environmental literacy initiative) which might prove an excellent initiative for the College, generally we expect that experiential programming in the College will be focused at the senior undergraduate or graduate levels once students have attained a clear identity with an academic field and can bring their understanding of their discipline to interdisciplinary conversations in a broader learning environment. We do not propose relocating existing first year programs - Explorations, TechOne, or Science One - into the College unless that becomes the desire of these individual programs in the future.

The College would be mandated to ensure that teaching in all of its various areas is research-infused and of the highest quality. Further, it is critical that the interdisciplinary programming that is developed remain intimately interconnected with the disciplines from which they evolve and enhance, and we would therefore recommend that discipline-based steering committees be put in place for all College Programs.

Division of Experiential Learning

There is a vast literature on "experiential learning" and "experiential education" and the Task Force does not pretend to have a complete or necessarily sophisticated understanding of these fields[11]. What do we mean by an "experiential" component to the educational experience of Simon Fraser University? For the Task Force, the answer probably lies somewhere between the definitions of "experiential learning" and "experiential education". J.J. Stehno's (1986) review of experiential learning models and D.A. Kolb's (1984) theoretical framework of experiential learning both articulate four defining features of experiential learning: "(1) action that creates and experience, (2) reflection on the action and experience, (3) abstractions drawn from the reflection, and (4) application of the abstraction to a new experience". Experiential education, in comparison, can be seen to build upon these four features but extends them in two important

---

[11] The article, "Reasserting the philosophy of experiential education as a vehicle for change in the 21st century" by Dr. Christian M. Itin, in The Journal of Experiential Education, Fall 1999, has proven useful to us in trying to decipher the difference between the fields of "experiential education" and "experiential learning".

ways. First, "the transactive component between teacher and learner" is critical in experiential education. Second, experiential education, building upon the work of John Dewey, Kurt Hahn, and Paulo Freire, also seeks to "consider the larger system level issues of education such as the socio-political-economic elements in the learning environment" and encourages both learner and teacher to explore "issues of values, relationship, diversity, inclusion and community"[12].

What we are seeking to create is a paradigm in the College that combines course-based learning (both disciplinary and interdisciplinary) with experience and engagement in the world. We believe that if fully developed in complement to our discipline based activities, Simon Fraser University will provide students with an unparalleled education that uniquely prepares them for their role in an increasingly multidimensional, globally interconnected, and socially conscious 21st century.

The Task Force has a broad, multifaceted vision for developing an experiential component to the undergraduate learning process at Simon Fraser University. Over time, we imagine that there will be an expansive and diverse array of experiential opportunities for students. These might include highly integrated experiences within disciplinary curriculums, participation on leading edge research teams, engagement in collaborative learning ventures with industrial partners, interdisciplinary thematic semesters of study, international studies abroad, community project participation either locally or internationally, work-integrated learning experiences, and others.

We imagine an "experiential component" in its fullest sense. At the most integrative end of the spectrum we cite the residential component of medical degrees or the PDP program in our own Faculty of Education as exemplary of an experiential educational component. Less intensive, but equally representative of an experiential learning activity is the ad-hoc industrial-faculty member collaborations offered through IRMACS, or the senior undergraduate research assistantships of undergraduate students. These are integrative examples, demonstrating experiential components intimately interconnected to the disciplines. There are other examples of initiatives at Simon Fraser University that qualify for inclusion as an interdisciplinary experiential component to the learning experience. The Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue which shares many of the qualities of experiential education in the definition presented earlier combines the features of comprehensive interdisciplinarity and significant experiential activity, with an array of social, political, economic, and community issues and values. Both student and educators are intimately involved in the overall learning experience.

The examples presented so far are less likely to come automatically to mind when one thinks of Simon Fraser University's activities in "experiential learning". The most commonly associated types of activities are those that can be broadly classified into our Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) unit. This unit is the area of primary responsibility and coordination for cooperative education, volunteer and internship opportunities, career planning, and more recently service learning. This latter area, commenced in August 2007, is defined by Student Services as a "type of experiential learning in which students connect their academic learning with community issues. Typically, community engagement and structured reflection is incorporated into an academic, for-credit course. Students' academic, career, and personal development is positively impacted." The Task Force clearly recognizes that the activities being engaged

---

[12] Itin, (1999), p. 3.

under the umbrella of work-integrated learning and international experiences (such as learning a foreign language, participating in a field school, international exchange program, or study-abroad experience) clearly fall under our vision for an experiential component to the education of Simon Fraser University students. We do not, however, have any desire for the new College that we ultimately recommend here to seek to assume responsibility for these activities nor to have the activities currently housed within Student Services relocated to the College. The College will serve both as a home to new experiential learning activities and as a conduit of connection between initiatives housed around the University. We encourage and expect that the College and Student Services will develop a strong and positive relationship with extensive interaction, just as the College must develop an integrative network of connections with disciplines across the University.

While we believe that the above examples will clarify our conceptualization of an experiential component to the educational experience of students, we wish also to note that we are not referring to those experiences that have been gained prior to enrolling at Simon Fraser University such as work experience or experiences and activities that might qualify for consideration as part of the University's Prior Learning Assessment processes. Rather, we are specifically referring to "experiences" obtained by students as part of their education at Simon Fraser University.

Simon Fraser University has long recognized the value of experiential learning. The considerable diversity of cooperative learning opportunities for students, our international field schools, and participation of students in research projects, are just a few of the ways in which we offer our students unique experiences to complement their discipline based learning. The examples and successes to date, speak to the ability of existing Faculty and administrative structures to successfully innovate and create some forms of experiential learning opportunities for students. The Cooperative Education and International Field School models are illustrative for the ways in which they combine both central infrastructure and support with connectivity to the disciplines they serve.

Over the past five years, the University has introduced the concept of a semester of study in a problem-centered area that changes from year to year. We have introduced cohort-based first year experience programs for undergraduate students. And we have mounted a new multidisciplinary graduate certificate program in Development. Despite their different foci, subject matters, and target audience, all three have two qualities in common: they seek to deepen the experience of students at the University, and they are highly interdisciplinary in design. All have been highly successful; attracting excellent students and all are being well received. But each of these learning forms has encountered considerable administrative difficulty within a structural system that is designed around disciplines.

The Task Force believes that our strengths in this area are hidden. We also believe that we should expand the opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning as part of their degree at Simon Fraser University. While there are members of the Task Force who would propose that this be a mandatory experience for students, defining of the SFU undergraduate program and that opportunities also be afforded at the graduate level, we ultimately reached the view that further exploration of this proposal is required and that we should instead conceive as a first step, the introduction of opportunities for students to obtain credit for experiential learning. This will require a thorough review of the way in which such credits fit within other changes to

the undergraduate curriculum (W,Q,B), the potential impact on overall degree credit requirements, and the ways in which these experiences can be evaluated, adjudicated, implemented and coordinated. Such a review must also identify existing opportunities and ensure that they are prominently featured in an overall coherent portal of information for students. While the W-Q-B initiative focused on the undergraduate experience, we believe that there are also great opportunities to be afforded at the graduate level. For example, many students in Masters or Doctoral programs in areas of public policy, international studies, environment, health, etc. might find a semester in dialogue, a language certificate program, or a community project extremely interesting and a value-added component to their degree. Further, we can even imagine that for some students the opportunity may not present itself during their degree for a study abroad semester, international field school or language in location program, but that once they have completed their degree requirements, they might be interested in participating through an alumni program. This strategy would provide valued continued learning opportunities for our alumni as well as strengthen their connection to the University, perhaps leading to Simon Fraser University being the first choice for further post-graduate education or as an option for financial contribution.

We believe this vision will require a coherent and easily navigable path for students, a portal opening to a variety of choices supported by an effective structure to support, stimulate, incubate and nourish experiential initiatives that will emerge and be developed within disciplines, within Student Services, and within a new College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning.

As one of the signature interdisciplinary and pan-university supplemental learning initiatives at the University, we believe that the Semester in Dialogue would be a perfect fit for our vision of the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning. Defined as a "College Program" under the structural elements framework of the University discussed below, the exceptional administrative provisions required to enable the Semester in Dialogue program to function would have institutionally sanctioned mechanisms that would resolve the cumbersome and somewhat ineffective temporary structures under which the program has been operating. In this spirit of administrative resolution, we also find considerable merit to the proposal to consolidate the Semester in Dialogue program with the Centre for Dialogue in an effort to more effectively coordinate programming, community outreach and oversight.

Division of Lifelong Learning

The Task Force also firmly believes that the University of the future must be actively engaged within its communities and must take a leadership role in addressing the pressing issues confronting society.

Continuing Studies at Simon Fraser University has functioned as the primary area of the University responsible for outreach to diverse populations for non-credit programming. It has also through its distance education arms, and collaborative ventures with academic areas across the University, supported the discipline-based teaching and community outreach missions of the University and currently offers numerous for-credit certificate programs.

Continuing Studies will be a critically important vehicle for the University of the future. Shifting demographics, changing educational needs of professionals and adult learners, engagement with diverse communities internationally, all will draw upon the expertise and activities located within our existing Continuing Studies umbrella.

We believe, however, that there needs to be some shift in the perception of this arm of the University's activities. We believe it imperative that Continuing Studies offer, and be seen to offer, services and courses of comparable academic quality to those offered within the disciplines at Simon Fraser University. We believe that part of the solution lies in a more effective integration of our outreach activities with our traditional programming activities. There should be more articulated pathways between non-credit and credit-learning and our service to diverse communities should be built upon the foundations of our research and teaching expertise. We also believe that there is a need for more direct involvement in the teaching activities of Continuing Studies by our faculty and for us to more effectively capitalize on the expertise of highly trained professionals and practitioners. Further, we feel that both lifelong and experiential learning represent unique pedagogical approaches to learning for both seasoned academics and professionals alike. Bringing together the expertise of Program Directors in Continuing Studies with faculty members in disciplines will create a vibrant and exciting new research Centre.

Ultimately, the Task Force concluded that there is a need for the University of the future to be intimately connected with and serving of its communities, both locally and internationally. This means for us that Simon Fraser University needs to develop a more integrated conceptualization of Continuing Studies within the University. While the positioning of much of Continuing Studies initial programming occurred through our Harbour Centre campus, it is by no means accidental that an increasing portion of our discipline-based programming has moved to downtown Vancouver. Nor it is surprising to us that there is an exponentially growing demand for Continuing Studies programming in our new city location of Surrey. The University of the future is one embedded within its communities, offering a spectrum of programming from Philosopher Café style events, outreach programs, non-credit programming, full credit degree programming at the undergraduate, graduate, masters and post-doctorate level. It is the nexus for intellectual engagement for all members of our community.

In conclusion, based on the three pillars of experiential learning, community engagement and lifelong learning, the Task Force makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 9: That a College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning be established.

9.1:　　　*That the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning be the locus and home for the encouragement, coordination, interconnection, and development of interdisciplinary, cross-Faculty experiential learning programs.*

　　　9.1.a: That the Semester in Dialogue and the Centre for Dialogue be consolidated and that they be classified as a College Program within the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning.

> **9.1.b:** *That the Vice President, Academic establish a Committee for Experiential Learning (CEL), and that this Committee be established with a mandate to develop a plan for introducing an experiential credit for undergraduate students. We further recommend that the CEL be mandated to submit its plan to Senate by September 2009.*
>
> **9.2:** *That the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning house the existing portfolio of Continuing Studies and Distance Education.*

Institute for Advanced Scholarship

Working Group 5 recognized the significant impact that a major research institute could have for the profiling of our research excellence and for stimulating research programs through the connection of Simon Fraser University researchers with leading world experts. Modeled after Institutes for Advanced Scholarship at Princeton, Harvard, and others, the goal of a Simon Fraser Institute for Advanced Scholarship (SFU-IAS) would be the pursuit of research excellence at the leading edge of pressing global issues. The SFU-IAS is envisioned as one of the pre-eminent Institutes for the exploration of critical interdisciplinary research questions that would bring together leading world scholars from the arts, humanities, applied, social and natural sciences within and beyond Simon Fraser University around a thematic project for a two-year period. With state-of-the-art facilities, an internationally acclaimed conference, and proceedings of the highest quality, the SFU-IAS would bolster Simon Fraser University's place on the international stage for research excellence. The Institute is also envisioned to have significant graduate educational and community outreach components. This ambitious vision[13] has captured the imagination of the Task Force and we believe it would prove an extremely important asset for the future of the University, particularly in the context of our urgent priority to advance our research intensity and excellence. To effectively realize the vision and stature envisioned, the project will require substantial investment. And yet, the Task Force believes that it has such potential that we recommend it be pursued through a targeted external fundraising campaign.

> **Recommendation 10:** *That the University establish a Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Studies of the highest caliber, made possible through a targeted fundraising campaign for this purpose. We further recommend that the University strive to realize its dream for the creation of the SFU–IAS by the year 2012.*

---

[13] Refer to the Working Group 5 report for a more detailed vision of the Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship.

Summary

Over the course of Volume II, we have recommended significant new structures for the future of Simon Fraser University including three new Faculties, a College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning, and a future Institute for Advanced Scholarship.

If we return to the four qualities, identified at the beginning of our report, that we believe should define Simon Fraser University by 2025, we can summarize our view as to how each of our major structural recommendations speak to the qualities we wish to build upon and exemplify.

For faculty members, we believe that the profiling of three new areas within the University's academic structure – environment and sustainability, engineering and computing, and communication, contemporary arts and design, will provide for all faculty members working directly or indirectly within these disciplines and interdisciplines a clear signal of commitment by the University to their areas of research, and will heighten Simon Fraser University's activities and strengths in these areas in national and international contexts. The design of the Environment Faculty, in particular, with its vision for a broadly inclusive and participatory structure of engagement by faculty from across the University we hope to become a model for interdisciplinarity and collaboration, providing significant new opportunities for knowledge discovery. The College of Experiential and Lifelong Learning is also a critically important component of enhancing the University for faculty members. Those faculty members seeking to innovate in the creation of new interdisciplinary programming will find a nourishing home that facilitates their ideas' incubation and development. Further, the expertise of our academic complement will more seamlessly permeate our outreach and community engagement activities thus ensuring the highest quality possible for all academic programming, credit and non-credit, offered by Simon Fraser University. And finally, our vision for one of Canada's top Institutes for Advanced Scholarship will become the focal point for world-leading research, attracting the best scholars from Simon Fraser University and around the world to engage and collaborate.

Our recommendations have been designed as well to serve our vision for developing an expanded range of outstanding programmatic options for graduate students, increasing the diversity and opportunity for interdisciplinary courses of study, and being more actively engaged in the research mission of the University. Prospective graduate students in Computing Science and Engineering Science will see Simon Fraser University similar to other Canadian and US Universities – with their disciplines clustered in a focused and visible configuration of a Faculty. But unlike other institutions, they will have unique educational experiences given the foci of our Engineering and Computing disciplines. For graduate students interested in issues of Environment and Sustainability, an area of increasingly critical need of study and research within the world, our graduate students will find a clear constellation of graduate programming opportunities both within the new Environment Faculty as well as through the communication portal that will exist to ensure that there are clear pathways of study known to students. Further, the specific plan for the development of new integrative graduate programming within the Faculty will provide our graduate students with exciting new interdisciplinary program opportunities. The structures that are being designed to bridge faculty members from across the University will also provide the strong networks of collaboration and interconnectedness that will provide for importantly diverse thesis and dissertation supervisory committees. Future

graduate students from Simon Fraser University will also benefit tremendously from the programming imagined through the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning. New interdisciplinary programming and unique curriculum initiatives such as perhaps a graduate dialogue semester, international experiences, etc., will enrich their discipline based learning. And finally, the Institute for Advanced Scholarship, with a key component dedicated to the participation and membership in the Institute by graduate students, will provide the structural mechanism for more actively engaging graduate students in world leading research.

The recommendations we have made in this section, are also designed to develop Simon Fraser University into one of the best educational institutions for undergraduate students. Simon Fraser University will be seen as *the* institution in Canada offering students a truly unique experience. Our three pillar experience – disciplinary grounding, interdisciplinary understanding, and experiential engagement with the world – will become internationally acclaimed and recognizable. From a disciplinary perspective, the establishment of a Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Communication and Design (name to be defined), will create an identifiable and highly visible new Faculty in areas of high demand and interest by undergraduate students. New interdisciplinary programming at the interstices of these disciplines and that of the Publishing Program will provide exciting new areas of study for prospective students. The new Environment Faculty is also a very important contribution to attaining our goals with regard to undergraduate education. Providing coherence and clarity to the undergraduate program offerings in the areas of environment and sustainability both within the new Faculty and external to it, will help prospective students see the considerable breadth and strength in environmental programming at Simon Fraser University. Further, the stabilization, independence and revitalization of the Environmental Science Program imagined to occur within the new Faculty will prove, we believe, extremely attractive to prospective students. Additionally, the blueprint for new integrative programming will result in the development of unparalleled educational opportunities for students both in the design of full degree programming but also, we expect, in the development of environmental awareness and literacy programs, supplemental credit initiatives, and environmental "value-added" components to non-environment specialist students. We also see through initial conversations among prospective participants (both as units and as collaborators) in the new Faculty, a significant desire to develop international study and experiential program initiatives. In addition to the benefits of the new Faculties for undergraduate students of the future, the Task Force recognizes that the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning will be one of the most significant contributors to the undergraduate experience of the future.

The final quality we sought to design our recommendations to serve was the role we envision for Simon Fraser University with respect to the local and international communities we serve. We had aspired to have Simon Fraser University become a "place where we fulfill our social responsibility to provide learning opportunities to all members of society through a comprehensive collection of programming ... where we [would] actively pursue and contribute to understanding and knowledge development in the large social and environmental problems of the world; and where we [would] provide our students with opportunities to learn with individuals, and participate in initiatives, in communities around the world". We have recognized our social responsibility to engage in perhaps the world's most pressing area of issues – environment and sustainability. We have appreciated the role of University's to foster,

nourish, and showcase the arts, art-making and culture within society. We have understood the continuing influence that technology is having in society. And we have chosen to coalesce our strengths in each of these areas so as to provide "neighborhoods" within Simon Fraser University dedicated to the study and knowledge development in each of these areas. The Task Force also appreciates that Universities must become increasingly interconnected with the fabric of society and must provide ways for all members of society to engage with us. In this spirit, we have developed the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning upon four critically important foundations: interdisciplinarity, experiential learning, community engagement and lifelong learning. The latter three of these, have particular import to our vital role in connecting with our communities.

"REMOVING BARRIERS: A DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE OF SFU"
FINAL REPORT

VOLUME III – INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure

Presented to the University Community
February 11, 2008

VOLUME III - INTERDISCIPLINARITY

The third area of the mandate for the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure is that of interdisciplinarity. Specifically, Senate mandated the Task Force to:

> *Consider and evaluate the University's effectiveness in incubating, facilitating, and supporting interdisciplinary research and programming and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend structural and/or policy changes that will enhance interdisciplinary innovation in the future.*

As we delve into this area of our mandate, the Task Force wishes to reinforce that all of the recommendations contained within this report are aimed to further Simon Fraser University in its pursuit of excellence: excellence in research, excellence in teaching, and meaningful engagement with, and contributions to, our community, both locally and globally.

Successful interdisciplinarity can, and will only, occur in the presence of strong, vibrant, and dynamic disciplines. We value the research being undertaken within disciplines and understand its importance to interdisciplinary research and we recognize that interdisciplinarity occurs both *within* disciplines as well as *outside* of disciplines. As such, the University's structures and policies must be designed to support innovation, knowledge advancement and the pursuit of opportunities in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary directions. We recognize that both disciplinary and interdisciplinary advancement will occur at all scales and in all settings.

The Task Force believes that, as with other areas of the University, interdisciplinarity can, and will, flourish if there is a vision for its future, a strategic plan to guide its development, the leadership to champion it, and the resources to implement the vision.

Over the following section, we highlight those ways in which Simon Fraser University is currently successful in supporting interdisciplinary research and teaching, identify areas that are in need of review, support or redesign, and set out an overall multifaceted strategy for how we believe interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University can emerge as one of our hallmark qualities that deserves the ongoing core commitment of the University.

What is Interdisciplinarity?

While there is an expansive literature speaking to the definition, qualities, hierarchies, and activities of interdisciplinarity[14], the Task Force finds that a straightforward operational definition of interdisciplinarity is that offered by Professor Cathy N. Davidson, Vice-Provost for Interdisciplinarity Studies, at Duke University:

> *"Interdisciplinarity is any productive research or teaching that occurs across, between, and among two or more areas of knowledge that typically have different histories,*

---

[14] While the Task Force did not conduct a thorough literature review of the theoretical classification and definition of Interdisciplinarity, we did read a number of works that we understood to represent dominant thinking in the field. The sources we consulted are identified in Appendix G - the Bibliographical references to our full report.

methodologies, or objects of study. Interdisciplinarity can occur across schools or it can happen within a single department; it can involve collaborations of many researchers or it can be embodied in the work of a single researcher." ("Why Interdisciplinarity?", in InterConnection, Volume 5.1, Fall 2006, {Newsletter on Interdisciplinarity Studies at Duke}).

Process Overview

The Task Force pursued its study of interdisciplinarity through two primary activities: a literature web review and an Interdisciplinarity Charette Day. The latter was held as a full-day event on March 23, 2007 and attracted more than 80 members of the University community. The Charette Day was designed to accomplish six goals:

1. *To hear members of the University community speak of their experiences in pursuing interdisciplinary research and teaching;*
2. *To understand the ways in which current structures, policies, frameworks, or supports, enable successful interdisciplinary research and teaching to occur;*
3. *To learn about the impediments to the pursuit of interdisciplinary research and teaching;*
4. *To develop a view of what SFU's goal(s) should be with regard to interdisciplinarity for the future (we think of the future being at least the next 20 years);*
5. *To determine if there are any principles that should guide the incubation, encouragement, facilitation, support, and/or evaluation, of interdisciplinary research and teaching; and,*
6. *To imagine/invent/or model – structures, policies, frameworks and supports to enable SFU to successfully facilitate interdisciplinary research and teaching.*

To realize our goals, we designed the event in two parts: the first – "Learning from Experience" – featured a series of presentations. Dr. Roberta Katz, Associate Vice-President of Strategic Planning, at Stanford University, began the day with an enlightening discussion about the multidisciplinary vision and activities at Stanford University. This was followed by eight presentations from the following Simon Fraser University faculty members:

- *Dr. Peter Borwein (Director of IRMACS, Burnaby Mountain Chair in Mathematics)*
- *Dr. Jeff Pelletier (Canada Research Chair in Cognitive Science; Professor, Departments of Philosophy and Linguistics)*
- *Dr. Bob Anderson (Professor, School of Communication)*
- *Dr. Ken Lertzman (Professor, School of Resource and Environmental Management)*
- *Dr. Marilyn MacDonald (Professor, Department of Women's Studies)*
- *Dr. Rick Gruneau (Professor, School of Communication)*
- *Dr. Meg Holden (Assistant Professor, Departments of Urban Studies/Geography) and Dr. Janet Moore (Assistant Professor, Urban Studies Program/Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue)*
- *Dr. Jennifer Marchbank (Director of Explorations, Professor, Women's Studies) and Dr. Jane Fee (Director of TechOne and Special Advisor to the Dean of Applied Sciences)*

The second part of the day – "Imagining a New Future" – consisted of small group design teams led by experienced SFU facilitators. Proceedings from the Charette Day can be found on the Task Force web site.

Evidence of Successful Interdisciplinarity at SFU

Simon Fraser University has from its earliest planning documents shown a clear institutional commitment to interdisciplinarity. This commitment appears in nearly all vision statements, university-level strategic plans, our statement of purpose, and our major communications to the external community. Testament to our commitment to interdisciplinarity is the strength of units such as the Schools of Criminology, Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts and Technology, Resource & Environmental Management, and the Faculties of Business Administration, Education, and Health Sciences. Equally evidentiary of our commitment are new initiatives in research funding through the CTE Fund for large multidisciplinary projects, the undergraduate student breadth requirement to encourage knowledge acquisition outside of primary disciplines of study, first-year experience programs such as Explorations, TechOne and Science One, and new interdisciplinary degree programs such as Global Health, Public Policy, International Studies and Urban Studies. Others are in the development stage such as the proposal by Dr. Rick Gruneau for the creation of a program in Sport, Commerce, Culture and Community. Finally, we have seen internal leadership in promoting and advancing interdisciplinary connection by such policy decisions as the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences which chose to use all of their Canada Research Chairs as vehicles for promoting and expanding interdisciplinary work.

Clearly there are a number of other examples. We hope, however, that the brief list in the above paragraph signals the success the University has achieved to date, and the actual realization of our commitment to interdisciplinarity.

Issues Raised and Areas Identified for Review, Support or Redesign

Despite our successes, many faculty members at Simon Fraser University believe that, as an institution, we could better incubate and support interdisciplinary research and teaching. Through the Interdisciplinarity Charette Day, a survey of faculty with joint appointments, and a variety of input provided during Working Group meetings and Task Force consultation processes, we have learned of the following issues and areas where Simon Fraser University is not as successful as we could be in facilitating strong interdisciplinary teaching and research.

At an institutional level, the University does not have a clearly articulated and focused vision or strategy for how to support interdisciplinarity. This is viewed as one reason underpinning the lack of a university-wide culture of understanding, support, or recognition of the merit of interdisciplinary work. A number of faculty members believe that this permeates performance review processes wherein they feel that there are difficulties in the measurement of the quality of interdisciplinary scholarship, in the establishment of parameters for assessing excellence for interdisciplinarity, and in the recognition of interdisciplinary scholarship being of potentially

equal caliber and quality to disciplinary scholarship. It was further noted that one of the primary structural mechanisms designed to promote interdisciplinarity – joint appointments – were not being used effectively or to the degree used by some other institutions. The Task Force attempted to compare our use of joint appointments with other institutions in the country but have experienced difficulty in obtaining information from other institutions. Those who have responded to our query for information, share our concern that joint appointments serve as important mechanisms for interdisciplinarity but that these have not been marshaled to most institutions' advantage.

Barriers to effective interdisciplinarity have been noted for, and by, students in relation to our teaching and program development, in our research activities, and in the way in which we have deployed Centres and Institutes in the past.

In the area of students, we learned from professors and students alike, that students encounter the following barriers to interdisciplinary study:

- they often experienced difficulty in taking cross-Faculty minors and double majors;
- they feel there is an over-prescription of prerequisites that make the design of interdisciplinary programs difficult and opportunities for students to explore other disciplines nearly impossible;
- they find having credits recognized towards overall degree credential from one discipline to another can often be extremely difficult and students may be required if they switch programs of study to ultimately take more than 120 credits for degree completion;
- they find the course approval process cumbersome and unwieldy for students seeking to study across disciplines;
- they believe that structures of registration priority to disciplinary majors is restricting exposure to other disciplines;
- they see a lack of choice in navigating a path of study at the graduate level and often non-disciplinary learning is accomplished through "special arrangements" or directed readings courses;
- they find that financial support structures, particularly for graduate students, come from discipline-based channels and research funding which is typically directed at discipline-based research and learning; and,
- they believe there is a significant lack of integrated, problem-centered courses available to students.

Participants in the Interdisciplinarity Charette Day and the literature review confirmed that the most frequent barriers to interdisciplinary learning for students derive from the difficulty of faculty members to effectively engage in interdisciplinary course and program development and teaching. The most frequently cited problems were the lack of encouragement and support for this activity and the low recognition of interdisciplinary teaching in discipline-based performance review processes. There is a view by many that interdisciplinary courses are perceived as diluted in quality and substance. Further, generally there is little if any provision for compensation or inclusion of interdisciplinary teaching outside of departments as part of annual workload activities. In part this may be attributed to the legitimate need of departments to ensure that their degree programming requirements can be sustained. However, such

legitimate calls on faculty members' time are acting as a substantial barrier to the realization of interdisciplinary programming objectives of the University. Finally, both the literature and Simon Fraser University faculty members confirm that there is a lack of visibility for those interdisciplinary teaching and programs that do exist and there is a lack of support and guidance for faculty members who seek to develop interdisciplinary courses and programs.

In general, interdisciplinary research is more easily pursued and encounters fewer barriers than does interdisciplinary teaching. A number of faculty members reported that if they are interested in engaging in an interdisciplinary team, they can do so by simply gathering together a group of diverse faculty members who may share interests in a project. This ability to marshal multidisciplinary research teams was in evidence through the number and diversity of applications that were submitted in short order to the newly created CTEF initiative two years ago. However, despite these positive reports, faculty members at the Interdisciplinarity Charette Day noted several critical barriers to effective and supported interdisciplinary research at Simon Fraser University. These included poor communication of interdisciplinary research initiatives; a lack of space for interdisciplinary teams to collaborate, meet, and exchange ideas; lack of financial support (particularly for the incubation of smaller-scale interdisciplinary research projects); a lack of opportunities that stimulate interaction among diverse disciplines; and a lack of full-time personnel to support initiatives.

The Task Force learned of many perceived inadequacies with our Centre and Institutes policy, one of Simon Fraser University's primary vehicles for interdisciplinary research. Our own initial review of Centres and Institutes had led us to conclude that there was considerably variability in the degree to which Centres and Institutes were stimulating and nourishing interdisciplinarity, and equally that there was great variety in the extent to which existing Centres and Institutes appeared to be dynamic and active areas of research.

Participants at the Interdisciplinarity Charette Day alerted the Task Force to a number of perceived deficiencies with our existing Centres and Institutes model including a lack of clarity as to the differentiation between Centres and Institutes, a lack of operational funding and administrative support, inadequate economics of scale for the support and facilitation of Centres and Institutes, a lack of effective enabling mechanisms to encourage faculty member participation and leadership in a meaningful way, the inability for graduate students to become integrated members of Centres and Institutes, the lack of encouragement for the development of courses and programming related to the Centre and Institutes' research activities, and the inconsistent quality of existing Centres and Institutes which was in part attributed to ineffective adjudication of new Centres/Institutes proposals, review processes and the lack of graceful phase out mechanisms for Centres and Institutes which were no longer dynamic and contributing research engines of the University.

Multifaceted Strategy

In view of the barriers to interdisciplinarity that have been identified above, and in consideration of the successes we have recorded, the Task Force recommends that a multifaceted strategy be adopted to successfully stimulate and nourish interdisciplinary collaboration in teaching and

research at Simon Fraser University. We note that in this area of our work in particular, our solutions extend beyond structures of the University and focus on leadership, support, policy revision and process review.

Support, Facilitation, Championship

The Task Force believes that to overcome the barriers to interdisciplinarity encountered, we will require leadership, commitment and focused attention. We are conscious that additions to the academic administration of the University must be carefully considered and thoroughly justified. It is our view, backed by observations of the activities of leading Universities internationally, the shifting intellectual context to questions of such grand scale that the only way to tackle them is from integrated contributions from the humanities, arts, social, applied and natural sciences, and the desire by students for interdisciplinary learning opportunities, that a renewed focus and commitment to interdisciplinarity is essential. This requires support, facilitation and leadership.

We believe that an Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration should be established. The design, mandate and responsibilities of the OIC are proposed as follows:

- The OIC would be led by a senior academic administrator appointed for a 3-year renewable term, holding the position title of Director. The Director would report jointly to the Vice-President, Research and the Vice-President, Academic.

- The Office would be responsible for:

  o championing interdisciplinarity at senior decision-making tables, as well as within and external to the University community
  o developing a strategic plan for interdisciplinarity at SFU, creating an implementation strategy, overseeing its execution, and preparing accountability reporting on interdisciplinary activities at SFU
  o working with the Advancement Office to develop a significant fundraising campaign in relation to signature interdisciplinary initiatives
  o facilitating interdisciplinary initiatives at SFU through advising, process development, problem-solving activities between units and individuals, and coordination
  o developing communication structures for members within and beyond SFU regarding SFU's interdisciplinary activities – to include development of "connections" databases, coordinate speaker series, develop newsletters, host events aimed at bringing researchers together from across disciplines
  o managing the Centre/Institute Shared Support Centre which would be housed within the OIC
  o supporting the Vice-President, Research in the processes related to Centre and Institute application, review and renewal
  o developing structures to support the strategic integrated research directions of the University (the SFU Health Network serves as an example)

o developing unified profiles for major areas of the University where diverse research and teaching activities would benefit from a consolidated profile to the external community (perhaps such as: Health, Environment, and other future areas), and,

o administering funding envelopes related to the support and development of interdisciplinary activities in collaboration with the Vice-President, Academic, Vice-President, Research, and an elected interdisciplinary adjudicating committee for proposal review.

Centres and Institutes Reform

The Task Force believes that a key element to a multifaceted strategy in support of interdisciplinary is the reformation of the Centres and Institutes policy. Our proposed reformation is designed to make Centres and Institutes better-suited to the support of research generally and interdisciplinary research in particular.

Simon Fraser University's policy for Centres and Institutes R40.01 is an overarching framework designed to:

> *"Facilitate collaborative research, especially multi-disciplinary research; to undertake specific types of teaching or training programs; to facilitate multi-university initiatives, such as centres of excellence; and to provide specific types of services to the community".*

We generally support these overarching goals. However, we find that there is a lack of definitional clarity regarding particular distinctions, objectives and capacities (such as what "types of teaching or training programs" are intentioned) of Centres and Institutes; that modifications to these structural vehicles can help them become a more powerful complement to other academic structures; that clarifications and qualifications are required to ensure that these structures do not become parallel academic universes or synonyms for Independent Programs, Departments, Schools or Faculties; and that the requirements for application, review and continuation are premised on a more substantial program of quality performance expectation and accountability.

Our investigation into the ways in which Centres and Institutes are currently being used led the Task Force to the view that there is considerable diversity in the extent of activity and substantial differentiation in quality and the degree to which existing Centres and Institutes are dynamic in nature and contribute to the overall research profile of the University.

Our review uncovered several examples of where credit courses (or even a certificate program in one case) are being offered through a Centre. These include the Centre for Labour Studies, the Centre for Education, Law and Society and the Centre for Sustainable Community Development. We also became aware that there have been historical examples where Institutes were used to host degree programming and/or academic appointment: Humanities, and the Institute for Health Research and Education serve as examples. At least in the latter case, however, the proposal that

established IHRE explicitly defined the Institute as a concept and structure unique from those envisioned and supported by the R40.01 policy. We are not certain whether the circumstances surrounding the creation of Humanities were also unique.

The Task Force believes that several substantive revisions are required to the conceptualization of Centres and Institutes at Simon Fraser University if they are to effectively advance the research mission and research profile of the University, if they are to serve as an important component of graduate student learning, and if they are to serve the University as devices to nourish and develop interdisciplinarity. The areas of revision we propose are summarized as follows:

- Re-conceptualization of the categories of Centres and Institutes
- Introduction of expanded and more rigorous review at the time of creation and renewal
- Introduction of 3 to 5 year renewable terms for Centres and Institutes
- Introduction of meaningful graduate student membership
- Establishment of temporally and numerically limited opportunities for faculty members to more fully engage with Centres and Institutes through joint appointments and secondments
- Empowerment of certain categories of Centres and Institutes to offer limited credit programming in the form of interdisciplinary course(s) or certificate programs that is supplemental to degree programming offered within disciplines
- Development over the longer term of a "Shared Centres and Institutes Support Office"
- Establishment over the longer term of limited financial support to enable faculty member participation and start up for Centres and Institutes, subject to increased budget allocation to the Vice-President, Academic Strategic Initiatives Fund and the Vice-President, Research "Centre and Institutes Start-Up Support Fund".

We note that in the release of our discussion document in December 2007, we originally proposed five categories of Centres and Institutes as follows: Departmental Research Centre, Faculty Research Centre, Faculty Research and Teaching Centre, Research Institute, and, Research and Teaching Institute. This categorization was intended to provide convenient clarity of the roles and capacities of each different category of Centre or Institute. During the consultation process we received some feedback that the categorization may be overly complex and that this complexity had implications for administrative efficiency. In careful reconsideration of these concerns, the Task Force recognized that Centres or Institutes that originally established solely for the purpose of research might find subsequently that there is an opportunity for unique supplementary interdisciplinary course development. While we wish to reassure readers that all credit programming will continue to require appropriate Senate consideration and approval, we did not wish to introduce an additional recategorization process for the Centre or Institute simply because of an educational programming opportunity. In consequence we have streamlined our conceptualization to a three-category system – Departmental Research Centre, Faculty Centre, and Institute.

We recognize and remind readers that all recommendations relating to academic appointment provisions for Centres and Institutes will be the subject of negotiations between the University

and the Simon Fraser Faculty Association, and the ultimate shape of the parameters related to these matters may be different than those recommended by the Task Force.

For the convenience of readers, Table 1 below provides a summary of the powers and capabilities of each type of Centre and Institute that we propose. Full details of each are provided in the full discussion of structural elements in Volume V of this report.

Table 1: Summary of Types of Centres and Institutes and their Defining Features

Category	Membership	Teaching	Appointments	Term	Reports to:
Department al Research Centre	Majority of members from single Department / School / Independent Program	Credit teaching not permitted.	Normally up to 2 temporally limited joint appointments or internal secondments	3 – 5 year terms, renewable	Chair / Director, Department, School, or Independent Program
Faculty Centre	Vast majority of members from single Faculty; significant membership from at least 2 disciplines	Non credit programming; supplementary credit courses of interdisciplinary nature; certificates; no degrees	Limited number of temporally limited joint appointments or internal secondments	3 – 5 year terms, renewable	Dean, Faculty
Institutes	Significant membership from 2 or more Faculties or involve another Institution or University	Non credit programming; supplementary credit courses of interdisciplinary nature; certificates; no degrees	Limited number of temporally limited joint appointments or internal secondments	3 – 5 year terms, renewable; unless prescribed by Multi-University agreement	Jointly to Vice-President, Research and Vice-President, Academic

Policy Revision

As part of our multifaceted strategy on interdisciplinarity, the Task Force recommends that a number of policies in the University be amended. It should be noted that a number of the recommendations made will be a matter of negotiation between the University and the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association and may result in different provisions than what we imagine here. Nonetheless, we felt it important to indicate the issues that we feel need addressing within the academic policy environment at Simon Fraser University. We further note that while the amendments we recommend are designed as ways to enhance interdisciplinarity,

the proposed changes will, in many instances, serve disciplinary research and teaching equally effectively.

- Joint Appointments

The Task Force suggests that the Joint Appointment Policy be revised as follows:

- o Limited timeframes for joint appointment provisions be introduced and that these be extended to particular categories of Centres and Institutes (i.e. for 3-5 year terms, renewable)
- o Flexibility be introduced into the nature of joint appointment relationships (i.e. they may have differential teaching commitments, service expectations or research locus between two or more units) and that these be articulated
- o Strategies be developed to ensure appropriate and adequate review mechanisms of interdisciplinary and multi-unit research and teaching
- o Expectations for faculty who are appointed to multiple units to have their workload activities in relation to each unit be clear and consistent with the overall expectations of annual workload requirements for faculty members of the university who are solely in disciplines

The Task Force also believes that it is critical that incentives be developed to encourage units to make joint appointments.

- Secondments Policy

The Task Force believes that the University requires a new mechanism to encourage faculty member participation in interdisciplinary teaching and research activities that are developed through Centres and Institutes. Such a policy would need to address issues of performance review, possibility of renewal for multi-year secondments, process for application, etc. The Task Force understands the tension between departmental teaching requirements and planning on the one hand and support for faculty member engagement in interdisciplinary initiatives on the other. As a consequence, we believe that while it is critically important that Department Chairs/School and Program Directors have a direct role in the approval of secondment applications, they have constraints placed upon them in their power to delay or refuse a secondment application. In terms of a delay, we believe that a Department must be able to effectively plan for the continued offering of degree program requirements and the financial functioning of the unit, and so the Department should have the right to delay for these two reasons the timing of a secondment. We believe that a Department should also have the right to deny a secondment application where the past performance of a faculty member has been assessed as unsatisfactory. Finally, a Department should have the right to ensure that a faculty member's annual workload expectation is being fulfilled. If a faculty member applies for secondment to an institute but this secondment does not fulfill the expected teaching and service expectations of a faculty member, then the Department should be empowered to place conditions on the secondment to ensure that these will be met. In such cases we imagine that teaching and service commitments would be met through

activities within the department. Notwithstanding these rights of the Department, the Task Force firmly believes that these matters should not be used to deter the approval of secondment applications, and the Director of the Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration should be seen by both parties as a facilitator to aid in the success of secondment applications.

- Team Teaching Policy

The Task Force understands from members of the University community that there is considerable variety across the University in the extent to which team teaching is recognized in annual workload calculations and is assessed within performance review processes. It is our view that a fair and equitable process of application, review, and recognition is not only a fundamental component of a positive culture, but also is necessary if all areas of the University are to be participants in initiatives that would integrate the strengths of disciplines across the University.

- Interdisciplinary Performance Review Mechanisms

A frequently cited obstacle to interdisciplinary participation and success at Simon Fraser University, as with institutions elsewhere, is the lack of effective review processes for interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching. In part this stems from a lack of defined parameters for effective review of interdisciplinary work generally; in part it stems from the diverse nature of interdisciplinary work that often makes comparisons across faculty members, and standards of assessment extremely difficult. It is an issue that most Universities struggle with. We believe that Simon Fraser University has a reputation for progressive academic policies that is often cited as a best practice example. The customized nature of criteria and standards for promotion, tenure and salary review should provide a vehicle under which interdisciplinary assessment criteria can be effectively developed. While we recognize that changes to performance review of academic members is a matter for negotiation between the University and the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association, we believe that the Director of the Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration should provide an independent discussion paper on interdisciplinary performance review. There is a significant literature on the topic and this issue has emerged in many other institutional contexts, though we were unable to locate in our limited research an exemplary model to offer the University and the Faculty Association as part of this report. The Task Force believes though that the University should consider the establishment of a framework for individual interdisciplinary review committees, an expansion to the Faculty College to include interdisciplinary expertise, and specific guidelines for disciplines on how to incorporate and evaluate interdisciplinary expectations for renewal, tenure and promotion into departmental criteria documents.

Financial Support

The final component of the multi-faceted strategy on interdisciplinarity recommended by the Task Force deals with financial support. We believe that it will be essential for the University to provide financial incentives and support to both individuals and units if we are to effectively and significantly move the interdisciplinary objectives and commitment of the University forward. In principle, we believe that the following financial vehicles would be effective for stimulating interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University:

- Large Project Funding (CTEF) – VPR Responsibility – no changes recommended to current process
- Small Interdisciplinary Project Funding (SIP) – OIC responsibility – competitive process with interdisciplinary adjudicating committee proposal review
- Interdisciplinary Conference Funding (ICF) – OIC responsibility – this should be considered as an extension of the existing Vice-President, Academic conference fund
- Interdisciplinary Teaching Development Fund (ITDF) – OIC responsibility – dedicated to the support of teaching development

A financial commitment of perhaps $90,000 to $100,000 across the last three funding vehicles would, we believe, serve as a reasonable starting investment in improving support for interdisciplinary activity. During the consultation process of the Task Force report, we heard that this investment was seen as too modest to significantly stimulate and nourish expanded interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University. We understand and respect this concern and many members of the Task Force share a concern about the initial level of funding being provided to this critical area of our mandate. However, there are several important additional factors to consider. First, the CTEF fund of approximately $500,000 established by the Vice President, Research two years ago serves as a significant supporter of multidisciplinary research. Second, the $90,000 to $100,000 figure quoted in this context is new funding directed solely to the last three of the funding vehicles in the list above. While we would like to see this investment increase, we do not think it reasonable to recommend a higher initial investment until the University's fiscal context is improved and the Office of Interdisciplinary Collaboration is established and able to determine if these are the best vehicles for interdisciplinary investment. Third, we note that the personnel and facilities budget for the Office of Interdisciplinary Collaboration are not included in this figure but presented in the implementation section of the report. Fourth and finally, we have seen convincing evidence from Stanford University that interdisciplinarity is a magnet for financial investment when there is a clear institutional vision around interdisciplinary priorities and leadership (of the kind imagined by the Director of the OIC) to spearhead a fundraising campaign. As a consequence of these four factors, we believe that there is opportunity for the multidimensional interdisciplinary strategy we have envisioned to have the potential to develop significantly by the year 2025 from the modest commitments we recommend in this report.

To succeed in creating a supportive, facilitative, and nourishing environment for interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University, we must create the space for this to occur. We would suggest, therefore, that through an incremental financial and space strategy, perhaps as a result of an external fundraising strategy, that the Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration be

developed over the long-term to have adequate physical facilities and infrastructure to support its activities and the shared Centre/Institute Support Centre. At a minimum, we imagine that a meeting room, teleconferencing facilities, reference library, and support personnel be provided to the OIC.

The Task Force recognizes that the funding allocation formulae used by the University has been devised as part of a complex consideration of enrolment activity and planned growth at the University within academic disciplines. While this strategy ensures that "funding follows scholars", we nonetheless feel that its current 100% disposition to Faculties reinforces discipline-based competition and barriers which will continue to stifle programming initiatives of an interdisciplinary nature.

Summary and Recommendations

We recognize that the multifaceted strategy we have identified in support of interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University is an ambitious constellation of structures, supports, policy revisions and developments, and financial strategies. Nonetheless, we feel this strategy is critical to advance both *disciplinary* and *interdisciplinary* research and teaching excellence in the future.

The establishment of an Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration will support faculty members seeking to pursue interdisciplinary knowledge discovery; it will be a centre for the interaction of faculty members across the University, and will serve as a catalyst for incubation of interdisciplinary research and teaching.

The reviews to be undertaken at both graduate and undergraduate levels, will ensure that students are able to effectively and seamlessly engage in study beyond their disciplines, thus providing them with an expanded perspective on the disciplinary areas they choose to explore.

The proposed revisions to the Centres and Institutes are envisioned to be a key component to our success in defining Simon Fraser University as a place where the "research innovation [of faculty] will find incubation, support and development" (p. 9) and where graduate students will be able to be "intimately connected with the research agenda and activities of the University" (p.10).

In the interdisciplinarity area of our mandate, we make the following recommendations:

> *Recommendation 11: That the University establish a new Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration (OIC) with the design, mandate and responsibilities outlined in this report.*

> *Recommendation 12: That the University's Academic Policies be revised as follows:*
>
> *12.1   That the Joint Appointments Policy be revised in consideration of the suggestions included in this report.*

12.2	*That the University develop a new policy which would allow for internal secondment of post tenure research faculty and permanent teaching faculty members for 2-5 year terms to Centres and Institutes.*
12.3	*That the University develop a new policy on Team Teaching.*
12.4	*That the University develop better provisions for the review of interdisciplinary research and teaching in all academic performance review processes.*
12.5	*That the Centres and Institutes policy be revised as envisioned in this report.*

Recommendation 13: That the Vice-President, Academic in collaboration with the Deans and Vice-Presidents undertake the following:

13.1	*Develop a series of incentive strategies and position funding arrangements that would lead to a substantial increase in the number of joint appointments at Simon Fraser University.*
13.2	*Review the current enrolment based funding allocation formula to identify ways in which funding can effectively flow to support supplementary interdisciplinary course credits offered through Centres and Institutes and new strategic and interdisciplinary program development.*

"REMOVING BARRIERS: A DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE OF SFU"
FINAL REPORT

VOLUME IV – PROGRAMS, PROCESSES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure

Presented to the University Community
February 11, 2008

VOLUME IV – PROGRAMS, PROCESSES AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

In Volume II of our report, the Task Force recommended major structural changes to the academic organization of the University. This has included the creation of three new Faculties, a new College, and a proposal for a new Institute for Advanced Scholarship.

This Volume examines four additional areas that came before the Task Force in the submissions we received: specific academic programs, existing structures, process reviews, and infrastructure support.

Specific Academic Program Areas

Cognitive Science Program

As a significant experiment in multidisciplinary collaboration spanning multiple Faculties, the Cognitive Science Program is an exemplar of what can be imagined, and how facilitation of that imagination is constrained. A series of pragmatic and logistical problems in the arrangements of collaboration have resulted in frustrations by both faculty members and students alike. Yet, the Task Force does not believe, at least upon initial investigation, that these problems require structural solution. Rather, we recommend that the commitments made by collaborating units be codified and formalized and that adequate commitment be given in terms of faculty teaching contributions and program service to ensure that program quality can be returned and sustained. We are aware that the Cognitive Science Program is scheduled for review under the Senate External Review processes in April 2008. This will prove an important and timely review. The Task Force believes that this review provides the opportunity for an objective expert assessment of the issues identified by the Cognitive Science Program in its submission to the Task Force.

> *Recommendation 14: That there be formalization and adequate commitments given to the Cognitive Science Program by participating units and that the Terms of Reference for the External Review Team of the Cognitive Science Program (scheduled for early 2008) specifically solicit the advice of the review team on the issues identified in the submission by Cognitive Science to the Task Force.*

The issues raised by the Cognitive Science Program have led the Task Force to further consider the processes by which new interdisciplinary programs present their proposals through the Senate process and the extent to which the issues the Cognitive Science Program has encountered may have been avoided had the original proposal included more formalized understanding of the expectations surrounding collaboration and the ways in which faculty members and students would be enabled and supported to participate. We suggest that Senate develop a required template to guide the development of interdisciplinary program proposals which would also provide Senate with a framework to ensure appropriate mechanisms for collaboration are envisioned. As part of defining these commitments, we would suggest that the following issues be addressed within that guiding framework:

- plans for the provision and prioritization of student access;
- description of how faculty members who contribute will have their contributions considered as part of annual workload expectations;
- overview as to how academic leadership for the program will be encouraged and supported and what arrangements will be made for recognizing leadership roles;
- identification of what oversight structures will be in place of the program and what accountability structures/processes will be in place to ensure the continued quality of the program; and,
- identification of the composition and reporting structure of the steering committee for the interdisciplinary program and what communication structures will be in place between the steering committee and the collaborating units.

> **Recommendation 15: That Senate develop a submission template to ensure that sufficient commitments are in place for the development of new interdisciplinary programs and that such a template addresses the issues identified in this report.**

IT/ICT Program

As one example of the potential for collaborative engagement with other units at the leading edge of knowledge advancement, the School of Computing Science and the School of Interactive Arts and Technology have developed a joint proposal for a new initiative in Information and Communications Technology (IT/ICT). This program represents a significant turning point in the interrelationship between the School of Computing Science and the School of Interactive Arts and Technology. The proposal from Computing Science and Interactive Arts and Technology calls for a program to be created at the convergence of information and communications technology[15].

In addition to being an important proposal for the future collaborative relationship between Computing Science and Interactive Arts and Technology, the proposal also draws expertise from, and extends partnership involvement to, Engineering Science, Business Administration, and Cognitive Science. Others may also be interested in this initiative. We can imagine particular interest being expressed from faculty members in Communication and Health. Students from all of these programs would benefit from the expanded collaborative environment, and it is envisioned that specialty streams could be developed within the undergraduate IT/ICT program such that students could then further specialize at the graduate level within the partnership disciplines or perhaps even in a graduate IT/ICT Program. Collaborative opportunities would also be highly likely with industry and the program would be extremely compelling as an object of external financial support, industrial collaboration, and co-op and career placement for students, thus serving our external community and our students in a highly effective way.

---

[15] "When combined, information and communications technology focuses on the development and use of computer-based information systems and communications systems to process, transmit, and store data and information." (IC/ICT Joint proposal, p. 1)

In recognition of this program's potential to position Simon Fraser University as a world leader in this emerging field of knowledge (there are currently no other competing programs in Canada and an initial review suggests no direct competition within North America), and in developing a culture of effective collaboration among disciplines within the University, the Task Force supports the development of an IT/ICT program.

Recommendation 16: That a new "Information and Communications Technology" (IT/ICT) program be collaboratively pursued at Simon Fraser University as follows:

16.1   *A Joint Program Development Committee be established with representatives from Computing Science, Engineering Science, Interactive Arts and Technology, Business Administration, Cognitive Science, and potentially others;*

16.2   *The IT/ICT Joint Program Development Committee develop a report for consideration by Senate by September 2009 outlining the feasibility, faculty gap analysis, resource requirements and draft curriculum of implementing an IT/ICT program at SFU.*

Publishing Programming Consolidation

The Working Group and the Task Force support the overall consolidation of publishing programming under one umbrella, and thus the inclusion of the undergraduate publishing courses from Communication and the Writing and Publishing Program from Continuing Studies as part of the Publishing Program in the new Faculty. We understand that the School of Communication and the Director of the Master of Publishing Program are supportive of our view and have agreed to transfer the undergraduate credit publishing courses from Communication to the Publishing Program. In contrast, we have learned that the Director of the Master of Publishing Program and the Director of the Writing and Publishing program at Continuing Studies have agreed to "continue to seek opportunities to complement each other's efforts and to coordinate offerings" but not to consolidate the Continuing Studies programming into the Publishing Program. As a consequence, the Task Force will not recommend the consolidation of the Writing and Publishing program of Continuing Studies with the Master of Publishing Program programming without a better understanding of the reasons for the decision of the program directors. We do, however, believe that there are compelling arguments to consolidate cognate publishing programs within a single unit and believe this should be reconsidered in the future.

Recommendation 17: That the undergraduate publishing courses now offered by the School of Communication be consolidated with the Master of Publishing Program and that Continuing Studies publishing programming be further explored for consolidation with the Master of Publishing Program.

TechOne Program

Simon Fraser University's TechOne program is a model first year cohort experience, providing entering students an introduction into the field of technology and future educational paths in Computing, Engineering, Business Administration, Mechatronics, Interactive Arts and Technology, and Communication. This unique program has been evolving since its inception at the University and it has recently undergone a fairly extensive redesign. The TechOne program which is comprised of six core courses, four interdisciplinary courses and two elective courses, will, by the various recommendations of the Task Force, serve three distinct Faculties. This program's history has been fraught with challenges in design, in interrelationships with various disciplinary units, and with a series of administrative constraints. Until recently, limited term teaching appointments were offered under the umbrella of the School of Interactive Arts and Technology and seconded to the program. Permanent positions have now been authorized under the appointment of other disciplines but again with the majority of duties seconded to the program.

In our Discussion Document released to the University community on December 17, 2007, the Task Force argued that the interdisciplinary, cross-Faculty nature of the TechOne program makes it an ideal candidate for inclusion as an independent College Program within the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning. Headed by a discipline-based academic steering committee, the program would find a nourishing and supportive home that would encourage interdisciplinarity. The Steering Committee of the TechOne program had, however, requested that the Task Force instead provide the TechOne program with the opportunity to stabilize its newly designed program and leave it in a familiar environment for a temporary two-year period. On the basis of this request, the Task Force accepted the view of the Steering Committee. Subsequent to the release of our report we have heard various views from the constituent disciplines served by the TechOne Program regarding the effectiveness of the program in serving their discipline's needs, their view as to where the program should ultimately be located, and the resource implications of the location of the program. While we are committed to elements of our original recommendation, we believe it will be essential for the University to develop a clear view of what direction it wishes to pursue with the TechOne program, how best to serve the needs of constituent disciplines, and the resource implications of these decisions. This needs to be done as soon as possible. As such we recommend that a process of review be undertaken with the oversight and engagement of the Vice President, Academic's office and constituent members prior to a decision being made as to the permanent home of the TechOne Program.

> *Recommendation 18: That the TechOne Program temporarily be moved to the new Faculty comprised of Contemporary Arts, Communication, Interactive Arts and Technology and Publishing.*
>
> *18.1. That the Vice President, Academic establish a review committee to examine the design, future and resource allocation of the TechOne Program and to develop a written report by December 2008 for how all constituent units will be provided with a first-year cohort experience that effectively serves their disciplines.*

> *18.2. That upon receipt of the report, the Director of the TechOne program along with the Deans from the Faculty of Engineering and Computing, the new Faculty comprised of Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts and Technology and Publishing, the Faculty of Business Administration, will propose to the Vice-President, Academic the future permanent home for the program. Once the location is agreed to by the Vice-President, Academic, a recommendation would then be forwarded through Senate for approval by no later than March 2009.*

Foreign Languages Study Program

The Task Force believes that given the University's commitment to internationalization and global participation and its geographical location at the edge of the Pacific Rim, Simon Fraser University should be positioning itself as one of the nation's leaders in the study and training in foreign languages and cultures. To date, this has not occurred. In particular, we have the following observations to make with regard to the way in which foreign language training is currently structured and offered at the University:

- First, foreign language learning at Simon Fraser University is viewed by students as incoherent, poorly profiled, and a difficult area of programming to navigate.
- Second, in our view the Language Training Institute has not found a successful partnership in its relationship with the Department of Linguistics.
- Third, there is poor integration between academic unit programming requiring foreign language learning and the language offerings of the University.
- Fourth, there does not appear to be a clearly developed strategic plan for foreign language study in relation to the University's key commitment and priority in internationalization nor in the development of foreign language learning in support of the communities within which we have situated our campuses (i.e. east Asian languages are not adequately developed at the Surrey campus).
- Fifth, the internationalization of disciplines across the University and the increased presence of international research teams and the study of issues globally speaks to the need for language study in disciplines across the University.
- Sixth, in comparison to most other universities locally, nationally and internationally who espouse a commitment to global engagement, Simon Fraser University does not have a sufficiently strong or diverse foreign language learning program.

Despite our findings, the Task Force believes that foreign language study and training is an area of critical import to future generations of students who will increasingly be needful of further language acquisition, cultural understanding, and international engagement. There is already evidence of foreign language learning becoming an integrated component of disciplinary learning at the University. For example, Chinese language learning is required in association with the dual undergraduate degree program in Computing Science, the new international experiential programs in Business Administration and the School of International Studies within the Faculty of Arts and Social has a requirement for language both have foreign language requirements. The Task Force believes there will be an active expansion of such integrated language requirements in the future.

We also see significant opportunities for the expansion of language learning in connection with our international agenda and potentially in terms of the creation of certificate programs to accompany majors, particularly in areas of international business, development, health, environment, and others. Further, there will in a need for the development of greater coherence and articulation between non-credit programming, our translation programs, and for-credit language learning. If structured in a coordinated and effective manner, we believe that ultimately non-credit language learning could form a pathway into credit language and cultural studies for those members of the community who, over time, seek to continue their exploration and acquisition of foreign languages.

In the discussion document released in November 2007, the Task Force recommended that the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning assume leadership and responsibility for both credit and non-credit foreign language instruction and development. During the consultation process, however, we received a strong appeal by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, especially the Dean's office, to provide them with the opportunity and mandate to execute the vision for the study of foreign languages and cultures that is articulated below by the Task Force. Through some web-based research, the Task Force has discerned three general models for the structuring of foreign language learning at institutions that have active profiles in international activities. These are: (a) area-based language learning (i.e. East Asian languages in an "Asian Studies Department"), (b) non-area based credit language learning (eg. Languages taught for the purpose of diversity but where the institution does not have a specific department dedicated to the area where the language is from), and (c) language resource centres. The location of language resource centres depends on the desired positioning by the University. We have found them located in Faculties of Arts, in Faculties of International Studies, in Continuing Studies operations, or as completely independent units that seem to be service centres to the University as a whole. We recognize that the predominant model is within the Faculty of Arts although we would note that these are typically in the presence of significant area-based programming, the type of which Simon Fraser University does not have many examples. The Task Force has thought carefully about models for foreign language learning at other institutions, the problems we see that challenge Simon Fraser University's language offerings, and the content of conversations and insights offered to us by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. What has emerged most clearly to us is that we have found in the Dean of Arts and Social Sciences an advocate and a passionate leader for the vision we have defined. In consequence, the Task Force has ultimately concluded that we should provide the Dean with the opportunity and the mandate to redefine foreign language and culture studies at Simon Fraser University.

We continue, however, to believe that the program of foreign language study (possibly renamed under a heading of "modern languages") that is pursued by the University should continue to be established on the basis of the governing principles and plan of action we initially envisioned in our discussion document and that it must be established as an independent unit from the Department of Linguistics. The six governing principles we identify are as follows:

(1) Be supplementary to area-based studies Departments and Schools;
(2) Be a university-wide cross-latticing entity;
(3) Have a service mandate to area-based foreign language learning in disciplines;

(4) Be responsive to academic programming that has an international character to it;

(5) Be integrated with the University's internationalization strategy and our commitment to responsiveness to the communities within which our campuses are situated; and,

(6) Be grounded in sound linguistic theory and pedagogy.

We note that our vision of foreign language learning is designed with a multifaceted purpose not only to develop and offer credit programming and courses towards degree credit, but also as a service and coordinating unit for the University. We further note that we have imagined a rationalization and consolidation of both credit and non-credit foreign language study within the program that is developed. As part of the consultation process we have heard, however, some concern from the Dean of Continuing Studies as to the location of non-credit language offerings. At this juncture, we wish to proceed with our recommendation for consolidation of credit and non-credit activities but recognize that further study of this component of our report should be collaboratively undertaken by the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and Continuing Studies. The Task Force recommends that the mandate, responsibilities and features of the Foreign Language Studies Program (name to be identified) should be established as follows:

(a) Offer non-credit, certificates and credit programming not offered in area-based studies departments although an area-based department wishing to have language instruction done by the Language Studies Program can do so;

(b) Provide a web directory of all language learning opportunities at Simon Fraser University, showcasing area-based language learning as well as its independent programming;

(c) Develop certificate and credit programming around a model that combines language and culture studies;

(d) Work with SFU International to look for opportunities for studies abroad language learning optional components wherever possible;

(e) House technology-based language learning infrastructure for all foreign language training at the University (including both area-based and non-area-based language learning);

(f) Provide professional development activities and teaching resource materials for language instructors within the Foreign Language Studies Program and area-based disciplines;

(g) Administer foreign language proficiency examinations for its programming and programming in area-based departments if an area-based unit so desires;

(h) Have a research mandate and consider housing a Centre for Language Teaching and Learning for faculty members from across the University interested in language acquisition, language learning, pedagogy, etc.;

(i) Work with academic units across campus in developing language programs to suit requirements they wish to have as part of their degrees (eg. with International Studies, Business Administration, etc.);

(j) Develop language certificate programs customized to external partners or in view of interest of activities of organizations (eg. Asian languages certificate program for Business Administration Students);

(k) House Continuing Studies programming related to translation; and,

(l) Have an advisory committee that will provide advice on strategic direction and activities and would include strong representation from area-based language disciplines.

The Task Force is optimistic that the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences will be successful in realizing the vision identified in this report for foreign language learning and for setting in place the framework for long-term leadership in this critical area of our internationalization and global participation strategy for Simon Fraser University's future. This area of activity is so critical to our view of success in preparing students effectively for the future that the Task Force believes it appropriate to require significant and demonstrated action on this important initiative within a fairly short timeframe. We are therefore recommending that a fully detailed plan for a foreign language studies program be submitted by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to Senate by no later than April 2009. Should a plan not be forthcoming, the Task Force recommends that the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning be requested to assume the mandate, responsibility and development of a program in Foreign Language Studies based on the vision outlined in this report.

> *Recommendation 19: That the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences present a detailed plan to Senate by no later April 2009 for the establishment of an independent unit for the study of foreign languages based on the vision identified in this report.*

Existing Structures and Activities

In examining the various submissions to the Task Force as well as the recommendations made by the Working Groups, there were four occasions where the Task Force concluded that the existing structures, and activities underway were the most effective approach for realizing our goals for 2025.

First, the submission from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences proposed the "establishment of a Department of First Nations Studies, housed in FASS. This department would take the lead in coordinating activities, programming, and research throughout the University." The Task Force notes the historically strong contributions to First Nations programming carried out by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, particularly that offered through Simon Fraser University's Kamloops operations. We also note the two recent programming initiatives before Senate that will lead to the expansion of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences First Nations programming activities. We applaud this historical and recent commitment to First Nations activities. The Task Force is, however, also aware that at the beginning of this year a University-wide First Nations Strategic Plan was developed and ultimately approved by Senate and the Board of Governors. This Strategic Plan provides a coordinating, facilitation and development role for a First Nations office with a senior-level Director position. The Task Force believes that this pan-University structure is the appropriate vehicle for encouraging the development of First Nations programming and understanding in all areas of the University.

Second, in its creation of the notion of a College for the University, Working Group 5 proposed that the portfolio of the Associate Vice-President, Students and International be conceived as a College. The Task Force does not believe that these areas of activity require, or would benefit from, the College structure.

Third, while some of the design of our multifaceted strategy to enhance interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University has been premised on issues raised by Dr. Rick Gruneau's proposal to the Task Force for the creation of a new program in Sport, Commerce, Culture and Community, as well as Dr. Ellen Balka's proposal for a Technology Assessment Teaching and Research Unit, we believe that our recommendations for changes to various policies and to the structural elements, will provide these proposals with the appropriate mechanisms to be successful. For new interdisciplinary initiatives that are non-degree granting and which seek to offer individual interdisciplinary courses or programs of courses leading to certificates or credit components of degrees, either a new College Program or the reformulated Centres and Institutes policy that provides for either a Faculty Centre or Institute would facilitate the development of these initiatives. While it remains true that new proposals using either of these routes – College Program or Centre/Institute - will require sponsorship from existing disciplines or Faculties or co-sponsorship from the College, we think it is important that there remain a requirement for evidence of sufficiently broad support for new initiatives. The Task Force recognizes the efforts and inventiveness of faculty members like Dr. Gruneau and Dr. Balka and we thank them for drawing to our attention a variety of issues that currently constrain new interdisciplinary initiatives from emerging at the University. It is our belief that with the changes proposed with regard to the Centres and Institutes policy, the creation of a College and its subsidiary "College Program", and the establishment of an Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration, we will have developed the structures and policy environment that will enable outstanding interdisciplinary initiatives to flourish in the future.

Fourth, while the Task Force makes a series of recommendations with regard to foreign language learning, we are convinced by the "Report of the Language Instruction Committee" written in 2005 and chaired by Dr. Paul McFetridge, that the issues surrounding English language instruction are significantly different from those of foreign language learning and that they need to be dealt with separately. We have found the Report to provide a comprehensive and compelling examination of the issues and possible paths forward. As a consequence, we do not wish to retrace an area that has been effectively assessed previously. At the same time we recognize that our recommendation to disaggregate English and foreign language learning currently housed within the Language Training Institute in Linguistics and to relocate only the foreign language component to the new College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning, leaves us with an obligation to address the future of the English language training that is currently offered through the Language Training Institute. It is our recommendation, therefore that the Report authored by Dr. Paul McFetridge and his committee, be revisited by the Vice-President, Academic with the goal of implementing a coherent, consolidated, and sustainable strategy for English language learning at Simon Fraser University.

> **Recommendation 20: That the Report of the Language Instruction Committee (2005) be revisited by the Vice-President, Academic with the goal of implementing a coherent, consolidated, and sustainable strategy for English language learning at Simon Fraser University.**

Process Review

In some cases, we felt that revisions to the process or policy framework of Simon Fraser University would prove more beneficial to the issue in need of resolution and to the overall cost and administrative efficiency of the institution. Many of these are intimately connected with our recommendations for a multifaceted strategy to enhance interdisciplinarity as described in the previous volume.

Student Mobility / Course Access Review

As noted in the previous Volume in the discussion of barriers to interdisciplinarity, we heard of a number of interrelated concerns with regard to the presence of obstacles for effective interdisciplinary study by students. We do not have a sense, nor the expertise, of what the exact scale of the problems reported are or the extent to which the problems noted intersect with other areas of student learning. As a consequence, we believe that those who are expert in the undergraduate student learning experience should engage in an evaluation of these issues.

> **Recommendation 21: That a Student Mobility and Course Access Review Committee be established by the Vice-President, Academic to identify barriers to interdisciplinary educational experiences of students. We further recommend that a report of findings, recommendations for improvement, and a plan for implementation, be submitted to Senate by April 2009.**

Graduate Student Interdisciplinary Program Review

In many areas of the Task Force report, we have noted the critical need by the University to increase our profile and activity in graduate education. We applaud President Stevenson's ambitious goal to have 25% of Simon Fraser University's student population be comprised of graduate enrolments. Achieving this goal is recognizably an important component of the overall institutional objective to secure Simon Fraser University's reputation as an outstanding comprehensive research institution. We have recommended elsewhere that graduate students should have a direct and enhanced connection to the research activity of the University through membership in Centres and Institutes. We have also recommended a number of structural recommendations that we believe will set the seeds for an expansion of graduate education in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary venues. We also believe that the changes to the Centres and Institutes policy as well as other structural elements will more effectively enable graduate certificate programs to be imagined and developed. Notwithstanding these important changes to

the benefit of graduate education, the Task Force supports the submission by the Dean of Graduate Studies to mandate him to research further the ways in which interdisciplinary programming for graduate students might be fostered.

> *Recommendation 22: That the Dean of Graduate Studies research and recommend a strategy for supporting and stimulating the development of new interdisciplinary graduate programming and providing financial support to graduate students who undertake interdisciplinary projects. We further recommend that his report be presented to Senate for consideration by September 2009.*

Infrastructure Support

A final area of consideration by the Task Force with regard to academic structure, is the examination of those structures of infrastructure support that are affected by the recommendations we have made in other areas.

The only area we can identify of immediate impact is the role of the Network Support Group currently housed within the Faculty of Applied Sciences. While there have been proposals submitted to us to relocate the Network Support Group (NSG) to the new Faculty of Engineering and Computing, we have also been made aware that the issues in supporting research networks and computing at Simon Fraser University extend beyond the boundaries of the units within the Faculty of Applied Sciences and that not all members of those being supported have been fully satisfied with the current structure and arrangements. In the discussion document released on December 17, 2007, the Task Force recommended that "a more systematic and institution-wide review" be undertaken and that such a review be undertaken "under the auspices and direction of the Chief Information Officer of the University". This recommendation has garnered considerable response from some sectors of the University community. While in some instances there has been an incorrect assumption that our intention was to relocate research computing into the portfolio of academic computing services (which was never our intention), we believe significant support has emerged for having the Network Support Group positioned within the new Faculty of Engineering and Computing. The Task Force is prepared to proceed with this recommendation on the condition that all areas of the University currently served by the Network Support Group continue to be supported.

> *Recommendation 23: That the Network Support Group be relocated to the Faculty of Engineering and Computing in April 2009 and that it continue to support all areas of the University that it currently serves. Further, we recommend that in April 2010, the Vice President, Academic follow up with areas served by the Network Support Group to ensure that all areas continue to be effectively served.*

"REMOVING BARRIERS: A DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE OF SFU"
FINAL REPORT

VOLUME V – ACADEMIC STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS

Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure

Presented to the University Community
February 11, 2008

VOLUME V – ACADEMIC STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS

General Overview

This fifth volume of the Task Force report examines issues related to the use of structural elements at Simon Fraser University and identifies those changes and additions we believe should be implemented.

Specifically, our mandate in this area was to:

> *Consider and evaluate the coherence, roles, responsibilities, functions, administrative requirements, costs, and terminology of the structural building blocks employed at Simon Fraser University (i.e. programs, schools, departments, centres, and institutes) and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend to Senate a strategy that will provide definitional clarity, administrative effectiveness, and appropriate differentiation among these structures.*

The Phase 1 Task Force discussed in detail the way in which structural elements have been used within Simon Fraser University and at institutions elsewhere. We do not wish to reiterate that discussion here and instead refer interested readers to pages 9-13 of the Phase 1 discussion document entitled *"Sommes Nous Prêts?"* (July, 2006).

We note, however, that Simon Fraser University's academic structure has, similar to most institutions in Canada, been designed using a traditional academic structural model – Faculties, Departments, Programs, Institutes, and Centres.

The Phase 1 Task Force provided, in our view, an excellent description of the purpose of academic structures:

> *"Structure provides for disciplinary identity, for academic programming cohesion and organization. It enables the channeling of resources, faculty, staff and students. Our structure is inseparably linked to the constellation of policies and procedures that enable us to manage our activities and that reward and inhibit us. Our academic organization communicates to our communities, both internally and externally, the priorities of the University, what we value and the ways in which we define and differentiate ourselves. Our structures create the framework for the flow of our communications, our interactions, and our innovation. However, the structure does not dictate or determine the totality of the activities and decisions that define our lives as members of a University community. Structure alone does not create organizational success. Strategy, leadership, recourses and people all play critical roles influencing and shaping an organization's success. Different structures may facilitate and enhance the ways these factors play out and create conditions that facilitate and support success."* (Sommes Nous Prêts?, p. 14)

Dr. Michael Howlett, in his submission to the Task Force, *"A Comment and Proposal Concerning Consideration of Faculty/Divisional Structure at Simon Fraser University"*, called on the Task Force to be imaginative in our consideration of academic structure and not to have a

limited perspective which results solely in the "slight or marginal modifications of the status quo". Rather, he asked us to consider the bigger picture and larger options that exist, such as "the territorial re-distribution of Faculties by campus, the combination and re-combination of Faculties into non-territorially-based Colleges, and the merger and division of existing Faculties into more equally representative units." We note its exceptional value in providing the Task Force with a view of alternative conceptualizations for governance and structuring of academic institutions. Ultimately, however, we do not believe that the University is ready for, or in need of, radical transformation. We do, however, agree with Dr. Howlett's call for the Task Force to consider the bigger picture and to be more imaginative than slight or marginal modifications of the status quo. While we recognize that some of our recommendations will be seen to fall in this latter category, we hope that there are elements that are indicative of our efforts to focus on the future on the University, and to creatively imagine new ways in which we can excel.

The Task Force has considered the ways in which our academic structures enable flexibility and responsiveness and yet provide enduring coherence and disciplinary identity. We have also considered the ways in which terms are used synonymously within the structure, and the reasons for an increase in the number of independent academic programs. We have chosen not to provide a detailed definition of those structural elements (eg. Faculties) that we feel serve the University effectively and require no change. We do, however, discuss several structural elements that we believe deserved further consideration, required redesign, or needed to be added to ensure that Simon Fraser University achieves the future we can imagine for it.

Department and School?

The Task Force considered deploying only the term Department within the academic structure rather than having both the terms Department and School exist as synonyms within the structural framework. Ultimately, however, we felt that there are particular areas of the University where the term School has significant meaning within the larger international context of the discipline. This can be seen in cases where there is a professional orientation of the discipline (eg. Engineering), where there is a practice basis to the field (eg. Contemporary Arts), where there is an applied focus (eg. Interactive Arts & Technology), or where there is a broad diversity or range of programmatic streams within the discipline (eg. Criminology). As a consequence, we have concluded that the terms Department and School both have important value to certain areas of the University and, therefore, we do not recommend the arbitrary removal of the term School from our structural vocabulary.

Independent Programs

Typically, the term program is understood to refer to the framework for a coherent undergraduate or graduate curriculum of study. In most cases, programs will exist embedded within Departments, Schools or non-departmentalized Faculties.

The Task Force has noted an increase in the number of small academic programs that have been created recently outside of departments within the University academic structure. It is

recognized that these nascent programs with small academic complements depend heavily on other academic units for course offerings, faculty expertise, and the fulfillment of administrative processes such as appointment, tenure and promotion committees, etc. We also realize that the collegial system of governance generally provides equal representative weight of these areas to large departments within the Faculty structure. These issues question the long-term efficiency and viability of a proliferation of small programs independent of disciplines within the Faculty structure. However, the Task Force believes that issues of representation within a Faculty not covered by academic policy, faculty collaboration arrangements, curriculum and workload arrangements across disciplines, and budget provisioning for these new programs should be a matter for decanal determination within the University's decentralized administrative system.

Notwithstanding these issues, the Task Force comprehends the important role that these programs play both within and external to Faculty, Departmental and School structures as a mechanism of change, experimentation, and new knowledge creation. They also serve as important vehicles for interdisciplinary collaboration within the framework of a Faculty due to their interconnection with other units and their dependence upon the contributions of faculty members from other disciplines. This is particularly true at nascent stages of development.

We recommend, however, that in order to maintain economic efficiency while simultaneously facilitating these important incubating structures, that models of shared support staff, advising, and other types of collaborative administrative strategies be considered and implemented wherever possible.

Throughout our report we have referred to this category of programs as "Independent Programs".

College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning

The Task Force believes that a new entity – a College – needs to be added to the academic structure of the University. We do not propose this as part of the structural templates to be deployed in other circumstances. Rather, we imagine the creation of a single College; the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning (herein after referred to as the College). The detailed rationale for the creation of this College was presented in "Volume II – Academic Structure Recommendations", but here we wish to highlight some of this unique structural element's features.

The College will be headed by a Dean. Given the role of the Dean in oversight and adjudication of student matters and in the performance review processes of academic staff, this position is conceived as a senior academic position. The roles and responsibilities of the position will be uniquely defined from Faculty Deans in consideration of the nature of the divisions embodied within the College. The College will be comprised of two divisions. First, a division of Experiential Learning that will house "College Programs" (see below), other forms of experiential learning, and University-wide coordination activities related to experiential learning. Second, a division of Lifelong Learning that will house the existing portfolio of Continuing Studies, Distance Education, and future activities related to the University's activities in promoting lifelong learning and engagement with our many communities.

The College may house College Programs, and may offer credit courses, (as is the case now for Continuing Studies) program components (eg. Semester in Dialogue), for-credit certificate programs, and non-credit programming. All programming within the Experiential Division must be of an experiential or interdisciplinary nature. The College will not be degree granting. Programming is envisioned to occur at both graduate and undergraduate levels. We wish to be clear that it is not our intention to create a parallel curriculum or synonym for Faculty and we further note that any credit program developed within the College would, as is true for discipline-based programming, require Senate approval.

College Programs

A College Program is an academic program created with a primary focus of delivering undergraduate or graduate programming that extends across more than one Faculty. Due to our recommendation that College Programs not be given degree-granting powers, they are conceived to provide supplementary or enhanced programming to that which occurs within Independent Programs, Departments, Schools and non-Departmentalized Faculties (these areas hereinafter referred to as disciplines).

The Director of a College Program would be an academic administrative appointment and report directly to the Dean of the College. They would be governed by the provisions in A13.03 and A13.04 as is true for all other academic administrators.

As College Programs have a credit-teaching mandate, we recommend they have the power of academic appointment as follows:

- Teaching faculty appointments may have their entire academic position appointed to a College Program or they may be cross appointed with disciplines. We believe that the use of joint appointments would be a particularly effective device to retain the interdependent nature of interdisciplinarity in relation to disciplinary programming.
- Tenure-track research faculty may also be appointed to a College Program, however, they must hold a joint appointment with a discipline.

It is our view that the review process for teaching faculty appointed solely to a College Program could be concluded within the College. The review process for joint appointed tenure-track faculty appointments, however, would require research assessment by the non-College discipline to which they are appointed. Additionally, appropriate interdisciplinary review mechanisms may be required for some members and these should be identified at the time of appointment.

We remind readers that all matters involving academic appointments are the jurisdiction of negotiation between the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association and the University. Our recommendations, therefore, must be considered within this context and are therefore subject to amendment by those parties. We hope, however, that our careful thought on these matters will be considered as important input into those negotiation processes.

Centres and Institutes

In Volume III of this report, the Task Force described the rationale and overarching qualities of a reformulation of the Centres and Institutes Policy R40.01 that we feel is needed to enhance both interdisciplinary and disciplinary research at Simon Fraser University.

This section of our report will focus on a more detailed articulation of the defining characters of the three types of Centres and Institutes that our reformulation envisions:

- ¬ Departmental Centre
- ¬ Faculty Centre
- ¬ Institute

Please note that the term "temporally limited joint appointment" used throughout this section of our report refers to a recommendation in the interdisciplinary section of our report (Volume II) that the joint appointment policy be revised to enable joint appointments for short periods of time (3-5 year terms) in connection with certain categories of Centres and Institutes.

Centre:

A Centre is defined as a structural mechanism established for the purpose of promoting collaborative engagement among its members in the area of research that primarily falls within the framework of a single Faculty. Such research activity must extend the disciplinary or interdisciplinary research provided within the contexts of Independent Programs, Departments, Schools or non-departmentalized Faculties. The majority of membership within a Centre will be from within a single academic Faculty.

We propose two types of Centres:

> *Departmental Research Centre* – A Departmental Research Centre (DRC) may be established when a group of cognate researchers from within a single Independent Program, Department, School, or non-departmentalized Faculty wish to associate and collaborate for the purposes of collectively representing themselves and their research niche to the external community. Graduate students may be granted student membership in a DRC. Such membership does not confer any qualifications or satisfaction of requirements towards their degree designation. This category of Centre will report to the Chair/Director of the Independent Program, Department, School or Dean of the non-departmentalized Faculty in which the majority of members belong and will normally not require any University resources. An Independent Program, Department, School, or non-departmentalized Faculty may choose to provide resources at its discretion. Members of DRCs will carry out their full obligations to their primary or joint academic units. With the focus on research, a DRC will not be permitted to offer any credit instruction. It may, however, be engaged in the offering of non-credit modes of instruction. Temporally limited joint appointments or internal secondments are permitted in accordance with the proposed revised policies on these appointments. Normally, no more than 2 SFU faculty

members may be temporally appointed to a DRC at any one time. Should a DRC seek an exemption to this limitation, they must apply at the time of establishment or renewal and include in their application a clear plan for offsetting the impact of the extended involvement of faculty members on the academic units from which faculty are drawn. These Centres will be established for 3-5 year renewable terms.

Faculty Centres – A Faculty Centre (FC) will be established where there is a group of researchers who wish to collaborate and associate in relation to a special research topic that extends the research programs of more than one Independent Program, Department, or School, especially those that are interdisciplinary in nature. To qualify as a FC, there must be significant membership drawn from two or more disciplines within a Faculty. Graduate students may be granted student membership in a FC. Such membership does not confer any qualifications or satisfaction of requirements towards their degree designation. While typically focused upon research, a FC may also engage in multi-, or interdisciplinary programming of a supplemental (non-degree granting) nature to programming within disciplines. It may, however, be engaged in the offering of non-credit modes of instruction. Temporally limited joint appointments or internal secondments are permitted in accordance with the proposed revised policies on these appointments. Normally, no more than 2 SFU faculty members may be temporally appointed to a FC at any one time. Should a FC seek an exemption to this limitation, they must apply at the time of establishment or renewal and include in their application a clear plan for offsetting the impact of the extended involvement of faculty members on the academic units from which faculty are drawn. FCs are expected to be self-financing. FCs will report to the Dean of a Faculty. They will have 3-5 year renewable terms.

Institutes:

An Institute is defined as a structural mechanism established for the purpose of promoting collaborative engagement among its members in the areas of research or research and teaching that crosses the boundaries of Faculties or which involve other Universities and/or Institutions. Such research and teaching activity must extend the disciplinary or interdisciplinary research and teaching provided within the contexts of Faculties. Significant membership must be drawn from each of two or more Faculties, or involve a University or Institution outside of Simon Fraser University. An Institute will be established where there is a group of researchers and educators who wish to collaborate and associate in relation to a special research topic that extends the research programs of more than one Faculty. They may also engage in multi-, or interdisciplinary programming of a supplemental (non-degree granting) nature to programming within Faculties. Graduate students may be granted "graduate student membership" in an Institute. Such membership does not confer any qualifications or satisfaction of requirements towards their degree designation. An Institute may offer credit and non-credit courses and certificates that lead to degree credit but will not be degree-granting. Temporally limited joint appointments or internal secondments are permitted in accordance with the policies on these appointments. A limited number of SFU faculty members will be permitted within an Institute. An application outlining the extent of faculty participation envisioned for a particular Institute must be presented to Senate at the time Institute approval or renewal. Such application must include a clear plan for offsetting the impact of the extended involvement for the academic units

from which faculty are drawn. Faculty members who teach approved credit courses within an Institute will have their instructional activity count towards their annual workload as provided by the Faculty Workload Policy A30.03. These Institutes are expected to secure significant external funding for their operations. Normally, they will have 3-5 year renewable terms unless the agreement of an Institute dictates other conditions on the term of the Institute.

Faculty Participation in Centres and Institutes

As has been overviewed in the sub-sections above, the Task Force recommends temporally and numerically limited appointment mechanisms for faculty members to engage with certain categories of Centres and Institutes. Such provision requires identification of the ways in which performance reviews will be conducted and workloads will be developed. With regard to performance reviews, the Task Force recommends that the primary academic department of the individual remain their discipline. As a consequence, as is true with current academic policy, performance review is centered within the disciplinary unit. The Centre or Institute would be required, as is the case for secondary appointments to disciplines, to provide an assessment to the primary discipline of the accomplishments and contributions made by the faculty member to the Centre/Institute, in accordance with the provisions and processes identified in the performance review policies of faculty members.

In the matter of workload assignment, the Task Force believes that the workload of faculty members who have joint appointments with Centres and Institutes will be as provided for in the Faculty Workload Policy (A30.03). Particularly in the case of Centres/Institutes that seek to have faculty members engage in credit teaching activities of the Centre/Institute, we envision that the faculty member, the Director of the Centre/Institute, and the Chair/Director of the disciplinary home will negotiate a workload arrangement that is consistent with University policy and is satisfactory to all parties. Given the diverse nature of agreements that might be imagined, we do not wish to make any recommendation that might constrain the productive agreement of the parties.

Centre/Institute Quality Review

The Task Force believes that Centres and Institutes at Simon Fraser University must be viewed as important vehicles for advancing research and enhancing the research profile and agenda of the University. To ensure that we are successful in this regard, the Task Force believes that there needs to be increased rigor introduced into the adjudication of the application of Centres and Institutes and the renewal processes that will occur in the final year of the term of the Centre or Institute. We also believe that those Centres and Institutes that do not meet the expected standards of quality should not be renewed.

The Task Force has not had the opportunity to research what processes should be established to achieve the goals we outline in the previous paragraph. We are aware that currently Centres and Institutes are established through review and approval processes of the Senate Committee on University Priorities and Senate, which we do not believe should be changed. We believe that,

particularly at the time of renewal, additional evaluation processes (perhaps with external review as in the case of CTEF applications) will need to be developed. We recommend that the Vice-President, Research be mandated to develop the appropriate review processes to ensure the overall quality and reputation of Centres and Institutes at Simon Fraser University. We further recommend, that the Vice-President, Academic participate in the development of appropriate review processes for those Centres and Institutes that involve credit teaching.

Summary and Recommendations

As we think about the changes we have proposed over the course of this volume, we return our thoughts back to the four qualities (see p. 9-10) that we are striving to have emblematic of Simon Fraser University in the year 2025.

Independent Programs are important vehicles for change, experimentation and new knowledge creation. The way in which they support interdisciplinarity through cross-disciplinary faculty collaboration and collegial interconnection will enable Simon Fraser University to meet its goals in creating a nourishing environment for faculty members, for providing new learning opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students, and for responding to pressing societal issues.

The College for Lifelong and Experiential Learning is one of the most significant initiatives being recommended by the Task Force. This entity will demonstrate Simon Fraser University's long-standing commitment to the educational experience of undergraduate and graduate students and to the communities we serve. It will incubate, develop and nourish cross-Faculty, interdisciplinary educational experiences for students that will enhance their disciplinary degrees. It will be the locus for profiling the many and varied experiential learning opportunities for students both newly developed within the College but also in academic areas throughout the University.

The changes to the Centre and Institute policy are viewed by the Task Force as important to ensure the increased stature of Simon Fraser University's research contribution and activity. The increased mechanisms for faculty engagement and commitment, for graduate student participation, and for the development of research driven interdisciplinary courses and supplemental components to graduate programming are, we believe, important contributions to the future of the University.

> *Recommendation 24: That the structural elements as described this report be adopted as part of the structural framework for Simon Fraser University.*

> *Recommendation 25: That the Vice-President, Research be mandated to develop a systematic and rigorous process of evaluation for the establishment and renewal of Centres and Institutes.*

"REMOVING BARRIERS: A DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE OF SFU"
FINAL REPORT

VOLUME VI – IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCESS FORWARD

Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure

Presented to the University Community
February 11, 2008

VOLUME VI – IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCESS FORWARD

The recommendations contained throughout this report are recognizably both substantial and ambitious. As a consequence, we have attempted to carefully think our way through at least some of the issues that will arise with the implementation of the initiatives and structural changes we have identified. Over the forthcoming sections we will discuss issues of impact on faculty, staff and student complements, assess logistical issues related to our multi-campus geography, provide our best assessment as to the potential cost implications of our recommendations, and propose an implementation timeframe for their execution. We will also outline the next steps in our process, identifying opportunities for consultation with the University community and the imagined timelines for consideration by Senate and the Board of Governors.

Implementation Issues

Implementation Issues for Students, Faculty and Staff

The most important implementation issue arising from our recommendations is the potential impact of our proposals on students, faculty, and staff. We assure all members of the University community that the work of the Task Force over the past year has been carefully guided by the Senate approved principles, and notably principle 8:

> 8. *Any proposed change to the University's academic structure should be based on carefully considered analysis of the reasons and need for change, its impact on members of the unit as well as other academic units affected by the proposed changes, its respectfulness of members of the University community, its transparency, and its opportunity for meaningful collegial engagement throughout.*

Students

Throughout our process we have attempted to seek the input and engagement of students. There has been notable engagement by student representatives from Communication, Contemporary Arts, and various of the disciplines and programs in environmental areas, and the graduate student caucus of the School of Computing Science. The engagement of these students has been critical to our understanding and consideration of the potential impact of various proposals. Generally, students have encouraged us to be forward thinking, to increase visibility and profile in the areas that we have designated for new Faculty creation, and to provide more coherent and easily navigable ways for the pursuit of their studies in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts. We have been buoyed by their enthusiasm and reminded of the critical mission of the University to provide outstanding educational opportunities and experiences for students.

The most critical issues of implementation confronting the student body with regard to the academic structure recommendations we believe are as follows:

- That there will be seamlessness in the implementation of new Faculty alignments, unit relocations, and new governance relationship and that these occur in a way that ensures that educational programming remains stable and of the highest quality.
- That the degree credentials in which students are currently registered remain intact, highly respected, and internationally recognized.
- That students registered in the Bachelor of General Studies, Applied Science, will be able to complete their program of study despite the dissolution of the Faculty of Applied Sciences.

We recommend that, should Senate approve the recommendations of this report, that the above three issues be accepted as commitments that must be guaranteed to students.

As the recommendations of the Task Force also include the onset of significant new opportunities for students in terms of experiential learning and new program opportunities, we further recommend that Senate recognize the following principles for students:

- That the introduction of a system of experiential credit initiative be undertaken with careful thought for undergraduate students in its relationship to the W, Q, B initiative, and for both graduate and undergraduate students in the ways in which it will provide a value-added component to the educational experience at Simon Fraser University without leading to an overall increase in degree credit requirements.
- That the opportunities for students to pursue new educational programming that may develop in each of the new Faculties, as elsewhere in the University, be designed with appropriate structures of transference that recognize the existing educational achievements and credit learning of students at Simon Fraser University.
- That appropriate "opportunity portals" be developed so that students have greater clarity in terms of the educational opportunities that exist for them in the areas of studying health, environmental issues, language training, and in the diverse array of experiential opportunities that are available across the University.

Faculty Members

We believe that the various processes of engagement we have undertaken prior to making our recommendations are the reason why the recommendations for new Faculties have been nearly unanimously supported by faculty members in all of the directly affected units. We take this as a very positive endorsement of the merit of our proposals and the view by the academic complement that our proposals will ensure a productive, creative, and stimulating research and teaching environment for faculty members' careers at Simon Fraser University.

Nonetheless, we also recognize that there will be a very few faculty members within directly affected units who will not see the proposed Faculty location for them as being the opportune environment for their intellectual research and teaching development and career. We believe it imperative that the University work with these individuals to ensure that suitable academic homes are found. While we recognize that there is an existing University process for relocation from one academic unit to another, we would suggest that the University develop a streamlined and expedited process for relocation. Further, we recommend that the Vice-President, Academic

identify an appropriate bridge-to-the-future style financial strategy to facilitate a smooth transition without negative consequence for the unit of departure or reception.

Staff Members

The dissolution of the Faculty of Applied Sciences is the one recommendation of the Task Force that has a direct impact on administrative, professional, technical and clerical staff. This undoubtedly has led, and will continue to lead, to a period of anxiety and uncertainty for staff members in this area. We believe, therefore, that it is fundamentally important that if the recommendations of this report are approved by Senate and the Board of Governors, that the University establish, immediately upon approval, a process of engagement, opportunity assessment, and review with all affected staff.

It is not in our power to guarantee positions to all affected staff. However, notwithstanding the limitations of our power, the creation of three new Faculties, all requiring new administrative infrastructure, should actually lead to a substantial number of additional position opportunities. As a consequence, we are highly optimistic, that all staff affected by our recommendation to dissolve the Faculty of Applied Sciences will find an opportunity for a continued employment relationship with the University.

We have confirmed with the Vice-President, Legal Affairs, that the full extent of all staff related employment policies and provincial labour regulations will be the foundation for decisions and that the University will make considerable effort to find suitable employment opportunities for all affected staff.

Implementation Issues for Administrative Areas, Systems and Infrastructure Support

The comprehensive nature of our recommendations will lead to significant transitional activities in various areas of the University's administrative offices, processes, systems, and infrastructures. Further, the interrelated and multifaceted nature of our recommendations will require concerted leadership, management and timely execution. To effectively steer this process forward, the Vice-President, Academic will establish a Senior Administrative Implementation Steering Committee that will oversee the management and implementation of the administrative changes. This Steering Committee will be comprised of the Vice-President, Academic, Associate Vice-President, Academic, Vice-President, Legal Affairs, Vice-President, Finance and Administration, Vice-President, Research, Associate Vice-President, Students and International, Chief Information Officer, Director, University Secretariat, Registrar and Senior Director, Student Enrollment, and Project Coordinator. A Working Group will also be established with membership from Human Resources, Academic Relations, Budgeting, Financing, Institutional Research and Planning, Graduate Studies, Student Services, and others as required.

While we cannot identify all administrative and implementation issues that will be undertaken, we are aware of at least the following categories:

- Academic leadership search processes for Faculty Deans, Dean of the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning, Director of Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration
- Staff searches for administrative offices of new Faculties
- Substantive changes to academic and research policies resulting from the direct recommendations of our report
- Changes to Senate Committee and Subcommittee membership and elections processes
- Editorial changes to academic, administrative and personnel policies that reference academic structural entities, bodies, or representatives
- Changes to registration systems, enrollment processes, calendar changes, advising, recruitment materials
- Degree designation matters including potentially new degree designations, grandfathering for Bachelor of General Studies, Applied Science and Applied Science degrees
- Financial systems changes and budget redistribution across new Faculties
- Personnel system changes and notifications for academic, professional and clerical staff
- Significant programming and reports changes by Institutional Research and Planning to ensure ongoing meaningful institutional data records
- Re-categorization process for Centres/Institutes
- Various new information documentation, media announcements, and publicity to prospective students, counselors, potential donors and the external community in general
- Eventual physical relocations of units to provide for clustering of Faculty activities

While the above represent the general implementation issues that will be required, we note two specific implementation issues that arise directly from the creation of new Faculties. First, the Deans' search policy will need to be examined in terms of faculty member representation for Faculties with fewer than four units. Further, the anticipated asymmetrical configuration of the new Environment Faculty will require a further amendment to the ratification procedure so that each department and school has a meaningful voice in the selection of the Dean. Second, the relocation of the Environmental Science Program from the Faculty of Science to the new Environment Faculty as an independent program will require a 1-2 FTE faculty position commitment to ensure leadership and stabilization of the program.

Multi-Campus Reality

Unlike some other multi-campus institutions, Simon Fraser University has retained a firm view that we are a single, unified University with several campus locations. All Faculties have a core presence at Burnaby Mountain. All Faculties are now offering programming at Surrey. And most Faculties have at least limited programming in downtown Vancouver. This geographic spread of our activities raises questions for the University. How do we retain a unified vision of Simon Fraser University? How do faculty, staff and students retain a sense of connectivity to the University as a whole, and to their colleagues and fellow students when separated by distance? How do faculty and students participate in the programming and activities at all campuses? These questions are not new for the University. Nonetheless, they are critically important questions being asked by our colleagues, and the activities of the Task Force have provided a venue for them to be revisited.

While addressing University multi-campus identity and connectivity is not a direct area of our mandate, we believe that the issues do interweave with some of our recommendations. If we truly seek to effectively serve our diversely located communities and to retain the excellence and importance of our core commitments to the liberal arts and sciences and to the opportunity for students to have a rich, rewarding, experiential, and multi-disciplinary education, we must find ways to better facilitate the movement of faculty and students between our campuses. In our view this means we must explore ways to solve two critical issues: transportation and course scheduling.

The Skytrain provides an effective transportation bridge between our downtown Vancouver campus and the Surrey campus, but transportation between either of these campuses and the Burnaby Mountain campus must be improved. With the announcement on January 14, 2008 of over $14 billion dollars being committed to improving transportation in the Greater Vancouver Regional District over the next six years, Simon Fraser University must urgently and actively lobby for improved access to our Burnaby campus and better interconnectivity between campuses.

The second area of challenge for a multi-campus institution is to ensure that course scheduling occurs in such a way as to enable faculty and students to move effectively between sites to deliver or obtain programming. This is a complex process that will require the expertise of the University's Registrar, the curriculum planning bodies of the University, and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. We recommend that the Vice President, Academic mandate the Registrar to undertake a review of course scheduling in consultation with the other areas identified and to prepare a report of recommendations for consideration by the Vice President, Academic.

In addition to these two critical areas of consideration, the vision of Simon Fraser University as a single institution with multiple campus facilities carries with it a requirement that each campus must be seen as embodying our core commitments and strategic priorities. As a consequence we must ensure that in addition to the defining features of each of our campuses and the unique populations they serve, that research and graduate level programming is a thriving and expanding component of all of our facilities.

Finally, while we must strive not to duplicate activities and functions, we must be mindful that in those Faculties with significant constituencies spread across campus sites, important segments of administrative operations of the Faculties must effectively serve each of the sites and have meaningful presence at them. This may require space planning to facilitate the presence of certain key members of the administrative team at each campus on a rotational schedule.

Context for Costs

When the Vice-President, Academic initiated the work of the first Task Force in the Fall of 2005, he did not do so in a context of financial crisis, crisis of reputation, or crisis of vision, that is often typical of restructuring exercises at other academic institutions. He did so in view of designing the best University for the future: a University that would be seen as a leader in the

liberal arts and sciences, in areas of great societal concern such as environment, education, and health, in recognition of the need for resuscitating the value and importance of arts and culture in society and in universities, and in areas of professional and applied fields. The Task Force has aimed to build upon our many and internationally renowned strengths and excellence. We have strived to enhance the environment for research and graduate education. We have sought to develop one of the most distinguished and exciting undergraduate student experiences in the nation. We have aimed to strengthen the environment for faculty members providing them with opportunities and support for discovery both within disciplines and in new interdisciplinary collaborations and it is envisioned that this will afford Simon Fraser University with the continued ability to attract and retain the world's leading scholars and educators. And, finally, the Task Force has recognized that Simon Fraser University in the future will engage with our communities in unparalleled ways, revitalizing art and culture in society, opening our doors to diverse communities locally and internationally and truly be an institution that, by its actions, demonstrates it is "thinking of the world" and contributing to it.

At present, we are clearly feeling the forces of tight fiscal realities and the Task Force has been critically concerned with the current reality and the recommendations that we are proposing. We do not wish in any way to minimize the current budgetary context nor to downplay the fact that our recommendations indeed have cost implications for the University. We understand that there are competing views as to what the priorities for investment should be and we have heard the concerns about the financial climate of the University raised during Open Forums discussions and in other feedback to the Task Force. As this discussion has unfolded it has at times taken the character of a competition between financial commitment to the core liberal arts and sciences and commitment to new initiatives. We wish to comment briefly on this critically important issue and perception. During the five-year period 2002/03 to 2006/07 the academic operating budget of the Faculties has nearly doubled, growing from $88.5 million to $166.4 million; an 88% growth. During this time, the budgeted CFL faculty complement grew 22% from 714.3 FTE to 874.4 FTE; annualized graduate and undergraduate FTE enrolment grew by a more modest, but still sizeable amount, 14%. The growth in the academic operating budgets and CFL faculty complements of the Faculties is, in the view of the Task Force, a clear demonstration of the commitment by the University to support and develop our core areas of commitment. We would not be prepared to make the recommendations we do in this report if we felt that in doing so we would in any way compromise the core strength of the arts and sciences, applied and professional programming of the University. Our reputation for excellence will continue to depend on our strength in these areas.

The Vice President, Academic has for many years had a modest budget to direct to strategic new directions of the University. For at least the past five years, this fund (aptly named the Strategic Initiatives Fund), has had a continuing base budget of $600,000 to $650,000. This is only 0.7% of the amount dedicated to the academic operating budgets of the Faculties in 2002/03. In 2008/09, the Strategic Initiatives Fund was increased to $950,000, but in comparison to the significantly increased academic operating budgets of the Faculties, this investment has proportionally declined in comparison, and represents approximately 0.6%. In the past, the Strategic Initiatives Fund has been used to develop such initiatives as the Faculty of Health Sciences, the University Curriculum Initiative (W-Q-B), and new program development.

Ultimately, the Task Force believes that to stop investing in new initiatives chosen carefully in consideration of maintaining excellence for the University's future would be a significant detriment to the institution. Over the past twenty years, the University has met several occasions of tight budgetary times with fierce resilience and pragmatic decision-making. Yet despite these belt-tightening periods, we have always continued to move the University forward. The Task Force believes we must continue this fundamental spirit of advancement.

We have noted that there will be costs associated with the recommendations we have proposed over the course of this report. We believe it essential to be open and transparent in our expectation of what the University may expect in terms of these costs. The costs notably are *estimates* based on our understanding of the scope of our recommendations and the current average costs in the University. The costs we identify should be understood to be the "costs of change" and do not represent long-term future development costs, just as our cost overview does not include the long-term future development costs of the already established academic Faculties and initiatives at the University.

We would also like to expressly note, that this cost summary is provided for information and disclosure purposes only. The Task Force does not have the power to recommend financial commitments of the University and thus this is not an element of our report for express consideration or approval by the University community or Senate. Budgetary decision making ultimately rests with the Board of Governors as part of the annual budget process. This will be independent of our report and the Task Force's activities.

The Task Force also does not wish to leave an impression with the University community that it is only the Task Force recommendations that have a cost. The University is constantly investing in those areas of the University that are untouched by our recommendations, and in a variety of ways that seek to constantly retain and improve the overall quality of teaching, research and outreach at Simon Fraser University. Outside of the main budget provisioning to the Faculties, it is noteworthy that over the past few years, the University has invested nearly $1.4 million recurring dollars in the University Curriculum Initiative, nearly $400,000 base budget in the Student Learning Commons, almost $5 million in retention awards to outstanding faculty members, and significant other amounts in new faculty position creation, faculty start-up, and specific project support. These are clearly not insignificant amounts.

The Strategic Initiatives Fund is suggested by the Task Force as the primary vehicle for financing the recommendations of our report to ensure that our initiatives do not represent a direct call on the existing Faculty budget lines. As is clear given the value of the SIF and the cost of our recommendations, we are recommending a commitment against the SIF for several years. A second source of funding that is critically important to the Vice-President, Academic's ability to support new initiatives, focused around technology, has been the Double the Opportunity (DTO) fund. This fund has not been fully expended in anticipation of potential developments from the Task Force and it could serve as the financial source for the creation of the Faculty of Engineering and Computing as well as the very nominal new positions expected in support of developing a new IT/ICT program.

In consideration of the work of the Task Force, the Vice-President, Academic has been conservative in his deployment of the 2007/2008 SIF, and has some funds remaining for dedication to the recommendations of the Task Force. This fund provides for both one-time non-recurring funding, which will be important for the transitional administrative costs of implementing our recommendations, as well as base recurring funding that would support the creation of the positions and annual budget of the new Faculties, College, and Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration.

Specific Costs

The Task Force imagines that each new Faculty will cost an average of $750,000 new base funding. Differences will exist between each of the three proposed Faculties based on the number of constituent units, the amount of decentralized budgeting already in place to the School/Department level, and the extent of administrative position start up cost requirements. This provides an estimated total for the creation of three new Faculties of approximately $2.25 million base funding. In addition to these administrative structure set up costs for the new Faculties, the Task Force report also calls for the dedication of 6-8 new FTE positions for new integrative programming in the Environment Faculty, which we predict will require an additional $750,000 base funding to the overall budget. The total budgetary costs of the three new Faculties, therefore is estimated to be $3.0 million.

The dissolution of the Faculty of Applied Sciences will provide $1.0 million toward this total. The unspent Double the Opportunity Fund will be able to cover the cost of the new Faculty of Engineering and Computing. This leaves a net base budget requirement of $1.25 million. The Vice-President, Academic has this base commitment available from outstanding funds from the 2007/08 Strategic Initiatives Fund, the dedication of the 2008/09 SIF fund and some portion of the future SIF fund for new position creation related to integrative programming in the Environment Faculty. The Task Force is aware that stipulating position growth of any magnitude for the Environment Faculty is a controversial commitment given the current freeze on faculty positions elsewhere in the University. We understand the concern of our colleagues in this regard. Nonetheless, we sincerely believe that there are several important reasons for proceeding with our recommendation for the commitment of faculty positions to the new Environment Faculty. First, the vision for the new Faculty is one that is intended to be inclusive of, and enhancing to, the existing strengths of the University. The integrative programming that is intended to emerge through the efforts of the Faculty Interdisciplinary Planning Committee is mandated to identify a modest number of core positions that will fill gaps, augment strengths, and enable new research and programming of an interdisciplinary character to flourish. This should have significant benefits to disciplines both within and external to the new Faculty. Second, the environment is clearly one of the most pressing societal issues of the 21st Century. There is near consensus that while progress in understanding is being made, solutions to issues of global climate change require new ways of thinking of environmental problems. The title of the New York Times article on December 25th, captures the direction that post-secondary educational institutions around the world are heading "Threat So Big, Academics Try Collaboration". Third, evidence from new initiatives across the continent demonstrates that areas of environmental research and education are attracting external financial support.

Numerous examples can be pointed to, but locally there have been two important announcements that demonstrate the potential within British Columbia. The University has just received a donation for the establishment of the Libre-Ero Chair Coastal Studies. In addition, the Provincial Government announced on January 25, 2008 that it will seek legislative approval for $94.5 million to create the Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions (PICS). This Institute will bring together top scientists, government and the private sector to develop innovative climate change adaptation and mitigation solutions. Hosted by the University of Victoria, the collaboration includes the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University and the University of Northern British Columbia. These examples are illustrative of the potential for attracting significant external funding, a strategy which the Task Force believes can be actively pursued to assist with the costs of the new Environment Faculty proposed for Simon Fraser University. Third, we note that the commitment of new positions to the Environment Faculty is dependent upon Senate approval of a blueprint for integrated programming that has a strong indication of future student enrolment demand and will require Board approval of the overall University's Faculty Recruitment Plan in each year where positions are recommended. Finally, we note that this is a staged recommendation, with anticipated commitment of faculty positions occurring over a three year period between 2009/2010 and 2011/2012 which therefore calls for a very modest position commitment (approximately 2-3 positions) in any given fiscal year.

The creation of the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning has minimal establishment costs, expected to be approximately $150,000 in total. It does, however, have more significant longer term costs as the Experiential Learning Division, and the experiential credit initiative are each implemented. It is anticipated that the total costs for the staged implementation of these over the next 3-5 years would be approximately $500,000 to $750,000 in base funding.

The third substantive cost proposal of the Task Force is connected to the establishment of an Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration (OIC), the activities it is mandated to undertake and support, and the Centres and Institutes Support Centre within the OIC. It is anticipated that the development of this shared infrastructure as well as staffing positions (Director, and support staff) and interdisciplinary initiatives operating budget will be in the neighborhood of $500,000 base funding. In addition, the Task Force has called earlier in this report for a commitment of approximately $90,000 to $100,000 base funding per year for the establishment of three new funds to support interdisciplinarity (Small Interdisciplinary Project Funding, Interdisciplinary Conference Funding, and Interdisciplinary Teaching Development Fund). We wish to make two important clarifications with regard to the financial costs of the Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration. First, The OIC is intended to develop incrementally as strategic funding envelopes of the University permit. In the implementation timeline that follows this section, we recommend that the OIC be established in September 2010. Further, we believe that there are significant external fundraising opportunities for interdisciplinarity that would enable the OIC to develop modest shared facilities to support all research centres and institutes of the University. Finally, the Task Force is of the view that even when fully developed, the staffing of the OIC should be minimal in complement. We envision a senior level academic director and up to 2 support staff to assist researchers across the University with administrative activities related to research collaborations, develop profiling networks of academic programming and research activity in strategic interdisciplinary areas of the University, and to help reduce administrative

burdens of faculty members related to interdisciplinary collaboration so that they can focus their time and energy on research and the development of interdisciplinary programming.

Perhaps the most ambitious cost item of the Task Force's proposals, is the creation of a Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship. Preliminary cost calculations for creating the program of distinction imagined, its state-of-the-art facilities, distinguished visitor housing and salary costs, institute personnel costs, international conference and proceedings activities, are significant. We imagine that an annual base operating cost of approximately $1.25 million is required, with a capital facility cost of between $10 and $15 million. The Task Force sees such potential of this initiative as advancing the University's international research profile and graduate education aspirations, that we have not shied away from our recommendation to proceed despite the magnitude of our preliminary costs. However, we do not believe it possible for the University to bear these costs directly, and therefore we recommend that this entire initiative be the focus of a major fundraising initiative of the University.

A final cost component of our recommendations is the costs for the transitional implementation of the recommendations. In consideration of temporary staff requirements for implementation in our student, financial and personnel systems, as well as project coordination during the implementation phase, we predict non-recurring implementation costs of approximately $450,000 spread over the next two years. Further, we anticipate that the Vice-President, Academic may need to dedicate up to $500,000 in a bridge-to-the-future program for non-relocating faculty members and program stabilization. We understand from the Vice-President, Academic, that these amounts can be identified through outstanding non-recurring funds remaining from 2007/08 as well as modest amounts from 2008/09 and 2009/10 calls on recurring funds of the University.

Implementation and Prioritization of Recommendations

The following schedule provides a projected ideal timeline for the implementation of the activities that are embedded within the recommendations of the Task Force over the course of our report.

I. Cognitive Science Review

    i.   April 2008 – External Review of Cognitive Science

II. Committees, Policy Changes, Academic Leadership Processes Begin

    ii.   June 2008 – Establishment of Committee on Experiential Learning (Report due August 2009)

    iii.   June 2008 – Establishment of Student Mobility/Course Access Committee (Report due August 2009)

    iv.   June 2008 – Mandate given to VP Legal to negotiate with SFUFA revisions to joint appointments policy along the principles of change identified, creation of new internal secondments policy, team teaching policy, process for review of

interdisciplinary work, and modifications to other academic policies affected by the changes in academic structure

v. June 2008 – Mandate given to VP Research to make revisions to Policy R40.01

vi. June 2008 – Mandate given to Dean of Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to develop a comprehensive plan for Foreign Language Studies unit

vii. June 2008 – Establishment of Environment Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Committee

viii. June 2008 – Establishment of Mandate to Dean of Graduate Studies to review interdisciplinary graduate programming and graduate financial support

ix. June 2008 - Creation of Joint Planning Committee for IT/ICT Program

x. June 2008 – Vice-President, Academic initiates process to appoint Acting Deans for each new Faculty.

xi. September 2008 – Vice-President, Academic to revisit Report on English Language Learning

xii. September 2008 – Process for Reclassification of Existing Centres/Institutes under new policy begins

III. Faculty and Unit Alignment Changes Occur

xiii. April 2009 – School of Kinesiology moves to Faculty of Science

xiv. April 2009 – Establishment of Faculty of Engineering and Computing

xv. April 2009 – Network Support Group relocated to Faculty of Engineering and Computing

~~xv.~~xvi. April 2009 – Establishment of Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Communication & Design (working name)

~~xvi.~~xvii. April 2009 – Master of Publishing Program and Contemporary Arts move from Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences to new Faculty

~~xvii.~~xviii. April 2009 – TechOne Program established in permanent location

~~xviii.~~xix. April 2009 – Establishment of Environment Faculty

~~xix.~~xx. April 2009 – Department of Geography is realigned from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to the Environment Faculty

~~xx.~~xxi. April 2009 – School of Resource and Environmental Managements is relocated from the Faculty of Applied Sciences to the Environment Faculty

~~xxi.~~xxii. April 2009 - Environmental Science Program becomes established as a new Department of Environmental Sciences within Environment Faculty

~~xxii.~~xxiii. April 2009 – Centre for Sustainable Community Development moves from Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences to Environment Faculty

~~xxiii.~~xxiv. April 2009 – Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies is formally positioned within the Environment Faculty

xxv. April 2009 – Establishment of College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning

xxvi. April 2009 – Consolidation of Centre for Dialogue and Semester in Dialogue into Program in Dialogue within College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning

xxviii.xxvii._____September 2011 – Dissolution of Faculty of Applied Sciences (date to be finalized)

IV. Assessment Reports are Due

xxx-xxviii.   December 2008 – Report on the future of TechOne
    Program provided to Vice President, Academic

xxix. April 2009 – Report of Environment Planning Committee due

xxxi-xxx.   April 2009 – Report on Foreign Language Study unit
    due from Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

xxxii-xxxi.   August 2009 – Report from Committee on
    Experiential Learning due to Senate

xxxiii-xxxii.   August 2009 – Report from Student Mobility and
    Course Access Committee due

xxxiii.September 2009 – Report due from Joint Planning Committee for IT/ICT Program

xxxiv.September 2009 – Report due from Dean of Graduate Studies regarding
    interdisciplinary graduate programming

xxxiv-xxxv.   September 2009 – Vice-President, Academic to have
    developed and begun execution of plan for English Language Learning

V. New Programming Commences

xxxvi.September 2009 – New Integrative Programming in Environment Faculty launched

xxxvii.   September 2009 – Establishment of unit for Foreign
    Language Studies in Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

xxxviii.   September 2010 – New IT/ICT Program launched

VI. Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration Established

xxxviii-xxxix. April 2010 – Search begins for Director of Centre for Interdisciplinary
    Collaboration

xxxix-xl.   September 2010 – Establishment of Office for Interdisciplinary
    Collaboration

xl-xli. September 2010 – Creation of SFU Health Network

VII. Development of Institute for Advanced Scholarship

xli-xlii. September 2010 – Fundraising campaign begins for Simon Fraser University
    Institute for Advanced Scholarship

xlii-xliii.   September 2012 – Establishment of Simon Fraser University Institute for
    Advanced Scholarship

Aside from the sheer pragmatic constraints on implementing the broad scope of recommendations contained in our report, we recognize that the University's current year financial realities may require a more staggered implementation of the recommendations in this report, than might be ideally desired. Should that be the case, we would recommend the following priority implementation of our recommendations:

1st Priority: - creation of new Faculties and policy changes

2nd Priority: - creation of College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning
3rd Priority: - establishment of Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration
4th Priority: - development of Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship

External Fundraising

We have noted the strong potential we believe the SFU Institute for Advanced Scholarship will have for attracting external donations. Equally, or perhaps even more likely, we believe that the new Environment Faculty that we have conceptualized will be highly attractive to external fundraising activities as well, perhaps, to new dedicated programs by provincial and national governments or organizations. We also feel that if the overall recommendations that we have made, combined with the existing strengths at the University, were packaged together, there could be a great opportunity for a campaign dedicated to the future of Simon Fraser University: a vision of social responsibility, community engagement, experiential learning, graduate education, research excellence, and leadership. We encourage the Vice-Presidents and Advancement office to explore such a potential.

Senate Consideration

In November 2006, Senate gave the Task Force a threefold mandate to review the academic structure of the university, evaluate the ways in which our academic structural elements are being deployed, and to determine if Simon Fraser University is effectively supporting, nourishing and developing interdisciplinarity. We have now, slightly more than a year later completed our report and have offered in its pages 25 recommendations in consideration of our mandate.

It is noteworthy as we draw our report to a close that our recommendations fall into three broad categories: (1) those that aim to directly change the academic structure of the University through the creation or dissolution of academic Faculties, a new College and the relocation of academic units; (2) those that require process review, program proposal development, or administrative action (such as a Foreign Language Studies program, an IT/ICT Program, a study and proposal on Experiential Learning, etc.) the fruits of which will require full development and future consideration by Senate; and (3) those suggestions to negotiated policies between the University and the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association that are the purview of the negotiation process.

We will leave it to the wisdom of the Senate Committee on University Priorities to whom we submit this report, to determine how best to develop motions to deal with the first two areas of our recommendations. We fully understand the need for the presentation of motions in accordance with the University Act and the powers and responsibilities of Senate. We ask though, that Senate and all of the readers of this report recognize that the vision the Task Force has set out for 2025, and the success we believe that can be achieved for the institution by its execution, is not a fragmented one. Our recommendations have been organized in sub-categories consistent with the three areas of our mandate. But really, it is a single vision, a single future, and we strongly believe that we have developed a carefully interwoven blueprint for Simon Fraser University's overall success.

APPENDICES

a. Appendix A – Senate Principles to Guide the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure
b. Appendix B – Procedural Framework to Guide Phase 2 Task Force
c. Appendix C – Phase 1 Task Force Vision for SFU in the Year 2025
d. Appendix D – Summary of Submissions to the Phase 2 Task Force
e. Appendix E – Summary of Working Group Composition and Submission Distribution
f. Appendix F – Summary of all Task Force Recommendations
g. Appendix G – Bibliographic References

APPENDIX A - PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE THE PHASE 2 TASK FORCE
ON ACADEMIC STRUCTURE

1. The University's academic structure should continue to enhance and support innovation, excellence, integration, engagement and adaptability in teaching and research.
2. The University's academic structure should allow for responsiveness within a framework of stability. It should reaffirm our commitment to the liberal arts and sciences, to professional and applied programming, and to the fundamental value of discipline based inquiry and to the opportunities afforded by interdisciplinarity.
3. The University's academic structure should enable us to be effectively positioned for the opportunities and challenges that will be presented to us: it should position us to succeed in a demand-driven student enrolment environment; it should be financially viable within a diversified fiscal environment; it should advance our distinctiveness and strategic strengths; it should support our engagement with, and response to, increasingly diverse communities and student populations; and it should retain coherence in response to changes that will occur within the intellectual, social, political and economic environment.
4. The University's academic structure should attract outstanding graduate and undergraduate students and facilitate excellence[1] in their learning experience.
5. The University's academic structure should consider our multi-campus presence and accommodate the distinctiveness of each campus while simultaneously contributing to a unified identity for Simon Fraser University as a whole.
6. The University's academic structure should incorporate the increasing number of academic programs into structures that will ensure stability, provide the ability for the units to advance themselves to the fullest extent, provide engagement for its members, and minimize the risks of under-representation in priority setting and budgetary discussions.
7. The University's academic structure should retain or enhance managerial and administrative effectiveness and efficiency particularly as it facilitates and supports effective planning, communication and decision-making, collegial governance, and resource allocation.
8. Any proposed change to the University's academic structure should be based on carefully considered analysis of the reasons and need for change, its impact on members of the unit as well as other academic units affected by the proposed changes, its respectfulness of members of the University community, its transparency, and its opportunity for meaningful collegial engagement throughout.

---

[1] For undergraduate students, the Faculty Structure Task Force believes that excellence should include the following qualities: opportunities for students to explore different disciplines, to engage in interdisciplinary problem-based learning environments, to be exposed to innovative pedagogical approaches and diversified learning opportunities (such as cohort programs, semesters of study, capstone courses, supplemental learning in tutorials, open laboratories and technological enhancements), to engage in experiential learning by means of cooperative education, research participation, civic engagement and/or international study environments, and to have experiences in writing intensive learning, quantitative understanding and knowledge breadth. For graduate students, the Faculty Structure Task Force believes that excellence should include opportunities to explore both the frontiers of knowledge within core disciplines as well as provide opportunities to understand the perspectives of, and intersections with, other disciplines.

APPENDIX B - PHASE 2 TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC STRUCTURE PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK

Senate has approved the following procedural framework to guide the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure:

1. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will have the following composition: the Vice President, Academic who will Chair the Task Force, seven faculty members (one representative from each of the existing Faculties with the exception of Arts and Social Sciences which will have two representatives), an undergraduate-student, and a graduate student. The Vice President, Academic will appoint all members to the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure in consultation with the Senate Committee on University Priorities. Clerical and/or professional personnel will be appointed as required by the Vice President, Academic. The composition of the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will attempt to ensure some continuity in membership between it and the Faculty Structure Task Force.

2. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will receive submissions from the University community.

3. Following the receipt of submissions, the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will establish Working Group(s) to undertake comprehensive evaluation of the proposals. The composition of the Working Group(s) will be determined and appointed by the Vice President, Academic in consideration of the submissions received. Students will be represented on each Work Group established.

4. Evaluation by the Working Group(s) will include extensive opportunities for engagement with members of the community affected by each submission.

5. The Working Group(s) will bring forward a detailed evaluation of submissions to the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure for consideration as a whole. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will engage in extensive University wide consultation on the potential models, strategies for change, and recommendations that it is contemplating in each of the three areas of its mandate. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure may choose to present options related to the areas of its mandate either separately or in combination.

6. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will endeavor to present its final recommendations to Senate by November 2007.

APPENDIX C – PHASE 1 TASK FORCE SUMMARY[2] OF THE VISION FOR SFU IN THE YEAR 2025

- *SFU will be known for the value it places upon, and commitment it has to, innovation, excellence, integration, engagement and adaptability;*
- *SFU will be recognized as the best comprehensive research university in Canada. Its academic strength and comprehensiveness will be demonstrated through its:*
  - o Reaffirmation and continued commitment to its liberal arts and sciences core
  - o Ongoing development and innovation of applied and professional programming
  - o Significant presence and growth in Health Sciences programming
  - o Significant growth and development in strategic research areas including Communication, Computation and Technology; Culture, Society and Human Behavior; Economic Organization, Public Policy and Global Community; Environment; and Health
  - o Evidence of differentiation from other universities
  - o Development of new academic programming within and beyond traditional disciplines;
- *SFU will be known for its far-reaching international strategy:*
  - o This will be in evidence through the many significant international educational and research partnerships between individual faculty members and institutional arrangements, faculty research teams and exchanges, student study abroad programs and joint degree learning opportunities, the expanded internationalization of the curriculum, and the increased opportunity for study and research into global issues;
- *SFU will be recognized for its expanded presence in providing outstanding graduate education*
- *SFU will provide one of the best student experiences in Canada*
  - o It will become a destination for graduate learning with unparalleled opportunities to engage at the frontiers of knowledge and understand the potential intersections with other disciplines
  - o It will offer a unique undergraduate educational experience characterized by the following:
    - ♣ required experiences in writing intensive learning, quantitative understanding, and knowledge breadth,
    - ♣ innovative pedagogical approaches and diversified learning opportunities (cohort programs, semesters of study, capstone courses, supplemental learning in tutorials, open laboratories, and technological enhancements)
    - ♣ experiential learning by means of cooperative education, research participation, civic engagement and/or international study
  - o It will offer a rich spectrum and integrated network of academic and non

---

[2] The key planning documents relied upon include: "SFU: Recreating Canada's Most Exciting University, The President's Agenda 2005-2009"; "Three Year Academic Plan of the Vice President, Academic 2004-2007"; Three Year Academic Plans of the Academic Faculties, Graduate Studies, Continuing Studies, and Student Services; "Strategic Research Plan of Simon Fraser University 2005-2010"; The Strategic Plans for the Vancouver Campus, Surrey Campus and Great Northern Way Campus; and "SFU International Strategic Plan – July 2004 – June 2006. "A Multi-year Enrolment Plan for Simon Fraser University (covering 2004/05 to 2010/2011)

academic student services, supports and experiences;
- *SFU's will have a projected student, staff and faculty complement as follows:*
  - o · an undergraduate student complement of 25,000 – 30,000 FTE
  - o a graduate student complement of 6,500 – 7,500 FTE
  - o an international graduate and undergraduate student complement of 3,000 – 3,500 FTE
  - o a faculty complement of 1,500 – 1,800 FTE with more than 150 faculty recognized as distinguished scholars and/or educators
  - o a staff complement of 2,000 FTE;
- *SFU will have the most comprehensive network of life-long learning opportunities in Canada*
- *SFU will have a comprehensive structure for seeding research and pedagogical innovation; and,*
- *SFU will continue its multi-campus strategy based on differentiated foci at each of its four campuses while simultaneously ensuring effective intercampus connectivity and a coherent and unified SFU identity*
  - o SFU will have significantly expanded physical facilities in Surrey, in Vancouver, and on Burnaby Mountain;
  - o SFU will have developed the best example of an integrated and engaged urban campus in the country at its Vancouver campus. The campus is expected to have:
    - ♣ an undergraduate and graduate student complement of 3,000 credit FTEs
    - ♣ significantly expanded non-credit programming
    - ♣ significantly expanded use of the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue;
  - o SFU will have fully developed academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate level in all Faculties at the Surrey campus and such programming will be distinctive for its cohort learning style and intimate learning experiences;
  - o SFU will have a defined presence at the Great Northern Way campus.

APPENDIX D – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE PHASE 2 TASK FORCE

1. School of Computing Science
2. School of Engineering Science
3. Cognitive Science Program
4. School of Kinesiology
5. Addendum to School of Kinesiology Submission by Dr. Andy Hoffer
6. Proposal for a Sport, Commerce, Culture and Community Program
7. Faculty of Health Sciences
8. Department of Geography
9. School of Resource and Environmental Management
10. Environmental Science Program
11. Joint proposal from Urban Studies Program and the Centre for Sustainable Community Development
12. Graduate Certificate in Development Studies
13. Submission for a new Faculty in the area of Media, new media, communications, information, performance, and dialogue by Dean Brian Lewis
14. School of Communication
15. Submission for a new Department of Media, Culture and Public Policy submitted by Drs. Alison Beale, Zoe Druick, Bob Hackett, Steve Kline, Kirsten McAllister, Catherine Murray and Yuezhi Zhao
16. Proposal for a Program in Technology and Society submitted by Dr. Ellen Balka
17. School for the Contemporary Arts
18. School of Interactive Arts and Technology
19. Master of Publishing Program and the Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing
20. Centre for Dialogue
21. Continuing Studies
22. Department of Philosophy Proposal for Two Centres: Ethics and Political Economy
23. Language Training Institute
24. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
25. Proposal from Dr. Michael Howlett

APPENDIX E - SUMMARY OF WORKING GROUP COMPOSITION AND SUBMISSION DISTRIBUTION

Working Group 1

MEMBERS: Charmaine Dean (Chair), Van Truong, Blaize Reich, Richard Lockhart, Nadine Schuurman, Sue Roppel

PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION: Computing Science; Engineering Science

Working Group 2

MEMBERS: Frank Gobas (Chair), Jonathan Chu, Mark Winston, Richard Lockhart, Sue Roppel

PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION: Health Science; Kinesiology; Cognitive Science; Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences - Item 5

Working Group 3

MEMBERS: Craig Janes (Chair), Jane Friesen, Van Truong, Tim Takaro, Steven Thompson, Sue Roppel

PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION: Geography; Resource & Environmental Management; Urban Studies Program and Centre for Sustainable Community Development; Environmental Science Program; Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences - Items 2 and 4.

Working Group 4

MEMBERS: Jack Martin (Chair), Bob Krider, Van Truong, Kitty Corbett, Cheryl Amundsen, Sue Roppel

PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION: Media, New Media, Communications, Information, Performance, and Dialogue; Contemporary Arts; Interactive Arts & Technology; Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences - Item 3; Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing

Working Group 5

MEMBERS: Paul Budra (Chair), Jonathan Chu, Catherine Murray, Rob Woodbury, Sue Roppel

PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION: Continuing Studies; Philosophy; Centre for Dialogue - Public Scholarship; Language Training Institute; Arts and Social Sciences - Item 1

APPENDIX F – SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: That a Faculty of Engineering and Computing be established.

Recommendation 2: That a new Faculty (name to be determined) comprised of the School of Communication, the School for the Contemporary Arts, the School of Interactive Arts and Technology and the Master of Publishing Program be established.

Recommendation 3: That an Environment Faculty (name to be determined) be established with the following founding units and programs:
- Environmental Science Program as a new Department of Environmental Sciences
- Department of Geography
- School of Resource and Environmental Management
- Centre for Sustainable Community Development
- Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies

Recommendation 4: That a Faculty Interdisciplinary Programming Committee (FIPC) be established with the membership, principles, and blueprint development requirements as outlined in this report and further that this blueprint be presented to Senate[3] for approval by April 2009.

Recommendation 5: That the School of Kinesiology be relocated to the Faculty of Science.

Recommendation 6: That units active in health research and programming pursue the development of new collaborative initiatives.

Recommendation 7: That a "SFU Health Network" be established.

Recommendation 8: That the Faculty of Applied Science be disbanded.

Recommendation 9: That a College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning be established.
- 9.1: That the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning be the locus and home for the encouragement, coordination, interconnection, and development of interdisciplinary, cross-Faculty experiential learning programs.
- 9.1.a: That the Semester in Dialogue and the Centre for Dialogue be consolidated and that they be classified as a College Program within the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning.
- 9.1.b: That the Vice-President, Academic establish a Committee for Experiential Learning (CEL), and that this Committee be established with a mandate to develop a plan for introducing an experiential credit for undergraduate students. We further recommend that the CEL be mandated to submit its plan to Senate by September 2009.

---

[3] Here and elsewhere in this report we will make recommendations that particular processes be considered by Senate. We use the term "Senate" to represent the full process of review and consideration that leads to Senate approval. In no way do we wish to convey any alteration to the standard processes of consideration of approval that exist within the University.

9.2: That the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning house the existing portfolio of Continuing Studies and Distance Education.

Recommendation 10: That the University establish a Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Studies of the highest caliber, made possible through a targeted fundraising campaign for this purpose. We further recommend that the University strive to realize its dream for the creation of the SFU–IAS by the year 2012.

Recommendation 11: That the University establish a new Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration (OIC) with the design, mandate and responsibilities outlined in this report.

Recommendation 12: That the University's Academic Policies be revised as follows:
12.1: That the Joint Appointments Policy be revised in consideration of the suggestions included in this report.
12.2: That the University develop a new policy which would allow for internal secondment of post tenure research faculty and permanent teaching faculty members for 2-5 year terms to Centres and Institutes.
12.3: That the University develop a new policy on Team Teaching.
12.4: That the University develop better provisions for the review of interdisciplinary research and teaching in all academic performance review processes.
12.5: That the Centres and Institutes policy be revised as envisioned in this report.

Recommendation 13: That the Vice-President, Academic in collaboration with the Deans and Vice-Presidents undertake the following:
13.1: Develop a series of incentive strategies and position funding arrangements that would lead to a substantial increase in the number of joint appointments at Simon Fraser University.
13.2: Review the current enrolment based funding allocation formula to identify ways in which funding can effectively flow to support supplementary interdisciplinary course credits offered through Centres and Institutes and new strategic and interdisciplinary program development.

Recommendation 14: That there be formalization and adequate commitments given to the Cognitive Science Program by participating units and that the Terms of Reference for the External Review Team of the Cognitive Science Program (scheduled for early 2008) specifically solicit the advice of the review team on the issues identified in the submission by Cognitive Science to the Task Force.

Recommendation 15: That Senate develop a submission template to ensure that sufficient commitments are in place for the development of new interdisciplinary programs and that such a template addresses the issues identified in this report.

Recommendation 16: That a new "Information and Communications Technology" (IT/ICT) program be collaboratively pursued at Simon Fraser University as follows:

16.1: A Joint Program Development Committee be established with representatives from Computing Science, Engineering Science, Interactive Arts and Technology, Business Administration, Cognitive Science, and potentially others;

16.2: The IT/ICT Joint Program Development Committee develop a report for consideration by Senate by September 2009 outlining the feasibility, faculty gap analysis, resource requirements and draft curriculum of implementing an IT/ICT program at SFU.

Recommendation 17: That the undergraduate publishing courses now offered by the School of Communication be consolidated with the Master of Publishing Program and that Continuing Studies publishing programming be further explored for consolidation with the Master of Publishing Program.

Recommendation 18: That the TechOne Program temporarily be moved to the new Faculty comprised of Contemporary Arts, Communication, Interactive Arts and Technology and Publishing.

18.1: That the Vice President, Academic establish a review committee to examine the design, future and resource allocation of the TechOne Program and to develop a written report by December 2008 for how all constituent units will be provided with a first-year cohort experience that effectively serves their disciplines.

18.2: That upon receipt of the report, the Director of the TechOne program along with the Deans from the Faculty of Engineering and Computing, the new Faculty comprised of Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts and Technology and Publishing, the Faculty of Business Administration, will propose to the Vice-President, Academic the future permanent home for the program. Once the location is agreed to by the Vice-President, Academic, a recommendation would then be forwarded through Senate for approval by no later than March 2009.

Recommendation 19: That the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences present a detailed plan to Senate by no later April 2009 for the establishment of an independent unit for the study of foreign languages based on the vision identified in this report.

Recommendation 20: That the Report of the Language Instruction Committee (2005) be revisited by the Vice-President, Academic with the goal of implementing a coherent, consolidated, and sustainable strategy for English language learning at Simon Fraser University.

Recommendation 21: That a Student Mobility and Course Access Review Committee be established by the Vice-President, Academic to identify barriers to interdisciplinary educational experiences of students. We further recommend that a report of findings, recommendations for improvement, and a plan for implementation, be submitted to Senate by April 2009.

Recommendation 22: That the Dean of Graduate Studies research and recommend a strategy for supporting and stimulating the development of new interdisciplinary graduate programming and providing financial support to graduate students who undertake interdisciplinary projects. We further recommend that his report be presented to Senate for consideration by September 2009.

Recommendation 23: That the Network Support Group be relocated to the Faculty of Engineering and Computing in April 2009 and that it continue to support all areas of the University that it currently serves. Further, we recommend that in April 2010, the Vice President, Academic follow up with areas served by the Network Support Group to ensure that all areas continue to be effectively served.

Recommendation 24: That the structural elements as described this report be adopted as part of the structural framework for Simon Fraser University.

Recommendation 25: That the Vice-President, Research be mandated to develop a systematic and rigorous process of evaluation for the establishment and renewal of Centres and Institutes.

APPENDIX G – REFERENCES CONSULTED

(Note we have not identified those bibliographic materials that were used only by the Working Groups).

Books:

Creating Interdisciplinarity: Interdisciplinary Research and Teaching among College and University Faculty, Lisa R. Lattuca, Vanderbilt University Press, 2001.

Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge. Disciplinarities. and Interdisciplinarities, Julie Thompson Klein, University Press of Virginia, 1996.

Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research, National Academies (of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine) – Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research Committee, National Academy Press, 2005.

Places of Inquiry: Research and Advanced Education in Modern Universities, Burton R. Clark, University of California Press, 1995.

Practising Interdisciplinarity, Edited by Peter Weingart and Nico Stehr, 2000, University of Toronto Press.

Reinventing Ourselves: Interdisciplinary Education. Collaborative Learning. and Experimentation in Higher Education, Editors Barbara Leigh Smith and John McCann, Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 2001.

Articles / Papers / Proposals:

"A Guide to Educational Programs in Environment and Sustainable Development at Columbia University", Office of Educational Programs, The Earth Institute at Columbia University, August, 2006.

"Campus 2020 / Thinking Ahead: The Report. Access and Excellence, The Campus 2020 Plan for British Columbia's Post-Secondary Education System", April 2007, Jeff Plant, QC, and Special Advisor to the British Columbia Provincial Government,

"Computing Curricula 2005", a report produced by the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), the Association of Information Systems (AIS), and the Computer Society of the Institute of Electronics and Electrical Engineers (IEEE-CS), an Information Technology, 2005.

"Education for a Sustainable Future", Science, VOL. 317, p.323-324. July 20, 2007.

Grand Challenges in Environmental Sciences, Committee on Grand Challenges in Environmental Sciences, Oversight Commission for the Committee on Grand Challenges in Environmental Sciences, 2001. **http://www.nap.edu/catalog/9975.html**

InterConnection, Interdisciplinary Studies at Duke University, Volume 5, Issue 1, Fall 2006.

InterConnection, Interdisciplinary Studies at Duke University, Volume 2, Issue 3, April/May 2004.

"Interdisciplinarity: Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities", Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 1972.

"One University in Many Places: Transitional Design to Twenty-First Century Excellence", The President's Response to the University Provost's Recommendations Regarding the University Design Team Report, Arizona State University, April 2004

"Proposal to Create the University of Toronto Centre for Environment", Proposal Submitted to the Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and School of Graduate Studies, April 30, 2004, jointly by the Institute for Environmental Studies, the Division of the Environment and Innis College Environmental Studies program.

"Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities", The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, 1995.

Rising to the Challenge: Integrating Social Science into NSF Environmental Observatories. Shalini Vajjhala, Alan Krupnick, Eleanor McCormick, Morgan Grove, Patricia McDowell, Charles Redman, Leonard Shabman, and Mitchell Small. Resources for the Future. September 2007.

"Risks and Rewards of an Interdisciplinary Research Path", by Diana Rhoten and Andrew Parker, in "Science", 17 December 2004, Volume 306.

"Resources for Interdisciplinary Studies", Julie Thompson Klein, Change, March/April, 2006, p.52-58.

Websites:

University of Alberta, Office of Interdisciplinary Studies, http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/arts/ois.cfm

"Companion Paper #3 - Enabling Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research", "Stepping Up: 2004-2010". University of Toronto, http://www.utoronto.ca

University of British Columbia, College of Interdisciplinary Studies, http://www.cfis.ubc.ca/index.html

Wayne State University, Interdisciplinary Research and Education, Office of the Vice President Research, http://www.research.wayne.edu/idre

University of Tennessee, University Studies Program, http://notes.utk.edu/bio/unistudy.nsf

"Interdisciplinary Project in the Humanities", University of Washington in St. Louis, **http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/%7Eiph**

"President's Opening Address", Dr. Drew Gilpin Faust, Harvard University, July 1, 2007.

Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies, Harvard University.

"Centres and Institutes: Policy on Establishment, Operation, Review, and Discontinuance", University of Toronto, November 30, 2005.

Stanford University Multidisciplinary Initiatives website, http://www.multi.stanford.edu/initiatives

Arizona State University website, http://mynew.asu.edu

Memo to Faculty Colleagues, Dr. B. Bruce Bare, Dean, College of Forest Resources, University of Washington, September 21, 2007.

Environmental Council Strategic Plan, The Environmental Council. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. April 7, 2006.

Simon Fraser University Documents:

"A Vision for Environmental Programming at Simon Fraser University", Jock Munro, November 5, 2007.

"Sommes Nous Prêts? Discussion Paper of the Faculty Structure Task Force", July 2006, Simon Fraser University.

"Final Report of the Faculty Structure Task Force", November 2006, Simon Fraser University.

President's Agenda, Dr. Michael Stevenson, Simon Fraser University. August 22, 2007.

Liber Ero Chair in Coastal Studies, Terms of Reference, Simon Fraser University.

Strategic Research Plan, Simon Fraser University

Centres and Institutes Annual Report, 2007

University Policies:
  o GP 38, Sustainability Draft Policy, Simon Fraser University, November 2007.
  o R40.01 – Centres and Institutes Policy

- o A30.03 - Faculty Workload Policy
- o A11.07 – Joint Appointments
- o A13.05 – Search Committees for Deans