

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Senate Committee on University Priorities
Memorandum

S.08-114

TO: Senate
FROM: Jon Driver
Chair, SCUP and
Vice President, Academic
RE: Faculty of Education
DATE: October 14, 2008

The Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP) has reviewed the External Review Report on the Faculty of Education, together with responses from the faculty, staff and students as well as the Faculty Executive, and input from the Associate Vice President, Academic.

Motion :

That Senate approve the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the Faculty of Education and the Dean of Education on priority items resulting from the External Review.

Following the review team's site visit the report of the External Review Team* for the Faculty of Education was submitted in March 2008. The responses from the Faculty of Education were received in June 2008.

The Review Team believes that the strongest resource in the Faculty is its people. They noted that although the challenges the Faculty is facing are interconnected and complex, the commitment to overcoming them is unflagging.

A number of recommendations were made by the Team which may strengthen the Faculty and prepare it for the future.

SCUP recommends to Senate that the Faculty of Education be advised to pursue the following as priority items.

1. Faculty Strategy:

- Undertake a strategic planning process leading to:
 - An agreed set of priorities or goals against which all individual and collective work can be planned, carried out and evaluated.
 - A structure of organizational units that best suits the achievement of these priorities, more closely aligns with the operations of the Faculty, and supports its various undergraduate, graduate and professional programmes.

- A review of decision making structures and processes to ensure clarity of authority and a high degree of transparency.

2. Communication:

- Continue to seek ways of increasing communication between faculty and staff members at the three campuses including the use of technology, a web portal and the consideration of the introduction of an annual retreat.

3. Research:

- Develop a Faculty Research Strategy that:
 - Defines how research excellence is assessed.
 - Connects the research interests and agendas through informal and formal means as well as individual and group efforts.
 - Provides mechanisms for intellectual exchange among all areas of the Faculty.
 - Aligns the research centres with the University's and the Faculty's priorities to ensure the best use is made of all resources.
 - Enriches the understanding of all aspects of teacher education.

4. Faculty Renewal

- Develop a succession plan for hiring faculty based on clearly defined priorities.
- Intensify efforts at mentoring junior and pre-tenure faculty.

5. Programmes

- Create a system for conducting regular, comprehensive internal evaluations for all programmes.
- Review of the balance of the faculty capacity against student enrollment in each of the programmes
- Develop guidelines for the establishment of new graduate programmes including the possibility of consolidation with existing programmes.

6. Administration

- Review the teaching and service loads carried by junior faculty.
- Review the adequacy of support services including technical support at Surrey and Burnaby and consider extending the video conference facilities between these two campuses.
- Review the performance of all staff members according to an agreed timetable.

- Address the concerns raised by staff regarding their working environment during by:
 - Increasing the level of support for, and communication with the Surrey based staff
 - Reviewing and reclassifying jobs where appropriate
 - Providing adequate IT equipment and services.

* Review Team

Dr. Rina Uptis – Review Team Chair (Queen’s University)
Dr. Graham Pike (University of Prince Edward Island)
Dr. Dennis Thiessen (OISE, University of Toronto)

CC Suzanne de Castell, Acting Dean, Faculty of Education



FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Response to the 2008 Report of the External Review Team

Introduction

The Academic Vice-President's Office is being provided with a two-part Faculty of Education response to the Report from the External Review Team: the first section has been compiled by the Associate Dean-Academic, to present a broad spectrum of responses from faculty, students, and staff. The second section is the Executive's synthesis after collective reflection and consultation with the Dean. We provide both so that a range of opinion is available to the VPA. The Executive's recommended actionable items are shown in section two in *italics*.

Acknowledgements

We wish to express our sincere appreciation to the External Review Team for their hard work, attentiveness and care in the conduct of this external review, and to acknowledge the prodigious efforts of our colleagues, students, staff and faculty, in collectively authoring the self study report which guided the reviewers, and in participating in such a frank and sincere way, in the meetings both prior to, and during, the process of this Faculty's external review, as well as in contributing to the development of this response.

Section One

A Compilation of Responses to the Report of the External Review Team

Framing a Response

It is of course not possible to respond to every element of the report, nor is there, we think, any need to do so: consensus across the Faculty of Education (FoE) is that the review team has arrived at a comprehensive and thorough understanding of our principles, practices and personnel.

For that reason, this response concentrates on matters of concern which arise for us, whether these are areas of disagreement expressed within our own Faculty community, or areas of divergence between the report/recommendations, and what we as a Faculty see as possible, desirable, and necessary at this time, or to draw particular attention to aspects of what we do that, not being explicitly mentioned in the review, we want to make sure are not eroded, lost or overlooked.

Widely expressed is appreciation to the External Review Team for a careful, thoughtful, generous and helpful report on our Faculty. It would appear from discussions, e-mailed comments, and a set of meetings to frame this response to the report, that we largely agree with, which, as they note, are things the Faculty of Education is already on its way to tackling: *"None of the challenges we name in this report will come as a surprise to the members of the Faculty; they have been working hard at these issues, both formally and informally... the Faculty continues to revisit these issues afresh, continuing to create ways of improving their work."* (#7)

The following aspects of the report will be concentrated on in our comments on that report and its specific recommendations:

1. **Making clear *"what is and what ought to be valued:"* establishing priorities (#1).**
2. **Fostering broad based orientation to scholarship (#21, #23, #27), e.g., *"teaching as scholarship."***
3. **Surrey/Burnaby: working cohesively and effectively across two campuses, with adequate and appropriate technical support.**
4. **Governance: *"ensuring the Faculty meeting is the FoE's main decision-making body, where all voices are heard and all opinions considered"* (#32, #33).**
5. **Organizational structure: promoting wider involvement, better communication, and more effective cohesion between and among programs, and between professional and academic programs, research and practice, in particular: *"that the five programs be restructured into two***

organizational units: Professional Development Unit (Undergraduate programs, Professional Programs and International Programs) and Graduate Education Unit (Graduate Programs, Field Programs and International Programs) (#5).

6. *Workload: "distribution of teaching and service among its members, paying particular attention to the loads carried by junior faculty" (#30).*
7. *Rapid recent growth in EdD and PhD programs: supervision needs are looming/do we have the capacity to meet these? Need to consolidate.*
8. *Staff needs, conditions, working environment, and advancement (#35-39).*

1. *Making clear "what is and what ought to be valued:" establishing priorities.*

"One of the most troubling features of the Faculty of Education is the confusion over what is and what ought to be valued... most keenly felt in the large contingent of junior faculty members..." (#7).

Clearly, we are being challenged to make more palpably 'real' in peoples' working lives, what the 'identity,' the core values, purposes and practices of this Faculty are, so that we collectively understand the course we are set upon, and so that people can know better how to structure their academic careers here.

We endorse the recommendation to re-examine priorities. An agreed upon set of priorities is a need made even more urgent by the recent financial cuts, which demand that we set out very clearly what are most important, non negotiable areas of operation, and what we can or must either defer, or even let go of, in order to make the best of the situation within which we have to work over the next several years. In order to do that in a well grounded and comprehensively informed way, the Executive has recently agreed to pursue a 'mapping' exercise in which we determine where our resources, both human and material, are currently being deployed, what concentrations of work and resources have proven to be most valuable to us, in terms of scholarship, supporting and advancing the professional communities we serve, and in terms of economic returns. We intend to have, by December 2008, a clear and well-structured plan of action, a specification of priorities, as well as a financial contingency plan, and this we are, again, already actively engaged in with our ad hoc Budget Analysis Committee recently established.

Distinctive strengths of the Faculty of Education, which we would protect, are its integral connections to the profession laddered through the educational field at all levels. This is structurally enabled through a well-established, flexible and responsive differentiated staffing model. In no small measure *because* of what that structure affords, a second distinction of this faculty is research and scholarship, at which we have consistently excelled. Maintaining but always grappling with

its non-departmentalized structure, a structure as ongoingly contested as it is fiercely protected, our foundational priority is interdisciplinarity, set in tension between excellence in research and graduate study, and excellence in field-based professional practice. We are, *structurally*, dynamic and diversified. This is what defines our faculty: that it is positioned within and constituted by powerful forces whose tensions support, sustain and renew our work. We defend our diversity as a strength, and embrace complexity as a support to attentive, innovative and responsive educational theory, research, policy and practice.

In terms of individual career decisions, a complex faculty sets out a complex assemblage of options, and we recognize that people currently fear that despite working inordinately hard, they may discover they have been misdirecting their efforts, from the FTPC perspective. That matters very much at tenure and promotion time, and is a major concern for too much of the rest of peoples' time. As reported by the chair of the FTPC, current practice involves "organizing meetings with pre-tenure colleagues, individual and in groups, and providing detailed and specific explanations about the expectations for scholarly achievements, among others." Having invited a faculty member to join our community, it is very much in our interests to assist them in staying here and in making satisfying career advancements that preserve enthusiasm, high quality performance, and good strong and collegial morale. We might consider adopting a 'peer advocacy' model in preparing portfolios and presenting cases, particularly for pre-tenure faculty, as we do not see the level of stress and anxiety experienced by too many colleagues as in any way productive for them individually, or for the faculty as a whole.

As one way to address the recommendation that we "employ a broad notion of scholarship," the Dean, with the Chair of the FTPC and colleagues, recently organized a meeting (April 2008), to revisit and possibly to revise our FTPC guidelines, and to enable an extended discussion of ways to make more explicit our FTPC criteria, recognizing this concern is of particular urgency for junior faculty colleagues. We do seek to honour a broad notion of scholarship, and have done so, through ongoing recognition of a wide variety of emergent scholarly endeavors and research practices. Operationalizing what breadth of scholarship looks like in specific instances is how we propose to address this recommendation, by compiling and analyzing a representative set of recent cases as the basis for providing 'profiles' of the ways, both typical and 'outlying', in which the several stages of advancement in the FoE have been achieved. Ongoing conversation with faculty about how applied scholarship is realized and recognized in practice and theory will continue to inform our understanding and its translation into tenure and promotion criteria. The FTPC is drafting revisions and will hold a further meeting with faculty to consider revisions that better provide faculty a clear and current specification of criteria for advancement.

With respect to research centres, clarifying priorities, as well as being guided by larger University priorities, will assist us in deciding on future development. The same is true of program development, and particularly the creation of new graduate programs.

To provide a current picture of the character of FoE research, the Education Research Office has undertaken to “synthesize information gathered in our interviews of faculty members to describe the landscape of scholarship in the Faculty. Alongside other efforts (e.g., faculty research presentations), this will clarify what our Faculty currently values as expressions of its members’ research and scholarship” (see full report in Appendix 6). This overview will highlight not only what is valued, but also identify what is absent, and/or undervalued.

Moreover, in response to graduate student and faculty expressions of need for a specialist in research methodologies, writes the ERO, “We will generate a profile of expressed methodological needs to submit to the Faculty at large and the Faculty Appointments Committee for consideration in framing a plan for hiring that reflects priorities observed in our interviews of faculty members.”

2. **Fostering broad based orientation to scholarship... [to] guide decisions about program excellence (#2), scholarly excellence (#21), research excellence, (#23), the constitution of committees, the staffing of offices, and the filling of administrative positions (#27); “...teaching should be recognized as a form of scholarship in its own right” (#9).**

We fully endorse the former point, but there is much discussion among us with respect to the second. One colleague felt that the overall tone of the review “emphasized practice at the expense of scholarship, which is disturbing.” On the other hand, we see a need for the FoE to take a broader look at the relationship(s) between research and practice, to be receptive to emerging conceptions and approaches, to better recognize the values, and the scholarly character, of applied educational work – most centrally, teaching. The report’s recommendation to *‘recognize teaching as a form of scholarship’* was therefore noted by many with considerable interest. “I see the two as intertwined,” wrote one colleague. “...Teaching should inform our scholarship, and our scholarship should inform our teaching.” This colleague concurs that, “much of what we do in our teaching is, in fact, scholarship.”

Our recent Faculty forum discussion of this notion concluded, however, with a reaffirmation of the primacy of peer-reviewed articles in ‘top-tier’ scholarly journals, and this was rather a disappointment to those who had hoped for a larger ‘vision’ of what scholarship might be taken to mean, and some clearer specification of what ‘teaching as scholarship’ might require or involve, as was encouraged by the reviewers. We anticipate that opportunities for conversation

on this notion will continue to be undertaken, as the faculty endeavor to grapple with what "scholarship" means within an academic educational environment.

In a Faculty that aspires to excellence, it is unfeasible to disregard the principle means by which scholarship has been conventionally recognized by the academic community. Teaching, in a university, cannot, normally, fully and entirely substitute for scholarship in its more traditional sense. The two are of equal value. There remain two basic conditions for university work to be recognized as 'scholarship' and these are rigorous peer review, and publication, nor is it usual to tenure and promote faculty members within an *academic* career, if they elect NOT to publish at least some of the time in high-quality, peer-reviewed scholarly books and journals. However other forms of peer-review, and other forms of 'making public' have been and will be very rightly and persuasively argued for: it is essential to keep this question open and alive to alternative forms and contents of educational work.

To maintain a conceptual distinction between teaching and scholarship is not to devalue teaching. Teaching can be brilliant, and research can be pointless and ponderous. Teaching may demand enormous intellectual acumen and accomplishment, theoretical work might amount to little more than messing about with numbers, or with language. Teaching may be more central than theory and research to the proper work of a Faculty of Education. But as closely imbricated with scholarship as teaching might be, it is not coextensive with it. Teaching doesn't become scholarship by calling it so, but by elucidating and specifying the relations, including the separations, between what we always only crudely denominate "theory" and "practice" in education, so that we can see when, and how one might look to the other for grounding, direction, priorities. One colleague wrote in, "Some but not all of educational scholarship originates in matters of interest and concern in professional spheres of teaching, leadership, and policy; many, but not all, professional matters can be informed by and guided by scholarship about education and related disciplines."

The report's recommendation has encouraged us to recognize that teaching (including graduate supervision) deserves to be recognized as a '**scholarly endeavor**' and that our teaching, our supervision, our course and program development work, must be infused with and informed by, the research upon which this Faculty has always placed such importance. In addition, we must more carefully evaluate and more highly value excellence in teaching in general, and in scholarly teaching in particular.

Such recognition is an encouragement to devise, institute, and publicize means of recognizing excellence in teaching far above and beyond the calculation of numerical student 'scores' and anecdotal comments. The External Review Team's recommendation calls upon us to rethink how we are defining scholarship, and we are indeed open to this kind of profound reconsideration.

Certainly it must be acknowledged that while we have very highly developed criteria for making reasonably nuanced evaluations of scholarly productivity, our operational criteria for discriminating execrable from exquisite teaching have at some times been based largely on end-of-course student evaluations. This is not the case now, as the FTPC chair explained, "The FTPC considers teaching portfolios in great detail in cases of contract renewal, tenure and promotion. The strong features of one's teaching are noted and recommendations for improvement are made, as necessary." This procedure greatly mitigates the risk of having little but elementary arithmetical calculations of student responses as the basis upon which quality of teaching is rated. We endorse the recommendation to further enlarge the scope of our vision of teaching, and pay closer attention to evaluating the scholarly quality of teaching (and supervision). We propose to encourage FTPC leadership in this area and urge Program Directors, and the EGSA to identify and design ways in which teaching (including graduate student supervision) may be more fully taken account of, and to make faculty more aware of how their teaching will be assessed, beyond standardized student evaluations, and including peer evaluation based on a careful consideration of the scholarly quality of course outlines and syllabi, curriculum development, textbook authoring, program evaluation, coordination and development (#10). Stressed the FTPC Chair, "Since graduate supervision is a part of the teaching portfolio, it is important to have information about the nature of this supervision."

Teaching is AS highly weighted, as a matter of both University and Faculty policy, as is scholarship, and different relative strengths are and have always been formally recognized. However, it is clear that this formal equality of value is not universally felt to be operative in practice, with perceptions of a 'hierarchy' having research and scholarship in reigning position, and professional practice very far down the scale of faculty values. This perspective harms not just faculty, but staff and students as well. Writes one colleague greatly disturbed by this recent reaffirmation of traditional criteria for 'scholarship,' "Some of us are committed to applied scholarship and to working extensively with professional educational communities, and to making a significant difference in this realm. I think that we, as a Faculty need to actively resist the movement towards "traditional scholarship;" that is, only the highest-rated, peer-reviewed journals."

Some colleagues provided persuasive accounts of many kinds of teaching (and program development as well) that certainly require considerable active research and scholarly work to do well. So nothing said above precludes the possibility, and the invitation, for individual faculty members to argue and to demonstrate that and how their own distinctive work in teaching, program development and/or student supervision "is, itself, scholarship," beyond being so in the sense that their teaching demonstrates and requires scholarship. This is simply to say that until we have a practicable way, routinely and consistently, to evaluate

teaching AS scholarship, we must more carefully evaluate and more highly value scholarly educational practice.

One well-established practice for evaluating teaching, but one which this Faculty has not used in the past, is to have the FTPC carry out on-site observations of teaching, as well as to pay explicit attention to the quality of the work students produce by the end of a course of studies, relative to their work at its outset. We are strongly supportive of these ways to promote scholarly teaching, and of undertaking to establish ways of paying closer and more nuanced attention to the scholarly quality of teaching, affording greater discernment than standardized student course evaluations can provide, so that teaching of the highest scholarly calibre can be better recognized across a range of academic and professional contexts, more seriously engaged and more adequately rewarded. As well, scholarship directly based upon and informed by one's teaching (curriculum studies, pedagogical theory and research, etc.) can and should be more strongly cultivated and encouraged.

We endorse recommendation #13: *"That the professional development unit develop a program of research that enriches the understanding of the teacher education program experience of beginning teachers, informs the ongoing investments in the program (i.e., Faculty Associates, Coordinators, faculty members, students) as participants and researchers in the program of research."*

The connections to the field that we so prize as a Faculty, in our Field Programs and Professional Programs work, must be, and be seen to be, connections of research and scholarship, and not just of flexible and responsive program development and provision. To this end we propose more intensively to encourage strong scholarly and research initiatives that focus on practical and professional concerns, and weave together responsiveness to the field, with intellectual leadership and scholarly contributions to the field. The corollary also holds, namely, that our research and scholarship across the Faculty should have some implicit, explicable and possibly even demonstrable professional connections. Research excellence without professional applicability is as questionable as professional development that is uninformed by scholarship. We also propose to encourage and support research that engages the field and the professional communities with which we work, and that involves the professional constituency of the faculty working directly with pre-service and in-service teacher education.

One colleague suggests, and we propose, "a more systematic teaching-based program of scholarship and research... perhaps overseen by the Institute for Studies in Teacher Education." We propose, in keeping with this suggestion, continued support for the scholarship-based revision of pre-service and in-service teacher education currently underway by the PDP Re-visioning Committee, the Professional Programs Committee, and the faculty members

teaching in Professional and Field Programs. The time has come for the Faculty-at-large to view professional development and our respective programming in this regard as requiring more than the application and derivation of research enterprises. Accordingly, we shall invite our FoE research centres and CRC Chairs to provide some direction in developing the precepts and guidelines of a more systematic Professional Development Program of scholarship and research. Addressing #23, the recommendation to foster a broader-based orientation to scholarship, can in part be structurally accomplished by addressing the perceived 'narrowness' in the orientations of our present research support services, implementing the review's organizational suggestion to place "research" (the research support staff, and the Research Opportunities Committee) within the portfolio of the Associate Dean-Academic. But attitudinally, a broad-based orientation to scholarship, and one that disposes faculty members to attend especially to the "praxis" dimensions of Professional Development Programs, requires attention to the criteria, practices and assessments of scholarly performance that prevail within the Faculty.

3. **Surrey/Burnaby: working cohesively and effectively across two campuses, with adequate and appropriate technical support: dedicated videoconferencing facilities [should] be established... (#35).**

Arrangements were (prior to the budgetary constraints recently announced) already underway at Burnaby to create videoconferencing facilities in two locations, though it must be acknowledged that current budget cuts threaten their completion at Burnaby, and Surrey already has such facilities. Technology provision and technical support, initially reported as a problem at Surrey in its earlier developmental stage, appear now to be largely resolved. However, one staff member, an educational media specialist, noted a pedagogically significant difference between Surrey's provision of technical assistance, and Burnaby/CET's "hands-on/learn to help yourself" helping style, suggesting the latter gave better preparations for the actual conditions under which teachers are in fact called upon to learn to use technology effectively in school settings, making Burnaby arguably a less "ecologically-valid" facility for technological teacher preparation. From a staff perspective, technology help has been at least as much of a problem at Burnaby as at Surrey (see #38), and until the present financial constraints and hiring freeze are lifted, we do not at this time see how we can improve conditions. This is a serious concern as the scarcity of technical support erodes staff satisfaction, consumes inordinate amounts of time, and results in migration of our staff to other, technologically better equipped and technically better supported positions. At both campuses, the ongoing challenges around FileMaker and the need to find solutions remain a high priority. It may prove to be a false economy to delay any further the hiring (recommended in the CET Report to the External Review, p. 137) of a senior technician/systems

administrator, since the ongoing costs and delays incurred because of insufficient technical assistance promise to cost far more than this position.

We envisage instituting a simple e-mail-based weekly 'update' to better support internal communication within and across campuses.

Cohesive and effective work of course requires more and other than technological adequacy and better means of cross-campus communication. We have yet to devise an intelligible basis upon which to locate faculty, staff and programs to one or the other campus, and our current undertaking to offer programs of all types, at all levels, at both campuses, is seriously in question for some. The concentration of staff, faculty and students which organization around specific programs and/or research centres affords would, some contend, contribute greatly to cohesion and effectiveness. At present, Surrey is very largely staffed by junior (and untenured) faculty members across program areas, and this has been largely happenstance rather than planned. Notwithstanding the excellent work of the Associate Dean-Administration in supporting the FoE community at the Surrey campus, the kind of institutional cohesion and effectiveness we seek across our two main sites of operation is unlikely to be arrived at without some systematic reanalysis. Therefore we propose a dedicated faculty retreat to consider proposals for the (re)organization of the FoE at Surrey/Burnaby, and see how the University's priorities for future development at the Surrey campus (science, health, technology) might guide our own development decisions.

4. Governance: "ensuring the Faculty meeting is the FoE's main decision-making body, where all voices are heard and all opinions considered" (#32, #33).

The fourth recommendation of our 2001 external review, interestingly enough, was that "*the faculty give serious consideration to revising its decision-making structure so that the general Faculty meeting becomes the main legislative vehicle.*" Clearly this is a highly resistant structural problem; for whose resolution good intentions have proven insufficient. Structural and policy change is indicated. The Dean has already instituted a 'question period' to advance this goal. Discussed during our self-study is a proposal to create a larger, more inclusive Faculty meeting format, in which all members across the community of the Faculty can hear, speak, and be heard with respect to all the major decisions of the Faculty. This reconceptualized format would meet every month, as the present Faculty meeting does. Even more generally open Faculty forums will continue to treat matters of concern that need to be taken up, discussed, and framed for further action. Forums and Faculty meetings, as appropriate, would engage in specifically research/scholarship-related discussion and debate: academic standards, curriculum, students, faculty-based or sponsored conferences, events

and publications, research, pedagogy, program priorities, prioritizing educational needs, faculty promotion and tenure, University priorities, and the like. Our ad hoc Governance Committee is working on the details of these initiatives.

In addition, the kinds of issues traditionally brought before the Faculty meeting, for example word-smithing new course proposals, announcements, or information about decisions already taken, might take secondary importance to discussing, for instance, the development of new programs, or new levels of programming (e.g., a new PhD program), the quality and consistency of our courses and programs, the economics and politics of faculty investments in community professional, academic and international programs, field schools, and the like, the question of which 'markets' for our programs and courses should take priority, and how we ought to respond to conditions of special educational need (such as the call to expand post-graduate certification in educational leadership, or the determination of new faculty positions), the determination of faculty-wide initiatives (a further television series, or the creation of a new research centre or the renewal of an existing centre). The agenda for Faculty forums and Faculty meetings should be and be known to be open to development 'from the ground up,' inviting all sectors of the community to bring matters of concern to the attention of the meeting, and agendas should be provided in greater detail and with more lead time. Minutes of meetings should be available on the (password-protected) FoE website. The greater use of "question period" should be encouraged toward these ends, as well as open invitations by program committees to hearings on significant curricular reforms. At those hearings, faculty and others could contribute to the shaping of proposals at a formative stage.

Well underway at this time is an active ad hoc Governance Committee, headed by the Associate Dean-Administration, which has already given a presentation to the Faculty meeting presenting 'maps' of our current governance structure, as a first step to reconsidering the structure of administration and decision making. This Committee will be explicitly requested to help develop an "agreed set of policies and procedures [for Faculty meetings] to ensure that all voices are heard and all opinions considered" (#32).

5. **Organizational structure: promoting wider involvement, better communication, and more effective cohesion between and among programs, and between professional and academic programs, research and practice, in particular: "that the five programs be restructured into two organizational units: Professional Development Unit (Undergraduate Programs, Professional Programs and International Programs) and Graduate Education Unit (Graduate Programs, Field Programs and International Programs) (#5).**

This recommendation was well received and much discussed. "Ideally this restructuring would allow for greater linkage to occur between the programs;" "We may be able to achieve some cost savings by reducing or eliminating the director roles and devolving some decision-making about curricula and scholarship to program coordinators and committees." Current and anticipated cutbacks, and an Acting Dean for the coming year means this is not an easy time to make a structural change of this magnitude: in one colleague's words, "I have a hard time seeing how restructuring the Faculty at this time will simplify the administration of the Faculty, it will only increase complexity in the near future and make us spend money at a time when we have none to spend." That such a reorganization should NOT increase bureaucracy, increase Executive power in ways that impede fuller participation in decision making, add to administrative positions or subtract from the already very hard-working staff contingent supporting our five program areas was stressed.

To lay the groundwork for a successful implementation of structural change of this order requires serious thought, collective 'processing' and extended discussion. Our first need is to stabilize and consolidate after a period of rather rapid growth in both programs and faculty, after which we can cautiously implement intermediate 'transitional' structural modifications, which support cohesion, consistency and quality across our academic and professional programs. As an example, for Graduate Programs, one colleague suggests that, "the Director of Graduate Programs should have greater control over all the budgets related to grad program offerings, including the EdD and international grad programs. It makes no sense to me to have the admin of grad programs budgets split (among Graduate Programs, Field Programs and International Programs)." It should be noted that off-campus programs were separated from Graduate Programs in 2004 to allow the Dean the opportunity to review program and budget processes. These processes are currently working well and we can look at the academic/curricular flow while keeping these effectively functioning processes in place.

While there is broad agreement about the need to improve communication, reduce costs, streamline operations, build stronger connections and collaborative work between academic and professional programs, and an enhanced flow of communications across all program areas, two central considerations are noted here, and elaborated in the appendices (see especially Field Programs, for finer-grained elucidation of the specifics here).

The first is that while the proposed restructuring (#14) does draw scholarly research and graduate scholarship more intelligibly together, in our Faculty, Professional Programs (like International Programs) cuts across both graduate and undergraduate areas, so the coupling of Graduate and Professional Programs structurally risks severing scholar/practitioner links as much as it promises to strengthen them. As stressed in Field Programs' response: "Field

Programs' Graduate Diploma programs would still require a distinct, separate infrastructure to support students and support relationships with school districts." Both Field Programs and Professional Programs have stressed the importance of NOT losing distinctive characteristics, processes, values and outcomes that are essential to our continued success. As Field Programs response stressed, "The MEd programs offered by Field Programs are distinctive in length, structure and nature from those offered under the auspices of Graduate Programs. We require a structure which supports distinctiveness, yet improves administrative efficiency, and improves connections across research, scholarship and practice, while maintaining consistency and quality across diverse kinds of graduate programming."

The External Review Report commends both Professional Programs and Field Programs, and recommends these sectors continue with the ways they have been serving the educational field. A 'smoother' operation that might render more similar Undergraduate Program operations with PDP, for instance, or Field Programs with Graduate Programs, does, however, risk losing that distinctiveness. Cited among the things we CANNOT risk losing are, for example, "The differentiated staffing model involving mentors, seconded teachers (as Faculty Associates) and faculty is essential to the strength and credibility of our programs and relationships with educators and school districts" (see Field Programs response, Appendix 2).

The External Review Report recognizes the distinctive and considerable accomplishments of Professional Programs, as well, writing that, "Though ongoing program development is evident in most programs, the most extensive engagement with such improvement efforts occurs in Professional Programs." From Professional Programs comes the critical question: "How will the specific needs (as identified through the report) and strengths of the 'organic' nature of PDP be accommodated through a combined institutional infrastructure? There is real concern that we must not lose the innovative and unique initiatives of Professional Programs, ones that truly mark our Professional Programs off from other, and more current players in this field."

International Programs' response expressed similar concerns about implementing the proposed restructuring: "An amalgamated organizational structure will significantly affect IP, especially in the crucial area of organizational leadership. Without a Director, it is not clear how International Programs could continue to have the institutional and administrative opportunity to provide leadership in all areas of the Faculty." Although the report commends International Programs and recommends the continued development of its programming models (#15), "...it is unclear how International Programs could continue to develop, implement and support credit and non-credit programs when re-organized as recommended by the ERC. Such initiatives require significant infrastructure support."

In sum, we propose more carefully to attune the proposed structural change to our distinctive needs and current conditions as, in its present form, says one colleague, "It doesn't represent where the 'professional' activity in our Faculty takes place, i.e., it is not just at undergrad level; second, it blurs the distinction between PDP and undergrad which are in fact very distinct. Our undergrad program does not just serve PDP. A great deal of valuable activity goes on at the undergrad level that is not of a purely professional orientation." The external reviewers made it clear that we might well elect not to make the proposed structural change as the best way to address the problems it was proposed to engage. We do strongly endorse the intents of the restructuring, and through a modification of their proposal, will pursue these, envisaging retaining distinctive units while gradually working towards enhanced consolidation and more effective relationships, both administrative and scholarly, across the range of our academic and professional programs.

6. Workload: "distribution of teaching and service among its members, paying particular attention to the loads carried by junior faculty" (#30).

One way to address the workload issues is simply better informing people about what faculty workloads look like, beyond each person's own case. Transparency about supervision loads, teaching and research allocation profiles, program development and coordination work, as well as indicating where additional incentives/rewards are provided for these elements of service, could be realized simply by reporting this basic workload information annually. That one move towards making information more fully accessible, on its own, might go considerable distance towards helping us promote more equitable distribution of supervision in particular, and of workloads in general.

A more streamlined organizational structure could also address the service aspect of workload, were this to mean fewer committees in which faculty members would be called upon to serve, and would afford a better idea of where to address concerns, as well as where to invest one's time.

7. Rapid recent growth in EdD and PhD programs: supervision needs are looming/do we have the capacity to meet these? Need to consolidate (#3 Graduate Programs, #13 Teacher Education programs, #18 EdD program).

"The financial stability of the EdD and the MEd programs is based upon a balance of revenue generation, teaching and supervisory capacity, as well as appropriate staffing infrastructure," one colleague observes. The External Review Team very explicitly recommended no further program growth and, indeed, a reduction (by 40+ students) in our current EdD commitment. To pursue this

recommendation would require us to carefully “reassess and evaluate current and future financial expenditures and budgets.”

Here again, the specifics of the recommendation need to be realigned to our own conditions: recommended is a French EdD cohort size of 20, however colleagues working in French programs, “doubt we will ever be under pressure to admit [that number] since we have a small pool of potential French applicants in the province.” By contrast, we have pressing demands for far more EdD places than the External Review Team recommends, and have in fact, with University approval, already built our EdD program on a larger scale, supplementing our tenure-stream faculty supervision capacity with highly qualified adjunct faculty.

A further, longer-range view of how to address the looming supervision needs arising from the EdD program specifically, is to, in one colleague’s words, “de-link the EdD from its sole association as an Ed Leadership degree, so that the degree can be applicable to other areas of research and practice.” Such an enlargement of our vision of “Educational Leadership” makes fuller participation in the EdD program far more relevant and attractive to many more of our tenure-stream faculty members, removing the excessive burden that has been placed on junior colleagues working in Educational Leadership. We do need to reduce their supervisory load.

With respect to easing the work of supervision while promoting better tracking and pacing of EdD students’ progress, the EdD program has implemented new on-line interactive software that allows students to document and track their progress through their program, and as they self-monitor, their supervisors have access to what they are doing and what they require. Instead of relying on annual reports or waiting for transcripts, this interactive system assists students and provides support through a ‘just in time’ system for getting support and tracking student work to keep students progressing through their program in a successful and timely way, which is invaluable for heavily committed mid- and senior-level educational professionals.

Concludes one colleague, “The recommendation to reduce the number of EdD students to 60 (in all probability three cohorts) may not be straightforward. Under the present economic conditions, the Faculty might have to reduce EdD numbers, but that course of action has to be examined very carefully to see if it in fact places us in another kind of fiscal difficulty, relative to the tenure-line appointments we have made on the basis of budgetary allocation through the WAFTE formula. In principle, we are prepared to rein the program in so that it does become sustainable and rigorous to the satisfaction of the faculty members, and are prepared to insist that a consistent process be defined and followed for the creation of all field, professional, international and academic programs.”

We should note, however, with respect to recommendations #3 and #15, there is the suggestion of contradictory directions: #3 proposes no further growth in Graduate Programs, yet #15 proposes *“continued development of community-based off-campus MEd and diploma programs based on models developed by Field Programs and International Programs.”*

Responds Field Programs: “Is Recommendation 15 intended to distinguish Field Programs’ and International Programs’ efforts and growth from that of community-based programs offered by Graduate Programs? The fact that the Team has included a recommendation specific to two program areas indicates these two areas are being encouraged to grow at a rate different from the rate of expansion recommended for other graduate programs. We seek clarification of the relationship between these two recommendations and the implications for Field Programs” (see Appendix 2).

With respect to graduate students across all program areas, the External Review Team, while strongly supportive of the EGSA, did not make recommendations that address important issues and concerns raised by students. However based on our self-study, we do see a need for intensified efforts to secure and stabilize adequate and more equitably distributed funding so more of our students can pursue full-time studies. We do not at this time have in place enough assured graduate student funding, and we will pursue this in the coming year. We also plan to organize workshops on graduate student supervision to address expressed concerns about quality of supervision, to attend to concerns expressed in the graduate student surveys about inconsistent course content, and to address the need for more attention to research methods courses, and qualitative research methods in particular. Students noted a “lack of intellectual and institutional community that graduate students need to support them in their work as new and emerging scholars.” We have now instituted a regular faculty seminar series, of which five sessions have been held since the review, to which graduate students are invited. We are attending, as well, to needs to involve graduate students (and sessional instructors) directly in Faculty meetings and on Faculty committees, as well as to more directly collaborate with EGSA, and to encourage strong support for and greater faculty involvement in Educational Review (#25, #34).

8. Staff needs, conditions, working environment, and advancement (#35 – 39).

The External Review Team’s last recommendations (#36, #37, #38, #39) directly address working conditions for staff; our concluding response is, accordingly, to these important directions for further improving the working environment of this Faculty of Education.

“That the University explore the problem of job classification and reclassification for staff in the Faculty of Education, with a view to finding a way to streamline the process” (#36).

“The Assistant to the Dean should make this a priority, and the incoming Dean should be made aware of the great importance of this. We need APSA managers to be proactive and sustain this initiative. We need the University to intensify efforts to get Human Resources to carry out these re-classifications,” urged one colleague. This issue of job classification has undermined morale and consumed time and resources beyond all proportion to its difficulty to accomplish. This is a dynamic Faculty, in which many staff are willing and able to master new skill sets and take on increasingly extensive and demanding responsibilities, and in order for the FoE to retain, and not just, again and again, re-TRAIN our staff in the FoE (as well as to promote the ‘institutional memory’ which keeps any organization afloat) we need timely help from Human Resources in order to keep reasonably in tune with the kinds of needs and changing conditions for those who work here. We can ill afford at a time of budget reduction to lose staff even as we are asking more of them.

While intensifying our pressure on the University’s Human Resources department to reclassify positions long outstanding, we can at the same time make internal revisions to staff assignments and within-classification enhancements and incentives including recognition, discretionary days, greater say in scheduling holidays, etc. APSA managers will request input from staff as to other ways in which we might, internally, ameliorate working conditions pending full formal job reclassification.

Issues and matters to do with job descriptions must be resolved to include flexible and creative ways to utilize current and future staff resources. One of the ways to do this is to build talent and optimize on the use of all differentiated and staff resources. This is particularly critical due to budget cut backs. The recommendation of **“annual reviews for all staff members...” (#37)** falls under the union’s responsibility, so while we endorse the value of better and more regular evaluation at ALL levels, and not just staff, we will have to devise a way – perhaps making such ‘review conversations’ a voluntary program – to take advantage of this recommendation without compromising the authority of the union over this area. APSA managers expressed the value of uniform, consistent evaluation criteria and for structured feedback mechanisms.

One staff colleague suggested that “a staff section could be added to the 3-year plan, so that concerns/productivity could be mentioned at least every 3 years rather than every 7 with an external review. [Since] the 3-year plan needs to be reviewed annually... the staff section would then also be commented upon on a yearly basis.”

Both APSA and CUPE staff greatly favoured a renewed emphasis on career planning, and providing and encouraging cross-training and professional development and advancement, devising a plan to build our own talent from within rather than expending energies and funds into ongoing recruitment and training, only to lose skilled staff to more attractive positions in other departments and faculties. To build and reward talent within our own Faculty will also help us in succession planning. Supervisors could promote and encourage staff to engage more as team members by invitation to more integrated faculty and staff meetings and events when appropriate. The External Review Team recommended **“that the provision of information technology and technical support on the Burnaby Campus be reviewed, with a view to finding cost-effective ways of making improvements and encouraging staff to share their knowledge”** (#37). Improved technical support for knowledge-transfer among knowledgeable and skilled staff working in different program areas will also help us to capitalize on current APSA expertise and find creative ways to resolve problems and develop staff, creating an integrated peer and teamwork environment. No less important is to develop software solutions that actually work for our staff and our needs, rather than trying to re-tool our staff and our systems to work with applications built for other purposes that do not serve us well. We **MUST** attend to our ongoing needs for better FileMaker solutions and support.

Conclusion and Summary of Actions Underway and Planned

This Faculty of Education has been well prepared, well advised, and across the faculty community there has been an expressed readiness to consolidate, prioritize, and execute well-considered plans.

We began within the period of the self-study itself to revisit and reconsider governance, to initiate collaborative cross-Faculty budget planning, to undertake space and technology restructuring, to better inform, advise and support new and junior faculty, to devise strategic plans for leadership succession, to re-invigorate our scholarly community by initiating a regular faculty seminar series, and to build stronger and more effective and efficient communications and structural linkages across our program locations.

We welcome further changes that enhance scholarly excellence, the advancement of the field, service to the community and to the profession, and the improvement of conditions for learning, and for working across the FoE. The External Review Team's structural recommendations, as we work out how best to implement these, recognize that, **“Any changes to the Faculty's organizational structure or governance must preserve the integrity and distinctiveness of individual program areas.”** As we consider restructuring, we remain attentive to the need to have strong senior faculty and administration at all of the sites where

we work, the need to pull all the various programs into more administratively manageable form without sacrificing their unique contributions, and the need to conserve resources during a time of serious financial restraint.

However there are constraints upon our ability to plan and to consolidate, which have at times been beyond our control. Field Programs' submission wrote of a *"desperate need for accurate budget information and predictable financial support for our programs. We are aware that other program areas share this frustration; however the consequences for Field Programs are more severe as our area is not included in the Faculty's traditional base budget. We receive an unstable "base" budget plus premium fee funding that is based on unreliable data collected from SIMS and dispersed on a slip-year basis followed by periodic adjustments. Without a stable, accurate flow of funds and information we are unable to plan for the short or long term and this, in turn, endangers our credibility and relationships with current and potential students, and school districts. The impacts of these precarious conditions can only be expected to increase in the context of current and anticipated budget cuts. We found no recognition of the difficulties created by uncertainties in funding our work, nor any recommendations that might enable us to pursue more reliable financial relationships within the Faculty and/or with the senior administration in the Team's Report"* (see Appendix 2). We clearly need to bring more of this program and budget planning within our own purview, and assume a larger role in, and responsibility for developing more accurate predictions, in consistently and regularly tracking our progress so as to become less reliant on university-level provision of information. *In fact much progress has been made along these lines in the past several years, not all of which may be apparent to all faculty since this work is necessarily conducted between budget officers.* The ad hoc Governance and Budget Analysis Committees, to that end, also have been expected to work more closely with each program committee to enable the FoE to develop greater autonomy with respect to planning in the service of our critical need for *"accurate budget information, and predictable financial support for our programs."*

The recommendation to create **"a clearer structure that more closely aligns with the FoE's major operations"** (#31), given our present needs and constraints, will take some time to fully think through. Reserving major structural rearrangements for the next administration, we propose for the coming year to work through the existing offices of the two Associate Deans, one based in Burnaby (Academic) and the other based in Surry (Administration). We propose to retain our program structures but build linkages among all graduate programs, whether external, community-based, International, or field programs. We endorse the proposal to shift the Education Research Office and the Research Opportunities Committee at least for a time under the portfolio of the Associate Dean-Academic, who will be responsible for promoting and supporting a broader approach to research and scholarship than can fairly be expected when all research officers share a similar background and expertise in cognitive psychology. Without fully implementing the structural reorganization proposed

by the External Review Team, then, we shall consider a clearer structure that draws together more coherently graduate programs with external, community, and field programs, such that each retains its own distinct administrative units in a more expansive graduate program, which in turn streamlines communication and action. Working in this way, moreover, will support us in exploring the ways we can link more closely together research, scholarship and teaching. To that end, Graduate, Undergraduate, and Professional Programs Directors would advise and confer with the Associate Dean-Academic with respect to appointments and faculty development, research, scholarship, and educational technology; and with the Associate Dean-Administration with respect to enrollment, space, and core systems technology. It will be the responsibility of the two Associate Deans and the Director of Administration to work closely together to make administration work smoothly and effectively in support of scholarship, research, teaching, and professional development. We will see how far this approach takes us, and review what has been accomplished and what this modified restructuring might leave still unaddressed, at the end of a year, that is, by June 15, 2009. This leaves major structural decisions for the next Dean, while advancing considerably the spirit and intents of the External Review Team's recommendations.

To act upon recommendation #39, **"that staff concerns about their working environment, and their recommendations for improvement, be carefully considered and acted upon,"** we will draw more fully upon the authority, knowledge and experience of both CUPE and APSA staff. Explicitly, in their response to this recommendation, APSA staff stressed that, "APSA managers have the skills and expertise to be involved in discussions that affect operations, staffing, etc. As such, the APSA group would like to be involved in any discussions before decisions are made that impact staff." To help secure this intention, we propose to add a staff section to our three-year plan, so that the concerns, ideas and proposals of staff can be taken up every three years rather than every seven, and reviewed annually.

More generally, we will be looking directly to the 'communities of practice' across the FoE within which particular matters of concern arise, and seek out the authoritative input of those who engage most directly with those particulars of concern, whether those be concerns of faculty, staff, or students. Far from retreating from our 'complexity' and our differences, this strategy obliges us to confront these very directly, not in any aspirations for consensus, but in the hope and expectation that we are not all concerned with – nor able to contribute usefully to – everything done in so expansive and diverse and inclusive a place as this Faculty of Education is becoming. We see and acknowledge the need for regular reviews/evaluation of courses and programs within each program area, as well as ongoing tracking of financial conditions, student progress, and working conditions and advancement for both faculty and staff. We have a well-formed and well-functioning Executive who can assume responsibility for the

necessary 'wide angled' overview of Faculty operations that help us see more clearly those structure by which we are best accomplishing our goals.

Devising a succession plan for hiring (#23), specifically to find a better balance of junior and mid-level faculty members, and to support the pursuit of priorities we have determined can begin now, although we are of course presently experiencing a hiring freeze. In the meantime, we shall encourage the FTPC, in cooperation with the Dean, Associate Dean-Academic and the Research Opportunities Committee, to lead renewed efforts at supporting and developing junior faculty (#24) through a focused and regular program of meetings concerned with FTPC file preparation, graduate and particularly doctoral supervision, difficulties with teaching, workshops on writing and publishing, research needs and opportunities, and the strengthening of scholarly community through a regular faculty seminar series. Junior and pre-tenure faculty will be consulted about their own perspectives on workload and the supports they need to succeed. As well, specific 'protective' changes will be pursued (e.g., <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i03/03c00101.htm>) involving graduated responsibilities, limits on supervision numbers for beginning faculty, and exploring co-supervision structures.

As to immediate plans, we propose a series of discussions in various contexts for the revisiting of our strategic plan, to update mission and vision statements, state prime values in specific terms, and adopt operational approaches to respond to the external review, to be completed before the Dean Search Committee sets its long list of candidates so that we might contribute to the conceptualization of the search process. Implementing our strategic plan demands that we periodically take stock of our progress and seek appropriate leadership. We can be guided by University priorities, but we also need, at the Faculty level, to seek out and to build Faculty-wide consensus in research, program development and community engagement. One goal is to actively seek out promising initiatives responsive to university priorities that appear capable of drawing faculty together, consolidate our strengths and afford a common focus, goal and mission. For example, a Faculty-wide collaboration that builds on the University's priorities with respect to the environment might take the form of multi-disciplinary research and development involving 'green schools' and 'ecological pedagogy,' a trajectory that is of great interest to several colleagues. We value a diversity of individual commitments; we also value the development of shared goals and collaborative activities, declared priorities around which all members of the Faculty can rally.

With the current and projected fiscal reductions, and having an Acting Dean for a one-year term, we see the road immediately ahead as one of consolidation, not further growth. We have gained a large number of excellent junior colleagues: our job now is their support and development. We have built new programs: now our work is to stabilize, monitor, evaluate and strengthen them. We have initiated reviews of budget and governance: now we work on implementation.

This is a time to conserve and consolidate, to turn our attentions inward, building collegial, scholarly, research and professional bonds within and across our Faculty and its constitutive communities of practice, and to cultivate the excellence we have here.

Armed with a most encouraging and helpful external review, we share the External team's confidence: *"We have every reason to expect that the members of Simon Fraser's Faculty of Education are, in fact, poised to take on this challenge... to achieve its vision and its goals"* (p. 32).

Section Two

The Executive's Response to Recommendations

1. We think it is quite appropriate to reconsider our priorities on a regular basis, including at retreats of the Executive or faculty, Faculty meetings, ad hoc committees and/or one or more Faculty forums. Budgetary and other conditions constantly change and call upon us to revisit our plans. Our mission and vision statements and strategic plan provide a context for such discussion. In terms of calendar, such discussion should be coordinated with the development of budgets. Ad hoc Budget Analysis and Governance Committees are currently meeting; an Executive and Research Opportunities Committee retreat is scheduled in late June, and such deliberations will continue in the fall. The first stage of the work of the ad hoc Governance Committee has been to produce a document clearly articulating the "Principles and Procedures of Governance for the SFU Faculty of Education." Through this document, beginning faculty members will have a clear point of reference into the process of roles and responsibilities of various Directors, and into opportunities to contribute to democratic and consensual decision-making. It is interesting that the Faculty position on this matter has evolved over the past few years. We note the response to this matter in the 2001 Response to the External Review: "The suggestion that the Faculty devote energy to developing a written constitution/set of by-laws/or handbook received little support in discussions of the report. Most of the governance of the Faculty is already described in written form, i.e., the mandate, composition, and procedures for election of Program Committees, the Appointments Committee, the Faculty Tenure Committee, and Program Directors. Although there is enthusiasm for improving how we operate within our current governance structure, there is little support for becoming any more legalistic or procedural and, indeed, some saw the task of developing a written document of the sort described by the Review Committee as a "black hole" task, unlikely to achieve the desired pay off. Thus, in terms of governance, the priority is seen to be continued discussion of and implementation of changes to how we use current structures" (p. 3). *An update to the Strategic Plan would be an appropriate documentation of this process, along with the forthcoming budget and governance changes that are recommended for Faculty operations by the Executive or our ad hoc committees.*

At the same time it bears noting that external conditions, such as provincial funding patterns and licensure policies greatly affect our sphere of work. Our priorities must be highly attuned to our broad political and institutional environment or they will be of little functionality.

2. Generally we think that commitment to broad-based scholarship and practice exists across our programs, but perhaps what we should take from this recommendation is that *at the program level each relevant coordinator or director should be called upon to give evidence that such practices are in place.* In the absence of program-specific external or accreditation reviews, this will require a good bit of self-discipline. We could put our programs on a rotation, however, and subject each to this type of scrutiny. *The Executive will initiate a process within the Faculty for this type of ongoing evaluation.*
3. We concur that our graduate programs are in general at an appropriate size given our resources. The one exception is premium-fee programs that carry their own funding integrity with them. *Field Programs, for example, may be able to make a case for some expansion in the next two years.* They are turning away many qualified students. Our French language programs have subsidized, empty seats that should not be included in caps. Areas that function on differentiated staffing are able to increase capacity much more quickly and efficiently than traditional programs. The challenge is maintaining quality and faculty oversight. We must address the competing forces to respond to market demand and the competitive environment in a way that does not compromise the quality of our programs. For example, is a large premium-fee program, by definition, a program with low faculty oversight, privileged students, and low standards? Is a small, subsidized core program, by definition, a program with high faculty involvement, disadvantaged students and high standards? Building capacity will mean making choices about self definition and adapting to the consequences.
4. We also concur that PDP is at an appropriate size that in fact will be challenging to sustain given our province's demographics and increased competition in this field. *We have not developed a premium fee PDP, but this should be considered especially for targeted audiences that would attract philanthropic or governmental subsidy.* We also have subsidized, empty seats in French immersion PDP that we would like to fill in order to assist the province in this area of teacher shortage.
5. In the short term we think it would be an unwise use of Faculty resources to conduct a major restructuring since the current systems are managing a highly complex set of challenges very well. The reliability and accuracy of the current program model is perhaps underappreciated in the visitors' response. These systems are moving thousands of students through an abundance of complex curricula with excellent quality control. This consistent, effective delivery of services has lulled some into complacency about the mass of precise administrative work that is being done. On the other hand we certainly can extract from the visitors' recommendation on restructuring some limited reforms that are feasible. *Ongoing curriculum review including the search for consolidation of courses is one such initiative; another is program research aimed*

at refining program quality. Our new direct-entry BEd program is a priority in this regard.

- 6-8. As stated above, an evaluative process of the type recommended would be needed if consistent, meaningful reforms were to be made across programs. *This is a major undertaking that the Executive should consider.* We have a sound model in the experience of the Research Opportunities Committee that in 2007 conducted such a review with external visitors and since then has been following up on the recommendations.
9. We agree with the importance of fully employing teaching performance in the evaluation of faculty. In April 2008, we held a forum on a family of topics related to this one and launched a serious dialogue about how to do better in this area. *The Tenure & Promotion Committee has been charged with the revision of our policies in evaluating teaching.* Detailed minutes of the forum were placed in the Faculty meeting minutes.
10. We concur with the recommendation. The problem, however, is documenting the quality of such work, especially in unconventional teaching settings such as PDP and Field Programs. As a part of the process described in 9, *we have targeted this project for attention by the respective Program Committees and Directors.*
11. To us, the suggested curricular coordination is highly desirable and a teacher education task force is addressing some of those issues currently. We do not believe an administrative restructuring is desirable or necessary. What is needed is strong, visionary leadership that is committed to real change in the curriculum. The possibilities are enormous when an integrated four- to five-year program is contemplated as the venue for renewal.
12. Increased faculty involvement is most desirable and closely related to the reward structure and evaluation reforms described above.
13. Embedding faculty research in the PDP is a way of forging connections between scholarship and professional practice. The Institute for Studies in Teacher Education (ISTE) directed by Peter Grimmett is one locus for such work. So, too, are the Faculty research centres, the CRC Chairs, and the faculty members who provide curricular leadership when they teach in Professional Programs. *The Professional Programs Committee is advised to oversee and promote this type of scholarly activity through the initiative of its PDP Re-visioning Subcommittee and the research initiatives of faculty members with PDP teaching assignments, in keeping with the distinctiveness and acknowledged quality of the PDP.*

14. We are committed to integrated development and implementation of Graduate and Field Programs and bringing the program committees closer together in communication, but merging the two program areas has a number of disadvantages, including the straightforward one that the workload would be excessive for a director who wished to remain active at all as a scholar-researcher. The faculty have expressed a preference for their peers to serve as our program directors, rather than a professionalization of these roles. We therefore must design those roles in a manner that permits fully functioning professors to occupy them. In our opinion the goals cited here are obtainable without this type of position amalgamation.
15. We very much appreciate the reviewers' support for our community-based and diploma programs. This evaluation affirms our longstanding commitment to these efforts to serve our colleagues in education and related fields.
16. The recommendation to develop guidelines on the determination of independent and consolidated PhD programs is good advice and could be required prior to the creation of any further such programs. *After our recent period of expansion, it makes sense to now take stock of where we are and set future policy in light of our experience. The Graduate Programs Director has begun such deliberations.*
17. There may be a significant contextual factor overlooked in the visitors' concern about our PhD expansion and that is the low PhD matriculation prior to the expansion. Up to 2004, in the Faculty's history, only 99 graduates of these programs were recorded. At that time, 27 of approximately 53 faculty members had zero or one student as a Senior Supervisee. It should be recognized that the Faculty had not developed its full capacity in this area. Therefore, to consider only the rate of increase since 2004 without this history, leads to questionable conclusions about growth metrics. It should also be said that with one exception, the increase was stimulated by an invitation to academic coordinators to build capacity to which they enthusiastically responded. No other measures were necessary. (In the one exception, a program that was doing alternate year admissions of four to five students was told that a retiring faculty member would not be replaced if they wished to remain at their current staffing level. Another program expressed its wish not to grow since, in their professional view, they were at a sustainable level. They were told that they could proceed according to their preference and have done so.)

It should be noted that students should have a critical mass of peers in order to have a quality doctoral experience. There should be the opportunity for community and dialogue in an outstanding doctoral program. Students should enter the profession with some base of colleagues.

Finally, the proliferation of doctoral tracks has come entirely from faculty initiative and has been vetted through the University's stringent process. We have been loath to deny qualified groups of faculty the opportunity to design and implement doctoral programs of their choosing. At the same time we do welcome a period of consolidation and stock taking. *Such reflection would be prudent and constructive in the wake of a period of growth and should take place under the guidance of the Graduate Programs Director.*

18. Amid a good deal of positive comment regarding the EdD, the reviewers express a strong reservation about the burden being placed on pre-tenure faculty and advise capping enrolment in the English language cohorts at 40. It should be noted that the program has been built over a decade and resourced to reach its current capacity of approximately 90. To reduce its capacity in such a dramatic fashion would undermine the expectations of many and leave the Faculty with an underutilized infrastructure.

An alternative approach is to bring further support to the pre-tenure faculty whom the reviewers believe are burdened in the area of supervision. To us this is a much-preferred way to address the perceived problem. *The Executive should take up this recommendation immediately. Our estimate is that, by revisiting the costs recovered from the University, program resources should be supplemented by approximately \$30,000 to redress the load being put on the pre-tenure coordinators of the EdD in a manner to be negotiated with them and the Graduate Programs Director.*

In our opinion, the significance of this program for the Faculty of Education at SFU is underappreciated by some. Through this program and some others we have the opportunity to prepare the leadership cadre that will direct BC's K-12 education, two ministries, and BC college/specialized university administration into the indefinite future. This will benefit BC, since the alternative is low-quality transported and on-line programs. This will benefit SFU's Faculty of Education in reputation, faculty satisfaction, applied research, influence and advancement. We need to resource the capacity we have planned for.

We have built all our programs around some of SFU's idiosyncratic structures and policies. Our University does invest junior faculty with more authority and opportunity than most other institutions. Those policies (such as senior supervision by Assistant Professors and co-supervision) were honoured in the development of many of our programs. Although the external reviewers expressed some reservations about University policy in this regard, the University has not had second thoughts about these policies. Until and unless the University alters its policies, units such as ours logically apply the structures we have been given. We are, however, seeking to better protect our junior faculty by means described elsewhere in this document (see #24).

19. At this point in our history it probably makes most sense to consider applying premium fees to all programs in certain areas (such as educational leadership/administration) and, separately, to those cohorts that incur extra costs due to remote delivery and other similar factors. If we discern an issue for certain students related to affordability, the bursary model could be applied by raising fees generally and redistributing some of the tuition. At the present time we have far more demand for our premium-fee programs than we can meet and there has been little expression of concern about the pricing. Note also that these programs are for working adults and result in significant pay increases and career advancement. Given the provincial government's cutbacks in funding we are likely to become more, not less, reliant on the premium-fee model. It is worth noting also that the people of British Columbia have knowingly supported this government through the ballot box and, one must infer, consequently support the government's policies toward advanced education. SFU is not removed from the financial impact of higher education policy in the province.
20. We appreciate the support of the visitors for our professional development and international efforts. It is our intention to keep these programs strong.
21. The team gives wise counsel on the breadth of research and scholarship that best serve our Faculty interest. We concur.
22. The suggestion that we create a succession plan is worthwhile. Similar to all efforts at planning in BC at the present time, serious limitations ensue. The provincial government has taken to not only reducing budgets but also to micromanaging more of the funds that do come through the Ministry of Advanced Education. In various ways AVED seeks to direct which programs receive targeted funding and their priorities change from year to year with little or no warning. Planning is certainly desirable, but we must note the uncertain context in which we deliver our courses and programs.

Approximately $\frac{1}{6}$ of our new hires over the past four years have been at the Associate level. Our current distribution among the tenure-line ranks is approximately 14 Full Professors, 19 Associate Professors, and 26 Assistant Professors.

23. Recently we held a Faculty forum to discuss further renewal, tenure, and promotion issues such as the evaluation of research. We have underway the process of revising the relevant policies. With this said, we would point out that our core requirement of peer-reviewed articles in ranking journals is likely to remain the most fair and appropriate criterion for judging research, particularly for tenure decisions. There is not only a high standard integral to such work but also it is the most valuable means for projecting the Faculty's ideas and reputation.

24. We do take to heart the importance of mentoring our junior faculty and have taken a variety of creative measures in order to facilitate this. Many are mentioned by the reviewers. In a recent meeting between the Assistant Professors and the Dean a discussion of procedures for co-publishing with graduate students suggested *that a workshop on this skill set should be sponsored by the Research Opportunities Committee*. At that same meeting, these recommendations from a Chronicle of Higher Education article were tendered and are offered as an *example of actions that should be considered by the graduate programs committee to best develop assistant professors as mentors*:

- New Assistant Professors should sit in on both comprehensive exams and dissertation defenses as an observer immediately upon joining the department.
- New hires should direct their first two dissertation committees jointly with a senior colleague.
- Regardless of graduate school policy, departments should establish safeguards to ensure that a new faculty member will not take on an advisee in the first year of employment. Limits should be set on the number of advisees an Assistant Professor is allowed before earning tenure.
- Individual programs should be encouraged to set written expectations and standards for directing a dissertation.

(See: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i03/03c00101.htm>).

25. This recommendation to intensify faculty communication about research and scholarship has our unqualified support. This has been an area of continual attention and limited success during the past five years. We are launching a new series of colloquia as this is being written. *Both the Associate Dean-Academic and the Research Opportunities Committee will continue to be active in this regard.*

26. We are currently and will continue to build the type of exchange mentioned here under current leadership structures. There may be a future restructuring, but we are not waiting for that prior to beginning this work. *The Executive is central to our current activities as well as the Research Opportunities Committee.*

27. This recommendation about the representation of the range of research orientations is welcome and, within the limits imposed by elections, we shall seek to implement it. *This is a message for future deans who are influential in the nominating process.*

28. The period of rapid expansion of centres is over, and *study and consolidation of their missions would be appropriate and will be undertaken by the Executive and the Centre Directors.*

29. The study of possible synergies among the centres is a welcome idea and one that the Research Opportunities Committee might well take up. *Already Centre Directors have begun meeting on this subject.*
30. Our recent Faculty forum examined the difficulty we have in evaluating teaching and service. A process of policy and procedural review is underway to improve this aspect of governance. Some progress has already been made in the design of our teaching evaluation forms, although we still need further attention to this in program areas such as Field Programs and PDP. *Those Program Directors will be encouraged to take up this recommendation.*
31. This recommendation about governance restructuring is not one we resonate with. We do not agree that our structure is "top heavy, impedes communication, and creates barriers." Authority is spread among a great many individuals such as an Executive of 11 members, 25 academic coordinators, four program committees with 16 total faculty members, and several other major committees. On the other hand, rolling much of the authority of autonomous Program Directors into the offices of Associate Deans would to us be much less diffuse in the distribution of authority.
32. The recommendations to reconsider the constitution of and participation in the Faculty meetings is welcome and should be acted upon. *An ad hoc Governance Committee has been in place for several months and is looking at such issues.* We think a review of the minutes of the meetings and the Faculty forums will show that there is healthy debate and meaningful decision-making going on in Faculty meetings. We believe that by turning out for meetings and expressing oneself, each faculty member votes powerfully to make the venue more significant and means should be found to heighten participation and attendance.

The freezing of EdD admissions for the calendar year 2007 is a clear example of the advise and consent role of the Faculty meeting and the attentiveness of the Executive to the voice of the faculty. Other examples include addressing gender and tenure status in the composition of the Executive.

33. To us it is certainly worthwhile to re-examine procedural issues such as authority and transparency and we have an ad hoc committee on governance that is doing so. This committee itself is another example of the administration's desire to respond to faculty concerns and consult widely. The ad hoc Budget Analysis Committee is another such example and was created by the administration without calls for it from the faculty in order to broaden consultation.

Better rates of attendance at Faculty meetings and forums would also contribute to a perception of "transparency."

34. We appreciate the support of the External Review Team for our community building efforts. *The Executive intends to continue moving ahead with this work.*
35. We plan to implement the recommendations on communication and resources at Surrey. *Additionally, the Dean and Executive will heighten their presence on that campus through more scheduled meetings and visits such as our June 16th forum on governmental relations.*
36. *The Dean's Office will use the findings of the review to renew our efforts at working with Human Resources to more effectively classify our staff, along with other related projects.*
37. *The suggestion that annual reviews of staff should more comprehensively occur is valid and will be taken to the Executive for action that comports with collective agreements.* Reviews should be seen as developmental in nature and an opportunity for growth and planning.
38. *The Associate Dean-Academic has been addressing these technology concerns with considerable seriousness of purpose and will continue to do so.*
39. We can always do more to complete the circle of listening, acting, and reporting back results. The Dean meets each semester with each staff group; once a semester each sends a representative to an Executive meeting. *Further means of communication will be developed by the Dean in consultation with other groups.*

Appendix 1: EGSA Response in Full

Re: Report from the External Review Team: Response from EGSA Executive

The EGSA Executive would like to express our appreciation to the External Review Team for the thorough job they did in writing this review and in providing thoughtful and challenging recommendations.

As the current executive leadership in EGSA, we were generally pleased that the External Review Team recognized the work that EGSA does in supporting the graduate student population and our contributions to the Faculty as a whole. They commended the EGSA for assisting new scholars, creating "venues for intellectual exchange" by organizing "an astonishing array of events", and representing graduate students on various governance bodies (p. 19).

In addition to this recognition, we applaud the team's recommendation that the Faculty of Education do more to directly and indirectly support our efforts on behalf of graduate students and for the benefit of the Faculty as a whole. To that end, we are willing to work with the Faculty and to share our ideas as to how Faculty could better support graduate students. So as to give the Faculty some direction in the initiatives the Faculty might initiate to support the graduate student population, EGSA has created a "wish list" of things we ask the Faculty to undertake: http://www.sfu.ca/egsa/resources_forms/wishlist/wishlist.html

The EGSA Executive would have liked to see the review team mention some of the concerns of graduate students, which were shared with them during the formal meeting and at the reception. These concerns included:

- The lack of intellectual and institutional community that graduate students need to support them in their work as new and emerging scholars
- Discussions about the varied interpretations of scholarship and what it means to be a scholar within the Faculty
- How Sessional Instructors are (un)represented within Faculty governance
- Inconsistency in quality of supervision
- The availability of professors to supervise graduate students
- Inconsistencies in course content and teaching in PhD programs
- Lack of opportunities for research assistant-ships among large segments of the graduate student population.

We would have liked to see such concerns as these acknowledged in the final report.

Finally, we would like to thank Dr. de Castell for her efforts and accomplishments in including graduate students in this review exercise. We look

forward to continuing our involvement as the Faculty engages in stages of discussion and decision-making that will follow in the months to come.

Thank you very much.

J.M. Young
GPC Representative
On behalf of EGSA Executive

Appendix 2: Field Programs' Response to the Report of the External Evaluation Team

We're grateful for the recognition given to the work undertaken by the faculty, staff and students involved in Field Programs. We offer the comments below on the document in an effort to enhance its clarity and impact.

Valuing the work we do in the Faculty of Education (Recommendations 1 & 2):

1. We recommend that the Faculty construct a set of priorities from which to operate over the coming years against which all of their individual and collective work can be planned, carried out, and evaluated.
2. We recommend that a broad-based orientation to scholarship and practice be used to guide how the Faculty of Education both understands and makes decisions about program excellence.

Field Programs endorses the recommendation that the faculty re-examine its priorities and take a broader look at the relationship between scholarship and practice. We feel the work undertaken in Field Programs would be better understood and appreciated as a result of this process.

Restructuring the Faculty of Education in order to address issues around communication, transparency, decision-making and governance (Recommendations 5, 14 & 31):

5. We recommend that the five programs be restructured into two organizational units: Professional Development unit (Undergraduate Programs, Professional Programs and International Programs) and Graduate Education unit (Graduate Programs, Field Programs, and International Programs).
14. We recommend the enhanced and integrated development and implementation of the graduate education programs as afforded through the restructuring of Graduate Education and Field Programs into a Graduate Education unit (with affiliations with International Programs as appropriate).
31. We recommend that the organizational structure of the Faculty be re-examined with a view to creating a clearer structure that more closely aligns with its major operations; a proposal to initiate discussion appears in Appendix C. This structure would involve two Associate Dean positions: the Associate Dean (Graduate Education and Research) established in parallel with the position of Associate Dean (Professional Development).

Field Programs is already included under the umbrella of Graduate Programs to some extent, however we agree communication can be improved. We would look forward to considering options for enhancing the flow of information with or without restructuring. Any changes to the Faculty's organizational structure or governance must preserve the integrity and distinctiveness of individual program areas. If the relationship between Field Programs and other units

involved in graduate studies is restructured, we must ensure these features of Field Programs activities are preserved:

- Field Programs' Graduate Diploma programs would still require a distinct, separate infrastructure to support students and support relationships with school districts. This is due to the nature of the relationships among program staff; students and school districts, which are unique and essential to the success of our programs;
- The differentiated staffing model involving mentors, seconded teachers (as faculty associates) and faculty is essential to the strength and credibility of our programs and relationships with educators and school districts.
- The academic integrity of our programs must be protected as it might be lost in restructuring;
- Field Programs must retain its ability to develop programs in collaboration with School Districts so programs continue to be responsive to the on-going and shifting needs for professional development evident in the field;
- Field Programs must be able to respond to requests from districts in outlying areas (outside of the Lower Mainland area);
- The focus on practitioner inquiry through field study work;
- Community-based cohort model which develops district-based professional learning communities;
- The cumulative, non-graded assessment process;
- Admission policies and procedures that acknowledge teachers' commitment to professional development as the primary consideration for admission.

External Evaluation (Recommendation 8):

8. We recommend periodic external reviews of the teacher education and graduate programs that are not already reviewed by accrediting bodies.

Field Programs welcomes the Review Teams support for an external review process. However, given the state of our financial resources it is unlikely that we will be able to engage in such a process unless external funds are provided by the Dean, senior administration or other sources for that purpose.

Errors in the text of the report supporting Recommendation 14:

There are a number of errors in the paragraph on page 14 (highlighted in italics below).

"The community-based (off-campus) MEd and diploma programs developed and implemented by Field Programs and International Programs offer educators relevant, responsive, and principled programs. For example, in the case of Field Programs, programs are grounded in principles of teacher/professional learning, with a particular focus on practice-based, self-directed, inquiry-oriented, and creative pedagogical experiences. These Programs have relied on either a differentiated or a sessional/contract staffing model, one that involves faculty

members when available. In the 2005-2007 period, faculty members only *volunteered* 14.5 courses (7 faculty members) to the Field Programs (*sometimes the involvement requires a stipend*)..."

- Possible confusion regarding Field Programs' community-based MEds and those offered by Graduate Programs: We want to make it clear that the MEd programs offered by Field Programs are distinctive in length, structure and nature from those offered under the auspices of Graduate Programs.
- Correction regarding costs related to faculty involvement in Field Programs: Faculty is seldom, if ever, on a "volunteer" basis. Unlike Undergraduate, Professional and Graduate Programs, Field Programs must pay real dollars to purchase faculty workload assignments or other portions of their time. Some programs have purchased short-term visits from faculty. Others required payment of a full sessional instructor salary at a flat rate equivalent to the cost of a 4-credit assignment although the course they taught may have had only a 2- or 3-credit value to students. Please note the use of the past tense in the preceding sentences, as this over-payment cannot continue in the context of increasing sessional instructor rates and budget reductions. We would appreciate the Review Team's support for our efforts to address and resolve this problem in our efforts to increase faculty involvement.

Request for clarification regarding Recommendations 3 & 15:

3. We recommend the consolidation of graduate programs with no further expansion in enrolment.
15. We recommend the continued development of community-based off-campus MEd and diploma programs based on models developed by Field Programs and International Programs.

Recommendations 3 and 15 seem to be contradictory from the perspective of Field Programs – is the team recommending expansion of community-based off-campus MEd and diploma programs, or not? Is Recommendation 15 intended to distinguish Field Programs' and International Programs' efforts and growth from that of community-based programs offered by Graduate Programs? The fact that the Team has included a recommendation specific to two program areas indicates these two areas are being encouraged to grow at a rate different from the rate of expansion recommended for other graduate programs. We seek clarification of the relationship between these two recommendations and the implications for Field Programs.

Missing from the Recommendations:

A dominant theme in Field Programs' submission to the Faculty's Self-Study document was the desperate need for accurate budget information and predictable financial support for our programs. We are aware that other program areas share this frustration however the consequences for Field Programs are more severe as our area is not included in the Faculty's traditional base budget.

We receive an unstable "base" budget plus premium fee funding that is based on unreliable data collected from SIMS and dispersed on a slip-year basis followed by periodic adjustments. Without a stable, accurate flow of funds and information we are unable to plan for the short or long term and this, in turn, endangers our credibility and relationships with current and potential students, and school districts. The impacts of these precarious conditions can only be expected to increase in the context of current and anticipated budget cuts. We found no recognition of the difficulties created by uncertainties in funding our work, nor any recommendations that might enable us to pursue more reliable financial relationships within the Faculty and/or with the senior administration in the Team's Report.

In closing...

We appreciate the Team's recognition of Field Programs' accomplishments and the strength of our relationships with in-service educators and school districts. We realize it is our responsibility to represent the distinctive nature of the work undertaken in Field Programs and the challenges created by the differences in the way it operates (e.g., financing) as compared to the other program areas in the Faculty of Education. We also realize that this may not have been achieved in the documentation provided to the External Review Team. We look forward to accomplishing this in our on-going self-study. In the meantime, we would appreciate the Team's recommendations regarding our need for predictable funding and accurate information to guide our efforts to plan for the future.

Appendix 3: External Communications Office Response to the External Review Report

A. External Communications

In response to the External Review report, page 19, where the reviewers expressed that "there has also been an extraordinary effort to make visible the research of faculty through the Office of External Communications, by the measures we were given, this effort has met with considerable success," the External Communications Office is pleased to know that the reviewers recognized the value of external communications. It should be noted that the strategy for the next two years is to focus on directing our external communications efforts to continue to promote our faculty research at the provincial level and to promote this research to an additional national and international stage as well.

In response to the recommendation that a restructuring that involve the External Communications Office that, "there may be ways that the Director of Administrative Relations, the External Communications Office, and the Executive Committee of the Education Graduate Student Association could join forces in enhancing opportunities for sharing research, within the Faculty, in the broader university context, and beyond," the External Communications Office notes that consideration of this recommendation will require thoughtful assessment and planning for optimal effectiveness. The External Communications Office should be involved at the very early stages of this discussion.

B. Internal Communications

Contributions by all program areas and units may demonstrate a greater commitment to addressing our own Faculty's internal communications. By using existing internal committees with the Associate Dean-Administration's office, providing coordination this may be achieved. Both external and internal activities may be then recognized and offer interface for all staff and faculty. This might include:

-
- a) A recommendation from the External Reviewers in which there is a, "...need for appropriate mechanisms for intellectual exchange including, retreats, colloquia, seminars, and common communication platforms or templates to make research interests more visible. This need for intellectual exchange was just as visible during the site visit for the 2008 external review. Faculty members, Faculty Associates, and graduate students expressed a strong desire to learn more about the research of their colleagues. At the same time that faculty members pointed to the need for this type of intellectual exchange, some lamented that when research seminars or other information sessions were held, attendance was often poor. It should be noted that there has been progress on this front, particularly in the last couple of years. For
-

example, the electronic newsletter, InRange, was instigated by the Director of Administrative Relations. Further plans are in the making." (page 19)

- b) To assess the situation in order to ensure initiatives are cost-effective (particularly given the current budget restraints) and accountable for efforts and achievements. To do this, any approach would require information, planning, and a strategy for implementation. For example, several questions need to be asked and answered in order to determine the best approach:
- how are the faculty, staff, and students communicating with one another now?
 - what information are people wanting?
 - how do people want to receive information?
 - how often do people want to receive information?
 - what possible internal communications vehicles can be established now?

Appendix 4: APSA Response

APSA MEETING: RESPONSE TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEW (May 5, 2008)

Attendees: Derek Warren, Howard Leung, Catherine Clarke, Jacquie Breadon, Ruby Ng

A group of APSA managers attended a feedback meeting to discuss the response to recommendations made by the external reviewers pertaining to the work environment and staff in the Faculty of Education at SFU. A draft of the response was then distributed to the broader APSA group for review and comments. In general, the APSA group was able to identify where efforts are already in place associated with the recommendations, were able to brainstorm additional solutions, and agreed that discussions can and should continue during APSA meetings, as well as, between managers and staff in program areas and work units.

Working Environment

We recommend:

35. That the problem of obtaining sufficient resources and technical support on the Surrey campus be explored and that dedicated videoconferencing facilities be established on both campuses.

While discussions are already taking place regarding tech support at the Surrey campus, pending budget, during the feedback discussion, the APSA group highlighted the importance of recognizing the complexity of this issue for both the Surrey and Burnaby campuses. The complexity transcends the immediate demands for technology and equipment, and even the need for a more robust technical infrastructure, but also the allocation of financial and staffing resources to support the infrastructure and needs during a time of budget restraints, effects on efficiency and productivity, and even the human impact (workload, stress, etc.). An important aspect of planning is for everyone to remember that the issue isn't about technological tools but also how they are used. Training and re-training should be considered among staff.

The group felt it is important to note that this is not a CET problem, but an issue that affects program area staff and the Faculty as a whole, and requires a solution that involves collaborative participation. For example, the group highlighted the importance for careful project planning (both current and future projects) that identify technology needs in order to get ahead of what ultimately needs to be achieved rather than implementing band-aid solutions when problems arise.

A suggestion for staff to identify and discuss cost-effective ways of finding solutions and sharing information was made. For example, regarding the

communication between the Surrey and Burnaby campuses, given the current budget restraints that may delay ideal solutions such as video conferencing facilities, a suggestion was made to, in the meantime, establish policies and protocols to support communication between staff from both campuses. Other suggestions and ideas included increasing cost-recovery measures whether for facilities or services, or possibly seeking external funding. Proposed solutions should first be planned and then implemented as a pilot project, possibly at the Surrey campus. It was again noted that even solutions depend on the availability of additional resources.

36. That the University explore the problems of job classification and reclassification for staff in the Faculty of Education, with a view to finding a way to streamline the process.

To date, the APSA group, in addition to individual contacts with HR, have met with Dario Nonis specifically on this issue and will continue to raise it with HR. Due to the fact that this is a university-level HR issue, the APSA group felt that it was important to continue to stay on the HR radar and be the squeaky wheel, and reminding HR people that there are positions pending classification, etc.

37. That annual reviews for all staff members be carried out according to an agreed timetable and set of guiding principles.

This is a good idea and has already been in discussion amongst the APSA group. One manager is collecting information from the University regarding a uniform, standard evaluation for CUPE staff. Other suggestions made include inviting someone from HR or career counselling to hold a workshop with staff about career planning and to get staff thinking about expanding professional opportunities, what qualifications and re-training may be needed.

It was noted that in order to enhance the likelihood of successfully conducting timely and useful evaluations, they need to be tied into something in addition to structured feedback. Possible incentives need to be discussed and considered whether in the form of recognition, discretionary days, etc. APSA managers will discuss and also obtain feedback from staff.

38. That the provision of information technology and technical support on the Burnaby campus be reviewed, with a view to finding cost-effective ways of making improvements and encouraging staff to share their knowledge.

See response to #35 above.

39. That staff concerns about their working environment, and their recommendations for improvement, be carefully considered and acted upon. Where this is not possible, staff should be fully apprised of the reasons.

APSA managers believe that certainly at the program level staff are addressing internal communications in specific ways, for example, through regular weekly meetings where discussions regarding issues, concerns, and questions are encouraged. The group felt it is important to continue this practice so that staff feel they are being heard and have a person to go to, and also noted that these discussions will also involve sharing information about the rationale for certain decisions that were made and a recognition that not everything can be acted upon as desired. Communication between program areas needs to continue to happen as well, for example, at APSA group meetings.

Also to Note:

Since restructuring was raised as a possibility in the report from the External Review, the group felt it was important to note that APSA managers have the skills and expertise to be involved in discussions that affect operations, staffing, etc. As such, the APSA group would like to be involved in any discussions before decisions are made that impact staff.

Appendix 5: International Programs Response

Ian Andrews, Bonnie Waterstone, Sharon Wahl, Margaret Froese, Sophie Dunbar

International Programs (IP) is an active member within the University's institutional and global agenda for internationalization. IP is the primary vehicle for international initiatives within the Faculty of Education.

It is gratifying that the ERC is respectful of the role that International Programs (IP) plays within the Faculty as it coordinates the program delivery and the revenue generation of international consultancies that often lead to credit based programs and international enrolments e.g., Thailand, Laos, Cambodia (TLC) Joint Program with Continuing Studies and CIDA (Graduate), Trinidad International Teacher Education Program (PDP ITEM), and the Field School Programs in India and Indonesia (Undergraduate).

Furthermore, the ERC indicates that the Faculty attends to a broader based orientation toward scholarship and practice, which closely follows the established protocols of International Programs. As a cross-disciplinary program area, IP works closely with faculty members to facilitate their specific areas of international research with other members of faculty and with other educational institutions in Canada and internationally.

In addition, it should be noted that:

1. The ERC recognizes that in order for the faculty to be recognized in a broader arena of research, service and teaching, this could lead to increased involvement in International Programs. There is opportunity for faculty involvement in the International Masters program, off shore graduate programs and in short-term non-credit programs.
2. One of the recommendations of the External Review team was to use a "broad-based orientation to scholarship and practice... to guide how the Faculty both understands and makes decisions about program excellence" (p. 10). In further explicating the framework for evaluating programs and setting program priorities, the ERC named the centrality of a praxis of theory and practice: "students need to engage in the theoretically rigorous study of practice and practice-based study of theory in order to become exemplary knowledge workers in their fields" (p. 10).
3. We would suggest that this understanding of praxis is the heart of the MEd programs, in particular the International MEd:
 - Coordination and on-going meetings of instructional team support a coherent thematic approach throughout the program, facilitating courses that encourage critique while offering support and contributing to curriculum development/re-evaluation.

- Cultural assumptions within North American theory/practice cannot be taken for granted in teaching/learning, which can lead to valuable critiques from students' "outsider" perspectives and an exciting teaching experience for instructors.
 - Practice/theory embedded in the design of the program with two Fieldwork courses, coordinated with core courses in educational theory.
 - Research based on the program is supported, which can then inform program development. Two Faculty members are currently doing research based in the International M.Ed. program. Roumi Ilieva is researching constructions of professional identities of non-native English speakers teaching EFL. Bonnie Waterstone is researching academic literacy and the politics of English in teaching international graduate students. In addition, a work-study Research Assistant has been approved to collect data to further support the on-going curriculum development of the August Orientation Program for the arriving students.
4. Overall faculty involvement in international and global education is evident with the contributions of such faculty members as Stephen Smith, Michelle Nilson, Kelleen Toohey, Wanda Cassidy, Özlem Sensoy, Mark Fettes, Sandy Vamos and Stephen Marshall to mention just a few. For example, Steve Marshall is researching academic literacy development – a comparative study of MEd students from Thailand, Laos and Cambodia.
5. Short term international programs were also exemplified and acknowledged by the ERC for the following reasons:
- Providing professional development to groups of teachers from other countries, for which this might not be available in home countries.
 - Giving SFU faculty and staff the opportunity to present and share their knowledge, skill, experience, vision and passion.
 - Promoting intercultural awareness for all participants.
 - Learning from the experience of teachers from other countries.
 - Continuing to promote and further strengthen the reputation of the SFU PDP program, internationally.
 - Supporting the concept and the reality of life-long learning.
 - Contributing financially, in the form of overhead, to the university and the faculty.

However, there are limitations to the recommendations of the ERC. The recommendation for two amalgamated organizational units does not take into consideration the specific roles and responsibilities that are inherent in the five different program areas.

In Appendix C, the proposed structure simplifies International Programs to provide international support in both the undergraduate and graduate areas, and it is unclear to whom the Coordinator of IP would report? Another issue with the

proposed restructuring is workloads. IP currently has a Director and the equivalent of two full-time coordinators. The workload of these three positions could not be handled by one coordinator position as recommended by the ERC.

An amalgamated organizational structure will significantly affect IP, especially in the crucial area of organizational leadership. Without a Director, it is not clear how International Programs could continue to have the institutional and administrative opportunity to provide leadership in all areas of the faculty. Although international initiatives are important, for most individual faculty members, international activities are a secondary focus and without sufficient support from IP these activities may not come to fruition. Therefore, it is unclear how International Programs could continue to develop, implement and support credit and non-credit programs when re-organized as recommended by the ERC. Such initiatives require significant infrastructure support.

The ERC recommendation for organizational amalgamation does not take into consideration the five different program areas. There is insufficient documentation to warrant such organizational restructuring. We are very convinced that this recommendation is not a high priority for the Faculty to address this coming year, especially when fiscal priorities, new premium fee non-credit opportunities and selected cutbacks need to be addressed.

In conclusion, it was good to see that the ERC also:

- Encourages the Faculty to continue to support the close community school base relationship we have with school districts throughout the Province.
- Supports the future of PTEM and APTEM as part of Aboriginal Programs.
- Supports the future of PQP.
- Agrees that the activity of research in both the Professional Development Unit and International Programs Unit be enhanced by having the Institute for Studies in Teacher Education.

Appendix 6: Education Research Office Response (March 2008)

Philip H. Winne, Research Coordinator, Tracey Leacock, Grants Facilitator,
Geniva Liu, Grants Facilitator

The Faculty's *Self Study Report Fall 07 - Spring 08* characterizes the Faculty as "a research leader among comprehensive universities in Canada... To sustain and expand this level of accomplishment, the Research Opportunities Committee, along with the [research] coordinator and an expanded staff have launched a vigorous process of investment in building research capacity in the Faculty over the past two years" (p. 5). Support for this claim is apparent throughout the *Self Study* wherein each of our Program areas reports applying state-of-the-art research in its instructional activities, and advancing research and scholarship through a program of research (see, for example: pp. 30, 40, 41, 49, 54, 57, 73, 74, 101, 105-106, 107, 124, 128, 129, 137). The Faculty as a whole expresses strong value in research and scholarship (e.g., p. 146, 148). Moreover, research assistantships, funded by internal and external grants, provide financial support for 30% of graduate students and as well as "invaluable" experience (p. 87). Finally, research and scholarly excellence are values faculty members would like to see as core. (p. 146).

The External Review Team's report validates the Faculty's self-perceptions: "There is no question that this Faculty has embraced research as a fundamental part of its culture... **There can be no doubt that the quality of faculty research is high** (pp. 6, 16, bold in the original).

Responses to Recommendations in the External Review

We concur with this overall judgment in the External Review Team's report. Specific responses to recommendations and observations follow. For background, we note the ERO, prior to the external review, had initiated interviews with all members of the Faculty that covered wide scope with respect to issues of scholarship and research. We plan for this data gathering and analysis to be complete circa 2008 June 20. Our objectives are to:

- gather information on the diversity of research interests, orientations, and methodologies represented in the Faculty
- identify what the Faculty at large values in research and scholarship, and
- acquire information needed to plan for support (e.g., through orientation-sensitive feedback on applications, attention to possible funding sources specific to each different need, organizing workshops for different methodological approaches) across the spectrum of Faculty needs regarding scholarship and research.

Recommendation 13. The Profession Development unit develop a program of research...

The external team observed, "The research agenda [in Professional Programs], however, has been more emergent than planned" (p. 14). Based on data gathered in interviews of faculty members, we will map potential topics for synergy involving faculty members' agendas in research and scholarship and PDP's objectives and processes.

Recommendation 21. A broad-based orientation to scholarship be used to guide how the Faculty both understands and makes decisions about scholarly excellence.

and

Recommendation 27. Careful attention be given to the constitution of committees, the staffing of offices, and the filling of administrative positions to ensure that a broad range of research orientations and methodologies are represented.

The external review team observed: Yet another important method to achieve this goal is through the membership of committees and staffing of offices charged with advancing the research enterprise. While it may be difficult – or indeed, impossible – to have representation from the entire spectrum of disciplinary orientations and methodologies of inquiry, it is important for each member of faculty to see their kind of research orientation represented on these committees and in the overall administrative structure... it is imperative that the Faculty as a whole broaden its notions of what constitutes educational research... In the 2007 Report on Research Productivity, it was noted that "a number of faculty felt that the research they pursued – both in terms of methods and disciplines – was not as highly valued as other areas and methods of research." The report went on to say that "the vision of scholarly excellence was insufficiently flexible" and that the Faculty needed to "embrace a broader definition of scholarship and research that maintains excellence, value, and impact in all fields and across research methods." These observations still hold true. (p. 20)

We will synthesize information gathered in our interviews of faculty members to describe the landscape of scholarship in the Faculty. Alongside other efforts (e.g., faculty research presentations), this will clarify what our Faculty currently values as expressions of its members' research and scholarship.

Recommendation 22. The Faculty create a succession plan for hiring, based on the overall priorities it sets for the next few years of its development, including, where appropriate, hiring at the Associate level.

Interview data and past information – specifically, discussion of proposals for new hires at Faculty meetings – document that faculty members seek one or more colleagues with specialization in research methodology(ies). The Faculty's *Self Study* noted in the section on student voices from Graduate Programs,

"Specific concerns were voiced across disciplines about a lack of research methods courses..." (p. 84).

We will generate a profile of expressed methodological needs to submit to the Faculty at large and the Faculty Appointments Committee for consideration in framing a plan for hiring that reflects priorities observed in our interviews of faculty members.

Recommendation 24. The Faculty intensify and coordinate its efforts at mentoring junior and pre-tenure faculty.

This is a priority of ERO. Workshops will be developed and delivered, starting in early September 2008, that respond to the needs identified in the external review and in our interview data. A section of the ERO web site will provide samples of research proposals as exemplars.

Recommendation 25. The Faculty recommit itself to connecting with their colleagues' research interests and agendas through informal and formal means, through individual and group efforts.

An objective of our interview protocol is to identify possible areas of collaboration among faculty members, and potential opportunities for cross-faculty mentoring. We also will use these data to identify opportunities to establish partnerships that bridge other Faculties at SFU.

Recommendation 26. The Faculty coordinate its efforts to provide mechanisms for intellectual exchange and develop coordinated faculty profiles by bringing together the work of the Education Research Office, the Director of Administrative Relations, the Executive Committee of the Education Student Graduate Association, and the Communications Office, under the auspices of the proposed new organizational structure where these activities would fall in the portfolio of Associate Dean (Graduate Education and Research).

In their analysis of why faculty members do not engage in enough intellectual exchange, the external review team opined that one component of "what is needed is an integrated system of data management to develop profiles to share within the faculty and to use to inform others" (p. 20). The ERO will develop a web-hosted tool to meet this need.

Recommendation 29. The Faculty explore efficiencies around the centres and research clusters to make best use of available fiscal resources, space, and staff, examining the feasibility of a "Centre of Centres" on the Surrey campus.

The ERO's data from faculty interviews will be added to information available to the Associate Dean-Administration to address this issue.

Recommendation 31. The organizational structure of the Faculty be re-examined with a view to creating a clearer structure that more closely aligns with its major operation... This structure would involve two Associate Dean positions: the Associate Dean (Graduate Education and Research) established in parallel with the position of Associate Dean (Professional Development).

The Faculty's recent approval of a job description for the Research Coordinator takes a step toward clarifying roles and responsibilities that relate to aligning with our emphasis on research and scholarship.

Recommendation 35. The problem of obtaining sufficient resources and technical support on the Surrey campus be explored and that dedicated videoconferencing facilities be established on both campuses.

The external review team observed, "The availability of technical support and research space were generally thought to be inadequate on the Surrey campus (p. 26). This exacerbates challenging conditions for newly appointed, junior faculty. ERO's data will be used to clarify needs and help set an agenda to rectify issues.

Report from the External Review Team

**Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University**

by

Dr. Rena Upitis, Queen's University (Chair)
Dr. Graham Pike, University of Prince Edward Island
Dr. Dennis Thiessen, OISE/University of Toronto

March 2008

Acknowledgements

Reviewing the work of one's colleagues is a challenging privilege. Our work was guided by the detailed and refreshingly honest self-study prepared by members of the Faculty of Education. We were also guided in our work by what we learned during our meetings with faculty, staff, students, and administration during our three-day visit to Simon Fraser University in mid-March 2008. Participants in these meetings were forthcoming and thoughtful with their prepared remarks and in their spontaneous responses to our questions. Special thanks to those members of the community who ensured we were provided with the documentation we needed, and for making arrangements for the site visit. We are indebted to the fourth member of the review team, Dr. Marjorie Griffin Cohen (Political Science/Women's Studies). As the internal member of the review team, she was able to provide us with valuable insights about historical precedents, cultural norms, and procedures and practices at Simon Fraser University.

Report of the External Review Team 2008

Faculty of Education Simon Fraser University

Before arriving for the site visit, which took place from March 12, 2008 to March 14, 2008, we were provided with extensive documentation including the Faculty's Self-Study, the Terms of Reference for the Review, the Curriculum Vitae of tenure-track and tenured professors, the President's Agenda, the Three Year Plan of the Vice-President (Academic), the Three Year Plan of the Faculty of Education (2007–2010), the University's Strategic Research Plan, the Institutional Service Plan and Report, a recent survey of Baccalaureate Graduates, Data on SFU Research Grants and Contracts to Academic Departments, and the 2007–2008 University Course Calendar.

The Terms of Reference for the review provided us with a framework for our questions and for the presentation of our findings and recommendations that appear in this report (see Appendix A). We were asked to provide the University with assurances about the quality of teaching, research, and administration, and the working environment of the Faculty. In addition, there were other specific issues identified for this particular review, which appear below, following the general terms of reference:

General Terms of Reference

- ❖ The quality of the unit's teaching programs is high and there are measures in place to ensure their evaluation and revision.
- ❖ The quality of faculty research is high and faculty collaboration and interaction provides a stimulating academic environment.
- ❖ The faculty members participate in the administration of the unit and take an active role in the dissemination of knowledge.
- ❖ The environment is conducive to the attainment of the objectives of the Faculty.

Terms of Reference Specific to the Faculty of Education 2008 Review

- ❖ An evaluation of the current undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs (including faculty, centers, external sites, international programs, premium fee programs) and a strategic analysis of the opportunities for expansion and/or consolidation to address conditions of financial constraint.
 - ❖ An assessment of the optimum size of the EdD program and the adequacy of resources available to support the program.
-

- ❖ An assessment of the character, quality, and integrity of the curricula, pedagogy, research and scholarship of the Faculty, including advice on how these should be pursued in the future.
- ❖ An evaluation of the Faculty's overall strategic direction which aims to maintain excellence in its programs of research and teaching across diverse areas of Education, while managing resources and communications across multiple campuses within a complex environment.

During our site visit, we sought additional information in order to respond to the terms of reference. The self-study did not contain, for example,

- ❖ information about faculty teaching workloads
- ❖ detailed budget information
- ❖ course evaluations
- ❖ program evaluations
- ❖ sufficient detail regarding graduate student supervisory loads
- ❖ enrolment targets, offers, and admissions
- ❖ EdD program overview
- ❖ submission to the B.C. College of Teachers
- ❖ progress and completion rates for graduate students

Documentation regarding these issues was provided to us during our visit. Additional materials were provided by participants as they took part in the interviews, including documentation from the Office of Francophone and Francophile Affairs, Communications, Advancement, International Programs, and Field Programs.

Our site visit included time on both the Burnaby and Surrey campuses. We met with just over half the faculty members, a dozen Faculty Associates, 5 CUPE staff at the Surrey campus and over 20 CUPE staff at the Burnaby campus, 4 APSA members at the Surrey campus and 14 APSA members at the Burnaby campus. There was a formal meeting with graduate students at the Burnaby campus (10 attended), in addition to a reception where we spoke with other students, faculty, and staff. Two undergraduate students met with us to describe the APTEM professional development model. We met at least once with various members of senior administration including the Vice President (Academic), the Associate Vice President (Academic), the Associate Vice President (Research), the Director of Academic Planning, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Dean of Education. Other meetings were held with the Associate Dean (Academic), the Associate Dean (Administration), the Chair of the Renewal, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, the Director of Graduate Programs, the Director of Undergraduate Programs, the Director of Field Programs, the Director of Administrative Relations, the Director of International Programs, and the Director of Professional Development Programs. Meetings were arranged with staff involved with the communications and advancement functions, as well as French programs. We also interviewed several of the directors of the centres and institutes. By the end of the three days, we interacted with well over a hundred people, individually or in small groups (see Appendix B).

The remainder of the report is divided into eight sections. We begin with a discussion of the Faculty's strengths. Next, we discuss the major challenges and opportunities, with the first of our recommendations contained therein. The following four sections focus on the basic terms of reference, namely teaching programs, research, administration, and environment where we present our observations and recommendations relating to each of these broad—but interconnected—areas. The body of the report closes with a summary of the recommendations and some brief concluding remarks, followed by appendices.

STRENGTHS

People

The strongest resource in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University is its people. The quality and commitment of the employees at all levels in the Faculty is high. Senior academics continue to contribute significantly to the Faculty's profile, as do faculty members in the middle and junior ranks. In fact, a notable feature of the current personnel make-up is the high proportion of junior faculty members: over 40% have been appointed in the last four years. Their enthusiasm and productivity levels since appointment suggests that the high quality is assured for the foreseeable future; indeed, as these junior faculty mature in their careers, exciting and path-finding scholarship, teaching, and service to the educational community looks likely in the years to come. Supporting the faculty members is a sizeable cadre of APSA and CUPE staff who are both skilled and dedicated, and who appear to find in the Faculty a stimulating and enjoyable work environment. The undergraduate students we spoke with were clearly excited and inspired by their professional development program (PDP), and we have every reason to believe that students in these programs feel well prepared for their future careers in teaching. The graduate student body is impressive and active: they contribute in significant ways to the research culture of the Faculty and to the overall intellectual community. Equally impressive are the professionals from the school districts who form a major teaching force in the Faculty of Education. These Faculty Associates are deeply committed to professional development and have a long history in shaping and contributing to the professional programs.

Members of the community are aware that in order to sustain and develop the work of the Faculty, changes inevitably need to be made. Faculty expressed strong interest in making these changes in productive ways, evidenced also by the Self-Study document that formed the backbone for the external review, and in the Three Year Plan (2007–2010) of the Faculty of Education.

Research

Simon Fraser's Faculty of Education has a deservedly strong reputation for research. There is impressive scholarly productivity across all ranks, and this is particularly commendable, given the large influx of junior faculty members over the past few years mentioned above. In fact, the high productivity in the years prior to the new appointments has been maintained and even increased in some areas, indicating that the new members of Faculty have been producing scholarship at an impressive rate from the very beginning of their careers. The Faculty as a whole has achieved enviable success with research funding, and there are a proportionally high number of research chairs and large research grants for a Faculty of Education of this size. Although perhaps not immediately apparent, there is an appropriately wide range of methodologies, questions, disciplines, and orientations represented in the research activities of the faculty members.

The centres, institutes and research clusters provide important mechanisms for promoting collaboration across disciplines within the Faculty, with other units in the University, and with other institutions. The graduate students who work directly with faculty members enjoy full involvement in the research enterprise, and have been well supported as indicated by their co-authored papers and conference presentations. There is no question that this Faculty has embraced research as a fundamental part of its culture: members of the Faculty of Education are committed to their research programs, to their graduate students, and to ensuring that the research they undertake has impact.

Programs

The Faculty of Education is well known and well regarded for its innovative and responsive teacher education and graduate programs. This innovation is a fine enactment of the Three Year Academic Plan for Simon Fraser University (2007-2010), where one of the stated objectives is to provide "the most innovative professional programs." In teacher education, the Faculty of Education offers a wide range of innovative options for pre-service teachers with particular Professional Development Program (PDP) modules, including modules in Aboriginal/First Nations Teacher Education, International Teacher Education, and French Education — areas of study that map directly on the strategic goals of Simon Fraser University. It also provides modules for para-professionals and the re-certification of foreign-trained teachers. In graduate programs, the Faculty of Education offers inservice teachers/educators graduate diploma, MEd, and EdD programs in different locations in British Columbia (e.g., Surrey, Kamloops, and Victoria) and in other countries (e.g., China, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia). From the evidence we received, the undergraduate and graduate courses taught by faculty, sessional instructors, and Faculty Associates (FAs) are regarded favorably, with over 75% at the "very good" level (highest possible ranking) in recent years. Since the inception of the Faculty's first PhD programs a quarter century ago, the Faculty has graduated close to 200 candidates. Many of these graduates are now in prominent academic, professional, and administrative positions across Canada and beyond.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The challenges the Faculty of Education faces are interconnected and complex. None of the challenges we name in this report will come as a surprise to the members of the Faculty: they have been working hard at these issues, both formally and informally, in recent years and in decades past. This observation should not be taken as a criticism: the challenges faced by Simon Fraser's Faculty of Education are, in many ways, systemic to education faculties across North America. It is encouraging that the Faculty continues to re-visit these issues afresh, continuing to create ways of improving their work. It is in this spirit that our recommendations are made as well. That being said, it is also the case that the Faculty is at a crucial juncture in its history. It now seeks to preserve the successful traditions of the past and adjust—sometimes reluctantly—to the current fiscal and societal forces that will provide growing and inevitable pressures in shaping new priorities. The shaping of priorities will require the goodwill of all members of the community, as well as the sense of innovation that has been a feature of this Faculty since its inception.

Priorities

One of the most troubling features of the Faculty of Education is the confusion over what *is* and what *ought* to be valued. This confusion is most keenly felt in the large contingent of junior faculty members when it comes to day-to-day decisions about how to set their individual priorities—both short- and long-term—regarding their research, teaching, and service. Even more senior members of faculty expressed uncertainty as to which ventures should take priority, particularly in the course of the coming years where the Faculty is facing looming financial constraints in what is perceived as an increasingly market-driven environment. These uncertainties about what ought to be valued are exacerbated by at least two other factors: (a) the tension between traditional notions of scholarly work and practical wisdom that every Faculty of Education struggles with, and (b) the dearth of ways in which individual faculty members have found the means to understand the work of their colleagues, which can lead to an undervaluing of their colleagues' contributions.

Regarding the first of these factors, the tension between scholarship and practice, it seems evident that a broader notion of scholarship coupled with a broader notion of practice is required as the Faculty begins to articulate more clearly what it is to be valued over the coming years.

Regarding the second factor, it is difficult to understand the work of one's colleagues—and by this we mean the contributions of faculty members, Faculty Associates, sessional instructors, administrators, school associates, among others—when there is a complex set of offerings across many levels of career development and geographic locations. We will say more about this complexity in the next section.

In short, this is the time for the Faculty to construct a set of priorities from which to operate over the coming years. The agreed upon mission and vision are not enough to provide a path forward. Neither is the important call to “establish a unified faculty vision of our core activities” as stated in the Three Year Plan of the Faculty of Education (2007–2010). What is needed is an agreed upon set of priorities where all members of faculty can see what they value as central to the

Faculty's core mission. We are calling for the development of a strategic plan, where priorities are defined to a greater level of specificity, priorities that all faculty members can identify with and embrace.

We recommend that the Faculty construct a set of priorities from which to operate over the coming years against which all of their individual and collective work can be planned, carried out, and evaluated.

Complexity

The multiplicity and complexity of the Faculty's many programs and operations can be viewed as both a strength and a weakness. At this point in the Faculty's development, however, with so many new faculty members, allied to a rapid expansion of programs and students, it seems to be more of a weakness than a strength. Some junior faculty and students with whom we spoke described as the Faculty of Education as a "chaotic" place to study and work, causing them to feel isolated and confused. They also lack an understanding of how to connect with people and systems that might support them and help create a sense of belonging to the Faculty. These challenges, we suggest, are compounded by problems of internal communication and a perception of insufficient transparency in decision-making.

Expansion

Over the last five years the Faculty has witnessed considerable expansion in its operations and personnel. During this period, for example, student enrolments in the EdD program have nearly quadrupled while the number of PhD students has at least doubled, as has the number of programs into which they have been admitted. Not surprisingly, this program expansion has been accompanied by a significant increase in faculty and staff, with the vast majority of new faculty appointments being made at the Assistant Professor level. This has created a further imbalance in the Faculty profile, with the consequent pressure on junior faculty to take on demanding administrative and teaching roles. Adding significantly to the challenges of expansion have been the growing pains of establishing the Faculty's operations on the Surrey campus and the complexities of conducting programs and projects on two sites. Our visits to both campuses suggest that communications between them are neither as effective nor as comprehensive as would be desirable for the satisfactory operation of the programs and the most efficient use of faculty and staff time.

Resources

In the current climate of fiscal uncertainty and restraint, it is unlikely that there will be additional resources available for personnel (new faculty or staff appointments), restructuring (e.g., renovation), or capital projects (e.g., new buildings). The lack of clarity on priorities and the tendency to maintain current practices (e.g., how staff are deployed or how space is assigned) conspires against changes that might be possible within the current circumstances and conditions, resulting in efficiencies and synergies to be achieved with existing resources.

Organizational Structure

We acknowledge that the organizational structure contributes to the problems noted under complexity noted above, especially around issues of communication and transparency. At the same time, if the faculty members either had more opportunities to participate in decision-making or were more fully engaged in governance, changes in the organizational structure of the Faculty of Education may not be necessary. It is not immediately clear if the organizational structure needs to be re-invented or simply re-invigorated. That being said, the expansion in both faculty and graduate students, and the increasing complexity of the Faculty (see above) suggests that some restructuring may be needed. As the Faculty of Education sorts out its priorities and addresses the challenges of complexity, any changes in the organizational structure will likely occur to the extent that they enable faculty members to better enact and manage their priorities in a spirit of frank and open communication and democratic decision-making, whether by consensus or some form of representational democracy. In the end, whatever the Faculty of Education does, it is not the structure that is the only solution (or the primary problem); the issue is how the people make use of the structure.

TEACHING PROGRAMS

Summary

Through five program units (Undergraduate Programs, Professional Programs, Graduate Programs, Field Programs, International Programs), the Faculty of Education offers a wide range of credit and non-credit courses, modules, and programs in teacher education and graduate education. Based on the qualifications of the faculty members, high applicant to enrolment ratios (as high as 20:1), the diversification and expansion of program activities, course assessments, student surveys (though the graduate students raised some concerns), the completion rates for graduate students, the successes of graduates (e.g., academic appointments, publications, leadership positions), some research results (mainly for the Professional Development Programs), an analysis of selected program documents (e.g., EdD Program Overview; Professional Programs' submission to the Association of BC Deans of Education and BC College of Teachers, 2007), and reputation, *the quality of the teacher education and graduate programs is high.*

Framework for Evaluating Programs and Setting Program Priorities

Following from our first recommendation about setting priorities and consistent with the general arguments about setting priorities for research (for a discussion about what constitutes valued scholarship, see below: *Framework for Evaluating Research and Setting Priorities*), it is important to consider what constitutes "valued programs" and valued teaching within these programs, and how programs are evaluated. For programs, the charge above to honour "a broader notion of scholarship coupled with a broader notion of practice" translates into a view of valued programs that both respects and encompasses how theory informs and is informed by practice.

In this concept of what constitutes valued programs, it is this praxis of theory and practice that is at the heart of how we construct, enact, and evaluate a wide range of professional and research programs. Whether preparing for a professional career or a research/academic career, students need to engage in the theoretically rigorous study of practice and practice-based study of theory in order to become exemplary knowledge workers in their fields. Though the particular engagement with the theory-practice relationship will vary in each program, students nonetheless learn how to generate, integrate, and apply knowledge in ways that are meaningful and relevant to the discipline- and/or career-related focus of their respective programs.

We recommend that a broad-based orientation to scholarship and practice be used to guide how the Faculty of Education both understands and makes decisions about program excellence.

In the following sections, we begin with some general observations and recommendations about the teaching programs. We then provide more specific observations and recommendations for teacher education, graduate education, and non-credit program activities.

General Observations and Recommendations Related to the Teaching Programs

In recent years, there has been a significant expansion of both doctoral programs (in both enrolment and, in the case of PhD programs, in areas/fields), a relatively steady state in the MA/MSc programs, and a fluctuation (enrolment) and some diversification (in sites, delivery modes) in the MEd programs. The overall increase in graduate enrolment has also resulted in a proportional decrease in faculty involvement in teacher education courses and PDP modules. Between 2002/03 and 2006/2007, in teacher education, the annualized FTE enrolments have increased (though the headcount is relatively stable). The overall enrolment in teacher education is likely to increase with the introduction of the Bachelor of General Studies (Education) program; some additional modules are also proposed (e.g., Aboriginal/First Nation, French, international, PTEM).

We recommend the consolidation of graduate programs with no further expansion in enrolment.

We recommend that, with the exception of the addition of the Bachelor of General Studies (Education) program, the focus in teacher education should be on maintaining the current level of enrolment.

The structure and requirements of all programs are clear and appropriate to their respective areas/fields. The innovative, responsive, and adaptive program models used by Professional Programs, Field Programs, International Programs, and many of the off-campus MEd programs and EdD cohorts provide various professional groups with timely, relevant, and rigorous programs to enhance the understanding and improvement practice.

Various program units have offered or supported teacher education courses or modules (Undergraduate Programs, Professional Programs, and to a lesser extent, International Programs and Field Programs). Similarly various program units have offered or supported graduate courses, diplomas, or programs (Graduate Programs, Field Programs, and to a lesser extent,

International Programs). Though across-program links regularly occur (e.g., between Undergraduate and Professional Programs, Field Programs and Graduate Programs), greater coordination is possible through a re-organization of programs under teacher education and graduate education (for further discussion on this point, see *Administration and Governance*).

We recommend that the five programs be restructured into two organizational units: Professional Development unit (Undergraduate Programs, Professional Programs and International Programs) and Graduate Education unit (Graduate Programs, Field Programs, and International Programs).

The Faculty of Education has made very good progress on many of the priorities identified by the University, particularly those involving programs for French teaching and Aboriginal/First Nations Education. French programs have expanded and are now integrated into a significant part of all program areas. There is a French module in Professional Development Programs, which has increased from 32 to 64 students over the past four years. Students can earn a B.Ed. as a second degree through a Minor in French Education. An MEd [Curriculum and Instruction] is now available in French on the Burnaby campus and has been offered in Victoria and Kelowna. A French Language EdD program in Educational Leadership began in 2007 with 13 students, and Graduate Studies Diploma programs are available in French language education and Pedagogical Differentiation for Immersion and Francophone teachers. In addition, and in cooperation with the Office of Francophone and Francophile Affairs and International Programs, a Dual Certification program is offered with two universities in France.

In the area of Aboriginal/First Nations Education, the Faculty of Education continues to work in partnership with Aboriginal/First Nations' peoples to develop programs that respond to the educational needs of these communities (e.g., in teacher education, the Indigenous Peoples' Teacher Education Module and the Kamloops' Indigenous Peoples' Teacher Education Module; in relation to school-based support, the planned development of Paraprofessional Teacher Education Modules; strategies to increase the enrolment of and program options for Aboriginal/First Nations' educators). There are also developments in graduate programs related to health education (e.g., MEd/MA program in Curriculum and Instruction with a specialization in Health and Physical Activity) and educational technology (e.g., master's and doctoral programs in Educational Technology and Learning Design). The application of the six elements of internationalization is a valued and integral dimension of teacher education, graduate education, and research.

Though ongoing program development is evident in most programs, the most extensive engagement with such improvement efforts occurs in Professional Programs (e.g., based on the commitment to inquiry-based renewal).

As noted in the Faculty's Three Year Plan (2007–2010), there is a need to develop "agreement on quality standards for program delivery, teaching, research and service." In the context of the teacher education and graduate programs, other than the indicators noted in the *Summary*, the Faculty of Education does not conduct any systematic, comprehensive, and regular program evaluation of its programs. Some formative evaluation occurs, but usually only on specific

aspects of the program. It also does not invite external reviews of its programs, other than those required by the BC College of Teachers in teacher education or the Canadian Counselling Association (forthcoming).

We recommend that the Faculty of Education create a system for regular and comprehensive internal evaluation of its teacher education and graduate programs.

We recommend that the regular and comprehensive internal evaluation of its teacher education and graduate programs address underlying principles, structure, implementation, and outcomes.

We recommend periodic external reviews of the teacher education and graduate programs that are not already reviewed by accrediting bodies.

The Education Graduate Student Association (EGSA) provides active and extensive support for its members, which we elaborate on in the section dealing with research. Faculty members could do more to directly and indirectly support the impressive efforts of the EGSA.

In the same spirit as the discussion below about what constitutes valued scholarship (see *Framework for Evaluating Research and Setting Priorities*), it is also important to consider what constitutes "valued teaching" and how this teaching is assessed. For the most part, teaching was mainly described in terms of teaching courses and supervising students (and here mainly graduate supervision). Though some spoke about teaching in terms of scholarship (transforming knowledge), how teaching informs and is informed by research, or contributions to teaching with colleagues (e.g., mentoring), through coordination or innovation (e.g., program leadership), or to the field (e.g., writing articles about how to teach certain issues or topics in a discipline), these wider perspectives on teaching do not seem to be considered in how teaching is understood or assessed.

We recommend that teaching should be equally valued to scholarship and recognized as a form of scholarship in its own right.

We recommend that the assessment of teaching include teaching practice (in courses), student supervision (with both graduate students and teacher education students), the integration of teaching and scholarship (e.g., in the form of action research or program evaluation, the development of curriculum or textbooks, contributions to the teaching of a discipline), and leadership in teaching (e.g., program coordination/development).

Teacher Education

Following the above recommendation to create a Professional Development unit, the following observations and recommendations refer to the combined interests and activities of Undergraduate Programs, Professional Programs, and where appropriate, International Programs.

In recent years, Undergraduate Programs and Professional Programs, and to some extent, International Programs have worked together on such matters as the development of the Bachelor of General Studies (Education) program, the curricular work related to the Writing-Intensive Designation, the articulation and/or coordination between PDP and the professional coursework semester, and the development of a capstone project.

We recommend the enhanced and integrated development and implementation of the teacher education program as afforded through the restructuring of Undergraduate Education and Professional Programs into a Professional Development unit (with affiliations with International Programs as appropriate).

Program development in PDP is in part organic, fostered by the ongoing appointment of Faculty Associates, and in part deliberate, stimulated by the need to address 13 Standards for Education, Competence and Professional Conduct of Educators in British Columbia and the desire to review and improve the program (e.g., revisioning process). On this latter point, in the revisioning process, PDP faculty members and Faculty Associates and Coordinators have embedded six key curriculum ideas into the program: social justice and equity, ecology, health and physical activity, literacy and numeracy, diversity, and technology. In these six core areas, some of the key issues facing educators—such as multiculturalism and special needs education—are addressed.

One of the enduring features and declared strengths of PDP is the differentiated staffing model. Faculty Associates are exemplary teachers who are seconded for two years, with approximately half of the 45 Faculty Associates appointed new each year. The dedicated time to the professional development of the Faculty Associates and Coordinators ensures a pedagogical continuity in the principles that define and guide the PDP, while at the same time honouring the unique contribution that each Faculty Associate and Coordinator brings to the PDP. In the last year, there were 90 applicants for the 22 Faculty Associate positions, an indication of both the quality of those who are hired and of the reputation of PDP in the field. That being said, it is also the case that the current costs of differentiated staffing means that the budget for Faculty Associates and part-time instructors is considerably greater than the budget for faculty members. This begs the question as to whether the FA/faculty budget ratio is appropriate in terms of program needs or budget allocation.

Between 2005 and 2007, 37 faculty members taught 94 undergraduate courses and 19 faculty members completed 35 PDP teaching assignments. The total of 129 teacher education courses was slightly less than the number of graduate courses taught by faculty members in the same time period (148.5 graduate courses). In terms of faculty involvement, steps have been taken to more fully define a PDP teaching assignment. It is not clear what an optimal level of faculty involvement in teacher education would be (especially in PDP) in a differentiated staffing model.

We recommend that faculty members work with the proposed new Professional Development unit to coordinate and increase the involvement of faculty members in teacher education.

The PDP is in part based on an image of practitioner inquiry, and thus research is inherent in the professional development of both students and instructors in the program. As a result, there have been a number of published and unpublished studies, reports, and conference presentations about teacher education at SFU (often associated with the PDP) conducted by Faculty Associates and Coordinators, faculty members, and some students. The research agenda, however, has been more emergent than planned. It has varied in focus, intensity, and frequency, and has not always been framed in ways that inform program improvement.

We recommend that the Professional Development unit develop a program of research that enriches the understanding of the teacher education program experience of beginning teachers, informs the ongoing efforts to improve the teacher education program, and engages all those with an investment in the program (i.e., Faculty Associates, coordinators, faculty members, students) as participants and researchers in the program of research.

Graduate Education

Following the above general recommendation to create a Graduate Education unit, the following observations and recommendations refer to the combined interests and activities of the Graduate Programs, Field Programs, and where appropriate, International Programs.

In recent years, Graduate Programs and Field Programs (and to some extent, International Programs) have worked together on such matters as the delivery of off-campus MEd programs, the articulation of graduate diploma programs and the MEd in Educational Practice, and the application of graduate regulations in admissions, program requirements, etc.

We recommend the enhanced and integrated development and implementation of the graduate education programs as afforded through the restructuring of Graduate Education and Field Programs into a Graduate Education unit (with affiliations with International Programs as appropriate).

The community-based (off-campus) MEd and diploma programs developed and implemented by Field Programs and International Programs offer educators relevant, responsive, and principled programs. For example, in the case of Field Programs, programs are grounded in principles of teacher/professional learning, with a particular focus on practice-based, self-directed, inquiry-oriented, and creative pedagogical experiences. These Programs have relied on either a differentiated or a sessional/contract staffing model, one that involves faculty members when available. In the 2005-2007 period, faculty members only volunteered 14.5 courses (7 faculty members) to the Field Programs (sometimes the involvement requires a stipend). While no numbers are available for the International Programs, the faculty participation in international projects appears to be modest and infrequent, and usually requires stipends to support their engagement.

We recommend the continued development of community-based (off-campus) MEd and diploma programs based on models developed by Field Programs and International Programs.

The Faculty of Education has significantly expanded its doctoral programs, so much so that there are now more doctoral (PhD and EdD) students currently enrolled than the total number of PhD students who have graduated since the inception of PhD programs in the 1980s. Though more attention has recently been given to the problems of expansion that arise from the rapid increase in EdD students (e.g., questions/concerns of supervision demands, the number of cohorts—“too big,” the pace of expansion—“too fast”), related questions/concerns can also be raised about the PhD expansion. For example, in the PhD expansion, why has this enrolment more than doubled since 2000? Why have there been so many new programs developed (with more still planned)? Why has the Faculty of Education developed programs in these areas/disciplines (e.g., academic/professional rationale)? What are the optimal conditions for a new program (e.g., number of faculty members, range of expertise among the faculty members, number of students, supervision load, supply-demand projections, depth and breadth of course offerings, etc)? In terms of program structure, why introduce separate programs instead of consolidation through fields identified within existing programs? The expansion has introduced the challenge of not only implementing high quality graduate programs in a number of new areas/disciplines (it can take a number of years to build a high quality doctoral program) but also sustaining this high quality across multiple programs with a large number of doctoral students in total but an uneven distribution of these students across the programs.

We recommend the development of guidelines for the determination of independent and consolidated PhD programs.

We recommend the establishment of enrolment targets that are commensurate with the capacity of each of the independent and consolidated PhD programs.

In the last year, the EdD program has addressed many of the challenges of its rapid expansion. The innovative, intensive, and pedagogically defensible program design enables both students and faculty members alike to understand expectations and to plan when and what they need to do. In order to better manage the growth of the EdD program, no additional EdD cohorts were started in the 2007 calendar year. The current cohorts are spread across different areas/disciplines and thus involve different groups of faculty members (Educational Administration, Higher Education, French Education). At least 22 faculty members have committed to be supervisors for one or more of the EdD students, and another 15 faculty members have played a role on at least one supervisory committee. Adjunct supervisors (some are emeritus faculty from the Faculty of Education, others are SFU graduates working in the field) have been appointed to support thesis research; the adjunct supervisors also receive training and mentoring on how to assist the EdD students in their studies. However, the primary responsibilities for the development, supervision, and overall implementation of the EdD programs mainly fall to pre-tenure faculty members. And though the above strategies make the supervisory load manageable, the current numbers are still demanding and higher than what most faculty members, especially pre-tenured faculty, should be expected to supervise. In fact, as of 2007, only 22 EdD students had graduated. With 72 students currently with supervisors, 11 students on leave, and 27 students still taking courses (Pro-Tem stage), and 13 students in the French EdD cohort, there are many students who are, or who will soon be in need of supervisory support.

We recommend that EdD cohorts be limited to no more than 40 registered students in educational leadership (Educational Administration and Higher Education) and 20 registered students in the French Language EdD program in Educational Leadership.

Some faculty members do not understand or support the increase in premium-fee programs or cohorts. They see such programs as driven by financial need and opportunism and not by responsiveness, invention, or academic priorities. They also worry that premium-fee program fees are not affordable (disadvantaged areas) by some school districts or groups that the Faculty of Education would otherwise wish to serve.

We recommend the establishment of balanced enrolment targets for regular and premium graduate programs, with due regard to responding to school districts or professional groups whose needs based on equity and/or diversity are high and whose circumstances make it difficult for prospective students to enroll in premium-fee programs.

Non-Credit Program Activities

Field Programs and International Programs have both initiated and responded to a wide range of non-credit activities, including: courses, modules, institutes and programs; consultations and advice; conferences and workshops; or network coordination and development. The Faculty of Education is committed to intellectually rigorous and practically relevant professional development activities (e.g., non-credit programs, projects, inservice strategies) for British Columbia teachers, educational leaders, and researchers throughout their careers. In the new structure, non-credit program activities would be the primary responsibility of the Professional Development unit.

We recommend a continued emphasis on serving the professional development needs of the academic and professional communities in the province, and with the growing number of international partners of the Faculty of Education.

RESEARCH AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION

Summary Assessment

There can be no doubt that the quality of faculty research is high. Individual records are generally strong in terms of externally funded research, books, book chapters, refereed journal articles, creative works, conference presentations, and professional non-refereed contributions to scholarship. In addition, there are many examples of faculty collaboration as evidenced by the activity in various research groups, centres, and research clusters. Many faculty members described their research programs with palpable energy and excitement.

Framework for Evaluating Research and Setting Priorities

In the 21st century, universities are increasingly faced with the challenge of making meaningful contributions to our local and broader communities through the public stewardship of ideas, the education of students who will become citizens and leaders, and the discovery and generation of knowledge. Such is the mission of a public university in a knowledge society, that is to forge a new relevance in its work: by addressing the most urgent and compelling problems of the day; by both generating new knowledge and making better and more creative use of what is already known; and by increasing the connectedness among people and institutions (e.g., through informational technology, networks, partnerships), across ideas and fields (e.g., through interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary study and application), through many contexts (e.g., through local and global projects). Faculties of education are uniquely poised to contribute to such a mission, and indeed, bear a considerable responsibility to do so. Valued scholarship in education therefore includes:

- ❖ research and development projects rooted in problems of educational practice;
- ❖ action-oriented initiatives designed to improve and, where justified, transform current policies and practices;
- ❖ integration and application of theories from two or more disciplines;
- ❖ a commitment to various forms of collaborative inquiry; and
- ❖ responsiveness to and engagement with academic and professional communities at all stages of the research and development process.

What constitutes valued scholarship in today's university will no doubt continue to emanate from the careful and sustained efforts to generate new knowledge. However, following from the above mandate, so clearly articulated by and so fervently pursued in most of the leading research universities around the world, valued scholarship in a knowledge society must also extend to other forms of knowledge work. The complexity of our most pressing theoretical and practical questions therefore requires sustained, creative and often combined efforts to generate, apply, and integrate knowledge—or in the terms increasingly used by granting agencies—knowledge mobilization and evidence-based practices. This broad notion of research scholarship has been recognized by the Faculty of Education itself, in its use of the parallel terms knowledge generation, knowledge transfer, and knowledge enactment in the Three Year Plan (2007–2010). This broad orientation to scholarship is consistent with the Faculty's mission statement in its commitment to "scholarly excellence", and in its vision statement through its commitment to the principle of promoting "a broad spectrum of scholarly and professional inquiry to advance theory, pedagogy and the practice of education."

For many years, the Faculty of Education has engaged in all three forms of knowledge work. Numerous projects devoted to generating knowledge include an applied phase where the results of the research are translated into implications for policy, program, or practice. Much of the Faculty of Education's outreach or field development activities are efforts in knowledge dissemination and mobilization (i.e., integrating and applying knowledge). The Faculty's ongoing inquiry-based development of some of its programs (e.g., PDP) is an example where knowledge is both translated and transformed through a continuous cycle of integrating and

applying what is known (in this case about teacher learning/development) and, through further study and evaluation generating further insights that in turn informs program improvement.

We recommend that a broad-based orientation to scholarship be used to guide how the Faculty both understands and makes decisions about scholarly excellence.

Faculty Complement

We have already commented on the uneven distribution of faculty members through the ranks. Approximately half the faculty complement is comprised of Assistant Professors. While it is clear that many Assistant Professors have been called upon to carry heavy loads in program coordination, teaching, and program development, it is equally clear that this has not happened at the expense of their research contributions. However, even though the most junior members of faculty are establishing strong beginning careers, it is questionable if the present pace is sustainable, particularly since the full force of the supervisory load for doctoral students already registered in the various programs has yet to be experienced. As noted previously, in the EdD program alone, as of December, 2007, 22 EdD students had graduated since the program's inception. There are presently well over 100 EdD students registered in the program, and they will all need supervision. There is a real need to balance the faculty complement and to create a comprehensive succession plan—and once again, this issue has been squarely identified in the Three Year Plan of the Faculty of Education (2007–2010).

We recommend that the Faculty create a succession plan for hiring, based on the overall priorities it sets for the next few years of its development, including, where appropriate, hiring at the Associate level.

Progress Through the Ranks

It is critically important that the Faculty support all of its members, but particularly the large cohort of junior faculty. As these members of faculty approach tenure and promotion, they need to have a clear idea of what is expected of them in terms of their work in the areas of research, teaching, and service. We urge the faculty to conceptualize research, teaching and outreach activities in light of the framework outlined above, that is, employing a broad notion of scholarship where the generation, application, and integration of knowledge are all valued and where agreed upon measures for evaluating all forms of knowledge and scholarship are developed and understood.

Pre-tenured faculty members require several other kinds of support and mentorship. There is ample evidence of various forms of mentorship, although it is not clear if these efforts are as extensive as they might be in that some junior members reported feeling that they were not being appropriately mentored. That being said, it should be noted that the Faculty has instigated several forms of support, including a range of informal gatherings that have been encouraged by the present and previous Director of Administrative Relations. Equally important are the information sessions regarding logistics of working on both the Burnaby and Surrey campuses, under the

auspices of the Director of Administrative Relations. In addition, we would like to highlight the success of the writing group, which involves nearly a third of the faculty members. This group has met several times to discuss ways of managing writing time, selecting venues for publication, and offering feedback on papers in progress. This kind of activity not only serves to support junior members on the road to tenure: it also serves to stimulate a healthy intellectual climate and build research capacity.

We recommend that the Faculty employ a broad notion of scholarship in assessing research excellence, especially at the crucial junctures when an assessment of a faculty member's performance is made (e.g., renewal, promotion, tenure, and salary review).

We recommend that the Faculty intensify and coordinate its efforts at mentoring junior and pre-tenure faculty.

Intellectual Exchange

The 2001 External Review (Phillips & Magsino), the 2007 Report on Research Productivity (Abrami, Haughey, & Uptis), and the Faculty's Three Year Plan (2007–2010) all highlight the need for appropriate mechanisms for intellectual exchange including, retreats, colloquia, seminars, and common communication platforms or templates to make research interests more visible. This need for intellectual exchange was just as visible during the site visit for the 2008 external review. Faculty members, Faculty Associates, and graduate students expressed a strong desire to learn more about the research of their colleagues. At the same time that faculty members pointed to the need for this type of intellectual exchange, some lamented that when research seminars or other information sessions were held, attendance was often poor.

It should be noted that there has been progress on this front, particularly in the last couple of years. For example, the electronic newsletter, *InRange*, was instigated in 2006 by the Director of Administrative Relations. Further plans are in the making. There has also been an extraordinary effort to make visible the research of faculty through the Office of External Communications, and by the measures we were given, this effort has met with considerable success.

The efforts to create venues for intellectual exchange are considerable on the part of the graduate students. The Education Graduate Students Association (EGSA) is very active in its efforts to support beginning scholars, having mounted an astonishing array of events for its members. These events include regular meetings to discuss issues and disseminate information; colloquia, symposia, and institutes on topics of interest to graduate students; conference organization; social events; travel support for conferences; new graduate student orientation; and representation on various governance bodies. There may be ways that the Director of Administrative Relations, the External Communications Office, and the Executive Committee of the Education Graduate Student Association could join forces in enhancing opportunities for sharing research, within the Faculty, in the broader university context, and beyond. At the very least, recognition of the EGSA activities by the Faculty is to be encouraged.

In summary, it would appear that faculty members understand the importance of intellectual exchange—of sharing and therefore valuing one another's ideas and research programs—and also, that mechanisms for such exchanges are already, to some extent, in place. What appears to be lacking is the institutional commitment to take part in these exchanges and an overall coordination of these opportunities. This lack of coordination is not only evidenced in the opportunities to share research internally and externally; it is also evidenced in the lack of an overall scheme to describe the research that is taking place. For example, we were not provided with a productivity table as part of the Self-Study, summarizing the research accomplishments of faculty members. But data of various kinds are being compiled by individuals and offices: what is needed is an integrated system of data management to develop profiles to share within the faculty and to use to inform others. Again, this is noted in the Three Year Plan (2007–2010) where it is stated that there is a need to track growth in an environment where “individuals and programs are growing in somewhat independent directions”. In fact, not only does this growth need to be tracked more systematically: the information should be used to *shape* growth and priorities.

We recommend that the Faculty re-commit itself to connecting with their colleagues' research interests and agendas through informal and formal means, through individual and group efforts.

We recommend that the Faculty coordinate its efforts to provide mechanisms for intellectual exchange and develop coordinated faculty profiles by bringing together the work of the Education Research Office, the Director of Administrative Relations, the Executive Committee of the Education Student Graduate Association, and the Communications Office, under the auspices of the proposed new organizational structure where these activities would fall in the portfolio of Associate Dean (Graduate Education and Research).

Broadening the Notion of Research and Scholarship

In keeping with the framework outlined at the beginning of this section, we feel it is imperative that the Faculty as a whole broaden its notions of what constitutes educational research in order to, in fact better reflect the work that is happening within its ranks. In the 2007 Report on Research Productivity, it was noted that “a number of faculty felt that the research they pursued—both in terms of methods and disciplines—was not as highly valued as other areas and methods of research.” The report went on to say that “the vision of scholarly excellence was insufficiently flexible” and that the Faculty needed to “embrace a broader definition of scholarship and research that maintains excellence, value, and impact in all fields and across research methods.” These observations still hold true.

One of the ways that the notions of research can be broadened is through the intellectual exchange mechanisms discussed above. By learning more about the work of one's colleagues, it becomes more likely that the work will also be valued. Another way of broadening the scope of

what constitutes research is through the decision-making processes around promotion, salary review, and tenure, also discussed above.

Yet another important method to achieve this goal is through the membership of committees and staffing of offices charged with advancing the research enterprise. While it may be difficult—or indeed, impossible—to have representation from the entire spectrum of disciplinary orientations and methodologies of inquiry, it is important for each member of faculty to see their kind of research orientation represented on these committees and in the overall administrative structure.

We recommend that careful attention be given to the constitution of committees, the staffing of offices, and the filling of administrative positions to ensure that a broad range of research orientations and methodologies are represented.

Research Collaborations

There are many members of faculty engaged in collaborative research projects in formal and less formal ways. A number of centres and institutes have been established for some time, including the endowed Centre for Education, Law, and Society (CELS), which has been in existence for a quarter century, the Centre for Imaginative Education (with the affiliated Imaginative Education Research Group, and Learning for Understanding through Culturally Inclusive Imaginative Development), and the Institute for Studies in Teacher Education. Others have been more recently established, such as the David Wheeler Institute for Research in Mathematics Education. In addition, projects such as the Learning Kit, that have received impressive amounts of external funding—while not constituted as centres *per se*—enjoy a high level of intellectual activity involving a number of faculty and graduate students. A vast array of research endeavours are represented by these centres, institutes, and research clusters—from research on early-education and child health, to neuroscience, to tools for enhancing self-regulated learning, to higher education, to arts education and audio visual imaging. Some of these endeavours align clearly with the University's five research priorities as outlined in the Strategic Research Plan (2005–2010): more could be done to align the others with the overall direction of the University.

SFU's centres and institutes, affinity groups, and research clusters are important mechanisms for promoting collaboration within the faculty both within and across disciplines. They also provide the context for collaborations that seek to unite the scholarly excellence with practical application. But while the promise of these centres is great, the danger is that a proliferation of research centres—which often rely on very few core members—serves to segment rather than bring together researchers within and outside the Faculty. We question whether the number of clusters is too great, causing the kind of troublesome complexity that was described earlier in our report: the parallel phenomenon of multiple graduate programs was discussed in the previous section. With so many research clusters, issues around staffing and space allocation become critical. We were made acutely aware of the challenges in finding space to house the centres and institutes. One group has created a virtual space to meet this challenge but feels its work would be enhanced with a permanent and visible physical location. Other centres and research clusters struggle to find adequate space to house the equipment they have acquired to carry out their research agendas. Most centres feel that their enterprises are understaffed. In order to maximize

the benefit of research centres/units, the Faculty may want to consider the development of guidelines for establishing centres/units, a process for periodic review of centres, "exit" or lifespan recommendations, and resources (space, staff, etc.).

There has been discussion amongst faculty members about the creation of a "Centre of Centres" on the Surrey campus, with the idea that several centres could be located in close enough proximity to begin to foster efficiencies in terms of operations as well as the sharing of ideas across centres and units. This, to us, is an idea well worth pursuing.

We recommend that the Faculty limit the number of research centres it both establishes and maintains by aligning research centres with university priorities for research and the overall set of priorities established by the Faculty.

We recommend that the Faculty explore efficiencies around the centres and research clusters to make best use of available fiscal resources, space, and staff, examining the feasibility of a "Centre of Centres" on the Surrey campus.

Structural Considerations

A number of the recommendations made in the 2007 Report on Research Productivity have been put into place or are underway. We have already discussed some of the recommendations that have yet to be implemented, including the hiring of mid-career faculty members, continually crafting ways to provide a more inclusive research culture, and bridging knowledge generation and dissemination. Another structural consideration that has particular importance in the present review is that of embedding research and its attendant graduate programs in an Associate Dean level of the organizational structure. In the 2007 review, it was recommended that the Associate Dean be responsible for (a) developing an inclusive and coherent vision for research, (b) supporting faculty research at all levels (from the design phases through to granting, publication, and knowledge mobilization), (c) creating a mentorship program for junior faculty, (d) further internationalizing research endeavours, and (e) building partnerships with educational practitioners and policy makers. We would add to this list of responsibilities the overseeing of the graduate programs as outlined in the previous section. An explicit recommendation coming out of this suggestion appears in the following section on administration and governance.

ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE

It is recognized that an external review team is presented with a snapshot of how the various administrative and teaching roles in the Faculty are distributed at a particular point in time, without a full understanding of its history, nor of plans for the future. We understand that some more senior faculty members have carried heavy administrative and teaching loads at some point in their careers, and that others will do so in the future, so that the burden is equitably distributed over time. However, it does appear to us that the current structure of program co-ordination and teaching distribution places undue responsibility on some junior faculty at a particularly

vulnerable time in their careers. For, example, between 2005-2007, five faculty members (of whom three are Assistant Professors) taught all of the EdD courses at a time of rapid growth in this program and a relatively small number of faculty have been actively involved in EdD thesis supervision; the co-ordination of graduate programs is now being undertaken by an Associate Professor and an Assistant Professor, both hired relatively recently. These demands on new and junior faculty are in addition to the inevitable pressures emanating from the launching of research careers, preparation for contract renewal, tenure and promotion, and the often daunting task of establishing credibility in the eyes of one's peers and in the field. To their credit, the faculty with whom we spoke appear to be rising to the challenge, though some bitterness was evident in their perception of having little choice in whether or not to take on these responsibilities, due to the vulnerability of their positions as pre-tenure faculty.

An additional strain for some junior faculty lies in the perception by some of their colleagues that the teaching, supervision and co-ordination they undertake is of lower value than the research-related activity that results in scholarly outcomes counted for tenure and promotion. However, we would suggest that the service and teaching loads carried by the junior faculty are critical to the Faculty's capacity to maintain and develop its programs and should be recognized as such by colleagues. Furthermore, these tasks should be afforded their true value within the criteria for tenure and promotion, as laid down in the University policy and reaffirmed in the Faculty's current Three Year Plan (2007-2010).

We recommend that the Faculty examine the distribution of teaching and service among its members, paying particular attention to the loads carried by junior faculty. In addition, teaching and service contributions should be adequately acknowledged as two of the three required areas of activity for contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and salary review.

The Review Team read and heard many comments about the administrative structure of the Faculty of Education and concerns from some about the degree of access to, and transparency in, decision-making processes. Some of the key recommendations of the 2001 External Review were concerned with issues of governance, including structural changes that would allow meaningful participation for all faculty, revisions to decision-making processes so that the general Faculty Meeting would become the main legislative vehicle, and the identification of a senior member of the administration with the mandate to improve staff relations. Community-building expertise was a key criterion in the selection of the new Dean in 2003. 'Revisioning the Faculty's Governance and Decision Models' constitutes a section of objectives in the 2007-2010 Three Year Plan. It is clear that strong efforts have been made over the past five years to address the structural and governance weaknesses identified and improvements in faculty relations have accrued. Recently, additional measures have been put in place; among these initiatives are the appointments of an Associate Dean Administration, a half-time Director of Administrative Relations and the establishment of a committee on governance issues. All of these are worthy initiatives that should contribute to the improvement of communications among, and participation of faculty members and staff. Nonetheless, comments about structure and governance were among the more critical statements made by both faculty and staff to the Review Team.

For some, the organizational structure of the Faculty is at fault, leading to a plea for the more traditional organization by discipline-based departments. For others, the current program-based structure would be workable if improvements could be made to communication and decision-making processes. We suggest a solution that takes elements from both of these positions. We believe that the complexity of the current structure creates a top-heavy layer of senior administration that may impede effective communication and create barriers to genuine participation by all members of the Faculty in decision-making; however, we also believe that a departmental structure would likely engender the same challenges and create new problems in communication among disciplines and interest groups.

We propose, then, a more streamlined version of the current structure that is rooted in the two strands described above, each headed by an Associate Dean and outlined in an earlier recommendation (see Appendix C). Each of these strands represents the two major elements of faculty activity: the professional development of teachers, and graduate education and research. This proposal is in no way intended to diminish the importance of undergraduate programs, field programs and international activities, but rather to consolidate administrative services around the activities that consume the majority of faculty time and resources. It also provides a clearer administrative structure that, hopefully, would provide for more effective lines of reporting and communication.

We recommend that the organizational structure of the Faculty be re-examined with a view to creating a clearer structure that more closely aligns with its major operations; a proposal to initiate discussion appears in Appendix C. This structure would involve two Associate Dean positions: the Associate Dean (Graduate Education and Research) established in parallel with the position of Associate Dean (Professional Development).

Whether or not this proposed structure is accepted by the Faculty, the Review Team contends that additional measures are required to ensure the meaningful participation of all faculty in decision-making and to increase the level of communication among programs and interest groups. In theory, the general Faculty Meeting remains the principal legislative vehicle. In practice, however, it appears that Faculty Meetings are often poorly attended and, in the opinion of some, devoted largely to the sharing of information rather than to the encouragement of healthy debate on matters of significance. This perception of Faculty Meetings has persisted despite the structural change (reported in the 2004 response to the 2001 External Review) of ensuring that Faculty Meetings do not conflict with regularly scheduled classes. This lack of regard for the key role of the Faculty Meeting also contributes to the perception, by some, of deficiencies in the transparency of the decision-making process, with key decisions—such as the rapid growth in the EdD program—not being open for discussion by all faculty members. Whether or not this perception is an accurate representation of reality, it remains a point of contention that needs to be thoroughly aired. In re-thinking the ways in which the Faculty Meeting operates (see recommendation below), the representation of Faculty Associates, students, and staff should also be reappraised. From the information we received, only five students, for example, are eligible to attend the Faculty Meeting for the 2007–2008 academic year. Four of the five students represent undergraduate/PDP programs. It would seem that there should be at least as many graduate students as undergraduate students at Faculty Meetings. At

other universities, the formal inclusion of 2–4 voting staff members would also be common in a Faculty or Education of this size. If the Faculty adopts the sort of structure we have suggested in Appendix C, committee structures—and therefore roles at Faculty Meetings may also be realigned.

An increase in transparency and trust in decision-making would also likely result from greater and more effective communication among all Faculty employees. We believe that the strategy advocated by the Director of Administrative Relations is sound: while the approach to community building through social functions has merit, a regular program of focused activities, such as writing workshops, that provides much needed support as well as community interaction is likely to have a more profound and longer-lasting impact. In addition, we support the idea of faculty members and graduate students being encouraged to take responsibility for leading informal seminars on topics of interest, to be timetabled to precede or follow Faculty Meetings.

We recommend that the role of the Faculty Meeting be re-envisioned, to reaffirm its place as the key decision-making forum, with an agreed set of policies and procedures to ensure that all voices are heard and all opinions considered.

We recommend that concerns about the lack of transparency in decision-making be addressed by the committee on governance issues through a process of faculty-wide consultation that results in a proposal to be brought to a full Faculty Meeting for discussion and approval.

We recommend that the program of regular community-building activities be continued, with a view to encouraging the dissemination of knowledge and providing support for colleagues as a way to improving communication between all members of the Faculty.

WORKING ENVIRONMENT

From our reading and discussions, it appears that there exists a more positive and constructive working environment for most employees than was evident to the 2001 External Review team. Given the growth in programs and student enrolment over the past seven years, it should be acknowledged that the current Dean's initiatives to improve employee relations have had a significant positive impact. As was pointed out in our discussions, gender discrimination appears no longer to be an issue that receives any regular attention. Many faculty and staff commented positively about their workplace, their collegial relationships, and the broad and varied opportunities they have for personal development and fulfillment. These successes notwithstanding, there remain concerns about the working environment that merit further exploration. An additional complexity of recent origin is the opening of the Faculty's operations on the Surrey campus.

Faculty concerns in general about organizational structure and governance, and their implications for the climate of the workplace, have been addressed above. More particular concerns were raised by the faculty and staff based in Surrey with regard to communication with the Burnaby campus and the level of support they have received in setting up their operations. On the positive side, the Surrey-based faculty expressed appreciation for the autonomy and the close professional relations they enjoy and for the supportive environment created by the senior administrator assigned to the Surrey campus. The negative consequences of working in Surrey include a sense of alienation from Faculty activities and decision-making that take place in Burnaby and the difficulties of establishing an effective workplace: one faculty member reported that it had taken six months to get a computer installed. The availability of technical support and research space were generally thought to be inadequate on the Surrey campus. While it was acknowledged that important Faculty information was relayed to them electronically and that they were always invited to relevant meetings on the Burnaby campus, Surrey-based faculty argued that the necessity of traveling to Burnaby in order to have face-to-face contact with colleagues created an additional strain. One suggested solution to this problem would be the establishment of dedicated videoconferencing facilities on both campuses and the expectation that these be used whenever possible for meetings that involve faculty from both sites.

We recommend that the problem of obtaining sufficient resources and technical support on the Surrey campus be explored and that dedicated videoconferencing facilities be established on both campuses.

Support Staff

CUPE and APSA staff we met at both campuses appeared to be skilled and dedicated to their work. For the most part, they expressed enthusiasm for their work environment and for the support that they received from each other.

As identified in the Self-Study and further expounded in our meetings, several areas of concern were noted by both staff groups. The first is a significant and continuing frustration over the lack of attention from Human Resources to job description reviews and reclassifications. Many CUPE staff feel that their jobs are not adequately defined and, therefore, they are not sufficiently rewarded for the important work they do. Their APSA colleagues are similarly frustrated over the length of time taken to get new jobs classified, or existing jobs re-classified, often leading to the hiring of temporary staff and the erosion of morale. CUPE staff also believe that, because job reclassification is so difficult to achieve, new hirings are made at higher levels, even though existing staff have the skills and experience required to move into these positions. Longstanding staff members, in particular, resent being overlooked for more challenging positions for which they feel appropriately qualified. It appears that job reviews for CUPE staff are irregular, at best, and usually not done at all. While the issue of job reclassification is a matter for Human Resources and, therefore, beyond the Faculty's control, regular job reviews should be achievable within the unit and would go some way to acknowledging staff members abilities, improving morale and providing a framework for professional development.

We recommend that the University explore the problems of job classification and reclassification for staff in the Faculty of Education, with a view to finding a way to streamline the process.

We recommend that annual reviews for all staff members be carried out according to an agreed timetable and set of guiding principles.

The second concern for both APSA and CUPE staff relates to the provision of information technology and technical support. The particular situation in Surrey has been outlined above; however, staff in Burnaby also feel that the support they receive is inadequate for their needs, though they recognize that the IT staff are doing the best they can with the resources they have available. The SIMS system was characterized by most staff as very slow and time-consuming, as well as unfriendly for Mac-users, though it was acknowledged that some significant improvements had been achieved in the newer versions. Some staff argued that additional technical support staff are urgently needed; others suggested that some individual problems could be alleviated if there were time and encouragement for staff to share their knowledge and expertise.

We recommend that the provision of information technology and technical support on the Burnaby campus be reviewed, with a view to finding cost-effective ways of making improvements and encouraging staff to share their knowledge.

A final note on the workplace environment for staff: in the Self-Study, and in our meetings, the CUPE staff expressed their appreciation for having a voice in the review process but also their expectation that nothing would happen as a result of their contributions, even though they have made specific recommendations. This appears to us to be an unsatisfactory, and potentially damaging, situation that merits careful attention.

We recommend that staff concerns about their working environment, and their recommendations for improvement, be carefully considered and acted upon. Where this is not possible, staff should be fully apprised of the reasons.

We acknowledge that many of the above points concerning governance and work environment are widely recognized within the Faculty and that our recommendations support, to a large degree, the vision outlined in the Three Year Plan (2007–2010) as well as the initiatives currently under way. We also understand, from our own experiences, the challenges of turning visions of community building and democratic decision-making into reality amidst a wider academic culture that still values and rewards individuality, competition and autonomy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations made throughout the report are listed below for ease of reference. They are numbered and organized under the main headings of the report.

Challenges and Opportunities

We recommend:

1. that the Faculty construct a set of priorities from which to operate over the coming years against which all of their individual and collective work can be planned, carried out, and evaluated.

Teaching Programs

We recommend:

2. that a broad-based orientation to scholarship and practice be used to guide how the Faculty of Education both understands and makes decisions about program excellence.
3. the consolidation of graduate programs with no further expansion in enrolment.
4. that, with the exception of the addition of the Bachelor of General Studies (Education) program, the focus in teacher education should be on maintaining the current level of enrolment.
5. that the five programs be restructured into two organizational units: Professional Development unit (Undergraduate Programs, Professional Programs and International Programs) and Graduate Education unit (Graduate Programs, Field Programs, and International Programs).
6. that the Faculty of Education create a system for regular and comprehensive internal evaluation of its teacher education and graduate programs.
7. that the regular and comprehensive internal evaluation of its teacher education and graduate programs address underlying principles, structure, implementation, and outcomes.
8. periodic external reviews of the teacher education and graduate programs that are not already reviewed by accrediting bodies.
9. that teaching should be equally valued to scholarship and recognized as a form of scholarship in its own right.
10. that the assessment of teaching include teaching practice (in courses), student supervision (with both graduate students and teacher education students), the integration of teaching

and scholarship (e.g., in the form of action research or program evaluation, the development of curriculum or textbooks, contributions to the teaching of a discipline), and leadership in teaching (e.g., program coordination/development).

Teacher Education

We recommend:

11. the enhanced and integrated development and implementation of the teacher education program as afforded through the restructuring of Undergraduate Education and Professional Programs into a Professional Development unit (with affiliations with International Programs as appropriate).
12. that faculty members work with the proposed new Professional Development unit to coordinate and increase the involvement of faculty members in teacher education.
13. that the Professional Development unit develop a program of research that enriches the understanding of the teacher education program experience of beginning teachers, informs the ongoing efforts to improve the teacher education program, and engages all those with an investment in the program (i.e., Faculty Associates, coordinators, faculty members, students) as participants and researchers in the program of research.

Graduate Education

We recommend:

14. the enhanced and integrated development and implementation of the graduate education programs as afforded through the restructuring of Graduate Education and Field Programs into a Graduate Education unit (with affiliations with International Programs as appropriate).
15. the continued development of community-based (off-campus) MEd and diploma programs based on models developed by Field Programs and International Programs.
16. the development of guidelines for the determination of independent and consolidated PhD programs.
17. the establishment of enrolment targets that are commensurate with the capacity of each of the independent and consolidated PhD programs.
18. that EdD cohorts be limited to no more than 40 registered students in educational leadership (Educational Administration and Higher Education) and 20 registered students in the French Language EdD program in Educational Leadership.

19. the establishment of balanced enrolment targets for regular and premium graduate programs, with due regard to responding to school districts or professional groups whose needs based on equity and/or diversity are high and whose circumstances make it difficult to enroll in premium-fee programs.

Non-Credit Program Activities

We recommend:

20. a continued emphasis on serving the professional development needs of the academic and professional communities in the province, and with the growing number of international partners of the Faculty of Education.

Research

We recommend:

21. that a broad-based orientation to scholarship be used to guide how the Faculty both understands and makes decisions about scholarly excellence.
22. that the Faculty create a succession plan for hiring, based on the overall priorities it sets for the next few years of its development, including, where appropriate, hiring at the Associate level.
23. that the Faculty employ a broad notion of scholarship in assessing research excellence, especially at the crucial junctures when an assessment of a faculty member's performance is made (e.g., renewal, promotion, tenure, and salary review).
24. that the Faculty intensify and coordinate its efforts at mentoring junior and pre-tenure faculty.
25. that the Faculty re-commit itself to connecting with their colleagues' research interests and agendas through informal and formal means, through individual and group efforts.
26. that the Faculty coordinate its efforts to provide mechanisms for intellectual exchange and develop coordinated faculty profiles by bringing together the work of the Education Research Office, the Director of Administrative Relations, the Executive Committee of the Education Student Graduate Association, and the Communications Office, under the auspices of the proposed new organizational structure where these activities would fall in the portfolio of Associate Dean (Graduate Education and Research).
27. that careful attention be given to the constitution of committees, the staffing of offices, and the filling of administrative positions to ensure that a broad range of research orientations and methodologies are represented.

28. that the Faculty limit the number of research centres it both establishes and maintains by aligning research centres with university priorities for research and the overall set of priorities established by the Faculty.
29. that the Faculty explore efficiencies around the centres and research clusters to make best use of available fiscal resources, space, and staff, examining the feasibility of a "Centre of Centres" on the Surrey campus.

Administration and Governance

We recommend:

30. that the Faculty examine the distribution of teaching and service among its members, paying particular attention to the loads carried by junior faculty. In addition, teaching and service contributions should be adequately acknowledged as two of the three required areas of activity for contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and salary review.
31. that the organizational structure of the Faculty be re-examined with a view to creating a clearer structure that more closely aligns with its major operations; a proposal to initiate discussion appears in Appendix C. This structure would involve two Associate Dean positions: the Associate Dean (Graduate Education and Research) established in parallel with the position of Associate Dean (Professional Development).
32. that the role of the Faculty Meeting be re-envisioned, to reaffirm its place as the key decision-making forum, with an agreed set of policies and procedures to ensure that all voices are heard and all opinions considered.
33. that concerns about the lack of transparency in decision-making be addressed by the committee on governance issues through a process of faculty-wide consultation that results in a proposal to be brought to a full Faculty Meeting for discussion and approval.
34. that the program of regular community-building activities be continued, with a view to encouraging the dissemination of knowledge and providing support for colleagues as a way to improving communication between all members of the Faculty.

Working Environment

We recommend:

35. that the problem of obtaining sufficient resources and technical support on the Surrey campus be explored and that dedicated videoconferencing facilities be established on both campuses.

36. that the University explore the problems of job classification and reclassification for staff in the Faculty of Education, with a view to finding a way to streamline the process.
37. that annual reviews for all staff members be carried out according to an agreed timetable and set of guiding principles.
38. that the provision of information technology and technical support on the Burnaby campus be reviewed, with a view to finding cost-effective ways of making improvements and encouraging staff to share their knowledge.
39. that staff concerns about their working environment, and their recommendations for improvement, be carefully considered and acted upon. Where this is not possible, staff should be fully apprised of the reasons.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

An external review that provides nearly 40 recommendations may leave the unintended impression that this is a Faculty in need of improvement. We do not wish to leave this impression. In fact—returning to our original observations—this is a Faculty with many enviable strengths. Our recommendations are made in considerable detail because we believe that the potential of the Faculty will be even further enhanced through a renewal of efforts to address the issues that negatively impact upon the wellbeing and productivity of some of its members. This renewal will require a greater sense of personal responsibility and commitment to wider Faculty goals by all members. We have every reason to expect that the members of Simon Fraser's Faculty of Education are, in fact, poised to take on this challenge.

At the beginning of this Report, we argued that the Faculty of Education's strongest resource is its people; the health and sustainability of that resource will depend upon how well the people care for themselves and each other. We hope that some of the recommendations we offer here will help the Faculty achieve its vision and goals.

Appendix A

Faculty of Education Simon Fraser University External Review Committee 2007/2008 - Terms of Reference

The purpose of the external review process is to provide the University with assurances that:

- a) The quality of the unit's teaching programs is high and there are measures in place to ensure their evaluation and revision.
- b) The quality of faculty research is high and faculty collaboration and interaction provides a stimulating academic environment.
- c) The Faculty members participate in the administration of the unit and take an active role in the dissemination of knowledge.
- d) The environment is conducive to the attainment of the objectives of the Faculty.

The Review Committee will assess the Faculty and comment on its strengths and weaknesses, on opportunities for change and/or improvement, and on quality and effectiveness. The Review Committee should make essential, formal prioritized recommendations that address its major concerns, with reference to the resources available to the Faculty and the objectives described in its three-year plans.

Issues of particular interest to the University and/or the Faculty that we would like the review team to consider during the review are:

- a) **An evaluation of the Faculty's overall strategic direction which aims to maintain excellence in its programs of research and teaching across diverse areas of Education, while managing resources and communications across multiple campuses within a complex environment.**
- b) **An evaluation of the current undergraduate, graduate and professional programs (including faculty, centers, external sites, international programs, premium fee programs), and a strategic analysis of the opportunities for expansion and/or consolidation to address conditions of financial constraint.**
- c) **An assessment of the character, quality and integrity of the curricula, pedagogy, research and scholarship of the faculty, including advice on how these should be pursued in the future.**
- d) **An assessment of the optimum size of the Ed D program and the adequacy of the resources available to support the program.**

Other areas of the Faculty to be considered by the review team include:

1. Programs

- structure, breadth, orientation and integration of the undergraduate programs including the cooperative education program
- structure, breadth, depth and course offering schedule of the graduate programs
- graduate student progress and completion, and support for graduate students
- enrolment management issues at the undergraduate and graduate levels including, for the former, majors and service teaching

2. Faculty

- size and quality of the faculty complement in relation to the Faculty's responsibilities and workload
- teaching, research and service contributions of faculty members, including the level of external research support

3. Administration

- size of the administrative and support staff complement, and the effectiveness of the administration of the Faculty
- adequacy of resources and facilities provided to support teaching and research, including library, laboratory, equipment, computing, and office space

4. Connection of the faculty within and outside the University

- the Faculty's concept and plan for teaching and research and relationship with the other units within the University
- relationship between the Faculty and the community
- relationship with alumni

5. Future Directions

- the plans of the Faculty are appropriate and manageable.

Appendix B
Itinerary for External Site Visit
March 12-14, 2008

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Reviewers: | Dr. Rena Uptis, Queen's University, Chair of Review Team Dr. Dennis Thiessen, University of Toronto Dr. Graham Pike, University of Prince Edward Island Dr. Marjorie Griffin Cohen, Political Science/Women's Studies, Simon Fraser University |
|-------------------|--|

Wednesday, March 12, 2008

| | | | |
|-------|-------|--|--|
| 7:15 | | Taxi from Delta Vancouver Suites to SFU Burnaby Campus | |
| 8:00 | 9:00 | <u>Opening meeting with Senior Administrators:</u> Dr. Bill Krane, Associate VP Academic (Chair) Dr. Jonathan Driver, Dean of Graduate Studies Dr. Paul Shaker, Dean, Faculty of Education Dr. Glynn Nicholls, Director Academic Planning Dr. Norbert Haunerland, Associate VP Research | Strand Hall, PCR Room 3187 <i>Continental breakfast served</i> |
| 9:00 | 9:15 | Enroute to Department | |
| 9:15 | 10:15 | Paul Shaker, Dean, Faculty of Education | EDB 8525 |
| 10:15 | 10:45 | Suzanne de Castell, Associate Dean – Academic | EDB 8545 |
| 10:45 | 11:15 | Heeson Bai, Director Graduate Programs | EDB 8541 |
| 11:15 | 11:45 | Stephen Smith, Director Professional Development Programs | EDB 8541 |
| 11:45 | 1:15 | Lunch, Executive Committee Reservation under "de Castell" | DAC |
| 1:15 | 1:45 | Tracy London, Advancement Officer Ian Andrews, Director, International Programs | EDB 8541 |
| 1:45 | 2:15 | Lannie Kanevsky, Acting Director of Field Programs Director of Administrative Relations | EDB 8541 |
| 2:15 | 2:30 | Danielle Arcand, French Programs | EDB 8541 |
| 2:30 | 2:45 | Cheryl Amundsen, Faculty | EDB 8541 |
| 2:45 | 3:00 | Phil Winne, Faculty | EDB 8541 |
| 3:00 | 4:00 | Executive Committee | EDB 8541 |

| | | | |
|------|------|--------------------------------|----------|
| 4:00 | 5:00 | Reception | EDB 8651 |
| 5:00 | | <i>Return to Hotel by taxi</i> | |

Thursday, March 13, 2008

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|------------|
| 7:45 | | Taxi from Delta Vancouver Suites to SFU Surrey Campus | |
| 8:30 | 9:00 | Campus Tour with Leonard Thong, Assistant to the Associate Dean – Administration Meet by the Security Desk at the top of the main entrance stairs. | Surrey |
| 9:00 | 9:30 | David Paterson, Associate Dean – Administration Director, Undergraduate Programs | SUR 15-645 |
| 9:30 | 10:30 | Surrey Faculty and Instructors | SUR 15-645 |
| 10:30 | 11:00 | Surrey CUPE Staff | SUR 15-645 |
| 11:00 | 11:30 | Surrey APSA Staff | SUR 15-645 |
| 11:30 | 1:00 | Lunch, David Paterson – Central City Brewing Co. Reservation under “Paterson” | Surrey |
| 1:00 | 1:45 | Travel to Burnaby Campus with David Paterson | |
| 1:45 | 2:15 | Burnaby CUPE Staff | EDB 8620F |
| 2:15 | 2:45 | Burnaby APSA Staff | EDB 8620F |
| 2:45 | 3:00 | Ruby Ng, External Communications | EDB 8541 |
| 3:00 | 4:15 | Faculty Members | EDB 7600F |
| 4:15 | 5:00 | Graduate Students | EDB 7600F |
| 5:00 | | <i>Return to Hotel by taxi</i> | |

Friday, March 14, 2008

| | | | |
|-------|-------|--|--|
| 8:15 | | Taxi from Delta Vancouver Suites to SFU Burnaby Campus | |
| 9:00 | 9:45 | Dr. Jon Driver, Dean of Graduate Studies (Coffee only served) | Strand Hall, PCR, Rm 3187 |
| 9:45 | 10:30 | Dr. Norbert Hauerland, Associate VP Research | Strand Hall, PCR Rm 3187 |
| 10:30 | 10:45 | Enroute to Department | |
| 10:45 | 11:00 | Sen Campbell, Faculty ENGRAMMETRON – Educational Neuroscience Laboratory | EDB 7504 |
| 11:00 | 11:15 | Peter Grimmett, Faculty | EDB 8541 |
| 11:15 | 11:45 | IPTEM Module – Virtual Class | EDB 8541 |
| 11:45 | 12:15 | Research Opportunities Committee Paul Shaker, Phil Winne, Cheryl Amundson, Sen Campbell, Geniva Liu, Tracey Leacock | EDB 8541 |
| 12:15 | 1:45 | Lunch, Ian Andrews and members of International Programs – Reservation under “Andrews” | DAC |
| 1:45 | 2:45 | Institutes and Centres in the Faculty of Education (Kieran Egan, Dan Laitch, Wanda Cassidy, Peter Grimmett, Maureen Hoskyn, Rina Zazkis) | EDB 8541 |
| 2:45 | 3:45 | Faculty Associates and Coordinators | EDB 8680-81 |
| 3:45 | 4:00 | Enroute to Strand Hall | |
| 4:00 | 5:00 | <u>Closing meeting with Senior Administrators:</u> Dr. Bill Krane, Associate VP Academic (Chair) Dr. John Waterhouse, VP Academic Dr. Norbert Hauerland, Associate VP Research Dr. Glynn Nicholls, Director, Academic Planning Dr. Jonathan Driver, Dean of Graduate Studies Dr. Paul Shaker, Dean, Faculty of Education | Strand Hall, PCR Rm 3187 <i>Light refreshments served</i> |
| 5:00 | | <i>Return to Hotel by taxi</i> | |

**Appendix C
Proposed Organizational Structure for Programs and Research**

