S.06-133

As amended by Senate 4 Dec 06

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Senate Committee on University Priorities
Memorandum

TO: Senate

FROM: John Waterhouse
Chair, SCUP
Vice President, Academic

RE: Faculty Structure Task Force
Final Report (SCUP 06- 52)

DATE: November 10, 2006

At its October 25, 2006 meeting SCUP reviewed and approved the Final Report of the Faculty Structure Task Force.

SCUP endorsed the report and recommends approval of the following motions to Senate:

Motion I:

That Senate approve a second phase to the faculty structure initiative and create a "Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure".

Motion II:

That Senate approve the following mandate for the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure:

1. Consider and evaluate proposals from the University community as well as those developed by the Phase 2 Task Force itself, and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend to Senate an overall academic unit configuration for Simon Fraser University;
2. Consider and evaluate the coherence, roles, responsibilities, functions, administrative requirements, costs, and terminology of the structural building blocks employed at Simon Fraser University (i.e. programs, schools, departments, centres, and institutes) and following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend to Senate a strategy that will provide definitional clarity, administrative effectiveness, and appropriate differentiation among these structures; and,
3. Consider and evaluate the University's effectiveness in incubating, facilitating, and supporting interdisciplinary research and programming and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend structural and/or policy changes that will enhance interdisciplinary innovation in the future.

Motion III:

That Senate approve the following procedural framework to guide the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure:

1. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will have the following composition: the Vice President, Academic who will Chair the Task Force, seven faculty members (one representative from each of the existing Faculties with the exception of Arts and Social Sciences which will have two representatives), an undergraduate student and a graduate student. In consultation with SCUP, the Vice President, Academic will appoint all members to the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure and will attempt to ensure some continuity in membership between the Phase 2 Task Force and the Faculty Structure Task Force. Clerical and/or professional personnel will be appointed as required by the Vice President, Academic.
2. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will receive submissions from the University Community.
3. Following the receipt of submissions, the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will establish Working Group(s) to undertake comprehensive evaluation of the proposals. The composition of the Working Group(s) will be determined and appointed by the Vice President, Academic in consideration of the submissions received. *
4. Evaluation by the Working Group(s) will include extensive opportunities for engagement with members of the community affected by each submission.
5. The Working Group(s) will bring forward a detailed evaluation of submissions to the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure for consideration as a whole. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will engage in extensive University wide consultation on the potential models, strategies for change, and recommendations that it is contemplating in each of the three areas of its mandate. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure may choose to present options related to the areas of its mandate either separately or in combination.
6. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will endeavour to present its final recommendations to Senate by November 2007.

Motion IV:

That Senate approve that the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure be guided by the eight principles of assessment outlined in this final report.

encl.

* Each working group shall include student representation.

Final Report of the Faculty Structure Task Force

October 19, 2006

Introduction:

Most university restructuring initiatives internationally have been precipitated by a context of crisis: whether fiscal crisis, crisis of reputation, or crisis of vision. None of these were in play at Simon Fraser University when the Vice President, Academic, Dr. John Waterhouse, established the Faculty Structure Task Force in October 2005. Rather, the mandate of the Task Force is to assess the opportunities of the future, to review Simon Fraser University's academic structure and its strategic vision for the future and to answer the following question:

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

After nearly a year of deliberations and community consultations, the Faculty Structure Task Force has concluded that there are opportunities for the University to advance its strategic goals more effectively and visibly. To do so will require some structural change. We do not believe, however, that changes in Faculty organization are necessary in all areas of the University.

We believe it essential that Simon Fraser University preserve the foundations upon which it has been built. Any changes to Faculty structure therefore must preserve six pillars: strong core disciplines, a comprehensive liberal arts and science education, interdisciplinarity, integration with our many communities, excellence in educational programming and research, and an international reputation for innovation. With these foundations in place and kept intact, the Faculty Structure Task Force believes that where change is required, we must not hesitate and we must be prepared to be bold. We must direct ourselves to creatively imagine, design and build our future; to embrace change as opportunity; and, to construct an academic structure that will ensure that in all areas of the University, we can realize our goal to be the best comprehensive research university in Canada. The Faculty Structure Task Force recommends that Senate approve the creation of a Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure. The Faculty Structure Task Force also recommends eight principles and a procedural framework that we believe should guide the deliberations and activities of the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure. These recommendations are specifically outlined at the conclusion of this report.

This Final Report of the Faculty Structure Task Force is not intended to reiterate the detail provided in our earlier discussion document *"Sommes Nous Prêts?"*[1] . That document, taken to the University community as part of a broad-based consultation process, outlined our understanding of structural elements, examined the inherent tensions of the University, and provided a comprehensive profile of the changing internal and external social, political, demographic, fiscal and intellectual contexts. We examined academic structures and studied restructuring initiatives at other institutions. We articulated a vision for Simon Fraser University in the year 2025 drawn from strategic planning documents, President's Agenda, and statements of our values and principles. Our discussion document came to no conclusions and made no recommendations.

---

1 The discussion document and executive summary can be found at http://www.sfu.ca/vpacademic/Committees_TaskForces/Ad_Hoc_Committees/Faculty_Structure_Task_Force/index.html

By contrast, this Final Report, informed by the views of the nearly 100 members of the University community who attended the open forums or wrote to the Faculty Structure Task Force, highlights only a few aspects of our investigation. In this Final Report we identify key issues in our internal and external environment that, taken together with the goals, vision and aspirations for Simon Fraser University in the future, have persuaded the members of the Faculty Structure Task Force that the University should consider and thoroughly examine the potential of alternative academic configurations, structures and/or systems of support.

Why the Task Force Recommends a Second Phase:

Simon Fraser University remains fundamentally committed to our values of innovation, excellence, integration, community outreach and engagement, and flexibility and responsiveness. As a community we continuously reaffirm our commitment to core liberal arts and science programming and research and our dedication to developing innovative professional and applied programming and approaches to inquiry. Simon Fraser University, however, is a remarkably different institution from when it first opened its doors in 1965. It is different in terms of size, profile, breadth of programming, diversity of research, and engagement with its community. The Faculty Structure Task Force believes that the internal landscape at Simon Fraser University has changed significantly in at least five ways.

First, since 1965 Simon Fraser University has witnessed a tenfold increase in its student population. Growth, however, has not occurred uniformly across the academic disciplines in the University. In the last decade alone, between 1994/95 and 2004/05 when all Faculties excluding Health Sciences were in existence, student enrolment has increased overall by 31%. There have been remarkable differences in growth by Faculty as depicted in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Student Enrolment Growth Comparison 1994/95 to 2004/2005 by Faculty

Faculty	1994/95 FTE Enrolment (Grad. & Undergrad.)	2004/2005 FTE Enrolment (Grad. & Undergrad.)	% Growth
Applied Sciences	1,867.40	3,284.64	75.9%
Arts & Social Sciences	7,353.20	8,723.28	18.6%
Business Administration	1,448.60	2,009.92	38.7%
Education	1,663.80	2,127.20	27.9%
Science	2,432.90	3,199.44	31.5%
Total University	14,765.90	19,344.48	31.0%

The unprecedented scale of growth in the Faculty of Applied Sciences can be attributed primarily to the "Double the Opportunity" program of the Provincial Government and to the creation of the School of Interactive Arts and Technology at the Surrey campus. The differential growth of units within the Faculty of Applied Sciences and by the Faculty of Applied Sciences in contrast to other Faculties across the University has led to increasing calls by these units to reconsider their configuration within the University's academic structure.

Second, Simon Fraser University now has five campuses[2] in four different cities – Burnaby, Vancouver, Surrey and Kamloops. Each campus has a unique role and mandate that maximizes its

[2] Includes the Great Northern Way Campus.

strengths in meeting the needs of the different communities within which it is situated. This unique recognition of, and responsiveness to, our diverse communities has succeeded in distinguishing Simon Fraser University from other universities in Canada. At the same time, however, Simon Fraser University must retain an identity as a single institution and we must ensure that the members of the University community and our academic programming and research, regardless of campus location, are integrated and connected in meaningful ways. We must ensure that while our academic structure provides an integrating framework for Simon Fraser University as a whole, it also has an embedded flexibility that will enable our five campuses to develop in accordance with their unique mandates and distinct communities. The significant campus development in Surrey and Vancouver in recent years lends itself to a reflective process that would determine whether the current academic structure can sustain our plans in the broadening multi-campus environment.

Third, there has been, particularly in recent years, a significant expansion of the number and types of academic units at Simon Fraser University. Included in this expansion is the emergence of a growing number of small, academic programs that are independent from departments or schools. These new programs are predominantly in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences although there have also been some new programs developed in the Faculty of Applied Sciences and the Faculty of Science[3]. The increasing number of programs demonstrates the remarkable way in which Simon Fraser University is able to diversify its programmatic offerings in response to contemporary society and as new fields of inquiry emerge. This genre of independent program is characterized by a small number of faculty and student enrolments, and yet it shares many of the structural and administrative features of significantly more complex and larger departments and schools. From a structural and administrative point of view, the Faculty Structure Task Force questions the efficacy of the predominantly uniform administrative model that currently governs academic units at Simon Fraser University.

Fourth, new areas of strategic research and programming strength have emerged at Simon Fraser University since the last review of Faculty structure in 1983/1984. We have witnessed "supplemental" areas of strength develop such as the new Faculty of Health Sciences. This new Faculty, created in 2004, was provided with the opportunity to develop its own programmatic and research streams before considering alignments with existing individuals and/or units within the institution. We heard in the community consultation process that there are questions of the intersection, strategic direction and affiliation for faculty members and units working in health areas around the University that need clarification and resolution.

We have also witnessed the emergence of other areas of strategic strength that have yet to be "clustered". These areas evolve over time when independent initiatives in dispersed departments achieve a level of critical mass and activity such that their combined activity presents new opportunities for the University. A "clustering" approach to their configuration might lead to synergies among the units and lead ultimately to new programs and research initiatives at the

---

[3] Some examples include the Asia Canada Program, Cognitive Science Program, Explorations Program, First Nations Studies Program, Graduate Liberal Studies Program, International Leadership Program, Urban Studies Program, the Master of Publishing Program, and the Masters of Public Policy Program. There are also small academic programs in other Faculties such as the Tech One Program in the Faculty of Applied Sciences or the Environmental Science Program in the Faculty of Science.

intersections of the units. Such clustering can also lead to increased visibility, increased ability to attract resources, increased attraction of outstanding undergraduate and graduate students, and an increased opportunity to work with faculty members who share a common vision. The Faculty Structure Task Force is aware that there are members of the University community who believe that several areas of strength have emerged and could benefit from consideration of a new structural arrangement. The Faculty Structure Task Force has not received, nor did it provide opportunity to receive, submission from areas of the University that see opportunities before them for supplemental or clustering strategies to rearrange their activities. We believe that an opportunity should be presented to the University community to forward submissions for evaluation against the principles contained within this report.

Finally, the Faculty Structure Task Force has heard that the current academic structure puts unnecessary pressure on curricular innovations. For example, cohort based undergraduate programs, while providing innovative learning environments, face many challenges from the current academic structure. Notwithstanding these challenges, some significant experiments in our curriculum and major new initiatives have been launched. The experimental Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue has been successful. Its cohort approach to thematic study focuses on teamwork, service learning and lateral thinking and has become an exemplar of curricular innovation. Other cohort-based learning programs are also progressing – Explorations and Tech One programs at Surrey, and a new Science One program is under development. It is anticipated that these various curricular structures could be used as "book ends" to the undergraduate experience combining broad-based introductions to thematic study and preparation for advanced learning, as well as a capstone strategy to develop a final integration of the undergraduate learning experience. While these curricular innovations are going forward, the current academic structure poses real challenges in areas such as resource allocation strategy, inadequate representation and advocacy at decision-making tables, and unanticipated policy and governance provisions that raise issues for participation in these initiatives by faculty and students alike.

The Faculty Structure Task Force envisions that there will be calls on Simon Fraser University to further diversify its approaches to learning. The pace of intellectual and technological change will require new areas and modes of lifelong learning, new certificate programs, and a level of responsiveness to new fields that as yet may be unimagined. There are also sweeping changes in areas of international relationships, national and international safety and security, international health issues, to name a few, that will likely create new areas of inquiry and produce demands for programming in areas that are only now emerging. We must ensure that our academic structure is well-positioned to support us in this view of the future.

Simon Fraser University, though an autonomous institution, must engage within contemporary society in local, regional, national and international contexts. It is essential that our academic structure enables us to successfully engage with the institution's external environment, for the changing and contemporary world in which we exist will make demands both for curricular change and research related innovation. While responding to the external context, the University must remain grounded in the raison d'être of universities and the traditions of disciplinary inquiry and discovery, and in the pursuit of knowledge that have historical traction and that help to maintain institutional stability. We must preserve the fundamental independence of the University. We must also embrace the critical importance of having the capacity to respond to the emerging

frontiers of knowledge development both inside and outside of traditional disciplines. The Faculty Structure Task Force has considered a wide range of factors that are changing the social, political, demographic, fiscal and intellectual context within which the University is situated. In our view, three such changes have the greatest potential to intersect with issues of academic structure.

First, historically enrolment at Simon Fraser University, as elsewhere in Canada, has operated primarily within an environment where demand for university spaces exceeded supply. This is dramatically changing. Within the next decade, the age 18-21 population of British Columbia (one of our primary enrolment populations) will decline by 3.6%. Further, the BC Grade XII Enrolment Projections produced by the BC Ministry of Education, present a flat lining of projected enrolments over the period 2004 to 2014. The flat-lining and decline are, however, not expected to be uniform across the lower mainland. In some areas, such as Surrey, there are actually predictions of growth. As Simon Fraser University has typically attracted many of its students from within the local area, these projections suggest differential demand for our campuses. At the same time of general declining 18-21 population projections, the age 25-29 population of British Columbia will grow by 21.2%. This trend presents significant opportunities for increased demand for graduate education. In the context of these population projections and flat-lined secondary education enrolments, the provincial government has committed to fund an additional 25,000 FTE enrolments throughout the province by 2010/2011; 3,000 FTE of which will, by current Ministry calculations, be directed to Simon Fraser University.

The combination of these population projections, trends and enrolment forecasts will shift us from the current supply-driven enrolment environment to an increasingly competitive demand-driven enrolment context. It is possible that by 2025 we will need to attract an additional 5,000 to 10,000 FTE students. While growth is indeed expected, equally critical to the demand environment is the desire by Simon Fraser University to attract the highest quality of students. Being successful in an increasingly competitive post-secondary education environment will require Simon Fraser University to be clearly recognizable for its strengths, its unique attributes and core commitments, and the quality of its teaching and research. The academic structure plays an important role in supporting all of these attributes.

To meet our growth goals and to respond to a significant shift toward a demand-driven enrolment market, the University must ensure that our research and program strengths are highly visible to prospective students and that we are meeting the increasing needs for graduate educational opportunities. It is the view of the Faculty Structure Task Force that we should examine in detail our academic structure to ensure we are well positioned in both of these areas.

Second, in addition to changes in demand for our programming, the University has been confronted with a substantial proportional reduction of operating funding from the Provincial Government over the short five-year period between 2000/01 and 2004/05: 69.2% to 53.9%, respectively. To continue to sustain high quality educational programming and excellent research facilities, the University has had to increasingly diversify its funding strategy. There is every indication that such diversification will become increasingly important in the future. We must therefore ensure that the University's reputation for excellence is strengthened, and that we are highly visible to prospective contributors to the University. We must ensure that students recognize our distinctive programming opportunities and attest to their high quality. We must

expand our international reputation to assist us in our financial diversification strategies. We must engage in research that will attract support from provincial and federal research investment programs and other contributors. In securing the financial viability to remain one of the best comprehensive research institutions in the country we must remain absolutely and fundamentally committed to the intellectual autonomy of the University, to preserving the liberty of our institution, to honoring our core commitments and to fundamentally preserving the raison d'être of a University to engage in knowledge conceived within a framework of inquiry, explanation, and discovery of phenomena.

Third and finally, within the external context, there have been several general transformations in the intellectual environment over the University's forty-year history. First, the conception of the University as a place of inquiry, discovery and broad-based learning where knowledge is pursued as an independent good, and where citizens of the world are created, has been expanded. With an increasing emphasis on the application of knowledge to issues of public interest and to the participation of universities in the commercialization of knowledge, there has been significant redirection, particularly among research funding agencies, of support for applied research. Also, the growing conviction that multidimensional, multi-perspective, and multidisciplinary approaches to research questions provide added value has led to increased research funding in support of interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and collaborative research initiatives. Undoubtedly these changes in the intellectual environment have had and will continue to have a direct impact on research and education and ultimately in the birth of new programs and disciplines.

Such notable changes in the direction of research granting funding strategies, however, must be viewed critically. We should not let this contemporary focus of priority be equated with a diminishment in the value of basic research and discipline-based inquiry. Simon Fraser University to date has managed to effectively balance its response to the opportunities afforded by the changes in the intellectual environment while simultaneously preserving its core commitments to traditional knowledge generation, discovery and innovation. Going forward, we must ensure that, while we maintain the ability to provide the mechanisms of adaptability and support necessary to successfully participate in new arrangements for creating knowledge and ensuring that society benefits fully from that knowledge, we also ensure that we preserve and reaffirm our commitments to basic research and disciplinary excellence. Any structural reform at Simon Fraser University must bear in mind these fundamental commitments.

Taken together, the many changes witnessed and anticipated in the internal and external contexts within which the university is situated represent to the Faculty Structure Task Force a convincing array of arguments for further examination of the academic structure of Simon Fraser University.

The Future of Simon Fraser University – a Profile in the Year 2025:

In the previous section we have surveyed changes in the internal and external environment that persuade us that a review of the academic structure at Simon Fraser University at this juncture is warranted. However, we do not wish to portray the University as a malleable institution governed by the winds of change. In contrast, the Task Force is struck by the degree to which our core values and commitments have stabilized and shaped Simon Fraser University over its history. This core is the anchor upon which we secure an ambitious vision of Simon Fraser University for the

future. The Faculty Structure Task Force's understanding[4] of the vision for Simon Fraser University in the future reaffirms our view that it is necessary to ensure that our academic structure best reflects our qualities and strengths and is a structure that will effectively and visibly advance our ability to realize the future that is imagined. We further believe that for an academic structure to serve the University effectively, it must be able to provide a solid framework that can withstand more temporal changes. We draw below our interpolation of the vision for Simon Fraser University in the year 2025.

In 2025, Simon Fraser University will continue to be known for the value it places upon, and the commitment it has to, innovation, excellence, integration, engagement and adaptability. Our commitment to a liberal education in the arts and sciences will remain the core of the University. We will also continue our development and innovation in applied and professional programming, and will see significant growth and development in the strategic research areas recently adopted by Senate: (i) Communication, Computation and Technology; (ii) Culture, Society and Human Behavior; (iii) Economic Organization, Public Policy and Global Community; (iv) Environment; and, (v) Health. Simon Fraser University will have an effective and comprehensive structure for incubating, promoting and supporting interdisciplinary research and programming innovation.

Our far-reaching international strategy will be in evidence through the many significant international educational and research partnerships that exist between individual faculty members and institutional arrangements, through the presence of faculty research teams and exchanges, through opportunities for students to avail themselves of study abroad programs and joint degree learning opportunities, through the expanded internationalization of the curriculum, and through increased opportunities for study and research into global issues.

Simon Fraser University in 2025 will have a significantly greater presence in Canada in graduate education, with expansion projections to between 25-30% of the student population. We will become a destination for graduate learning in both the core disciplines and in interdisciplinary problem-based research. Our graduate students will thus be provided unparalleled opportunities to engage at the frontiers of knowledge within core disciplines and to obtain a full understanding of the intersections with other disciplines. We will offer an increasingly diverse array of graduate programs responding to an increasingly more mature population seeking graduate educational opportunities.

Our undergraduate students will be afforded one of the best student experiences in Canada. We will offer a unique undergraduate education characterized by required experiences in writing intensive learning, quantitative understanding, and knowledge breadth; innovative pedagogical approaches and diversified learning opportunities (cohort programs, semesters of study, capstone courses, supplemental learning in tutorials, open laboratories, and technological enhancements); and experiential learning by means of cooperative education, research participation, civic engagement and/or international study. We will have a more diversified undergraduate student complement with increased participation by First Nations students. We will supplement these educational experiences with a rich spectrum and integrated network of academic and non-

[4] It was not the mandate of the Task Force to create a vision for Simon Fraser University's future. Rather, it was our role to review the strategic planning documents of Simon Fraser University and understand the future that has been articulated by the President, strategic planning bodies and bottom-up academic planning processes.

academic student services and support.

Simon Fraser University in 2025 will continue its legacy for having the most comprehensive network of life-long learning opportunities and outreach programs in Canada. To this end we will embrace the opportunities afforded by our Vancouver and Surrey campuses and the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue.

Inspired by this vision of Simon Fraser University in 2025, the Faculty Structure Task Force believes we must ensure we are able to realize this ambitious portrait of our future. To do so will require that our structures and governance framework are flexible, supportive, facilitative, and stimulating of innovation and imagination. It is the view of the Faculty Structure Task Force that the academic structure of the University should be more extensively examined to ensure it is capable of supporting our future.

Feedback from the University Community:

Over the past year, the Faculty Structure Task Force has consulted the University community on five separate occasions. The first consultation, held on February 27, 2006, provided the Task Force with an opportunity to report to the University community our planned activities and to hear direction from the community as to what some of the areas of investigation should be for us. On July 10, 2006 the Faculty Structure Task Force presented its discussion document, *Sommes Nous Prêts?*, to the University community for consideration and feedback at four Open Forums[5].

We have examined the tensions inherent in a university and the values and commitments that have defined Simon Fraser University and which continue to frame our understanding of what we will be in the future. We have thought about the contextual forces that are shaping our world and which present opportunities and challenges for the University in contemporary society. We have reviewed the way in which other universities have sought to define themselves through their academic structure and the reasons why some have engaged in restructuring exercises. We have traced the history of the academic structure at Simon Fraser University and examined where our strategic plans are directing us. As we engaged in our investigation we identified four issues that we felt required further discussion with the University community, and which became the focal point for engagement with the community at the Open Forums:

(i) Some curricular initiatives seem to be inadequately supported by the current academic structure.

(ii) A variety of models of interdisciplinarity and approaches to the development of strategic strength are deployed at Simon Fraser University. Some academic areas might further advance the strategic goals, values and profile of the University if they were considered for further development under these frameworks, or if they adopted a different framework.

[5] The four forums were held on July 17, September 12, September 15 and September 19, 2006. The first two forums were held at Simon Fraser University's Burnaby Campus, the third at the Vancouver Campus and the fourth at the Surrey campus.

(iii) There has been a tripling of the number of academic units since the University opened in 1965 and there is an increasing number of very small academic programs. There is reason to explore whether the current administrative structure is effectively differentiated and supportive for academic, collegial, administrative, financial and managerial purposes across the various types of academic units.

(iv) There is an opportunity to explore the creation of an incubator for combining interdisciplinary research programs with the creation of innovative academic programming.

In total, nearly 100 members of the University community responded to our invitation and joined the members of the Faculty Structure Task Force in a discussion about our document. The Faculty Structure Task Force also received several written comments. The issues raised, advice provided, insights revealed, and views heard from this community consultation process may not be shared equally by all members of the University community or indeed by all of the members of the University community who participated in the consultation opportunities. As such we do not intend to portray the following summary of issues raised in the consultations as carrying the endorsement of the entire community. The feedback received by the University community has been critically important to the Faculty Structure Task Force's understanding of the current environment, and so has shaped the recommendations contained within this Final Report.

We present here a brief sketch of what we learned from the community consultation process:

(a) The Faculty Structure Task Force heard that our discussion document was viewed as a carefully constructed and non-threatening, but perhaps overly conservative report. In some quarters, the discussion document was seen as disappointing for its lack of boldness, its absence of specifics particularly about the extent to which restructuring might be required, and its omission of specific recommendations or articulated process for a second phase.

(b) We were advised that the University should place greater priority on the student learning experience and that this priority be more clearly represented in our principles to guide Phase 2. In particular it was noted that two areas of the undergraduate experience should be better supported by the academic structure: opportunities for academic exploration and timely degree completion. At the graduate level, the Task Force heard that there would likely be an increased demand for highly interdisciplinary problem-based learning in some areas. Such increased demand by graduate students at the intersections of disciplines, however, was not viewed as supplanting the ongoing desire and need for graduate students to have identifiable disciplinary training from established disciplines. It was suggested that Simon Fraser University needs to find a way to support both types of graduate experience and that the academic structure of the University of the future should be characterized by its flexibility to allow for pedagogical innovation, breadth of experience, diversity of learning goals and, a combination of interdisciplinary and core disciplinary training.

(c) The Faculty Structure Task Force was encouraged by representatives from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to appreciate the lack of desire for structural change within their Faculty, to realize that changes that occurred as part of the 1984 restructuring were damaging and traumatizing for some members and some units and that any process that moves academic reconfiguration forward must not repeat the 1984 experience. The Task

Force was also cautioned not to assume that silence is support, nor equally that silence is dissent. It was noted that a Phase 2 would need to find ways of soliciting engagement to the highest degree possible by the silent majority. The underlying message received by the Task Force from those members of the community who participated in the consultation process from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences was that we must be certain to retain configurations and structures that are serving areas of the University well. We must also be mindful of the anticipated impact that reconfiguration may have on other areas.

(d) We were urged by various representatives from the Faculty of Applied Sciences to move forward to Phase 2 so that specific options for structural change could be evaluated. The Task Force heard arguments related to the growth of Computing Science and Engineering Science at Simon Fraser University over the past decade, to the existence of independent Engineering Faculties at 22 of 30 Canadian Universities, and to the view that some members within the Faculty of Applied Sciences do not feel connected to the vision of the Faculty for the future. The Task Force also heard representatives from Kinesiology voice a need for clarification and articulation of the relationship between Kinesiology and the Faculty of Health Sciences. We also listened to a member of the School of Communication who urged us to be bold, to embrace change and respond proactively to the changing contemporary society, and to seek new ways to promote and support interdisciplinarity at Simon Fraser University.

(e) The Faculty Structure Task Force listened to a number of members of the university community outline interdisciplinary initiatives that were seen to be inadequately supported by the current academic structure. In fact, comments went so far as to suggest that the academic structure and the governance framework were directly impeding innovation at Simon Fraser University. While our structural configuration was seen to be constraining or inhibiting by some, others viewed the lack of support for interdisciplinary initiatives to be the result of a lack of facilitating mechanisms and policies, rather than the byproduct of inadequate structural configurations. There was considerable support by the University community for this area to be more fully explored in a second phase of the faculty structure initiative.

(f) We listened as several ideas for new structures or reconfigurations and for potential strategies that would better facilitate and support interdisiplinarity were presented. It is noteworthy that the Faculty Structure Task Force did not evaluate any of these proposals nor was there sufficient argumentation provided that addressed how such initiatives met the principles for assessment and the goals and aspirations of the University in the future. Nonetheless, the Faculty Structure Task Force did take such submissions and imaginations as an indication of a strong interest by some members of the University community to proceed to a second phase where such proposals could be more fully developed and their viability carefully considered.

(g) We were advised to consider the important pragmatic issues that would need to be evaluated – most notably issues of fiscal resources, power structures, governance issues, responsibility and lines of authority – and be aware that the difficulties embedded within each of these areas would need to be addressed and overcome if any restructuring in the future was to be successful. The Faculty Structure Task Force was cautioned that achieving success would require decision-making on the basis of irrefutably sound argument, political astuteness, and clarity of vision.

(h) The Faculty Structure Task Force listened repeatedly to concerns that the discussion document did not specifically outline a process if a Phase 2 of the academic structure initiative proceeded. It was not clear to members of the University community how areas that view themselves as well supported by the current academic structure would be preserved and supported if change were to occur elsewhere. Nor was it clear to the University community whether the process that unfolded in phase 2 would be respectful of Simon Fraser University's tradition of broad-based consultation, collegial decision-making and bottom-up planning. Calls were made to ensure that evidence and sound criteria would be employed to evaluate how alternative unit configurations would satisfy the principles presented in the discussion document, or how resource reallocation would occur. There was also an issue raised as to how the concerns of individual faculty members would be assessed if they felt that a new unit alignment was incompatible with their personal research, pedagogy, or public profile.

The Faculty Structure Task Force has been importantly influenced by each of the views outlined above.

It is clear to the members of the Faculty Structure Task Force that there is strong support in some areas of the University for changing the current configuration of academic units. Such change however must be carefully evaluated and considered and it must be remembered that there are areas of the University that are well served by the current academic structure and whose contributions to the core values, commitments and future of the University must be preserved. Structural change, if any, must also be implemented through a process that respects the long-standing tradition at Simon Fraser University for collegial governance, community engagement and evidence-based decision-making.

It is also clear to the Faculty Structure Task Force that the area of interdisciplinarity needs to be more fully investigated. At the time of presenting our discussion document, the Faculty Structure Task Force was of the view that the University might wish to consider the creation of a supplemental structure such as a Centre or Institute aimed at combining interdisciplinary research programs with the creation of new interdisciplinary academic programming. The issue of interdisciplinarity was one of the most commonly raised issues at the Open Forums. What became apparent to the Task Force is the degree of interest and concern about the way in which interdisciplinarity is incubated and facilitated, encouraged and supported both within and outside of the disciplines. We were advised that if some areas of Simon Fraser University are to be competitive in the future (both for the success of their research aspirations and also their ability to recruit excellent undergraduate and graduate students) it will be imperative for them to move to more problem-based, interdisciplinary educational opportunities. This will further require the University to develop a better strategy for supporting interdisciplinary innovation in research and teaching. However, the challenges faced and opportunities imagined will likely extend beyond the limits of structural solutions. Nonetheless, it is the Faculty Structure Task Force's view that, as innovation in both the disciplines and at the intersections of disciplines is one of the fundamental commitments of Simon Fraser University, the impediments to achieving interdisciplinary innovation at Simon Fraser University must be examined regardless of whether those barriers have structural or policy roots.

Finally, it is clear to the Faculty Structure Task Force that the principles we articulated as guidelines for a second phase of the restructuring initiative needed to speak more centrally to the ways in which academic structure and both graduate and undergraduate education intersect. We have listened.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Task Force:

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

There is no one right answer to the question of structure, and the Faculty Structure Task Force has not engaged in the type of careful reflection, analysis, and imagining of whether there are alternative configurations in some areas of the University that might lead to better recognition and actualization of the values, strategic priorities and vision of the University for the future. On the basis of our own investigations and the feedback received through the consultations held with members of the University community, the Faculty Structure Task Force strongly believes we should proceed to a second phase of the faculty structure initiative so that such detailed analysis can occur.

In compliance with our mandate, the Faculty Structure Task Force has identified eight principles of assessment that we believe should guide the next stage of academic structural review.

1. The University's academic structure should continue to enhance and support innovation, excellence, integration, engagement and adaptability in teaching and research.
2. The University's academic structure should allow for responsiveness within a framework of stability. It should reaffirm our commitment to the liberal arts and sciences, to professional and applied programming, and to the fundamental value of discipline based inquiry and to the opportunities afforded by interdisciplinarity.
3. The University's academic structure should enable us to be effectively positioned for the opportunities and challenges that will be presented to us: it should position us to succeed in a demand-driven student enrolment environment; it should be financially viable within a diversified fiscal environment; it should advance our distinctiveness and strategic strengths; it should support our engagement with, and response to, increasingly diverse communities and student populations; and it should retain coherence in response to changes that will occur within the intellectual, social, political and economic environment.
4. The University's academic structure should attract outstanding graduate and undergraduate

students and facilitate excellence[6] in their learning experience.

5. The University's academic structure should consider our multi-campus presence and accommodate the distinctiveness of each campus while simultaneously contributing to a unified identity for Simon Fraser University as a whole.
6. The University's academic structure should incorporate the increasing number of academic programs into structures that will ensure stability, provide the ability for the units to advance themselves to the fullest extent, provide engagement for its members, and minimize the risks of under-representation in priority setting and budgetary discussions.
7. The University's academic structure should retain or enhance managerial and administrative effectiveness and efficiency particularly as it facilitates and supports effective planning, communication and decision-making, collegial governance, and resource allocation.
8. Any proposed change to the University's academic structure should be based on carefully considered analysis of the reasons and need for change, its impact on members of the unit as well as other academic units affected by the proposed changes, its respectfulness of members of the University community, its transparency, and its opportunity for meaningful collegial engagement throughout.

The Faculty Structure Task Force concludes its work by recommending the following four motions to Senate:

Motion I:

That Senate approve a second phase to the faculty structure initiative and create a "Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure".

Motion II:

That Senate approve the following mandate for the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure:

1. *Consider and evaluate proposals from the University community as well as those developed by the Phase 2 Task Force itself, and, following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend to Senate an overall academic unit configuration for Simon Fraser University;*
2. *Consider and evaluate the coherence, roles, responsibilities, functions, administrative requirements, costs, and terminology of the structural building blocks employed at Simon Fraser University (i.e. programs, schools, departments, centres, and institutes) and,*

---

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

following exploration and consultation with the University community, recommend to Senate a strategy that will provide definitional clarity, administrative effectiveness, and appropriate differentiation among these structures; and,

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

The Faculty Structure Task Force believes it imperative to respond to the feedback received from the University community regarding process. We recommend that the following process be employed to guide the activities of the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure.

Motion III:

That Senate approve the following procedural framework to guide the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure:

1. *The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will have the following composition: the Vice President, Academic who will Chair the Task Force, seven faculty members (one representative from each of the existing Faculties with the exception of Arts and Social Sciences which will have two representatives), an undergraduate student, and a graduate student. The Vice President, Academic will appoint all members to the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure. Clerical and/or professional personnel will be appointed as required by the Vice President, Academic. The composition of the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will attempt to ensure some continuity in membership between it and the Faculty Structure Task Force.*
2. *The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will receive submissions from the University community.*
3. *Following the receipt of submissions, the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will establish Working Group(s) to undertake comprehensive evaluation of the proposals. The composition of the Working Group(s) will be determined and appointed by the Vice President, Academic in consideration of the submissions received.*
4. *Evaluation by the Working Group(s) will include extensive opportunities for engagement with members of the community affected by each submission.*
5. *The Working Group(s) will bring forward a detailed evaluation of submissions to the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure for consideration as a whole. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will engage in extensive University wide consultation on the potential models, strategies for change, and recommendations that it is contemplating in each of the three areas of its mandate. The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure may choose to present options related to the areas of its mandate either separately or in combination.*
6. *The Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will endeavor to present its final recommendations to Senate by November 2007.*

Finally, as required by the mandate given to the Faculty Structure Task Force,

Motion IV:

That Senate approve that the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure be guided by the eight (8) principles of assessment outlined in this final report.

In summary, the Faculty Structure Task Force recognizes the important ways in which we are successful at Simon Fraser University, the ways in which we are positioned to achieve our future aspirations, and the ways in which, in many areas of the University, the current academic structure of the university reflects our qualities and strengths and has enabled us to evolve successfully over the past 40 years. The Faculty Structure Task Force holds the view though that there are opportunities for strengthening and better positioning the University for the future. We have heard from a number of Schools in the Faculty of Applied Sciences that the academic structure is not serving them as well as might be imagined. We have heard the struggles of innovative programming such as TechOne and the Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue recalled at open forums. We have heard the call for Simon Fraser University to find new ways of incubating and supporting innovation and new programming particularly those of an interdisciplinary nature. We have listened to some of our colleagues paint pictures of imaginative new programs, Faculties, and interdisciplinary structures. We have also heard the clear ring of voices in units that feel well served by the current structure and see their disciplines flourishing and their future strong.

The Faculty Structure Task Force wants to ensure that all areas of the University feel equally well served by the academic structure. We want to position ourselves to creatively pursue the growth and opportunities that will emerge as a result of change, and in a manner that ensures not only our continued vitality but also our continued relevance to the educational mission of post-secondary education in Canada and in the world. We believe that if we establish effective structures that are both stable and adaptable, that are both historically rooted and contemporary, we will not only avoid the crisis that otherwise could potentially accompany further shifts in the intellectual, fiscal, or demographic environments; but we will have secured for SFU a legacy appropriate to the university's illustrious beginnings in a time of urgent transformation – a transformation which SFU was able to imagine not as crisis but as opportunity. We will be able to reaffirm our legacy – *Nous sommes prêts!*