

S.94-54

FOR INFORMATION

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC

MEMORANDUM

To: Senate

From: J. M. Munro, Chair
Senate Committee on Academic Planning

Subject: External Review - Faculty of Education

Date: July 20, 1994

Attached for the information of Senate is a summary of the external review of the Faculty of Education which was carried out in July, 1993. The report and the response of the Department were reviewed by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning at its meeting of July 6, 1994 and the Committee approved a motion to receive the report. The full report and the response of the Department are available from the Secretary of Senate for senators to review.

J. M. Munro

External Review - Summary for Senate

Faculty of Education

The External Review Committee visited the Faculty of Education in May, 1993, and reported in July, 1993. The committee had the following composition:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Chair | Dr. Ian Winchester Ontario Institute for Studies in Education |
| Members | Dr. Geoff Milburn University of Western Ontario |
| | Dr. Nancy Zimpher Ohio State University |
| Internal member | Dr. Ellen Gee Department of Sociology and Anthropology, SFU. |

The overall view of the Faculty of Education is that it is a very successful unit which has been performing three main tasks well for a quarter of a century. It has produced numerous school teachers for British Columbia. It has produced a number of people who graduated from the undergraduate program with a B.Ed. degree and who subsequently went on to a variety of careers and it has had a successful graduate program. All of these things are to be commended. The future for all three parts of the program is bright in the short run, and with some adjustments should continue successfully well into the next century. On top of this, the research and publication record of the faculty is outstanding in comparison with other Canadian Faculties of Education.

On the other hand, there are a few factors which tend to suggest that the future cannot be exactly like the past and that preparation for this future will require some adjustments. One of these is connected with the changing university system in British Columbia. Another has to do with the general tone of restraint and the general desire for "more for the money" which has hit B.C. as well as the rest of Canada. The third has to do with the increasing feminization of both the complement of graduate students and the university teaching force, an important factor in the present and future of the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser. A final factor is related to the rapidly changing demographics of British Columbia, particularly greater Vancouver, namely the transformation of the area from a traditional Anglo-Celtic bastion to that of a large cosmopolitan centre. The future of the Faculty largely depends upon how it copes with these factors.

The committee received some submissions which led the committee to note that the climate of the Faculty is not welcoming to junior faculty, particularly junior female faculty, and that allegations were made that sexual and political harassment had occurred.

The Review Committee made a number of recommendations and suggestions which are summarized here.

1. The revision of the B.Ed. degree be completed and implemented.
2. There should be more harmonization in the admission of students from the Undergraduate Program to the Professional Development Program.
3. The ratio of regular faculty to Faculty Associates should not decrease.
4. The Professional Development Program's vitality should be preserved and nurtured through the continuing commitment of the Faculty and through the continuing involvement of Faculty Associates in program design and implementation.
5. The conceptual framework and the coherence of the Professional Development Program warrants more attention.
6. The Professional Development Program should be subject to systematic program review and student evaluation.
7. Faculty workload associated with the graduate programs should be examined closely, including a more purposeful organization of course offerings and more equity in graduate teaching and advising loads across the Faculty.
8. The Director of Graduate Programs should study ways and means of offering assurances of financial support to graduate students for longer periods.
9. Space should be provided for interaction among students, faculty and staff.
10. Graduate student advisory arrangements should be reviewed and material describing them updated and circulated to all new graduate students along with information on faculty publications and research interests.
11. The Faculty should review the entire range of its current offerings, assess its particular areas of strength, select those academic responsibilities which it can perform most productively, and devote its available resources to those selected areas. Steps should also

be taken to enlarge the direct role of faculty members in teaching. Strategic planning for programs and course offerings at the graduate level is also required.

12. New faculty members should be supported with collegial mentoring. Reasonable norms and expectations for junior faculty regarding publication for purposes of tenure and promotion should be outlined.
13. The Dean should work with the support staff to develop a mechanism for regular consultation and the provision of more efficient and satisfactory work arrangements.
14. Operating hours should be revised to meet the needs of the more non-traditional student population.
15. Further transformation of the Faculty environment to a more interactive instructional laboratory for teaching and learning would be desirable.
16. The Faculty of Education should draw up a constitution including a council, or councils involving faculty, other instructional staff, support staff, and students, advisory to the Dean.
17. The Executive of the Faculty should consider ways to improve the perception of a lack of real communication and to improve the actual communication or coordination, if required.

The Committee also made two suggestions:

- A review of program structure might result in the refocussing of existing specific programs of study, into some broader general programs. Such reconfigurations might allow more integration of faculty talents and might attract a more diversified graduate cohort.
- The creation of new delivery systems for graduate programs might give SFU a competitive edge in this market.

Summary prepared by Alison Watt, Director, Academic Planning Services and edited by John M. Munro, Vice-President, Academic.

Report of
the Committee to Study and Recommend on the State of the Faculty of Education in Simon
Fraser University, British Columbia, commonly known as
the
Education Review Committee

Ellen Gee, SFU
Geoff Milburn, UWO
Ian Winchester, OISE (Chair)
Nancy Zimpher, Ohio State

July, 1993

Introduction

A Committee of four persons, including Ellen Gee as internal resource person, with Nancy Zimpher, Geoff Milburn and Ian Winchester as external members, was struck by the Vice-President (Academic) of the university as part of the regular seven-year review of the Faculty of Education. The Committee was chaired by Ian Winchester. The Committee was provided with a number of materials in advance (Appendix I). It then visited Simon Fraser University for three days and interviewed a wide range of individuals and groups (Appendix II). It also encouraged other submissions during and after the site visit in order to know the views of those individuals who were unable to meet with the committee to their convenience during the site visit, or who had something to say which they may have felt could not be said in a public forum.

The overall view of the Faculty of Education which emerges is clear. This is a very successful Faculty which has been performing three main tasks well for a quarter of a century. It has produced numerous school teachers for British Columbia. It has produced a number of people who graduated from the undergraduate program with a B.Ed. degree and who subsequently went on to a variety of careers. And it has had a successful though small graduate program. All of these things are to be commended. The future for all three parts of the program looks bright in the short run, and with some adjustments should continue successfully well into the next century. On top of this, the research and publication record of the faculty is outstanding in comparison with other Canadian faculties of education.

On the other hand, there are a few factors which tend to suggest that the future cannot be exactly like the past and that preparation for this future will require some adjustments. One of these is connected with the changing university arrangements in British Columbia. Another has to do with the general tone of restraint and the general desire for "more for the money" which has hit B.C. as well as the rest of Canada. And the third has to do with the increasing feminization of both the complement of graduate students and the university teaching force, an important factor in the present and future of the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser. A final factor is related to the rapidly changing demographics of British Columbia, particularly greater Vancouver, namely the transformation of the area from a traditional Anglo-Celtic bastion to that of a large cosmopolitan centre. The future of the faculty largely depends upon how it copes with these factors.

A few disturbing notes jarred the otherwise pleasing litany of accomplishments, optimism and good-will in the Faculty which greeted us. In particular, we received reports of inappropriate behaviour directed at junior female faculty members at the hands of both senior male and female faculty. This reported unacceptable behaviour ranged from the sexual to the political. These reports amount to serious allegations which affect the entire tone and climate of the faculty and which cannot be swept under the carpet.

There were also a few personally disgruntled faculty who felt that their specialty was not adequately represented in the faculty vision or programs or who felt they were bypassed for high administrative office. And the support staff, as a block, did not feel that they were being optimally used, adequately appreciated or systematically consulted. Not all of the dissatisfaction here can be adequately addressed. Personal disgruntlement may have a deep cause, or it may simply be an individual response to a particular circumstance. We were not in a position to determine truth in such cases. The general dissatisfaction among the support staff, however, suggests that lines of communication between them and faculty, especially faculty with defined administrative responsibilities, must be systematically opened up.

What emerged, in spite of some difficulties, was a picture of a Faculty of Education

that on all measurable criteria ranks with the best in Canada and is as happily constituted as any known to us. It is a Faculty with a past of considerable accomplishment facing a number of new challenges and a few internal problems, some structural, some individual and personal. There is no reason to think that the Faculty cannot face its new challenges and be as successful in the future. Its structural problems are soluble. Its individual ones may disappear with solutions to the structural problems, though some appear to be personal and intractable.

In what follows we shall turn to the terms of reference, of which we were given ten.

Report

Our task was to examine the Faculty, report on ten existing conditions, which were listed for us and which we list 1.-10. below, and comment on opportunities for improvement. What follows immediately is our report in these terms.

1. The strengths and weaknesses of the Bachelor of Education program in terms of structure, breadth, orientation and other factors.

The current Bachelor of Education degree is designed to prepare students academically and professionally for a teaching career at both elementary- and secondary-school levels. This five-year program (with a minimum of 150 semester hours) is composed of academic majors and minors (selected from outside the faculty of Education), the Professional Development Program (PDP) and Education 404. Both of the latter are administered by the Faculty of Education. The degree (as described in the Faculty Report for the External Review) is a minimum of five years in length with the Professional Development Program to be taken after at least 76 hours in to the elementary program and 106 hours into the secondary program.

A newly designated B.Ed. has been approved in principle by the Faculty of Education. It, too, is composed of 150 semester hours with 80 credits to be taken outside the Faculty and 70 credits to be taken in the Faculty (including introductory education courses as well as field-based components in the SFU Professional Development Program and upper division coursework in education). It would appear that one strength of the newly proposed B.Ed. program is its foundational sequence. In this students are given a through preparatory sequence to the PDP through "case studies in education" and "issues in education". The culminating upper-level sequence would include two to three courses in "designs for learning". Together these pre- and post-PDP experiences have the potential of making the new B.Ed. a more cohesive totality with better integration of the PDP with the students whole degree program than the present arrangements.

During the External Review process the faculty described three "routes" to entry into the teaching profession via programs at Simon Fraser. These were (1) the 4+1 academic degree plus PDP, (2) the non-degree PDP year following a minimum of 76 semester hours, (3) the five-year B.Ed. At present, only a few students enroll in the traditional B.Ed. program. Most choose to enter the PDP through the minimum-hours route or through a Bachelor of General Studies, which is administered by the Faculty of Arts. None of these routes offers a completely coherent route to certification, including the less popular B.Ed. route.

Further, there appears to be an anomaly in program options in that students can enroll in a more general course of study, the Bachelor of General Studies, which is not a designated route to teacher certification. This path results in cases wherein students actually accumulate more courses in education than in other degree options while achieving entry into the PDP. This irony of non-education students receiving more education courses

than designated B.Ed. students seems odd or even inappropriate. Thus the currently proposed revision of the B.Ed. offers an attractive option at matriculation for students, integrating academic and educational course-work in a useful and convenient sequence in conjunction with the PDP experience.

Recommendation. The development work achieved through the revision of the B.Ed. degree is to be applauded. More specifically the Review Team recognizes the considerable support at all levels, including the Provost's and Dean's offices and within the faculty planning group. We would encourage immediate acceptance and implementation of the new B.Ed. option, for a number of reasons. First, the present programs uncouple the PDP experience from the academic experience in educational study as such. Second, the unpopularity of the present B.Ed. as a route to teaching qualification in Simon Fraser is very likely due to the format of the present B.Ed. Third, the fact that the B.G.S. is so popular as a route to teaching qualification suggests that a need is being met that the present B.Ed. does not meet.

While we think that this option should be implemented without delay, this is not the end of the process. Many who were involved in its planning were enthusiastic. But there were some who were left out of the process and they should be included into the continuing dialogue. Also, there will have to be major collaboration between those who work on the undergraduate programs and those who work primarily with PDP experience for this degree course to become a coherent one, as well as one which will replace the B.G.S. plus PDP as the preferred route to teaching qualification.

Other issues exposed during the External Review include the students' concern over delays in admission decisions relative to PDP. This is a problem relevant primarily to students interested in pursuing the B.Ed. degree. Although not totally clear to the review team, it appears that students could potentially experience some form of program entrapment at the point at which entrance to PDP is decided. Students must declare a major and complete most of the course-work required for the major before assurances are made relative to access to PDP. Thus it could be the case that students select and complete a teaching major, i.e., a discipline of study appropriate for the teaching profession, without any guarantees that the pedagogical components necessary for certification will be available to them.

Recommendation. The situation relative to student selection of an academic major and degree route should be consonant with access to the PDP. Admission to PDP should not be delayed unnecessarily such that a student might complete a degree and still not know if she or he might be admissible to PDP. Perhaps this is only a problem of student perception, but it is a real threat to their program planning. It also may be a factor limiting the Faculty's capacity to attract highly competent and committed students to the B.Ed. program.

A cluster of more general observations could be made about the undergraduate program that points to the contemporary nature of the offerings and the sessional and independent study opportunities. One issue discussed by faculty members is the degree of attention given to current issues in education such as the implementation of British Columbia's Year 2000. Differences of opinion exist about the degree of direct attention this initiative warrants within programmatic opportunities, and whether the role of the Faculty should be one of "facilitator" or "friendly critic". The fact that such debates exist is likely a positive tension within the Faculty. Furthermore, the contemporary opportunities provided through the Summer Semester and the SITE program, though staffed largely by part-time faculty, offers a rich opportunity for students to become acquainted with talented lecturers from elsewhere in the province, as well as national and international education figures.

Recommendation. It is critically important to guard the ratio of regular faculty to faculty associates at some roughly constant level, rather than increase the number of part-time faculty in the execution of the total program. It is a strength of the SFU program that talented practitioners and visiting faculty members can participate in the program and that undergraduate students can be exposed to such intellectual and professional stimulation throughout their educational experience.

2. The strengths and weaknesses of the Professional Development Program, including the remote programs.

The Professional Development Program (PDP) is a twelve month (three semester) teacher education program which blends practical experience and university course work into a single programmatic sequence. Students who successfully complete the PDP are recommended to the College of Teachers for a British Columbia Teaching Certificate. The PDP year includes an integrated semester of coursework (Education 401/402), a teaching semester (Education 405), and a coursework semester (Education 404). As noted in the Faculty Report for the External Review, the program goals noted on page 53 of the report constitute the conceptual framework for the program objectives. Further, various faculty members explained that the program goals are currently under review.

Much discussion in the Review Team interviews was devoted to the PDP. In formulating recommendations for the continued growth and improvement of the PDP, the Review Team wishes to note that no other topic received so much discussion at our meetings. We also want to note that no other topic seemed so fraught with tensions.

1. Clearly the PDP is a centrepiece of the SFU program. Both the reputation of the Faculty and its vitality are dependent on it. The distinction of the Faculty is largely dependent upon its commitment to the PDP as well as on its success at research.

2. The PDP offers an opportunity to make vital linkages between classroom practice and academic course-work. This dichotomy between practice and scholarship is one of the central sources of unresolved tension in the Faculty. Some faculty members feel that the PDP as it stands is too much under the sway of practitioners and current classroom wisdom, particularly "progressive" educational assumptions and practices. Thus the practical sessions are seen by a significant number of faculty to be conducted in the virtual absence of current research on teaching and learning and of contemporary criticism of classroom practice. Thus some view the PDP as dominated by conceptions of progressivism and faddism, temporal and experiential, to the detriment of scholarly knowledge or even as exhibiting a bias against such knowledge; perhaps even close-minded in its conceptual perspective. Still others expressed concern over the amount of focus on general educational concepts and practices, to the detriment of a more content-oriented focus on pedagogy. It must be observed that although these observations were forceful in nature, intended to expose the very essence of the programmatic tensions that exist, they also reflected to the Review Team a strong degree of vitality over what counts in the education of future teachers, which must be gauged in the final analysis as a strength of the PDP experience.

3. Faculty applauded the collegiality exhibited among those who work in the Professional Development Program, including positive interactions that occur around the construction of faculty modular teams and the cohesion achieved by organizing students into instructional cohorts. The faculty clustering enables constant interaction between practitioners and academics which adds reality to the notion of integrating theory and practice. Students acknowledge the sense of cooperation and team-work vital to their socialization into teaching as a career as provoked by the PDP experience. Tensions exist

in this dimension of the PDP as well, again particularly with regard to the faculty. Some feel the assignment of certain faculty to the PDP excludes others from any real decision-making authority in the PDP. Others noted that the module organization works best when all members participate, but that it is possible and does happen that certain faculty contribute only minimally to the module, leaving decision making and implementation of the curriculum to faculty associates and module coordinators. Some faculty spoke specifically to exclusion and hoped that the influences of some faculty and module coordinators might be diminished so as to provide more opportunity for the involvement of a broader base of the faculty.

4. There was general support for the contribution of the faculty associates (FA) to the Professional Development Program. Although issues of FA utilization are raised elsewhere in the report, here it seems appropriate to note how critical the role of these practitioners is to the authenticity and credibility of the PDP experience. Of those we met, these faculty associates appear to be genuinely committed to the PDP experience, to have accumulated sound educational experience themselves, and to exhibit considerable enthusiasm toward the responsibility of preparing future teachers. Herein some tensions exist as well, particularly relative to the conceptual focus of PDP. Some viewed the focus as essentially situated almost exclusively on practice and on "what works" as opposed to a more critical posture on teaching and learning, both of which some assumed was a function of the "influence" of Faculty Associates on curriculum design. Others, in contrast, believed this interaction and tension to be the essence of integrating aspects of PDP's conceptual design. It is likely that such "clashes of perspective" have to be channelled toward the ultimate creation of consistent program coherence.

5. The vitality of the PDP was observed to be a strength. Such vitality, faculty observed, is achieved because the PDP experience is essentially redesigned annually, with the establishment of the modular teams as scheduled for two semesters at a time. As such, some said, the program is always "moving and changing," and the strength of the modular team lies in the robust planning opportunities made necessary by the annual modular assignments. Again, this is likely a strength and a weakness of the program, in that annual shifts make continuity in conceptual design a problem not only for consistency in the program but also for program evaluation.

6. Faculty commented as well on the relationship between the totality of PDP and the research and inquiry interest of the faculty. Some observed that more linkages in this direction are highly desirable. The newly formed Institute for Studies in Teacher Education aims to promote and carry out research in the area of teacher education. Ultimately the research agenda of the Institute could link nicely with programmatic interests fostered by the PDP. Again, some faculty observed an "inside/outside" effect of involvement in the Institute, as with the PDP. There seems a continuing feeling on the part of some that they are excluded from or not in the mainstream of programmatic and research initiatives relative to PDP. Said more positively, some faculty expressed the view that all faculty are teacher educators; thus a centre on the study of teacher education is redundant to the already extant faculty organization.

7. On the conceptual basis for the PDP, numerous observations were put forward. The clearest rendering of the conceptual base is in the program goals noted above. Beyond these statements, faculty observed that the essence of the concept of PDP is in the very fabric of the Faculty itself, what the individuals who compose the faculty believe and study, and how those notions manifest themselves in the curriculum. And, of course, as acknowledged above, the practitioner orientation of the FAs is clearly a conduit for programmatic development. Another source for programmatic conception is the exploration of student views about what distinguishes their participation in PDP, in response to the question of what characterizes a teacher prepared at SFU. Students responded that they were prepared as "constructivists", given tools to apply knowledge

acquired in PDP to the classroom, with the aim of becoming life-long learners themselves, who see teaching as a puzzlement and as experimental, and who exhibit creativity and energy relative to innovative classroom practice. This view was consonant with faculty observations about the degree of confidence instilled in the SFU graduate relative to classroom management and the reflective capacity needed to effectively participate and lead within the "cauldron" of the classroom. These reflect personal testimony toward a sense of the conceptual basis for PDP.

These observations represent the essence of what was told to the Review Team about the Professional Development Program. While they are not inclusive of all that was shared, they are presented as above to reflect not only perceived strengths in the program, but also the tensions that underlie the totality of programming necessary to sustain PDP. The following recommendations flow from this commentary:

Recommendation. The Professional Development program continues to be the most distinctive programmatic attribute of the Faculty of Education at SFU. Its vitality should be preserved and nurtured through the continuing commitment of the Faculty itself, and through the continuing involvement of Faculty Associates in program design and implementation.

Recommendation. The conceptual framework for the Professional Development Program warrants more attention. While the program goals statement as put forward in the Faculty Report constitutes essentially a set of programmatic objectives. What is missing is an elaborate discussion of Faculty consensus on conceptions of teaching and learning, schooling and the process of learning to teach. In the absence of such a conceptual statement, the program recreates itself annually at the hands of those who compose the various modular teams, but may not consistently reflect the ethos of the program as fostered over the years by the Faculty. As such, disputes arise as to the essence of PDP that warrant resolution, explication and, once espoused, continuing review and refinement.

Recommendation. Beyond the explication of a clear conceptual framework for the Professional Development Program, program coherence is also an issue. Serious consideration should be given to making the program more coherent. Once derived, a strong, consensual philosophy, rationale and guiding principles can foster cohesion, such that a) consistent themes are dealt with throughout the program, b) clearer articulation can exist between on-campus didactic experiences and field-related assignments, c) students can more carefully articulate central themes that undergird the program, and d) greater integration can exist between prior PDP experience and those that follow the 401/401,405 experiences.

Recommendation. There was little evidence of systematic program and student evaluation relative to the PDP, and particularly the linkage of PDP to other program options, including the B.Ed. and other prerequisite course experiences. There should be systematic program and student evaluation for the PDP Program. While there may exist data relative to follow-up of graduates from the PDP experience, a more comprehensive program- evaluation design and formative and summative assessment of student progress and career success would provide relevant information for on-going program review and redesign. Further, engaging students and faculty more actively in assessing programmatic effectiveness and consequences of the PDP experience would provide vital opportunities for both parties to more directly participate in the process of programmatic renewal.

3. The strengths and weaknesses of the graduate program and plans for graduate program expansion.

The graduate program at SFU has experienced steady growth and revision since its inception 26 years ago. Currently, based on revision in 1979, the graduate program focuses on the integration of knowledge with professional practice, and includes both masters (M.Ed./M.A.) and doctoral programs (Ph.D.), and individual programs and off-campus programs for B.C.-interior communities. Most recently, the scope of the masters program includes programs in administrative leadership, curriculum and instruction, psychology of education and counselling psychology. The doctoral program includes programs in instructional psychology and in curriculum. Further, a "designated program" is offered to instructors in the University College of Cariboo (UCC). These programs are reflected in the Faculty Report for the External Review on page 73.

During the Review Team visitation, a number of issues surfaced relative to graduate programs as follows:

1. One major point of discussion was on the future directions of the graduate programs. Two concerns are encouraging faculty to focus on the future. First is the offering of graduate degree programs in B.C. by external institutions. It would appear that existing graduate institutions in B.C. simply haven't the resources to respond to all the needs and interests of practising school professionals for growth and development opportunities. This is particularly the case in the area of educational administration, wherein practitioners are seeking degrees through part-time correspondence courses. A second development that is likely to affect the undergraduate, PDP and graduate offerings at SFU in the decade to follow is the likely expansion of professional education programs into newly created four-year and advanced program institutions likely to be approved in the province during this time-frame. Thus questions arise about the competitive posture of SFU relative to these other initiatives, particularly in the preparation of educational professionals.

2. Concern over issues of expansion of competitive educational institutions raises the programmatic question of focus for future SFU graduate programs. Specifically individual faculty members expressed interest in expanding SFU's program to include a broader definition of education; e.g., the helping professions, the allied health professions, and educating individuals who serve educational needs in non-school related settings. There appears to be at present an absence of unanimity on these future directions and leadership here is sorely needed.

3. Issues about current operations of graduate programs include a) the ability of a stable or declining number of faculty to serve the demands of an expanding student population and still retain the scholarly excellence already achieved by the faculty; b) a reduction in support services through the Faculty due to budget restraints that limits the quality and opportunity for advertisement and other services typically extended to graduate students; c) concern over limited numbers of full-time students, and implications of a part-time student cohort inadequately served relative to faculty/student access and socialization needs; d) lack of funds to support graduate assistantships; e) the absence of coursework in research methodology for graduate programs which are used for credentialing upgrades; and f) general tensions over the focus of current programs on academic versus practical perspectives, the need for more conscious treatment of gender equity issues in the curriculum, a focus on the needs of more non-traditional students interests in the curriculum, the absence of program evaluation and student assessment in the programs, and the intentional, planned nature of the programs versus more random course offerings.

These concerns warrant a series of programmatic recommendations and suggestions

relative to the graduate programs:

Recommendation. There should be strategic planning for programs and course offerings at the graduate level. The graduate programs could benefit greatly from the strategic planning of programmatic structures and course offerings. Such strategic planning at the graduate level could resolve directions relative to expansion or reduction of the preservice initiative, the extension of programs into non-traditional educational areas such as the helping professions more generally, and philosophical issues relative to the content of graduate programs.

Suggestion. The specification of graduate programs by specific disciplines of study (e.g. curriculum and instruction, educational psychology, educational administration) could well be refocussed into a more general collective of programs wherein education curriculum, and supervision and educational administration, for example, could be merged into a more general program focusing on "educational leadership". This is only provided as an example of what might evolve from a review of programmatic restructuring. Such reconfigurations would allow more integration of faculty talents and attract a more diversified graduate cohort. And the reinstatement of graduate programs that do not now operate due to low faculty availability in certain areas might then be possible.

Suggestion. The creating of new delivery systems for the graduate program, and particularly considering some aspects of full-recovery extension programs may allow a competitive edge relative to other available graduate degree programs in the province. This option would be particularly viable perhaps in meeting the needs of senior administrators in regional school districts.

Recommendation. While concerns about budget reductions and increased loads are pervasive across programs, and in higher education generally, a closer look at faculty workload relative to the graduate programs is desirable, including a more purposeful organization of course offerings and more equity relative to graduate teaching and advising loads across the Faculty.

Related to graduate work is the Faculty's increasing interest in field service. In this regard, a new directorship has been created for the coordination of in-service and field relations. Such initiatives have traditionally focused on both the credit and non-credit in-service needs of practising teachers. More recent planning has focused on broadening the range of participants in these programs, creating collaborative programs with other agencies, maximizing the relationship between existing programs and outreach initiatives, being more proactive rather than strictly responsive to immediate training and credentialing needs, monitoring offerings and attending to cost efficiencies.

The creating of a fourth directorship for in-service and field relations is to be applauded. The potential for adding a more regional planning base and collaborating with existing programs towards more effective outreach appears a highly desirable direction for the Faculty. The relationship among and between the directorships, and particularly relative to graduate programming, is recommended in order to be more efficient about the totality of programmatic offerings and more incorporative of faculty capacity.

4. The adequacy of support for graduate students and the rate of progress through the graduate program.

We assume that the notion of "support" refers primarily (although by no means exclusively) to financial aid to graduate students during their course of study. This budget line within the Faculty has been so reduced in recent years that, as the Report suggests, the program is "generally short of money... for graduate student support." Nevertheless, the

Faculty continues to make what allocations it can for this purpose, either in direct awards, or by means of sessional teaching appointments or various forms of assistantships. On the other hand, because a large proportion of graduate students are following part-time programs while they continue in full-time employment (particularly at the masters level), the need for such funds may not be as significant as the sheer number of students may suggest. We noted the Director of Graduate Programs' personal interest in this matter, and we are, in general, satisfied that the Faculty's commitment to the allocation of funds for this purpose remains firm despite its diminishing resources.

Recommendation. On the question of the administration of such funds, a few graduate students reported to us some difficulties arising out of the relatively short period (usually a single session rather than an academic year) for which such support was normally provided (or at least guaranteed). Although it may be difficult for the Faculty to make significant administrative changes in this regard, given the inevitable uncertainties attached to such sources as sessional teaching, nevertheless we think that the students' concern is understandable, and we recommend that the Director of Graduate Programs study ways and means of offering assurances of financial support for more extended periods.

Recommendation. It was also drawn to our attention that the Faculty may be able to offer forms of support for graduate students other than grants of money. Although graduate students to whom we spoke emphasized that the Dean and Director of Graduate Programs "worked tirelessly and sensitively on [their] behalf," they drew our attention both to the lack of office space for EGSA and also to the need for a lounge or meeting area for graduate students in general. The lack of such facilities, they argued, contributes to what they perceived as "minimal contact with faculty and other graduate students in general" and "barriers which inhibit informal and formal exchange of ideas and information." Given the importance of discussions among graduate students and faculty members (and the sheer number of graduate students), we consider these representations persuasive, and we recommend that the students' requests be given further study both by the faculty and the University administration.

Recommendation. On a relatively small but related matter, we noted that graduate students expressed great interest in the formal list of faculty members (together with detailed comments on their publications and research interests) provided to us as part of the review process. The students suggested that the information provided therein would be of great help in planning courses and discussing research possibilities. We recommend that this booklet, or one that includes similar information, be provided annually to all in-coming graduate students.

We examined in detail the statistics on students' progress through the graduate program. On the question of withdrawals before completion, the Faculty's record at the master's level is about average for the University as a whole, and at the doctoral level slightly higher than average. Similar conclusions may be drawn from the statistics on the number of years taken to complete both degrees. Thus we have no special concerns for Education as opposed to other faculties within the university. On the other hand, rates of completion remain a general concern, if only because graduate students within Education are older than those in other faculties.

On Ph.D completion-rates, we noted one statistic that caused us some concern. According to the Report (p.86) the number of Ph.D. male graduates from 1988 to 1992 slightly exceeds the number of female Ph.D. graduates during the same period--although the number of female admissions to that program is almost double the number of male admissions. We draw this matter to the attention of the Faculty.

Recommendation. On the question of withdrawal and completion rates, it is difficult to make specific recommendation that will be effective. We note, however, the Faculty's

intention to provide additional opportunities to complete the masters degree by courses. We had some representations on the one hand that the methods for allocating academic advisors to graduate students were not always working effectively, and on the other hand that the roles of program and research advisors were not always explained as clearly as some students expected. We recommend that these advisory arrangements be reviewed, and appropriate changes be made to the written materials provided to students entering the graduate program.

5. The size and background of the faculty complement in relation to the Faculty's responsibilities and workload.

The faculty prides itself on its model for differentiated staffing. Of the entire complement, between 35 and 45 persons fall into each of the following categories: (a) tenure-track or limited-term academics, (b) faculty associates on two- or three-year appointments, (c) sessional instructors and (d) teaching assistants. In addition, there is a significant (but varying) number of school associates attached to the PDP program. Such a model has proved to be extraordinarily flexible (and effective) in meeting the Faculty's major responsibilities: research and scholarship, undergraduate and graduate teaching, on-site and off-site courses, and professional induction and in-service programs. In our judgment, the success of the model is measured by the high reputation of the Faculty in Canada and elsewhere, the outstanding research record of faculty members, the innovative nature of many components of the Faculty's work, and the esteem felt for the institution by many students with whom we spoke.

Nevertheless, from the comments within the Faculty's Report and also from observations made directly to us, there appears to be some evidence of "wear and tear" in the current operation of the model. For this development there appear to be many causes, some of which are external (and outside control of the Faculty), and others internal. The budget cuts of recent years (while student enrolments continue to increase) are causing stress. All three Directors of programs report some difficulty in meeting their obligations (through cuts in the number of FAs, unfilled academic posts, lost opportunities for graduate development, and so forth). In addition, the provincial context within which the Faculty operates seems to be changing more rapidly than the institution can accommodate. Competing institutions are emerging, new clienteles (especially in the college systems and in related health or caring fields) are knocking at the door, and opportunities for new graduate programs are presenting themselves. At the same time, Ministry policies and requirements (which often have important financial--and staffing--implications) can not always be planned for or accommodated.

On the other hand, the fact that there is only a small number of academics (relative to other appointments) within the institution raises important questions of academic accountability within and among the various Faculty offerings. We note here, for example, that only about a quarter of undergraduate courses are taught by tenured faculty members. The remainder are outside their direct purview. In addition, we noted that some groups within the differentiated model reported varying degrees of what they labelled "exclusion." Some faculty members, for example, suggested that their direct influence on the PDP program was not as great as they wished. Sessional lecturers in distant points or on one-time assignments are perceived as somewhat detached from University influence, while a particular FA highlighted his own feeling by remarking that he felt at times more like a "faculty disassociate."

There is clear evidence that the Faculty recognize these--and related--problems in the differentiated model, and has already begun to come to terms with them. Some of these initiatives are limited in scope but important nonetheless--such as the Dean's interest in evaluating instruction within the Faculty. We note the studies under way to assess the contributions made by each component within the differentiated model, and we applaud the

general statement within the Report that "we deem it more desirable to provide quality services than to spread ourselves thinly in many directions." In general, the Faculty recognizes that it faces important questions and it has begun to examine alternative solutions.

To assist the review procedure we offer the following suggestions:

Recommendation. First, that the Faculty continue to base its mission on its strength. Rather than submit to a decline in a whole range of offerings, caused largely by budget reductions, the Faculty, in our judgment, should review the entire range of its current offerings, assess its particular areas of strength, select those academic responsibilities which it can perform most productively, and devote its available resources to those selected areas. In that process, the academic expertise of faculty members (and the particular inter-disciplinary configurations in which that expertise is enshrined) will be a major consideration. The number of options to be considered is very large (and it is not within our warrant to be overly directive in this matter), but during our on-site discussions our attention was drawn to the need to extend doctoral offerings, especially those in programs designed to provide support for emerging colleges in British Columbia, and also those for leaders within the teaching profession. But whatever areas are selected for emphasis, it should be recognized that the selection process inevitably requires that some current offerings will be reduced in emphasis. The task for the University and Faculty administration, and for the committee structures within the institution, is to provide a climate in which such priorities may be established with a minimum of rancor and divisiveness within the community.

Recommendation. We are also persuaded that the notion of differentiated staffing should continue to be accompanied by a very carefully coordinated policy and program of academic accountability. Given the varying demands for professional programs within the Faculty, the question of academic control is a major concern (indeed, such control, in our judgment, is a defining characteristic of professional preparation within a university setting). In all such programmes, especially the PDP, the faculty should continue to monitor its academic supervision of the curricula.

Recommendations. On the question of academic supervision of the Faculty's overall offerings, we recommend that the administrative steps be taken to enlarge the faculty's direct role in teaching. Some benefits may be gained on the one hand by pruning the total number of courses offered within the Calendar and on the other hand by carefully designating compulsory courses within specific programmes. In addition, some academic and pedagogic benefits may be obtained by longer range scheduling of faculty commitments to teaching.

Within the model of differentiated staffing, the needs and professional growth of various groups will continue to require careful study. New faculty members will require collegial mentoring to ensure that they are not overwhelmed by the pressures of contemporary University life, nor discouraged by the daunting prospect of competing with senior professors. We are persuaded also of the need to direct attention to the unique difficulties faced by the FAs. The anomaly of their nine-month (rather than ten-month) salary should be examined. Additional attention should be paid at senior Faculty and University levels to examining ways in which the experience gained by FAs during their terms at SFU can be put to better use in their subsequent professional careers.

In summary, then, although the current system of differentiated staffing has worked well, and ought to be retained, we recognize that in several areas it requires careful study and reform.

6. The research and teaching contribution of faculty members, including the level of external research support.

On one point in our discussions with various constituents, faculty, student and administration, there is unanimity: the research record of the faculty members in Education is outstanding in comparison with other Faculties of Education in Canada. As one of our respondents remarked (in our judgment, accurately) "the Faculty is seen as unusually productive (for a professional school) in a scholarly way." By all measures of scholarly output in Education faculties in Canada, SFU stands at, or very near, the top. In many fields of educational scholarship, including curricular, social and philosophic issues, and psychological/counselling questions (and in offering these examples we are by no means exhausting the list), scholars at SFU are very highly regarded indeed. In our discussions with faculty members we were very impressed by this universal commitment to scholarly investigation, research and publication.

We noted the interest in extending research into more pedagogic functions of the faculty. The current interest in including research questions in the PDP curriculum and teacher development, for example, attracts (and deserves) full support. On the other hand, one faculty member with a strong dissenting voice told us orally that there was no evidence that the research of the faculty members (or indeed recent research in Education in general) had any impact whatsoever on the curricular offerings of the PDP. We take it that there is a distinction to be made, here, between the results of research efforts undertaken by the faculty and the questions of a research nature which might equally inform the PDP curriculum.

Recommendation. We are pleased to note that the Faculty acknowledges that the pressure to publication may have some human costs. It is important to recognize the particular pressure that the very high level of achievement of senior faculty may exercise on younger or novice academics, and on the need to provide appropriate counselling and monitoring. Indeed, we believe that there is need on the part of the Faculty to characterize reasonable norms and expectations for the junior faculty as regards publication (e.g., one good scholarly article per year) for purposes of tenure and promotion.

The scholarly interests of the Faculty may also be measured in success in competing for research funds. The listings of such support in the Report are very impressive indeed--and certainly better than most (perhaps even all) Faculties within the country. We note also the editorial work for scholarly journals undertaken by faculty members, and the impressive list of honours conferred on particular individuals. We are persuaded that current members of the administration and their predecessors should take considerable pride in the procedures and policies that have made possible this outstanding record.

On the question of the teaching contribution of faculty members, we note that the standard means of accountability for instruction appears to be in place and to be working satisfactorily. We comment elsewhere on the circumstances of the teaching responsibilities of the faculty (and other instructors) within the differentiated model, and the difficulties that require some redress.

7. The size of the administrative, secretarial and support staff complement.

This is one of the difficult matters for us to judge, for a number of reasons. Were we conducting this review in the 1930's for a faculty of comparable size, there would have been virtually no support staff to speak of except, perhaps, the Dean's secretary. Were there to be Directors, they would have had to do all the administrative work themselves, dependent upon writing largely in long-hand and with the aid of the Royal Mail's frequent deliveries. There were no computers to complicate things, nor were there even electric or

electronic typewriters. Duplicating technology was either the Gestetner or more likely, multiple carbon copies of any important document.

Although these are increasingly difficult times, a considerable administrative, secretarial and support staff cadre is in place at Simon Fraser. As we mentioned earlier, we think that the three present Directors and the fourth one proposed makes good sense given the program divisions. Each Director, the Dean and the Associate Dean, appear to be adequately supplied with assistance. No administrator suggested to us that there was an understaffing problem in her or his realm.

However, at an open meeting with support staff (including the secretarial staff), the view was widespread that at peak-load periods (such as at registration time, or the beginning of a new term), a number of staff are overworked--while, often, at the same time others have nothing to do. This affects the PDP program and the undergraduate program disproportionately.

One of the views strongly expressed and strongly assented to was that the support staff, had they some appropriate structural mechanism, could probably organize things among themselves much better than they are presently so that such peak periods be better covered. But the mechanism is lacking. There is also a strong sense that because of the various divisions and hierarchies within the support staff complement, reflecting the organization of the positions of power and influence on the teaching faculty side, there is a less than rational usage of support staff. It is very hard for us to judge these claims. But often support staff, if given a chance, are able to see things relating to their tasks which cannot be seen by those whose responsibilities are more general.

One incident which seemed to cause much general distaste were the structural changes in the media centre involving some loss of staff, some reduction in hours and some physical rearrangements. The support staff generally felt that this was badly handled to the detriment of the students needing the media centre facilities. And this had resulted, according to the support staff, from a near total lack of consultation on the part of the Senior Administration. The Senior Administration, perhaps naturally, saw things differently and felt that there had been detailed consultation but that no changes would have been judged satisfactory by the support staff, though some were necessary nonetheless. We detail this reported incident because it seems to us to illustrate the difficulty of our making appropriate judgments about the size of the administrative, secretarial and technical support staff complement.

Recommendation. Our general impression, the difficulties notwithstanding, is that compared to other Canadian universities, the Faculty of Education at SFU is well served in this regard. If there is a problem, it may lie in the less than optimal usage of the complement which exists. Therefore we recommend that the Dean should work with the support staff to develop a mechanism for regular consultation and the devising of more efficient and satisfactory work arrangements than those which presently exist. We are aware that the Associate-Dean and Dean already have some informal mechanisms in place, but believe that it is important to make the support staff involvement in their own working arrangements a formal, open and widely supported matter.

8. The adequacy of resources provided to support teaching and research, including computing, media, library resources, office space and laboratory facilities.

A facilities tour during the review visits provided the external team an opportunity to view the Centre for Educational Technology (CET), the Exemplary Centre for Interactive Technologies in Education and the Provincial Resources Centre. As well, the team visited many offices and support staff facilities and met with faculty, students and staff in a variety

of classroom settings. Clearly, a general observation about the beautiful natural setting of Simon Fraser is in order. Repeatedly, for instance, students referred to "coming up" to SFU as like entering a retreat-like setting, where concentration on academic life was encouraged not only by the programming but also by the aesthetics of the environment.

More practical observations were heard as well. Faculty, staff and students alike seek more spaces where informal interaction can occur, not only within groups, but across groups as well. Not only are informal lounges sought, but in the case of the graduate students specifically, office space is requested. Relatedly, a more part-time transient student body suggests the need for more space to simply "be" during the time spent on campus; locales distributed throughout the Faculty building where students can study or talk with each other. Some students and several of the staff commented about restricted hours for facilities in demand by students. That is, facilities are often closed at just the early evening hours that many students are arriving on campus. On a more positive note, a number of the classrooms appear designed for small group interaction. The tables and chairs are flexible, and the review team saw different rooms used in different ways.

Recommendations. As possible, space should be created to accommodate the interactive needs of students, faculty and staff. Further, there should be some redistribution of operating hours to meet the needs of the more non-traditional student population on which Simon Fraser's Faculty of Education importantly depends. While it appears that budget restrictions have caused adjustments in availability of materials and equipment, there has been no diminution of assignments that require the use of these (increasingly unavailable) facilities.

The facilities identified above present a very impressive array of materials and equipment in use. Clearly the users of these laboratory facilities benefit greatly from the capability created by the staff working directly in the labs. As with these types of facilities generally, outreach and drawing in more users from the ranks of both faculty and student are desirable. Further, to the degree that the focus is on K-12 settings, more attention could be given to enabling faculty to integrate these facilities and what they represent into their own on-campus instruction. While the review team did not observe faculty teaching, it appeared evident that improvement of university teaching was not necessarily an overt goal of these centres.

Finally, and particularly with regard to the centres named above, they hold the potential of recreating the setting at SFU to a more laboratory-focussed professional program. That is, professional practice is often grounded in two dimensions--didactic, on-campus work and school or field based work. A linkage of theory to practice is likely a dimension of clinical activity that would engage students and faculty in more interactive diagnosis of practice. This view of professional growth could be enabled through the use of mediated cases, interactive video, teaching clinics that allowed for regular video taping of teaching and the creation of classroom simulations, peer teaching and the use of observation facilities for analysis of teaching, for instance.

Recommendation. While the facilities that serve the Faculty are impressive, the transformation of the Faculty environment to a more interactive instructional laboratory for teaching and learning would be desirable. Creating instructional spaces, laboratories and clinics that emphasize the interactive and diagnostic nature of learning to teach could greatly enhance the instructional potency of the educative process. This is an expensive and labour intensive refocussing of programmatic interests, but also one that might underscore for others in the university the clinical capacity needed to prepare professional educators. The accomplishments of the Faculty in introducing technology in staff and faculty offices is a step in this more clinically oriented direction.

9. The effectiveness of the administration of the Faculty

The effectiveness of the administration of the Faculty of Education at SFU is a complicated topic since the question of just where the "administration" of a university Faculty begins and ends has no clear answer given the generally "flat" organizational structure of universities. The Faculty of Education is such a "flat", complicated, differentiated and overlapping arrangement for training teachers, undergraduates, graduates and on- and off-campus others. So just "who is administering what and when" is an interesting question in itself.

In one sense, the administration of the Faculty is the responsibility mainly (though certainly not exclusively) of the academic faculty members and this part of each faculty member's work is continuous with their teaching, their supervising and their research roles. In this sense the Faculty of Education and the university appear to be well-served. On the evidence available to us, the academic teaching staff are highly effective in pursuing their administrative duties. This seems to be as true for the ordinary faculty members as for those who have assumed administrative duties of a specialized organizational kind, such as the Directors of programs and the Decanal team.

The overwhelming number of students, non-academic teaching staff, support staff and the faculty members themselves, are happy with the general administrative performance, of faculty, of directors, of others in administrative responsibilities and of the Decanal team. A few feel excluded from some part of the decision making (for example, some faculty members feel excluded from the PDP program organization). But this is certainly not the main perception, which is---as reported to us---strongly positive.

Two submissions from individuals, both faculty members, expressed the view that the present administration is not effective. Indeed, they thought that this has been true for previous administrations as well. One accused the administration (and here the whole academic faculty were implicated, not just the decanal team and the directors of programs) of failing to consider the "real issues" and suggested that there were things which the Faculty as a whole could not fail to know ("to not not know"), such as: (1) failure to employ research results in Education in reforming the curriculum and the organization of the faculty; (2) failing to recognize that the "real world of Vancouver" is not a white anglo-celtic preserve of happily married couples with two children and that the student body and faculty do not reflect this. These are important and striking claims, if true, and raise issues which should be seriously debated by the entire faculty in a sober and careful manner and about which leadership from the Dean (and others with administrative leadership responsibility) would be in order.

We also received submissions which drew attention to inappropriate and unacceptable behaviour on the part of senior faculty, both male and female, towards junior female faculty. These submissions relate to the broad context of "administration" here at issue. In particular, the submissions alleged that junior female faculty were sometimes exposed to unwanted sexual attentions and sometimes to unwanted political pressures at the hands of senior faculty members. Thus the climate of the faculty, according to the suggestion of these submissions, is not welcoming to junior faculty, especially junior female faculty. These claims may relate to matters of fact or to matters of perception or both. Whatever the truth here, and we are in no position to determine that, there is no doubt that a central issue of "climate" is involved. In the whole broad sense in which the administration of the faculty is in the hands of the academic staff as a whole, there is clearly a wide-ranging responsibility, especially falling on the senior faculty members, to look to the appropriate welcoming of the junior members. When it is possible in a faculty for an outside team to read or hear reports of behaviour of an intimidating or even harassing nature, then clearly something is wrong.

Were there to be open and general faculty discussions on the various political views which relate to the Faculty's optimal functioning, perhaps such intimidation and harassment would cease. But this cannot be possible unless the Faculty finds a way to relate its administrative and academic decisions to some form of open discussion rather than back-room caucusing or hallway decision making. If there is intimidation verging on harassment occurring in the Faculty, for political ends, it should be widely known and condemned for what it is, namely, brutal tactics for political ends not universally shared either by the women or the men of the Faculty.

Another faculty member made vague suggestions that the present senior administration did not keep promises made with respect to recent hirings and staffing. We do not know what to make of vague suggestions of promises not kept.

Recommendation. The above suggests that the present arrangements for faculty discussion, for political activity and for decision making are not satisfactory. We are aware that the present Dean has attempted to open up the channels of discussion by having open Faculty meetings. But reports to us suggest that the lack of procedures, and the present socialization of the faculty members, make these meetings less than effective and perhaps completely useless. The difficulties seem to be partly ones of size, partly ones of faction, and partly ones of procedures. The only ones about which action can be easily and directly taken are those relating to procedures and we therefore recommend that a Faculty constitution, including a council or councils (involving faculty, support staff and students) advisory to the Dean, be drawn up in full, including procedural requirements (e.g., Bourinot's rules of order). It is not our point that the Dean's traditional freedom of action should be limited. But without adequate systematic means for discussion and advice, all Decanal decisions are potentially suspect.

One final matter which involves the relationship between the Dean and the Directors recurred with some frequency, namely, the view that the Directors operated their own independent fiefdoms without serious interaction with one another or with the Dean. On the evidence of the success of the various programs, this seems to us to be a surprising comment by some faculty. Nor was it raised by any of the Directors or the Dean. However, since there is an unfortunate common perception to be combatted here, we recommend that the Dean meet with the Directors and their closest associates to see if ways and means can be found to (a) improve the perception of a lack of real communication or coordination among the various divisions of the Faculty and (b) to actually improve the communication or coordination should the recurring suggestions here have substance.

In summary, we find that the administration of the Faculty is generally effective at all levels. However, there is need for better communication between the academic staff and the non-academic staff in terms of the organization of tasks related to the work of the Faculty as a whole. (See 7. above). There is need for the Faculty, under the leadership of the Dean, to produce genuine forums for academic staff, non-academic staff, graduate students, undergraduate students and professional students so that grievances can be addressed and positive suggestions that have promise revealed and discussed fully in an open atmosphere.

10. The relationship between the Faculty, the teaching profession, school districts and the Ministry of Education.

From the evidence available to us from the variety of submissions, the relationship between the Faculty and the teaching profession, the school districts and the Ministry of Education is generally effective and supportive in both directions. We did not receive a single complaint that school districts were hard to work with or that the Ministry of Education was difficult or silly or lacking in knowledge or understanding---the standard fare in some jurisdictions. Nor was there any undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the Faculty's relationship with the teaching profession either as organized or in general.

For our investigation to have been complete we would have had also to interview members of the teaching profession at large, the teaching profession as organized, school district officials and members of the Ministry of Education. Thus our view of the state of affairs is restricted to the informants available to us, all of whom were connected with SFU to some degree.

Nonetheless, we have no grounds for thinking that there were any difficulties here that need to be systematically addressed.

Final Remarks

In the above pages we comment in detail on the mission of the Faculty of Education, the various activities it engages in, the quality of the program as a whole and of the various specializations within it, and its resource allocation. The mission of the Faculty, namely to train teachers, to give undergraduate and graduate degrees and to engage in research related to education is an important one and one which is carried out well.

On the other hand, there are factors presently at play which will have a long-term impact on the relative emphases the faculty can devote to each of these activities. Unless long-term strategic planning is engaged in, the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser could find itself left behind by the onrush of events in British Columbia. In particular, the development of a new university where there has been a traditional outreach, and the advent of a number of degree-granting colleges, each of which will want to engage in some teacher training and undergraduate degree granting in education, are bound to have long term impact on Simon Fraser. So are the advent of a number of universities from the United States operating in the province granting advanced degrees, perhaps especially to college teaching staff.

The rapidly changing demographics of British Columbia, particularly the greater Vancouver area, are also likely to have an impact on the emphases in that mission. These demographics reflect trends due to immigration and family building. They also reflect the continuing pressures facing and aspirations of women, pressures and aspirations which necessarily have an equal and often opposite impact on men. And, again, there is need for strategic planning on the part of the Faculty to cope with such changes.

Now is a good time for the Faculty to have a realistic look at its predictable future client base and to begin preparing for that eventuality.

A matter which the terms of reference do not naturally lead us to discuss is that of the relationship between the results of research in education and related fields and the practice of teacher training. The question has been raised in this inquiry as to whether there

is any present impact on the teacher training programs at Simon Fraser from either the research results derived from the faculty members there or from research results in the field of education as a whole. We are not in a position to comment on this. But this does seem to us one of the matters to which the Faculty should devote serious consideration.

Finally, the allegations of mistreatment, intimidation or even harassment of some faculty members, especially junior female faculty, at the hands of both male and female senior faculty, which were brought to our attention are matters of grave concern and must be dealt with. No one in a contemporary Faculty of Education should have to feel politically or sexually harassed. Senior faculty members of either sex should not prey on, or attempt to exert power over junior faculty members of either the opposite or the same sex for whatever ends---even good or desirable ones. The only ultimate barrier to such things is the general knowledge that they may or do go on and that they are generally considered wrong and condemnable. But greater openness of faculty discussion and a cultivated sense of gentle conduct at all times should certainly be aimed at, especially at Faculty retreats and general Faculty meetings.

This is a good Faculty. But it could be even better.

Appendix I - List of Materials Officially Provided to Committee

Graduate Studies Handbook
Graduate Studies Factbook, January 1993
Faculty of Education, Faculty Research, may 1993
Simon Fraser University calendar, 1992-93
Faculty of Education, Faculty Report, External Review, May 1993
Simon Fraser University Fact Book, 13th Edition, May 1993
From Retreat to Review (memo from Dean to Faculty)
Pacopab submission (Dean's summary of Faculty Budget)
Dean's memo to faculty re budget cuts
Correspondence with Vice president, Academic re: budget
Bachelor of Education Proposal
Irregular admissions paper
Peter Norman to faculty re In-Service
B.C. College of Teachers report
Faculty reply to BCCT report
Appendix to faculty reply
Graduate Programs Master's Degrees
U.S. Graduate Programs in B.C.
Indonesian Project (Master's Degree)
Vietnam Project
Centre for Education, Law and Society

Appendix II - List of Meetings with Groups and Individuals During Site Visit and Facilities toured

Groups Interviewed

Graduate Students
Support Staff and Dean's Assistant
Faculty
Program Coordinators and Faculty Associates
Field Services Personnel
Students

Individuals Interviewed

Dr. John Munro
Mrs. Alison Watt
Dr. Robin Barrow
Dr. Bruce Clayman
Dr. Cornel Ham
Dr. Phil Winne (telephone)
Dr. Mike Manley Casimir
Dr. Sharon Bailin
Dr. Marv Wideen
Dr. A. J. (Sandy) Dawson
Dr. Milt McClaren (telephone)
Mr. Peter Norman

There were also private meetings arranged on an individual basis with the External Review team at the request of individual faculty and staff, as well as individual written submissions. To protect the privacy of some we have chosen not to identify any of these. The facilities of the Faculty were toured, including EXCITE, CET, French Resources Centre and Teacher Education.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
DEAN OF EDUCATION



Memorandum

To: Jock Munro
Alison Watt

From: Robin Barrow

Subject: Faculty of Education Review

Date: 1994-06-27

Attached are copies of our response to the External Review. The response has been seen by all members of faculty, staff, etc. and comments have been solicited. Dr. Jack Martin will represent me at the meeting of SCAP on July 6th.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rob".

RB:nr
Enclosure

The Faculty of Education was reviewed in 1993 by a committee of four persons, including Dr. Ellen Gee as internal resource person, Dr. Ian Winchester (O.I.S.E.) as chair, Dr. Nancy Zimpher (Dean of Education, Ohio State University), and Dr. Geoffrey Milburn (University of Western Ontario) as external members. The faculty is extremely grateful to the committee both for the helpful, efficient, and human way in which they conducted the review and for their report which, overall, we find useful and gratifying. As the report says "This is a very successful Faculty which has been performing three main tasks [preparing future teachers, educating others through the B.Ed. route, and providing graduate education] well for a quarter of a century...The research and publication record of the faculty is outstanding...a Faculty of Education that on all measurable criteria ranks with the best in Canada and is as happily constituted as any known to us". Bearing this general encomium in mind, in the remainder of this response we will concentrate on the specific recommendations and particularly the critical points in the report.

Bachelor of Education Program

We regard the general comments made by the review team on the Bachelor of Education program as valid and to the point and we wholeheartedly endorse the first recommendation regarding the acceptance and implementation of the new B.Ed. option. In fact the new B.Ed. has now been accepted by the faculty. The need for more effective harmonization of activity between Undergraduate Programs and the Professional Development Program is also noted. It is in fact a problem of which we have been aware for some time. The new B.Ed. program should contribute to developing a closer collaboration and we have recently initiated a degree of formal co-operation between the two program committees. Over the coming months we will further explore the possibility of combining or otherwise integrating the two program areas.

The third recommendation in this area, that we should "guard the ratio of regular faculty to faculty associates at some roughly constant level" is a little unclear, and we are not sure whether the reference to "faculty associates" at this particular point should not rather be to "sessional instructors". In any event, we are alert both to the danger of too many sessional instructors without any overall connection with the faculty and to the advantage of drawing on the experience of faculty associates.

Professional Development Program

The overall comments of the review team on the PDP seem to us well-founded. We are pleased to see that the high quality of the program is explicitly noted and concur with the judgement that the evident variety of viewpoints amongst faculty on certain issues relating to the program is a sign of the vitality and intellectual commitment of faculty members. The first recommendation, which refers to the importance of both faculty and faculty associate involvement, we wholeheartedly endorse.

The second recommendation, that "the conceptual framework for the PDP warrants more attention", we also accept, and would merely note that we have already begun work on re-assessing and, if need be, reconceiving such things as the goals of the program, its structure, and the roles of faculty and faculty associates. The report suggests that what is needed is "an elaborate discussion of Faculty consensus on conceptions of teaching and learning". While we do not think that consensus is necessarily either possible or even desirable, we intend to keep alive the debate that strives towards a common understanding. The preceding comments also speak to the third recommendation.

We view the fourth recommendation, that "there should be systematic program and student evaluation" for the program, with mixed feelings. On the one hand, our students generally feel that they spend too much time evaluating the program and their faculty associates. On the other hand, it is true that we have relatively little information from past students looking back on their PDP experience. It is worth noting, in this connection, that the B.C. College of Teachers did a survey in 1991 of recent graduates when reviewing all teacher education programs in the province. By and large PDP students were supportive of the program, much more so than the graduates of the other faculties of education in B.C. In general terms, we will continue to explore ways to assess and evaluate all aspects of the program and to gather data relating to long term student reaction.

Graduate Program

Once again we were pleased to see how well the review team appreciated the background to our activity in this area, noting in particular the extent to which out-of-province institutions are operating within B.C. to provide graduate programs.

The first recommendation, that "there should be strategic planning for programs and course offerings at the graduate level", is readily conceded. Such strategic planning is in fact already underway. Similarly the second recommendation, that there should be "a closer look at faculty workload relative to graduate programs", strikes a responsive chord with many. As the University is currently reviewing workload in general, it seems advisable to refrain from specific action at the faculty level until University policy is established.

We note with pleasure the committee's recognition of the importance and value of our recent initiative to create a fourth Directorship in In-Service and Field relations and believe that we already have a most fruitful dialogue emerging between this office and that of Graduate Programs.

Turning to the issue of support for graduate students, we should preface our remarks by stating that we believe that the relative lack of support for graduate students is a major problem for this institution. In respect of the recommendation that the Director of Graduate Programs should study ways of providing financial support, we are pleased to say we have recently endorsed a major fund raising initiative to establish an Endowment Fund for Graduate Fellowships. Similarly, in respect of the recommendation for more space for students, we are making further space available in the new space recently allocated to the faculty. It must be said that this space is not of good quality (being windowless), but that there is little the faculty can do, so long as it cannot get any more space from central administration. The recommendation that we make available our booklet listing faculty research interests is already being acted upon.

With respect to the recommendation that student advisory arrangements be reviewed, the Graduate Programs Committee is currently looking into this whole complex matter.

Faculty

The report next offers a sensitive and in our judgement essentially accurate summary of the nature and attendant difficulties of faculty responsibilities and workload, and recommends, first, that we should review our "entire range of current offerings". This is a major task that we are already beginning to undertake by a variety of approaches. The program areas, as is evident from the report itself and our response, are each in the process

of attempting to re-think their mission and to develop specific initiatives. The Dean's Office is meanwhile collecting data regarding individual faculty practice and wishes concerning course offerings, which will be used to reshape the overall curriculum offerings of the faculty in a more coherent and more realistic way.

The recommendation that the faculty should be concerned about academic accountability for programs is entirely consistent with our own view, and steps are being taken to ensure that faculty continue to monitor the academic supervision of curricula in all program areas. The careful mentioning of new faculty members is something that we have recently tried to implement and will, in future, seek to improve, and, we shall also consider the particular needs of in-coming faculty associates.

Research and Teaching

The report recognizes the high scholarly reputation of the faculty. It recommends that we should "characterize reasonable norms and expectation" for purposes of tenure and promotion. This is indeed something that we know to be of concern in some quarters. (The issue of looking into the question of promotion and tenure is in fact the only outstanding matter to be addressed, following a faculty retreat that set the agenda for the last two years.) It is, however, not without its problems. We are bound to some extent by University regulations and would not necessarily wish it otherwise. On the one hand, we value our ability to compete with any other faculty, professional or otherwise, on a straight-forward academic basis. On the other hand, we are a professional school and that does imply some different criteria from non-professional schools. The question of what should count as scholarship or research is another of those areas where the faculty is of very different minds. It is possible that what is really needed is a greater understanding of the current situation, rather than a radical change. Nonetheless, this issue will be fully and directly addressed in the coming months.

Staff

The sense that there is some considerable dissatisfaction amongst staff was frankly surprising to many of us, and, naturally, disturbing. It is also not entirely clear to what extent there is general dissatisfaction, as opposed to considerable dissatisfaction on the part of a few. Nonetheless, we wish to act so as to make all staff as satisfied as possible. In respect of communication, we have already initiated a regular (c. three monthly) series of

meetings with the Dean, although we need time to develop a set of procedures to make such meetings profitable. At any rate, we take this concern very seriously and will work to improve the situation. Currently, we are providing professional development in team-building and communication through the consultative expertise of a faculty colleague.

Resources

When it comes to the question of resources we more or less endorse everything the committee says and only wish that we could get hold of more resources, particularly space where we feel we have been badly treated as compared with other faculties in recent allocations. The specific recommendation, that we provide space for the interactive needs of students, faculty, and staff, is being worked on, as is the issue of operating hours. Likewise, the broader question of creating "a more interactive instructional laboratory for teaching and learning" is receiving our considered attention.

Administration

Here, we are not sure that we are in agreement with some of the committee's suggestions. For instance, while everybody wants genuine opportunities to air their grievances, make their points, etc., it is fairly clear that the faculty as a whole explicitly rejects the idea of a series of meetings to debate every issue. The idea of drawing up a Constitution for the faculty does not appeal. The claim that the Directors "operated their own independent fiefdoms without serious interaction with one another or with the Dean" struck us as, at best, an overstatement of the point that we are indeed trying to provide Directors with a degree of autonomy. We note, of course, that the committee reports these comments as *perceptions*, which it explicitly suggests are hard to believe on the evidence of the success of the various programs, but accept that perceptions have to be taken account of. Dealing with the very vocal dissatisfaction of a few, improving communication, and raising morale generally will be our first priority in the coming months.

We were extremely concerned to note reference to "inappropriate behaviour being directed at junior female faculty at the hands of both senior male and female faculty" (a point subsequently glossed as "allegations of mistreatment, intimidation or even harassment"). It goes without saying that we condemn, without qualification, any such behaviour. However, in this instance the somewhat opaque wording of the review has made our task more than ordinarily difficult. Inquiry into the matter indicates that what is

... .

primarily being referred to here is political or ideological harassment, attempts to bully or otherwise intimidate people into acquiescence or a particular view of "correctness." (It appears that there is no reference to any current specifically sexual harassment.) This charge is, of course, very difficult to "answer", since it is necessarily based on allegations that are unsubstantiated and few in number, and that cannot be examined unless the individuals concerned feel inclined to bring them forward (whether confidentially to, say, the Dean, or to the University Harassment Office, or in any other way).

Our response has been: 1) to invite all faculty to attend meetings to discuss the "climate" of the faculty in general terms, and, in particular to make suggestions for change and improvement; 2) to remind all faculty forcefully and clearly of the existing policy in the University concerning harassment, which, amongst other things, invites those who have a concern to talk with the Harassment Office. (Coincidentally, the Harassment Office had been invited to address faculty and staff on various occasions at the time the review appeared) 3) to invite all "junior faculty", if they felt so inclined, to meet together and consider some kind of group perspective on their experience, worries, suggestions, etc.; 4) to invite any individual, who wished to do so, to talk privately and confidentially with the Dean (or some other administrator).

In these ways, we have sought to "raise consciousness" and to ensure that everybody is aware of the range of behaviour that may, these days, be deemed to be harassment or in other ways unacceptable, to ensure that everybody is aware of the existing procedures and mechanisms for dealing with certain kinds of complaints, and to provide individuals with as much support as is possible in the circumstances to feel safe in coming forward with their concerns, either as a group or individually. It seems fair to say that the view of the vast majority of the faculty is that while there have indeed been certain incidents that reveal a lack of what the review calls "a cultivated sense of gentle conduct," and that more open discussion and a greater degree of amicable disagreement could be achieved, on the whole this is a notably friendly and warm faculty. (This point is, of course, acknowledged, even complimented, by the review, which is merely adding, correctly, that insofar as the aggressive kind of behaviour referred to is going on, it is unacceptable). Having said that, this process certainly leaves no individual with any excuse for not being aware of the danger in question, and we certainly shall continue to take all the steps we can to ensure the comfort and security of all faculty, and particularly new faculty.

. . . .

In conclusion, once again we thank the review team for their work on our behalf, express our satisfaction without complacency that the high quality of our faculty is acknowledged, and set ourselves to dealing with the outstanding concerns noted above.