1. Approval of the Agenda

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of Senate of March 30, 2020

3. The Minutes of the Open Session of April 6, 2020 will be considered for approval at the Senate meeting on June 8, 2020

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

5. Report of the Chair

6. Question Period *

7. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)
   i) Annual Report 2019-2020 (For Information) S.20-52
   ii) Full Program Proposal for a Geographic Information Science Minor S.20-53
   iii) Full Program Proposal for Graduate Diploma in Management S.20-54
   iv) Full Program Proposal for Master in Management S.20-55
   v) Full Program Proposal for a Minor in Indigenous Languages S.20-56
   vi) Name Change of Art, Performance, and Cinema Studies Minor S.20-57
   vii) Name Change of Film and Video Studies Minor S.20-58
   viii) Senate Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units S.20-59
   ix) Suspension of Admission and Dissolution of the Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate S.20-60
   x) Suspension of Admission to the Latin American Studies Graduate Certificate S.20-61

B) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS)
   i) Program Changes (For Information) S.20-62
   ii) New Course Proposals (For Information) S.20-63
   iii) Course Changes (For Information) S.20-64

C) Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning
   i) Implementation of the SETCwg and TAWG Reports on Teaching Assessment S.20-65
D) Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)
   i) New Course Proposals (For Information) S.20-66
   ii) Course Changes (For Information) S.20-67

E) Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)
   i) Senate Committee Elections (For Information) S.20-68

8. Other Business
   i) Election Report to Senate (For Information) S.20-69

9. Information
   i) Date of the next regular meeting – Monday, June 8, 2020

Agenda items and papers for the June meeting will be required by the Secretary at noon on Thursday, May 21, 2020. Submissions may be emailed to senate@sfu.ca, but must be followed up by a signed paper submission. These items will be considered by the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules on Tuesday, May 26, 2020 with Senate distribution on Friday, May 29, 2020.

The Senate agenda and papers for this meeting are available on the Senate website at http://www.sfu.ca/senate/agenda.html.

Detailed curriculum papers can be found on Docushare at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682

Kris Nordgren
Assistant Registrar, Senate & Academic Services
Secretary of Senate pro tem

*Questions should be submitted in writing to Kris Nordgren (email kdn1@sfu.ca) with “Senate Question” in the subject line by Wednesday, May 13th at 9:00 am.
At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed the Annual SCUP Report for April 2019 to March 2020. The document is attached for the information of Senate.
I. Principal Responsibilities

The principal responsibilities of SCUP include:

- The operation of the system of academic planning;
- To recommend the priorities that should be attached to the central allocation of resources required to implement approved new programs and strengthen existing programs;
- To review and approve notices of intent and full program proposals for submission to the provincial degree program approval process;
- To consider and make recommendations to Senate on proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs and the discontinuance of programs;
- To be responsible for the operation of the system of external review of academic units set out in the Senate Guidelines for External Reviews;
- To receive and review recommendations for the establishment and disestablishment of academic departments, research units, centres and institutes under Policy R40.01, and forward recommendations to Senate;
- To provide advice to the President on the annual operating budget, annual capital budget and Five Year Capital Plan before they are submitted to the Board of Governors for their approval.

II. Meetings Held

- April 17, 2019
- June 5, 2019
- September 4, 2019
- October 9, 2019
- October 23, 2019
- November 6, 2019
- December 4, 2019
- January 8, 2020
- February 5, 2020
- March 11, 2020

III. Academic Planning

In relation to academic planning responsibilities, SCUP did not receive any reports this year.
IV. Proposed Programs Approved for Further Planning

SCUP considered and approved the following program proposals for further planning:
- Minor in Social Data Analytics (June 5, 2019)
- Masters in Management (September 4, 2019)
- Minor in Creative Writing (September 4, 2019)
- Joint Major in First Nations Studies and History (December 4, 2019)
- Minor in First Nations Languages (December 4, 2019)
- PhD in Contemporary Arts (December 4, 2019)
- Indigenous Business Leadership Executive Master in Business Administration (January 8, 2020)
- Geographic Information Science Minor (January 8, 2020)

V. New and Revised Programs

SCUP considered, approved, and recommended to Senate the following new programs:
- Certificate in International Studies (April 17, 2019)
- Graduate Certificate in History (April 17, 2019)
- Certificate in Creative Technologies in Digital Journalism (April 17, 2019)
- Master of Arts in Terrorism, Risk, and Security Studies (November 6, 2019)
- Minor in Creative Writing (December 4, 2019)
- Minor in Social Analytics (December 4, 2019)
- Professional Kinesiology Certificate (February 5, 2020)

VI. Program Suspensions and Dissolutions

SCUP considered, approved and recommended to Senate the following suspensions of admission, and program dissolutions:
- Development and Sustainability Graduate Certificate (suspension December 4, 2019)
- Sustainable Development Post Baccalaureate Diploma (suspension December 4, 2019)
- Latin American Studies Minor Program (suspension December 4, 2019)

VII. External Reviews

SCUP received external review reports and related comments, and developed recommendations for priority action items in relation to the following:
- Department of English (October 23, 2019)
- Department of Sociology and Anthropology (October 23, 2019)
- School for the Contemporary Arts (October 23, 2019)
- School of Communication (October 23, 2019)
- Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry (November 6, 2019)
- Department of Archaeology (January 8, 2020)
External review mid-cycle reports were received from the following academic units:
- Faculty of Education (June 5, 2019)
- Department of Chemistry (January 8, 2020)
- School for International Studies (February 5, 2020)
- Department of Linguistics (February 5, 2020)

VIII. Centres and Institutes

SCUP approved and recommended to Senate the establishment of the following Centres or Institutes:
- SFU Africa Research Centre (March 11, 2020)

SCUP approved the renewal of the following Centres or Institutes for a five-year term (October 9, 2019):
- Jack Austin Centre for Asia Pacific Studies
- Centre for Global Workforce Strategy
- Chronic Pain Research Institute
- Institute for Performance Studies
- Institute for the Reduction of Youth Violence

SCUP reviewed and approved the renewal of the following centres for a one-year term:
- Centre for Research on International Education
- Centre for Restorative Justice

SCUP approved and recommended to Senate the following:
- Revised Policy R40.01 – Research Centres and Institutes (June 5, 2019)

SCUP considered the following document for information:
- Centres and Institutes Report 2018/19 (October 9, 2019)

IX. Budget and Financial Issues

SCUP received regular updates and various documents in order to gain a familiarity with the operating and capital budget issues at the University, and to enable SCUP to discharge its advisory responsibilities.

Documents received for information:
- 2020/21 Budget Consultation (October 9, 2019 and March 11, 2020)

After a review of the available information in relation to the proposed 2020/19 University Budget, SCUP provided its comments to the President (October 23, 2019)
X. Establishment of Committees

No committees were established in this reporting year.

XI. Establishment of Chairs and Professorships

SCUP was consulted on and/or considered the naming of or revisions to the name of a Chair and/or Professorship:

- Renaming of a Chair (closed session December 4, 2019)
- Terms of Reference and Naming of a Chair (closed session January 8, 2020)
- Naming of a Professorship (closed session March 11, 2020)

XII. Other Matters Considered by SCUP

SCUP was consulted on, and/or considered, approved and recommended to Senate the following:

- Establishment of the Department of World Languages and Literatures (September 4, 2019)
- Name Change of the Department of First Nation Studies (December 4, 2019)

XIII. Committee Memberships

April 2019 – May 2019

P. Keller (Chair)          W. Parkhouse          T. Brennand          T. Bubela
G. Chapman                A. Dastmalchian       J. Derksen          P. Elmi
J. Freedman               R. Khan Hemani        S. Ho               J. Johnson
D. Laitsch                T. Leacock            K. Magnusson        A. Mohar
Z. Naqvi                  M. Roman             J. Scott            C. Shaw
P. Tingling               C. Walsby             S. Rhodes           B. Basi

June 2019 – March 2020

P. Keller / J. Driver      W. Parkhouse          T. Brennand          T. Bubela
(Chair)                    E. Chenier            J. Denholm          J. Derksen
G. Chapman                R. Khan Hemani        J. Johnson          D. Laitsch
C. Fowler                 Z. Naqvi              S. O’Neill          A. Parmar
T. Leacock                C. Shaw               P. Tingling         C. Walsby
M. Roman                  B. Basi
Submitted to Senate by:

Jonathon Driver
Chair, Senate Committee on University Priorities
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate
FROM: Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and Provost pro tem, and Chair, SCUP
RE: Full Program Proposal for a Geographic Information Science Minor (SCUP 20-21)

DATE: April 28, 2020
PAGES: 1 of 1

At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the Full Program Proposal for a Geographic Information Science Minor in the Department of Geography within the Faculty of Environment, effective Spring 2021.

Motion:

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Full Program Proposal for a Geographic Information Science Minor in the Department of Geography within the Faculty of Environment, effective Spring 2021.

c: T. Brennand
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION
Senate Committee on University Priorities
Wade Parkhouse, Chair
Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
Faculty of Environment (SCUS 20-14)

FROM

DATE
March 6, 2020

PAGES
1/1

Action undertaken by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies at its meeting of March 5, 2020, gives rise to the following recommendation:

Motion

That SCUP approve and recommend to Senate the Full Program Proposal for the Geographic Information Science Minor in the Department of Geography within the Faculty of Environment.

The relevant documentation for review by SCUP is attached.
Geographic Information Science (GIScience) minor

Full Program Proposal

January, 2020
Department of Geography
1 Credential to be awarded
Geographic Information Science minor

2 Location
Simon Fraser University, Burnaby Campus

3 Department(s), School(s), Faculty(ies) offering program
Department of Geography in the Faculty of Environment

4 Anticipated program start date
Spring 2021

5 Description of proposal program

5.1 Aims, goals and/or objectives
A minor in Geographic Information Science (GIScience) will prepare students from across SFU to use spatial data for analysis, communication and production of maps. Spatial data includes all data sets, including those constituting Big Data, which have location associated with them. In addition to introducing students to the methods and techniques of GIScience in both corporate software and open source environments, a focus on GIScience theory, critique and community engagement will furnish students with the agility to seize a broad range of career opportunities now and adapt to future domain advancements. Students will be able to work in a range of careers including policing, business analytics, community mapping, heritage management, municipal cadastral management, geological science, ecological science, biological monitoring, public health among others.

While students could choose to take a sampling of GIScience courses without undertaking the minor, we believe that having a recognized credential in a well-known and sought-after field is more desirable. In addition, it will help employers recognize their specialized skill set and spatial literacy.

The learning objectives associated with the GIScience minor are focused on the theory, skills and techniques required to prepare, analyze, interpret and communicate spatial data. These skills are described in detail below:
**Goal 1:** Integrative knowledge of how Geographic Information Science (GIS) theories, methods, and technologies facilitate critical analysis of spatial phenomena.

1a. Identify how GIS theory informs the development of GIS methods and drives the development of new technology

1b. Evaluate the relevance, accuracy and limitations of conventional and emerging geospatial methods, data, and technology

**Goal 2:** Knowledge of spatial data acquisition, storage, visualization, analysis, and modelling.

2a. Understand the relationships between spatial conceptualization, data collection methods and technologies, field surveys, and resulting representations as a basis for understanding spatial phenomena

2b. Describe the scope of core GIScience theories, practices, software tools, and technical terminology

2c. Use GIS to describe and explain patterns and processes at multiple scales

**Goal 3:** Understanding of the relationship between GIS and other areas of geographical scholarship, and to the broader social, physical and environmental sciences.

**Goal 4:** Familiarity with the process, practice and evaluation of knowledge creation in Geographic Information Science research.

4a. Describe how existing GIS theory, methods, and technology are advanced, tested and updated

4b. Identify, read, critically evaluate and summarize GIS research

4c. Understand how participation from various stakeholders can impact the outcome of GIS-based solutions

**Goal 5:** Effective reading, writing, oral, and visual communication skills.

5a. Communicate quantitative, spatial and statistical data effectively in reports and presentations

5b. Create accurate graphic, cartographic, geovisualization and other geospatial products
Goal 6: Use quantitative and qualitative GIS knowledge to inform societal problem-solving and policy at multiple scales.

5.2 Mandate and strategic plan
SFU’s strategic plan focuses on innovation (including in the realm of Big Data), community engagement and interdisciplinarity. The GIScience minor is aligned with each of these goals. First, spatial data is ubiquitous and voluminous and constitutes the bulk of existing Big Data. Second, communities are increasingly using mapping to understand and make claims about themselves and their interests, as well as to implement and contest development projects. Third, GIScience is truly multidisciplinary in its reach and scope; there are few units on a university campus in which it is not already contributing to research. The GIScience minor will increase students’ ability to engage in data science in ways that can communicate to many audiences in different communities. It can also help those communities speak to each other.

5.3 Target audience
The goal of the GIScience minor is to be attractive and accessible to a range of students from the humanities to natural sciences. The content and delivery of our courses focuses on developing the numeracy and technical skills needed to complete the course work. As a result, we already accommodate many levels of numeracy and technical proficiency while nurturing the required skills as students progress through the program. We anticipate that students with virtually any academic background will be able to thrive in our program. This is a distinguishing characteristic of the GIScience minor, in that it cultivates skills among students who may not have imagined themselves as technically proficient.

5.4 Content and summary of requirements for graduation
The GIScience minor requires 25 credits total, and consists of the following courses:

Lower Division Requirements

Students must complete one of:

GEOG 100 - Our World: Introducing Human Geography (3)
GIScience Minor

GEOG 111 - Earth Systems (3)

Students complete a total of 6 units from the following:

GEOG 251 - Quantitative Geography (3)
GEOG 253 - Introduction to Remote Sensing (3)
GEOG 255 - Geographical Information Science I (3)

Upper Division Requirements

Students complete a minimum of 16 units from the list below:

GEOG 351 - Multimedia Cartography (4)
GEOG 352 - Spatial Analysis (4)
GEOG 353 - Advanced Remote Sensing (4)
GEOG 355 - Geographical Information Science II (4)
GEOG 356 - 3D Geovisualization (4)
GEOG 451 - Spatial Modeling (4)
GEOG 453 - Theoretical and Applied Remote Sensing (4)
GEOG 455 - Theoretical and Applied GIS (4)
GEOG 457 - Geovisualization Interfaces (4)

5.5 Delivery methods
This minor program will be delivered primarily through classroom and laboratory instruction at SFU Burnaby campus. However, we anticipate that—in the future—blended course delivery might replace some of the face-to-face courses.

5.6 Linkages between program outcomes and curriculum design
The learning goals of the GIScience program are outlined in section 5.1.

The table below demonstrates how each course in the curriculum aligns with the educational goals for the program:
## Department of Geography Curriculum Map - BSc GIS Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Goals</th>
<th>GEOG 100</th>
<th>GEOG 211</th>
<th>GEOG 251</th>
<th>GEOG 253</th>
<th>GEOG 255</th>
<th>GEOG 351</th>
<th>GEOG 352</th>
<th>GEOG 353</th>
<th>GEOG 355</th>
<th>GEOG 366</th>
<th>GEOG 451</th>
<th>GEOG 453</th>
<th>GEOG 455</th>
<th>GEOG 457</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Integrative knowledge of how Geographic Information Science (GIS) theories, methods, and 1a. Identify how GIS theory informs the development of GIS methods and drives the development of new 1b. Evaluate the relevance, accuracy and limitations of conventional and emerging geospatial methods, data,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Specialized knowledge of spatial data 2a. Understand the relationships between spatial conceptualization, data collection methods and 2b. Describe the scope of core GIS science theories,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Understanding of the relationship between GIS and other areas of geographical scholarship, and to</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Familiarity with the process, practice and evaluation of knowledge creation in Geographic 4a. Describe how existing GIS theory, methods, and 4b. Identify, read, critically evaluate and summarize</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Effective reading, writing, oral, and visual 5a. Communicate effectively in reports and 5b. Create accurate graphic, cartographic</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Use quantitative and qualitative GIS knowledge to inform societal problem-solving and policy at</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>E/R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I** INTRODUCES - Students are not expected to be familiar with the content or skill at the collegiate level. Instruction and learning activities focus on basic knowledge, skills, and/or competencies and an entry-level comprehension.

**E** EMPHASIZES - Students are expected to possess a basic knowledge and familiarity with the content or skills at the collegiate level. Instruction and learning activities concentrate on enhancing and strengthening knowledge, skills, and expanding complexity.

**R** REINFORCES - Students are expected to possess a strong foundation in the knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate level. Instructional and learning activities continue to build upon previous competencies and increased complexity.

**A** APPLIES - Students are expected to possess an advanced level of knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate level. Instructional and learning activities focus on the use of the content or skills in multiple contexts and at multiple levels of complexity.

**T** ASSESSED - This educational goal is assessed for grades in some way in the course (e.g., through testing, assignments, etc.)
5.7 Distinctive characteristics

There are few if any technical and computational programs at SFU that allow entry from a range of Arts, Science, Health, Business, SIAT and Environment students. Moreover, there is no other minor that focuses on spatial literacy (data and analysis).

Another distinctive characteristic of the minor is the emphasis on community engagement and empirical application as part of the curriculum. We believe students trained in agile GIScience thinking, methods and technology will be well prepared to work at all levels of industry, government and non-profit throughout their careers in this domain.

5.8 Anticipated completion time

We anticipate that 2-3 years will be required to complete the program from the time of declaration of the minor; like other minors, for most students it will be undertaken while the student is also completing a major program in another department.

5.9 Enrolment plan for the length of the program

Based on Geography’s knowledge from hosting the GIScience certificate for more than two decades, we anticipate that the Department will be able to host at least 25 to 30 minor students at any one time.

5.10 Student evaluation

Student evaluation will be through traditional channels used at SFU (letter marks and percentages). In addition, the fourth-year classes will serve as capstones allowing students to integrate their knowledge, experience and creativity using spatial data.

5.11 Faculty appointments

We do not anticipate any extra faculty requirements to mount the program currently.

5.12 Faculty members

Nick Hedley, Associate Professor, 100% of teaching load
Shivinand Balram, Lecturer, 100% of teaching load
Suzana Dragicevic, Professor, 100% of teaching load.
Nadine Schuurman, Professor, 100% of teaching load.
Remote sensing faculty member, assistant professor, 100% of teaching load.

5.13 Program assessment

Our Department is routinely assessed every 7 years. This minor program will be assessed as part of the external review process.

Though there are no Canadian governing bodies for GIScience programs, there is an Undergraduate Consortium for GIScience (UCGIS) in the United States. The mandate of the UCGIS is to support GIS education and training through advancement of core principles. See: https://www.ucgis.org/about-and-mission for more information. The UCGIS maintains materials for teaching on their website. Courses in GIScience at SFU already largely adhere to core UCGIS principles — and will continue to do so.

Our goal is to ensure that our efforts to encourage community engagement and informed global citizenship through the minor will be recognized as part of the program assessment.

5.14 Related programs

Like the proposed GIScience minor, the GIScience certificate in the Department of Geography has a low entry barrier from a math and computing perspective. However, the certificate is intended primarily for Geography majors whereas the minor is targeted at students in non-Geography programs.

There is presently a major in GIScience jointly hosted by Computing Science and Geography. However, there are significant barriers to entry to the major as it requires a solid mathematics and computing background. In addition, it requires 120 credits in total whereas the proposed minor requires 25.

A social data analytics minor program is presently being proposed in FASS. The SDA minor would be complementary to the GIScience minor.

BCIT has three GIS programs. The Advanced Certificate is a part time opportunity to learn basic GIS skills while working. The Advanced Diploma is a post graduate degree that offers training in intensive GIS skills. The Bachelor of Technology in GIS offers the same courses as the Diploma but combines them with other courses in management and liberal arts to comprise a degree. These programs are technology and software focused. We do not anticipate that they will compete with our more theoretically-oriented GIScience minor.
UVic also offers three GIScience programs. The Geomatics Concentration is designed for Geography BA students to acquire basic GIS skills and understanding. The BSc Geomatics major is run jointly by Geography and Computing Science and stresses technical aspects of Geomatics. The Minor in Geographic Information Technology is designed for students pursuing any UVic degree program to acquire a GIS background.

The University of British Columbia (Vancouver) offers a range of GIScience courses between the Department of Geography and the Faculty of Forestry. The Irving K. Barber School of Arts and Sciences (UBC Okanagan) offers four unique GIScience courses.

Likewise, the University of Northern British Columbia offers a suite of GIScience courses. UNBC also offers a Minor in Geographic Information Systems.

Most small universities in BC, including those that were formerly colleges, offer introductory GIScience courses. Many of these courses are articulated and receive transfer credit at SFU. Up to one third of the proposed minor’s upper division credit requirement may be filled by course equivalent transfer credits.

5.15 Consultation with and support from other post-secondary institutions
The Department of Geography student body already includes many students who transfer laterally from other postsecondary institutions. We will continue to articulate with and recognize the credentials that transfer students received from Colleges and Universities across BC and elsewhere.

5.16 Evidence of student interest
We base our estimates of student interest on the high and increasing enrollment in our GIScience courses and certificate program. Enrollment in the Certificate has increased almost 300% in the last 4 years, from 36 in Spring 2015 to 102 in Spring 2019. We anticipate this positive trend to continue.
5.17 Evidence of labour market demand

The demand for people trained in the use of GIS is widely remarked upon. The University of Southern California website describes demand for GIS professionals as follows:

As GIS opportunities and salaries continue to grow, there will be a high demand for professionals who combine the technical acumen to source accurate spatial data with the critical and spatial thinking skills to apply that information in solving complex problems.

They go on to cite 2018 market research that estimates the value of the GIScience field as potentially $17.5 billion by 2023. They also note that the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects employment for GIScience specialists to grow 19 percent between 2014 and 2024 (https://www.bls.gov/ooh/architecture-and-engineering/cartographers-and-photogrammetrists.htm) — which is a much higher rate than most professions grow (see: https://gis.usc.edu/blog/4-reasons-to-consider-gis-as-a-career/)

Our program includes courses in spatial/geographic augmented reality (AR) and spatial virtual reality (VR). VR and AR are two market sectors that have exploded in the past few years and are Canada’s fastest-growing tech sector: with market valuations of between $70-75Bn by 2023 for AR, and $10-15Bn for VR (VentureBeat, May 2019). Vancouver is a hotbed of innovation and investment in these areas and is one of only two Digital Superclusters invested in by the Federal Government. (https://digitalsupercluster.ca/canadas-digital-technology-supercluster-receives-funding/)

Geography has extensive experience with the SFU Co-op program through which we have learned that GIScience credentials are among the most requested by potential employers, and the most important predictor of landing a job. The minor program will extend that opportunity to other Schools and Departments across many faculties at SFU.

In addition, the minor will familiarize students with both large commercial software environments and open source GIScience programs. Through these joint avenues, we will prepare students to work with corporations and government, as well as non-profits and NGOs. We anticipate that the inclusion of open source teaching environments in the program will prepare students for community engagement throughout their subsequent careers. In this way, we plan to instantiate community engagement and outreach as part of a lifelong process of work and being an informed global citizen.
5.18 Resources
This program will not reduce nor significantly impact other programs or resources within the Department of Geography. However, should it prove very popular (which we anticipate), we may be forced to respond by increasing both our computer lab capacity and faculty teaching capacity. The problems of lab space and computing resources are the main limitations on increasing student numbers and have proven the most intractable and expensive. We are working with the Dean's office to resolve them. Should additional faculty be needed we will integrate this need into our Faculty Renewal Plan.

5.19 Budget
Currently, we do not anticipate charging extra fees for equipment use or tuition.

6 Contacts
Professor Tracy Brennand, Chair and Professor, Department of Geography, SFU. tabrenna@sfu.ca
Appendix A: Proposed Calendar Entry

Geographic Information Science Minor

Admission Requirements

All students must be in good academic standing and must obtain approval from the Geography Academic Advisor in order to be enrolled in the Geographic Information Science (GIScience) Minor. Students may apply for admission to the minor program at any time.

Program Requirements

The GIScience minor requires 25 credits total, and consists of the following courses:

Lower Division Requirements

 Students must complete one of:

GEOG 100 - Our World: Introducing Human Geography (3)
GEOG 111 - Earth Systems (3)

Students complete a total of 6 units from the following:

GEOG 251 - Quantitative Geography (3)
GEOG 253 - Introduction to Remote Sensing (3)
GEOG 255 - Geographical Information Science I (3)

Upper Division Requirements

 Students complete a minimum of 16 units from the list below:

GEOG 351 - Multimedia Cartography (4)
GEOG 352 - Spatial Analysis (4)
GEOG 353 - Advanced Remote Sensing (4)
GEOG 355 - Geographical Information Science II (4)
GEOG 356 - 3D Geovisualization (4)
GEOG 451 - Spatial Modeling (4)
GEOG 453 - Theoretical and Applied Remote Sensing (4)
GEOG 455 - Theoretical and Applied GIS (4)
GEOG 457 - Geovisualization Interfaces (4)
ATTENTION Dr. Paul T. Kingsbury  
Associate Dean, Undergraduate, Faculty of Environment  

FROM Bryan Kinney, Acting Director, School of Criminology  

RE Geography, Support for GISc Minor  

DATE February 16, 2026  

Please accept this, my belated and brief, memo of support for the GISc Minor in Geography.

On behalf of the School of Criminology, please register our full support for the proposed Minor. I can see great potential for improving access to spatial competency and a wider fluency in spatially relevant theory and methodology. Criminology has a long tradition (at least as far back as my joining the SFU community in 1997 as a graduate student) of sending our spatially minded students and faculty of the School to Geography to get precisely this training.

The real value of the Geographic Information Science Minor is the structured training students will receive in order become more theoretically and methodological aware of the issues involved in curating GIS datasets, their academic uses (and potential abuses or misuses). These are the key distinctions between academic pedagogy and the training of technical skills/methods needed to operate a Geographic Information System (GIS) proficiently.

At the undergraduate level is clear to Criminology that there is no compete / overlap of courses here. Quite the opposite in fact. Criminology has at least four (4) 3cr classes that would benefit greatly from spatially aware students; Crim 340 (Criminal Justice Policy Making and Analysis); crim 352 “environmental criminology theory and practice”; as well the pair of courses on crime prevention techniques and analysis (crim 350 and 450).

Please advise if you would like additional discussion.
MEMO

ATTENTION Paul Kingsbury, Associate Dean, Undergraduate, Faculty of Environment

FROM Nienke van Houten, Director, Undergraduate Programs, Faculty of Health Sciences

RE GISc Minor Proposal

DATE February 19, 2020

The Undergraduate Studies Committee for the Faculty of Health Sciences strongly supports the proposal for the GISc Minor in Department of Geography in the Faculty of Environment. This program will be valuable for students to gain theory, skills and techniques required for analysis and interpretation of spatial data and we acknowledge that these skills are transferable to many disciplinary contexts.

The program proposal has many novel and exciting aspects that will create a unique opportunity for students to train in an area that is currently underserved at SFU. The goals are well constructed and aligned to the curriculum.

Though our GIS course is not a good fit for the minor program at this time, we envision future opportunities to collaborate in this program as there are many real-world applications to GIS and health.

Nienke van Houten, Ph.D.
January 30, 2020

RE: GIScience Minor Full Program Proposal

Dear Margaret

The Archaeology Department UEC has reviewed the GIScience minor and the committee chair has informed me that no concerns were identified.

We appreciate the opportunity to review it.

I wish you success with this new program.

Sincerely,

George

George Nicholas
Chair
Date: February 11, 2020
Memo To: Paul Kingsbury, Associate Dean, Undergraduate, Faculty of Environment
Re: GISc Minor Proposal
From: Catherine Murray, Associate Dean Undergraduate, FASS

FASS strongly supports the GISc Minor, recognizing the historical and interdisciplinary links to the Department of Geography at this University, and the productive partnership between Urban Studies and Geography.

I note that the technical training these students will acquire is thorough and timely. As FASS launches its own new interdisciplinary minor in Social Data Analytics in the Fall of 2020, I expect there will be a number of synergies emerge between the teaching and research missions of the two programs. The Chair of Criminology has also identified the salience of the courses in the minor for research into the social and spatial dimensions of criminal behavior. We look forward to exploring future mutual opportunities to co-promote courses, schedule them non-competitively, and perhaps even collaborate on future “Semesters In...” seminars where interdisciplinary capstones in service of academically grounded, community-based learning may occur. Urban Studies is also supportive.
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION Senate DATE April 28, 2020
FROM Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and Provost pro tem, and Chair, SCUP
RE: Full Program Proposal for Graduate Diploma in Management (SCUP 20-16)

At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the full program proposal for the Graduate Diploma in Management in the Beedie School of Business, effective Fall 2021.

Motion:

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the full program proposal for the Graduate Diploma in Management in the Beedie School of Business, effective Fall 2021.

c: A. Gemino
A. Dastmalchian
Graduate Diploma in Management

Full Program Proposal

February 6, 2020
Beedie School of Business
Executive Summary

The Graduate Diploma in Management is an alternative exit offered within the proposed Master in Management (MiM) program. Students who have completed 24 units of the MiM core management courses and have maintained a minimum 2.5 cumulative grade point average will be eligible for this Diploma.

The proposed Graduate Diploma in Management is intended for recent university graduates with less than three years of relevant full-time work experience and is an alternative exit offered within the proposed Master in Management (MiM) program.

The Graduate Diploma in Management will feature courses that combine people and performance enabling skills with digital literacy in the context of management complemented by career management services and co-curricular experiences. The Graduate Diploma will help students to successfully leverage their undergraduate education and more effectively launch their careers.

PART A [3 pages maximum]

Proposed credential to be awarded

Graduate Diploma in Management

Location of program

The initial program will be offered at the Burnaby campus with the potential to be offered in more locations as the program grows.

Academic unit(s) offering proposed program

The Beedie School of Business (SFU Beedie).

Anticipated program start date

Fall 2021.

Anticipated completion time

Two semesters

Summary of proposed program

a) Aims, goals and/or objectives of the proposed program

This Graduate Diploma is being proposed to help launch the careers of recent post-secondary graduates from non-business undergraduate majors. The goals of the program are to enhance the employability of recent graduates from non-business undergraduate majors by providing them with transferrable needed for employment in the future of work.

The learning goals are as follows (the highlighted words in the learning goals below are intended to bring attention to key objectives in the school’s mandate):

1. Communicate an organization’s position and understand how natural, social, and cultural systems create opportunities and constraints for delivering on its mission.
2. Identify opportunities, develop a plan, create a budget and collaborate effectively to achieve complex innovation objectives in a team-based project environment.
3. Generate sustainable alternatives through global research and data analysis and apply multiple criteria to make evidence-based recommendations.
4. Use a systems approach to analyze an organizational process and propose an innovation that could create sustainable stakeholder and shareholder value.
5. Identify key messages, develop persuasive stories and create impactful visuals using technology that effectively communicates trends and recommendations to stakeholders.
6. Demonstrate emotional intelligence, an awareness of human behavior and the need for equity, diversity and inclusion to collaborate and lead in global work environments.

An important component of this Graduate Diploma will be a focus on career management.

b) Anticipated contribution of the proposed program to the mandate and strategic plan of the institution

The Graduate Diploma aligns with SFU’s mission particularly by equipping post-secondary students with knowledge, skills and experiences necessary in the future of work.

The Graduate Diploma also aligns with SFU’s Academic Plan 2019-24 by addressing 4 of the 5 challenges as follows:

- **Academic Quality/Curriculum**: Innovating program delivery including blended online and face to face programming and flipped classroom instruction.
- **Engagement**: Placing an emphasis on experiential learning with the inclusion of community-integrated learning projects, possible international partnership opportunities, and optional community-based internships.
- **Bridging Divides**: Working in partnership with other faculties across interdisciplinary boundaries and co-designing streams as part of the MiM experience.
- **Faculty Renewal**: Providing opportunities for faculty to further develop graduate program/course design and instructional skills as well as increasing the tuition revenue to support the faculty complement.

c) Potential areas/sectors of employment for graduates and/or opportunities for further study.

The opportunities for graduates include future employment in the major occupational groups as described in the BC Labour Market Outlook 2018 of “Sales and Service, Business, Finance and Administration and Management” (Table 2.6, p. 17).

The curriculum and career programming offered throughout the Graduate Diploma will aim at preparing students to launch their careers in diverse areas. As student gain years of experience in the workforce, there is the potential for them to transition into higher level or more in-demand jobs or return to university for additional education in other Graduate Diplomas, Masters programs, or the Executive MBA. These programs require particular levels of management experience, not initially accessible by MiM students, but represent established opportunities for further studies with career experience.

d) Delivery methods

The Graduate Diploma will be offered using a cohort and blended delivery model. That is to say that all courses will be supported by Canvas - SFU’s learning management system - as well as have in-class instruction or face-to-face components. There will also be regular, frequent career programming.
e) **Related programs in the institution or other British Columbia post-secondary institutions.**

The Graduate Diploma in Management is differentiated from SFU Beedie’s Graduate Diploma in Business Administration (GDBA) in that it focuses on the acquisition of skills to support career launch; whereas, the GDBA is intended for students with more than 3 years’ work experience who are looking for career progression or career transition.

The Graduate Diploma in Management is differentiated from other Graduate Diploma offerings in that the curriculum is designed to reinforce the application of management skills at a graduate level (such as digital literacy, people, and performance skills) rather than around traditional functional areas (i.e., finance, accounting, operations, etc.).

**Contact information**

Andrew Gemino, Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Beedie School of Business, gemino@sfu.ca, 778-782-3653.

**PART B [2 pages maximum]**

**PROGRAM DETAILS**

a) **Graduation requirements, target audience**

The Graduate Diploma will be available as an alternate exit for the MiM program after completing 24 units of the core programming. The Graduate Diploma will provide a graduation pathway for students who can achieve a 2.5 cumulative grade point average. The target audience will be recently graduated, non-business undergraduate majors, including those that have completed a Business Minor, from Simon Fraser University (SFU) or students working through a non-traditional pathway. The program will be of special interest to those who wish to obtain more management knowledge and career management experience post-graduation so that they can be better prepared to enter the changing labour market.

b) **Admission requirements**

This Diploma is set up as an alternative exit offered within the proposed Master in Management (MiM) program. Students who have completed 24 units of the MiM core management courses and have maintained a minimum 2.5 cumulative grade point average will be eligible for this Diploma.

c) **Evidence of student interest and labour market demand**

We have relied on information from the BC Student Outcomes, Annual Surveys for BC Baccalaureate Studies by program area report, interviews with current students and potential applicants to the MiM program, and the BC Labour Market Outlook: 2018 edition for evidence of student interest and labour market demand.

The BC Labour Market Outlook (Table 2.6, p. 17) suggests: *Within the 10 major occupational groups that are defined by Canada’s National Occupational Classification, more than half (51 percent) of the projected job openings in BC over the next 10 years will come from the top three occupational categories (Sales and Service, Business, Finance and*
Therefore, these foundational skills are the focus of the program’s curriculum and will influence future employment in the following areas:

- **NOC 1122** Professional occupations in business management consulting
- **NOC 2171** Information systems analysts and consultants
- **NOC 4163** Business development officers and marketing researchers and consultants
- **NOC 6411** Sales and account representatives — wholesale trade (non-technical)

Also, given this data in combination with the BC Students Outcomes Annual Survey for BC Baccalaureate Studies report, there is a clear opportunity to close the skills and expectation gaps for Arts and Science majors by providing graduate management skill education for recent graduates from the programs. This education should better prepare a larger number of students for the top three National Occupation Classification (NOC) categories requiring over 461,000 jobs in BC over the next 10 years. (Please see the Beedie School of Business MiM Full Program Proposal for more details).

d) **Eligibility for scholarships, awards, and financial aid**

We expect that scholarships, awards, and financial aid will not be provided.

**RESOURCES**

a) **Enrolment Plan**

The Graduate Diploma in Management exists to provide an alternative exit for students who are unable to fulfill the full requirements of the MiM. If a student in the MiM completes 24 core credits, they may be eligible to transfer to the Diploma and graduate. It is estimated that less than 5% of MiM students will transfer to the Diploma.

b) **Resources required and/or available to implement the program (financial and personnel) including any new faculty appointments**

The resources required for this Graduate Diploma are the same as for the Masters in Management program needs. This includes additional staff and faculty with delivery costs similar to other graduate program offerings.

Additional staff will be supported by the share of tuition provided by SFU to the program and startup costs will be covered by the Beedie School of Business as an investment that will be recovered through tuition revenue. Additional instructional costs will be covered by new faculty and temporary instructors. These additional faculty costs, including benefits, will also be covered by a share of tuition but only in cohorts larger than 24.

Teaching loads will initially be impacted as the Beedie School continues to push to recruit more faculty over the next five years as indicated in Beedie’s 2018-2023 Five-Year Academic Plan. The goal is to move to an increased number of faculty members by 2023 as it will provide the increase in teaching load necessary to offer the MiM program.

c) **Faculty member’s teaching/supervision**

The MiM will feature team-based applied projects rather than thesis-based project work, reducing individual faculty supervision requirements. An academic director for the MiM will serve as the graduate supervisor for students in the MiM and the Graduate Diploma program.
Faculty members teaching in this program are the same as those suggested to be teaching in the Masters in Management program. Please see the Beedie School of Business Master in Management Full Program Proposal appendix for a list of faculty members.

d) Proposed tuition and other program fees including a justification

The proposed tuition fees in fall 2021 for domestic students are $6833.33 per term with annual increases of 2% thereafter; and for international students, $11,500 per term with annual increases of 4% thereafter.

The integrated career management and co-curricular experiences are critical components of the program that are not included in tuition fees. The proposed program fees directly related to the staff and operational expenses associated with this program are $1,500 per term for domestic and international students with annual increases of 2% thereafter. Please refer to the Masters in Management Proposal for fee justification.

The total program fees will be $16,666.66 for domestic students and 26,000 for international students.

PART C: Appendices

Appendix 1 Calendar entry
Please see attached.

Appendix 2 New courses
Please note that the new course approval forms and sample course outlines are repurposed from the Beedie School of Business Master in Management Full Program Proposal appendix.

Appendix 3 Letters of support
Please note that the letters of support provided are repurposed from the Beedie School of Business Master in Management Full Program Proposal appendix.

Appendix 4 Abbreviated curriculum vitae for non-SFU faculty
Courses will be taught by existing Beedie School of Business faculty, along with adjunct and sessional faculty to be specifically hired for the MiM/Graduate Diploma in Management.

Please see the Beedie School of Business Master in Management Full Program Proposal appendix for a list of faculty who may teach in the program.
APPENDICES

Graduate Diploma in Management
Full Program Proposal
Management
Graduate Diploma

Description of Program
The Graduate Diploma in Management will feature a core of management courses that combine people skills with digital literacy and performance enablers all grounded in the context of management. This program is affiliated with the Master in Management (MiM) program.

Admission Requirements
Applicants must satisfy the University admission requirements as stated in Graduate General Regulation 1.3 in the SFU Calendar. For more information, contact Beedie School of Business.

Program Requirements
This program consists of 24 units of course work. Course work may be substituted at the discretion of the academic director.

Students must complete

- BUS 580- Enabling Results Through Collaboration (3)
- BUS 581- Making Decisions with Data (3)
- BUS 582- Accounting Literacy in Organizations (3)
- BUS 583- Creating Value in Organizations (3)
- BUS 584- Managing Projects (3)
- BUS 585- Financial Literacy in Organizations (3)
- BUS 586- Marketing and Sales (3)
- BUS 587- Applied Project (3)

Program Length
Students are expected to complete the program requirements within three terms.

Academic Requirements within the Graduate General Regulations
All graduate students must satisfy the academic requirements that are specified in the graduate general regulations, as well as the specific requirements for the program in which they are enrolled.
APPENDIX 2
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>580</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Course title** (max. 100 characters)

**Enabling Results Through Collaboration**

**Short title** (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)

**Results Through Collaboration**

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is..." If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)

Develop ability to harness talents and expand personal and team capacity to solve a complex organizational problem. Students will work to develop themselves as a high performing team. Students will deepen their existing knowledge about teaming and collaboration while working to solve an organizational problem. As part of the process, they will also continue to increase their awareness of self and others. By the end of this course, students should know how to develop and support a high-performing team in their organization.

Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</th>
<th>35 hrs of blended instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Frequency of offerings/year

Twice a year

Estimated enrollment per offering

40

Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

n/a

Prerequisite and/or Corequisite

n/a

Criminal record check required

Yes

if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

Yes

No

Additional course fees?

Yes

No

Campus where course will be taught

✔ Burnaby

✔ Surrey

✔ Vancouver

□ Great Northern Way

□ Off campus

Course Components

✔ Lecture

□ Seminar

□ Lab

□ Independent

□ Capstone

Grading Basis

✔ Letter grades

□ Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory

□ In Progress / Complete

Repeat for credit?

Yes

No

Total repeats allowed?

0

Repeat within a term?

Yes

No

Required course?

Yes

No

Final exam required?

Yes

No

Capstone course?

Yes

No

Combined with a undergrad course?

Yes

No

If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course
Shauna Jones, Susan Christie-Bell, Kathleen Burke, Kate Dilworth, Tom Culham
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
Academic Unit / Program
Beedie Graduate Programs
Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)
Stephanie Reimer
Email
stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign
Graduate Program Committee
Signature
Date
Department Chair
Signature
Date

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by PGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for overlap in content.
Overlap check done? ☑ YES
This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

Faculty Graduate Studies Committee
Andrew Gemino
Signature
Date
January 8, 2020
A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL
Senate Graduate Studies Committee
Jeff Derksen
Signature
Date
MAR 16 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check
Course Attributes
Course Attribute Value:
Instruction Mode:
Attendance Type:
If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:
Financial Aid Progress Units:
BUS 580: Enabling Results Through Collaboration

Course Description
In a world of uncertainty, complexity, volatility, and ambiguity, organizations are faced with increasing challenges. Harnessing the power of high-performance teamwork, and understanding your strengths and weaknesses as a team player, will be crucial to solving complex and meaningful problems. CEOs, CPOs and NGOs state that we need to "increase our capacity to collaborate" not just in our institutions, but also across institutional boundaries and sector boundaries if we are to make a difference in the world (Scharmer, 2019).

Enabling Results Through Collaboration develops students' ability to manage oneself and others: to expand capacity within and for themselves and others to solve a complex organizational problem. Research shows that the best way to learn about collaboration is to collaborate. Drawing on recent and pivotal team research, students will work to develop themselves as a high performing team. Students will deepen their existing knowledge about teaming and collaboration while working to solve an organizational problem. As part of the process, they will also continue to increase their awareness of self and others. By the end of this course, students should know how to develop and support a high-performing team in their organization.

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:

- Reflect on your own management strengths and weaknesses
- Recognize and define the characteristics of collaborative teams and know when it is advantageous to use teams
- Demonstrate empathy and emotional, social and cultural intelligence in working with their teams and organizational partner
- Discuss and recognize the organizational context of teams
- Apply the processes of teamwork including stages of development, cycles, cooperation and competition, and communication to achieve desired results
- Experience, work through and reflect on issues teams face, such as conflict, power and social influence, decision-making, leadership, problem-solving, creativity and diversity
- Harness the power of individuals and critical thinking to create high-performing teams for the purpose of achieving organizational objectives

Subjects/Topics
In each module students will have a theoretical and practical component. The theoretical components are listed below. The practical components will have students' complete tasks and processes for to their team development.

Module 1: Characteristics of High Performing Teams
Module 2: The processes of Teamwork through 5 Lenses
Module 3: A Deeper Dive into Relationship Theory
Module 4: Decision Making, Communication & Meetings
Module 5: Cooperation and Competition
Module 6: Hosting Productive Conflict
Module 7: Hosting Productive Conflict 2
Module 8: Problem Solving
Module 9: Power & Social Influence
Module 10: Organizational Context of Teams

Book and Materials
   - ISBN# 978-1-4833-7834-3
2. Selected readings may also be provided on Canvas or through external links

Learning and Assessments

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENTS – 40%
Reflective Learning Portfolio – 25%
Students will complete a weekly reflection and submit to their online Learning Portfolio. The purpose of the portfolio is to have students reflect on their learning and what it means to them. They will learn as part of this assessment. The instructor will pose questions and make comments to prompt more thinking and expand the students learning about teaming and collaboration and the part they play as an individual: what works, what doesn’t, what they still grapple with, and “aha” moments, to name a few.

Case Analysis – 15%
Students will be provided with a team case where they respond to questions to demonstrate how they might apply their semester long learning to another organizational situation.

TEAM ASSESSMENTS – 60%
Experiential Collaboration Project – 40%
Students will collaborate in teams of 4-5 members in an experiential project with an NGO to solve an organizational issue or challenge. They will develop their skills in collaboration while solving a complex problem that could not be solved individually. Students will report to the organization’s representatives as well as their instructor. Students will submit:

1. A project plan and team agreement (5%) which outlines the team’s understanding of and goals for the project, their norms, agreed on guidelines for working together, and performance criteria on which each member will be evaluated.
2. An assessment and project update (15%) presenting their findings mid-point through the project to ensure they are on the right track with their organizational partner. This will be presented to and followed by a discussion with the organizational partner. The team will use the feedback to move forward with the project.
3. A final presentation (20%) offering their findings and recommendations to the organizational partner. Teams will draw on the learning from previous courses on how to present data and recommendations in a purposeful and persuasive manner.

Final Team Debrief Interview – 20%
Your team will meet with your instructor and one other person (a TA or organizational partner) where you will reflect on your process, learning, and application around collaboration and how you have met the course learning objectives. This debrief will be more of a conversation or question period than an actual "oral report" or "presentation". You will be asked questions to see how you applied the course content to effectively collaborate on the experiential collaboration project. All members must be present to receive a grade.
**Assessment summary**

**Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Reflective Learning Portfolio</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Case Analysis</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential Collaboration Project</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Plan &amp; Team Agreement</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment &amp; Project Update</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Final Presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Team Debrief Interview</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Note on Grading:** 40% of a student's team grade is subject to his/her contribution to the entire team project. All team members will assess his/her contribution to the overall project, and they will provide a percentage reflective of this contribution. The instructor will assign the contribution score based on submissions by team members using the Team Agreement as a reference.
# New Graduate Course Proposal

**Course Subject (eg. PSYC)**  BUS  
**Number (eg. 810)**  581  
**Units (eg. 4)**  3  

## Making Decisions with Data

### Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)

**Making Decisions with Data**

### Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should not begin with phrases such as “This course will...” or “The purpose of this course is...” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)

The fundamentals of statistical analysis, data visualization and business analytics with an emphasis on how to communicate effectively with data in a collaborative team environment. Working with a variety of data sources and software, work in teams to learn how to conduct descriptive and inferential statistics and apply it to business decision making. Understand tools for cleaning and preparing data sets in order to investigate relationships between variables, and to create visualizations to derive meaningful insights. More advanced topics will investigate modeling business decisions using analytical tools such as predictive analytics, multiple regression and decision analysis. Work in teams to develop and interpret models in a variety of applications to business decision making.

### Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>35 hours of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>35 hours of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equivalent courses** (courses that replicate the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

| n/a |

**Prerequisite and/or Corequisite**

| n/a |

**Criminal record check required?**

| Yes | No |

**Campus where course will be taught**

| Burnaby | Surrey | Vancouver | Great Northern Way | Off campus |

**Course Components**

| Lecture | Seminar | Lab | Independent | Capstone |

**Grading Basis**

| Letter grades | Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory | In Progress/Complete |

**Repeat for credit?**

| Yes | No |

**Total repeats allowed?**

| 0 |

**Repeat within a term?**

| Yes | No |

**Required course?**

| Yes | No |

**Final exam required?**

| Yes | No |

**Capstone course?**

| Yes | No |

**Combined with a undergrad course?**

| Yes | No |

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.*
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course:
Michael Johnson, Srini Krishnamoorthy, Jason Ho, Miremad Soleymanian
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
Academic Unit / Program
Beedie Graduate Programs
Name (typically Graduate Program Chair)
Stephanie Reimer
Email
stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.
Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

Graduate Program Committee
Signature
Date
Department Chair
Signature
Date

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done?  YES
This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.
Andrew Gemino
Signature
Date January 8, 2020
A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL
Jeff Derksen
Signature
Date MAR 16 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check:
Course Attribute:
Course Attribute Value:
Instruction Mode:
Attendance Type:
If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:
Financial Aid Progress Units:
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BUS 581: Making Decisions with Data

Course Description
In this course, students will learn the fundamentals of statistical analysis, data visualization and business analytics with an emphasis on how to communicate effectively with data in a collaborative team environment. Working with a variety of data sources and software, students will work in teams to learn how to conduct descriptive and inferential statistics and apply it to business decision making. This course presents tools for cleaning and preparing data sets in order to investigate relationships between variables, and to create visualizations to derive meaningful insights. More advanced topics will investigate modeling business decisions using analytical tools such as predictive analytics, multiple regression and decision analysis. Students will work in teams to develop and interpret models in a variety of applications to business decision making. A capstone assignment will require student teams to communicate statistical findings using visualization and storytelling techniques.

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:

- Work with team members to solve complex real-life business issues using sophisticated and real data sets.
- Apply basic data cleansing and preparation techniques. Conduct exploratory data analysis to visualize data using a variety of perspectives.
- Understand the use of descriptive and inferential statistics in the context of business decision making.
- Apply critical thinking, judgement and creativity in the context of data and statistical interpretation.
- Apply an analytics mindset to ask the right questions, collect data, prepare it and conduct statistical analysis.
- Apply statistical and analytical techniques to develop business intelligence insights, and present them in a compelling way to enable smart and sustainable business decisions.
- Develop and evaluate decision models related to risk, capital investments and strategic business decisions.
- Conduct predictive analytics using time-series methods to forecast business data.
- Develop a multivariate predictive model that demonstrates reliable predictors. Understand the context of qualitative (or categorical information) and how it can be modeled using regression analysis.
- Communicate findings within individual and team-based environments using visualization and storytelling techniques.

Subjects/Topics

Module 1: Descriptive Statistics
Descriptive statistics, appropriate use and application. Interpret statistics (including strengths and limitations) in the context of business decisions.

Module 2: Visualization I
Data preparation, cleansing techniques and the identification of outliers and their potential consequences. Exploratory data analysis using visualization tools. Create a variety of visualizations to explore relationships and develop meaningful insights.

Module 3: Visualization II
Advanced topics in visualization including using multiple data sources and cross-joins, calculated fields and the creation of interactive dashboards and story boards. Topics in storytelling with data with applications and examples.

**Module 4: Hypothesis testing for comparative groups**
Hypothesis testing for comparative groups. Independent and dependent t tests for comparative analysis. Create visualizations that support the investigation of relationships between two variables.

**Module 5: Simple Linear Regression**
Development of a simple linear regression model to investigate relationships between data and the development of a predictive tool. Interpretation and validation of key properties of the statistical model. Transformations and non-linear relationships.

**Module 6: Multiple Regression**
Multiple regression. Interpretation and validation of key properties of the statistical model.

**Module 7: Predictive Analytics I**
Time-series methods for forecasting and prediction including stationary, trend and seasonal effects.

**Module 8: Predictive Analytics II**
Advanced methods for predictive analytics. Apply methods to evaluate the accuracy of comparative predictive models.

**Module 9: Decision Analysis I**
Decision Analysis applied to managerial problem solving. A variety of approaches will be investigated to model and evaluate business decisions (payoff tables, tree diagrams and decision trees).

**Module 10: Decision Analysis II**
Sensitivity analysis to understand uncertainty and risk associated business decisions (Monte Carlo simulation, data tables).

**Book and Materials**


**Learning and Assessments**

**Assessment summary**
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

**Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Final Exam</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Assignment #1: Descriptive Statistics Case Study</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment #2: Vizathon Competition</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment #3: Predictive Analytics Case Study</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Accounting Literacy in Organizations

**Course title (max. 100 characters)**

**Accounting Literacy**

**Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)**

Accounting Literacy

**Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as “This course will...” or “The purpose of this course is...” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)**

An understanding of generally accepted accounting principles and the ability to use and interpret financial reports. Business drivers, analysis techniques and a deeper understanding of organizational opportunities and challenges to effectively use financial data to support management decisions and planning.

**Rationale for introduction of this course**

See attached Masters in Management Proposal

**Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)**

Fall 2021

**Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)**

35 hours of blended instruction

**Frequency of offerings/year**

twice a year

**Estimated enrollment per offering**

40

**Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)**

n/a

**Prerequisite and/or Corequisite**

n/a

**Criminal record check required?**

☐ Yes  ☑ No

**Additional course fees?**

☐ Yes ☑ No

**Campus where course will be taught**

☑ Burnaby  ☑ Surrey  ☑ Vancouver  ☐ Great Northern Way  ☑ Off campus

**Course Components**

☐ Lecture  ☑ Seminar  ☐ Lab  ☐ Independent  ☐ Capstone  ☘

**Grading Basis**

☑ Letter grades  ☐ Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory  ☐ In Progress / Complete

**Repeat for credit?**

☐ Yes  ☑ No

**Total repeats allowed?**

0

**Repeat within a term?**

☐ Yes  ☑ No

**Required course?**

☑ Yes  ☑ No

**Final exam required?**

☐ Yes  ☑ No

**Capstone course?**

☑ Yes  ☑ No

**Combined with a undergrad course?**

☐ Yes  ☑ No

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.*
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Scott MacEachern, Fereshteh Mahmoudian, Jamal Nazari

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

Academic Unit / Program: Beedie Graduate Programs
Name (typically Graduate Program Chair): Stephanie Reimer
Email: stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check:________
Course Attribute:________
Course Attribute Value:________
Instruction Mode:________
Attendance Type:________

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:________
Financial Aid Progress Units:________

Page 2 of 2 Revised December 2017
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Course Description
This course assumes no prior knowledge of accounting or exposure to accounting courses. Students will be provided with basic accounting and financial knowledge to strengthen decision-making with respect to resource allocation for value-creation.

Students will be provided with the knowledge and capabilities needed to work with accounting and finance departments of various companies. This includes an understanding of generally accepted accounting principles and the ability to use and interpret financial reports. Business drivers, analysis techniques and a deeper understanding of organizational opportunities and challenges will feed into preparing students to effectively use financial data to support management decisions and planning.

Objectives
The course objective is to enhance a business professional’s use and understanding of accounting tools and processes, and enhance cross-collaboration with Finance colleagues. By the end of this course, students will:

- Demonstrate an understanding of core accounting principles (eg. accrual accounting, historic cost, etc.) and the reasoning behind these,
- Critically evaluate financial statements and relationships between financial statement accounts,
- Demonstrate an understanding of the informational content within management reporting,
- Demonstrate a deeper understanding of management reports and cost analysis, leading to more insightful management decision-making,
- Apply enhanced use of budgeting and forecasting techniques for planning and monitoring of performance against plans, and
- Demonstrate an understanding of how to manage working capital to maximize cash flows.

Subjects/Topics

Module 1: Introduction to Accounting
What is accounting and how useful is accounting information? Who are the users of accounting information, what are their needs and what are the costs and benefits of meeting these needs? What is the difference between management accounting and financial accounting? What are the different forms of businesses that require accounting?

Module 2: Measuring and Reporting Financial Position
An overview of the three major financial statements and the relationships between them, followed by a comprehensive introduction to the statement of financial position. Identification and classification of assets and liabilities. Valuation and impairment of assets. Business entity, historic cost, prudence, going concern and dual aspect accounting conventions.

Module 3: Measuring and Reporting Financial Performance
An introduction to the income statement, revenues, cost of sales, gross profit, expenses, and net income. Accrual accounting concepts including revenue recognition criteria, the impact of long-term contracts, and situations where expense may be greater or less than cash outflows. Depreciation via the straight-line and reducing balance methods. How the costing of inventories impacts cost of sales and how difficulties collecting accounts receivable can impact the income statement.
Module 4: Analysing and Interpreting Financial Statements
Using financial ratios to examine the financial health of a company. Identification of primary financial ratio classifications, including profitability, efficiency, and liquidity. Focus on key ratios including the current ratio, acid test ratio, earnings per share, and P/E ratio.

Module 5: Relevant Costs for Decision Making
What is meant by 'cost', relevant cost, opportunity cost, and sunk cost. Performing cost-benefit analysis with consideration of these costs.

Module 6: Cost-Volume-Profit Analysis
Cost behaviour of fixed, variable and semi-fixed costs. Finding the break-even point when a company shifts from a loss position to profitability. The contribution margin ratio, margin of safety, and achieving a target profit. Using marginal analysis to consider only costs and revenues that vary with a decision to assess opportunities including: entering contracts, efficient use of scarce resources, make-or-buy decisions, and closing or continuation decisions.

Module 7: Full Costing

Module 8: Managing Working Capital
The importance of working capital and its component parts. Establishing policies to control working capital by managing inventories, cash, trade receivables and trade payables.

Module 9: Budgeting
How budgets link with strategic plans and objectives. Time horizons, importance of budgeting, how budgets link to one another, and the budget-setting process. Incremental versus zero-base budgeting. Preparation of static and activity-based budgets.

Module 10: Accounting for Control
Using a budget to exercise control over the business. Variances in sales, materials, labour and overhead, with explanations for these variances. Standard quantities and costs and setting these standards.

Book and Materials
   * ISBN# 978-129-2183-763
2. https://www.myaccountinglab.com
3. Selected readings may also be provided on Canvas or through external links

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.
** Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td>Weekly Quizzes</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Assignment</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# New Graduate Course Proposal

**Course Subject (eg. PSTC)**  BUS  
**Number (eg. 810)**  583  
**Units (eg. 4)**  3

## Creating Value in Organizations

### Creating Value

**Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as “This course will…”) or “The purpose of this course is…” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)**

Analyzing how organizations create value, or impact, is a foundational skill for management. The analysis begins with an understanding of an organization’s value chain and the processes it uses to achieve value and extends to the Business Model Canvas to explore an organization's model for value creation. Develop skills in analyzing processes from a customer perspective using a design thinking approach and explore customer experience using customer journey maps. Design process innovations using a service design approach. Develop skills in product life-cycle assessment using a systems perspective, and use a design thinking approach to propose reductions in environmental impacts within a product life-cycle.

### Rationale: For introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</strong></td>
<td>35 hrs of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of offerings/year</strong></td>
<td>Twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated enrollment per offering</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Equivalent courses (courses that replicate the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

- n/a

### Prerequisite and/or Corequisite

- n/a

### Criminal record check required?

- Yes  
- No

### Additional course fees?

- Yes  
- No

### Campus where course will be taught

- Burnaby  
- Surrey  
- Vancouver  
- Great Northern Way  
- Off campus

### Course Components

- Lecture  
- Seminar

### Grading Basis

- Letter grades  
- Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory  
- In Progress/ Complete

### Repeat for credit?

- Yes  
- No

### Total repeats allowed?

- 0

### Repeat within a term?

- Yes  
- No

### Required course?

- Yes  
- No

### Final exam required?

- Yes  
- No

### Capstone course?

- Yes  
- No

### Combined with a undergrad course?

- Yes  
- No

---

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.*

---
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RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Andrew Gemino, Andrew Harries, Kate Dilworth, Sarah Lubik

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL

A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL

The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ✓ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)

Library Code: 
Course Attribute: 
Course Attribute Value: 
Instruction Mode: 
Attendance Type: 

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units: 
Financial Aid Progress Units: 
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BUS 583: Creating Value in Organizations

Course Description
Analyzing how organizations create value, or impact, is a foundational skill for management. The analysis begins with an understanding of an organization's value chain and the processes it uses to achieve value and extends to the Business Model Canvas to explore an organization's model for value creation. You will develop skills in analyzing processes from a customer perspective using a design thinking approach and explore customer experience using customer journey maps. From this foundation you will be able to design process innovations using a service design approach. Finally, you will develop skills in product lifecycle assessment using a systems perspective. This integrated perspective will enable you to propose reductions in environmental impacts within a product lifecycle.

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:
- Describe an organization’s value chain
- Analyse value creation using a business model canvas
- Analyze a customer's experience using customer journey map
- Use service design framework to redesign a process
- Create a life cycle assessment of a product or service
- Design an innovation that addresses an environmental issue in a lifecycle assessment

Subjects/Topics
Module 1: Strategic Analysis and the Value Chain
Introduces strategic analysis using competitive advantage and the value chain. Considers the global supply chain and value generation.

Module 2: Business Model Canvas
Explore an organization's value creation model using the Business Model Canvas. Use the idea of minimum viable product and challenge yourself to identify the smallest element of a product that could provide value to the customer.

Module 3: Design Thinking
Work through the 5 stages of design thinking and understand the importance of empathy, ideation, defining, prototyping and testing ideas.

Module 4: Customer Experience Mapping
Introduces the customer experience map that expresses the customers level of engagement/frustration with an existing process. Develop skills in customer journey mapping and analysis. Understand the importance of the customers/stakeholder perspective.

Module 5: Service Design
Explore the activity of planning and organizing components of a service to improve its quality and the interaction provider and customers. Service design uses a design thinking approach to enact a process of change for an existing service.

Module 6: Lean Management
Define a value stream and develop an experiment intended to improve value for customers for the value stream. Suggest how the value can be pulled through the system by the customer.
Module 7: Systems Thinking and Life Cycle Assessment
Introduces basic foundations of general systems theory and open systems. Uses Life Cycle Assessment as a systems technique to assess environmental impacts across stages of a product's life from raw materials through processing, manufacture, distribution, use, repair and disposal/recycling.

Module 8: Process Innovation
Apply the tools you have learned (design thinking, journey mapping, lifecycle assessment) to translate an idea into an innovation that creates value or impact. Identify an opportunity in your life cycle assessment and suggest a process innovation that can make an environmental impact.

Module 9: Presenting your Innovation
Reinforce your learning by presenting your group innovation proposal that describes an environmental impact on an existing product or service.

Module 10: Reflecting on Creating Value
Discuss what is meant by "value" in organizations. Consider your role in value creation and the role of intellectual property in value creation. Consider the difference between entrepreneurs and entrepreneur.

Book and Materials
10. Selected readings may be provided on Canvas or through external links

Videos and External Links
Innovation Overview
Guy Kawasaki – Art of Innovation
Leyla Acaroğlu, Paper beats Plastic - Ted Talk 2013
Service Design – A Tale of Two Coffee Shops

- Why is innovation the buzzword right now? (Links to an external site.)
- 6 key steps to creating an innovation mindset (Links to an external site.)
- 5 ways to master the new innovation game (Links to an external site.)
- 3 ways that new technologies are accelerating innovation

Learning and Assessments
Assessment summary

Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

** Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.

| Individual | Assignment #1: Business Model Canvas | 20% |
| Group      | Assignment #2: Customer Journey Mapping | 20% |
|            | Peer assessment                      | 20% |
| Group      | Assignment 3: Group Lifecycle Assessment | 15% |
|            | Assignment 4: Group Innovation Presentation | 25% |
| Total      |                                           | 100% |
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>584</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Managing Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course title (max. 100 characters)</th>
<th>Managing Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as &quot;This course will...&quot; or &quot;The purpose of this course is...&quot; If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management skills will be developed using both plan-based and agile approaches. Agile methods will include SCRUM techniques. Project management techniques are reinforced with development of a business case using data from enterprise systems. Data integration skills, including structured query language, are introduced and used to develop and present a business case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale for introduction of this course**
See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>35 hours of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of offerings/year</td>
<td>twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses) |
| n/a |

| Prerequisite and/or Corequisite | n/a |

| Criminal record check required? | Yes | If yes is selected, add this as prerequisite |
| Additional course fees? | Yes | No |

| Campus where course will be taught | Burnaby | Surrey | Vancouver | Great Northerm Way | Off campus |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Components</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Basis</th>
<th>Letter grades</th>
<th>Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>In Progress / Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeat for credit?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total repeats allowed</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeat within a term?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final exam required?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone course?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined with a undergrad course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course
Kamal Masri, Andrew Gemino, Blaize Reich
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done?  ✔ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check: ____________________________
Course Attribute: _________________________
Course Attribute Value: ___________________
Instruction Mode: ________________________
Attendance Type: _________________________
If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units: ________________
Financial Aid Progress Units: ____________
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Course Description
Getting things done requires vision, planning, analysis, coordination, determination, and the foresight/courage to pursue opportunities when they emerge. Project management skills will be developed using both plan-based and agile approaches. Agile methods will include SCRUM techniques. Project management techniques are reinforced with development of a business case using data from enterprise systems. Data integration skills, including structured query language, are introduced and used to develop and present a business case.

Pre-Requisites

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:

- Create a work breakdown structure to plan a project
- Use agile methods to define and work towards project objectives
- Develop data skills to integrate data across enterprise systems.
- Reinforce data skills by creating a business case for a proposed change.
- Create presentation on the business case and make a recommendation.

Subjects/Topics

Module 1: Project Management I
Develop skills in work breakdown structures, activity dependencies and work package constraints to create a project plan with cost estimates and timelines.

Module 2: Agile Project Management
Use techniques from SCRUM methods to design a series of weekly sprints that will result in successfully completing the final project in the course. Participate in a stand-up meeting.

Module 3: Project Management II
Develop a simple communication plan to support coordination. Use a risk management framework to estimate project risk and suggest mitigation activities to manage risk.

Module 4: Creating a Business Case
Explore the elements of a business case and understand the important of storytelling in developing an effective business case.

Module 5: Enterprise Systems
Understand enterprise systems using the context of global supply chains and the importance of the supply chain in BC economy.

Module 6: Enterprise Data Overview
Introduce enterprise data integration, the foundations of relational database and accessing data. Use the contexts of global supply chain to show integration challenges.

Module 7: SQL Skills and Data Integration
Develop introductory skills in SQL and basic scripting to create data to integrate data from multiple systems around an operational issue.
Module 8: SQL Skills and Business Case Support
Reinforce data skills by integrating and using data to support a business case around an opportunity for improvement.

Module 9: Applying Data Skills
Work in team environment to complete a business case for opportunity.

Module 10: Presentations: Business Case
Reinforce learning and integrate aspects across Modules 1 - 9 by presenting the development of a business case.

Book and Materials
5. Selected readings may be provided on Canvas or through external links.

Videos and External Links
Work Breakdown Structure
Dan Pink: The Puzzle of Motivation
Yves Morieux: 6 Rules
What is a business case?
Using SQL

Learning and Assessments
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

** Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Assignment #1: SQL Data Integration Assignment</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment #2: Business Case Vision Statement</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Assignment 3: Agile Sprints Definition</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment 4: Business Case Presentation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Course Proposal

Course Subject (eg. PSYC) | BUS  
Course number (eg. 810) | 585  
Units (eg. 4) | 3

**Financial Literacy in Organizations**

**Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)**  
Financial Literacy

**Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as “This course will…” or “The purpose of this course is…” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)**  
Economic models that influence and affect business management. Understand how consumers and firms make economic and business decisions and how they interact in markets. Understand major decision-making areas confronting modern financial managers today. A general understanding of financial markets and how they can be used for personal finance. Covers traditional subjects such as capital budgeting, net present value, risk/return, capital structure and corporate governance.

**Rationale for introduction of this course**  
See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

**Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)**  
Fall 2021

**Frequency of offerings/year**  
twice a year

**Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)**  
35 hrs of blended instruction

**Estimated enrollment per offering**  
40

Equivalent courses (courses that replicate the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)  
n/a

**Pre-requisite and/or Corequisite**  
n/a

**Criminal record check required?**  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No  
If yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

**Additional course fees?**  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

**Campus where course will be taught**  
[ ] Burnaby  
[ ] Surrey  
[ ] Vancouver  
[ ] Great Northern Way  
[ ] Off campus

**Course Components**  
[ ] Lecture  
[ ] Seminar  
[ ] Lab  
[ ] Independent  
[ ] Capstone

**Grading Basis**  
[ ] Letter grades  
[ ] Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory  
[ ] In Progress/Complete

**Repeat for credit?**  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No  
Total repeats allowed? 0

**Repeat within a term?**  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

**Required course?**  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No  
Final exam required?  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No  
Capstone course?  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

**Combined with a undergrad course?**  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No  
If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.*
RESOURCES

If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Victor Song, Jan Simon

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

Academic Unit / Program  Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)  Email
Beedie Graduate Programs  Stephanie Reimer  stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL

A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

Graduate Program Committee  Signature  Date
Department Chair  Signature  Date

FACULTY APPROVAL

The courses form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each PGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ✓ YES

This approval indicates that all necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

Faculty Graduate Studies Committee
Andrew Gemino  Signature  Date
January 8, 2020

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Senator Graduate Studies Committee
Jeff Derksen  Signature  Date
MAR 16 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)

Library Check:  
Course Attributes:  
Course Attribute Value:  
Instruction Mode:  
Attendance Type:  

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:
Financial Aid Progress Units:
BUS 585: Financial Literacy in Organizations

Course Description

The objective of the first part of this course is to introduce students to economic models that influence and affect business management and students will learn how consumers and firms make economic and business decisions and how they interact in markets.

The focus of the second part is the major decision-making areas confronting modern financial managers today. Provides a general understanding of financial markets and how they can be used for personal finance. Covers traditional subjects such as capital budgeting, net present value, risk/return, capital structure and corporate governance.

Objectives

By the end of this course, students will:
- Utilize key economics concepts of the theory of the firm in practice
- Identify different market settings and their impact on firms
- Employ economic tools and theories in resource allocation problems
- Utilize key financial analysis tools
- Understand the relationships between investment, operational and financing decisions
- Interpret financial statements and analyze corporate financial performance
- Set appropriate internal financial targets and evaluate a company's capital structure
- Understand how capital structure effects firm valuation
- Understand the role of corporate governance in practice

Subjects/Topics

Module 1: Consumer behavior
Introduce and explain preferences and utility; budget sets; optimal choice and derivation of a demand function.

Module 2: Firm behavior
Introduce opportunity costs, sunk costs, depreciation, the user cost of capital and economic profit; profit maximization; cost minimization.

Module 3: Market structure
Introduce and explain monopoly, oligopoly, imperfect competition, Nash equilibrium and other pricing strategy.

Module 4: Measuring a Nation's Income and Cost of Living: GDP and CPI
Introduce key macroeconomic variables of interest, national income, unemployment, inflation, interest rates, growth rates, and exchange rates.

Module 5: Financial Markets and Net Present Value
Introduce the basic concept of financial market in a perfect competitive environment and explain the concept of net present value.

Module 6: The Time Value of Money
Introduce the concept of opportunity cost and how to measure the time value of money by using the concept of opportunity cost.

Module 7: Net Present Value and Other Investment Rules
Introduce why NPV rule is the dominant rule for financial forecast, and explain why the other investment rules serve as complements.

**Module 8: Net Present Value and Capital Budgeting**
Introduce the projected earnings generated by a project or investment as part of a business plan.

**Module 9: Capital Structure: Basic Concepts and Limits to the Use of Debt**
Introduce the interaction between equity and debt and explain the benefits and cost for the use of debt financing.

**Module 10: Corporate Governance**
Introduce the importance of corporate governance for the firm valuation and the basic mechanisms of corporate governance.

**Book and Materials**

**Learning and Assessments**

**Assessment summary**
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

**Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class participation</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>Assignment #1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment #2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment #3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# New Graduate Course Proposal

**Course Subject (e.g. PSYC)** BUS

**Number (e.g. 610)** 586

**Units (e.g. 4)** 3

## Marketing and Sales

### Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (e.g. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Course delivery (e.g. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>35 hours of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency of offerings/year**

- twice a year

**Estimated enrollment per offering**

- 40

**Equivalent courses** (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

**Prerequisite and/or Corequisite**

- Criminal record check required? [ ] Yes
- if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite
- Additional course fees? [ ] Yes [ ] No

**Campus where course will be taught**

- [ ] Burnaby
- [ ] Surrey
- [ ] Vancouver
- [ ] Great Northern Way
- [ ] Off campus

**Course Components**

- [ ] Lecture
- [ ] Seminar
- [ ] Lab
- [ ] Independent
- [ ] Capstone

**Grading Basis**

- [ ] Letter grades
- [ ] Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory
- [ ] In Progress / Complete

**Repeat for credit?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Total repeats allowed?**

- 0

**Repeat within a term?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Required course?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Final exam required?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Capstone course?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Combined with a undergrad course?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.*
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RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course
Lily Lin, Andrew Harries, Miredad Soleymanian
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
Academic Unit / Program: Beedie Graduate Programs
Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair): Stephanie Reimer
Email: stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content.

Overlap check done? [ ] YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check: ___________________________
Course Attribute: _________________________
Course Attribute Value: __________________
Instruction Mode: _________________________
Attendance Type: _________________________

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units: _______________
Financial Aid Progress Units: ___________
BUS 586: Marketing and Sales

Course Description

Progress within organizations and society depends not only on innovative ideas but also on persuasion - the ability of innovators to get others to adopt those ideas. This course is designed to provide students with a roadmap from understanding organizations' and consumers' marketing environments, to collecting and interpreting marketing data, to creating innovative marketing strategies, to effectively communicating these strategies and ideas.

The foundations of the course include: (1) an introduction to marketing concepts and research (including digital marketing), (2) the development of a brand (for products, services or people including yourself), (3) presentation design and delivery, and (4) strategic selling and storytelling.

Objectives

The overall objective of this course is to provide students with a set of skills that will enable them to position, promote and sell ideas, services and products to colleagues, partners and customers. These skills are essential in the rapidly evolving workplaces of the future.

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Identify innovative ideas and marketing opportunities through market research
- Simplify ideas and build compelling vision for products or services
- Segment markets and define personas at the centre of those segments
- Build effective branding and marketing strategies
- Develop and enhance their personal brand (some employers are now expecting their recruits to have a strong personal brand: https://www.forbes.com/sites/glennlilpship/2013/04/08/personal-branding-is-a-leadership-requirement-not-a-self-promotion-campaign/#49abe8ae226f)
- Develop the ability to communicate knowledgeably and persuasively about marketing communications and professional presentation skills.

Subjects/Topics

1. Defining Your Offer
What problem are you solving, for whom, what alternative ways can they solve the problem, why would they find your offer more compelling than the alternatives

2. Personas, Segments and Positioning
Defining Personas. What binds them together to form segments? What criteria do they use most heavily to make a purchase decision? Positioning statements and maps.

3. Brand Development

4. The Marketing Mix: An Introduction (Part 1)
Building your go-to-market plan. Introduction to the 4 P's.

5. The Marketing Mix (Part 2) & Digital Marketing
Integrate the three components of marketing planning, namely situational analysis, STP, and the marketing mix in a non-traditional marketing context. Guest lecture from digital/social marketer on the state of the art in maximizing the effectiveness of your marketing spend.
6. The Marketing Mix (Part 3) & Integrated Marketing Communications
Putting integrated marketing communications into practice. Designing effective marketing campaigns for local companies.

7. Highly Effective Presentations & Storytelling
How to build and deliver highly effective presentations. Presenting marketing campaign to local businesses.

8. Strategic Selling: An Introduction (Part 1)
An introduction to personal and team selling. General overview of concepts and strategies for selling in different industries.

9. Strategic Selling (Part 2)
Apply knowledge to real-cases. A hands-on primer on consultative selling.

10. Strategic Selling (Part 3)
Sales training in the field and an interactive engagement with potential customers.

Book and Materials
4. Selected readings may also be provided on Canvas or through external links

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Branding Assignment</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Strategic Selling Exercise</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                          | 100% |
## New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>587</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Applied Project

#### Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)

**Applied Project**

#### Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is...", include this in the description)

The opportunity to apply student learning in the context of a management challenge outside of the classroom. An emphasis is placed on the integration of learning across the core program and reflective practice. Student will integrate their knowledge across courses using an experience outside of the traditional classroom and work in a team to achieve a goal. The course serves as an opportunity to apply skills on a significant management challenge and to reflect on, and communicate about, students’ management practices.

#### Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>35 hrs of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of offerings/year</td>
<td>twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

n/a

#### Prerequisite and/or Corequisites

n/a

#### Criminal record check required?

- Yes [ ] if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

#### Additional course fees?

- Yes [ ] No [ ]

#### Campus where course will be taught

- Burnaby
- Surrey
- Vancouver
- Great Northern Way
- Off campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Lecture [ ]
- Seminar [ ]
- Lab [ ]
- Independent [ ]
- Capstone [ ]

#### Grading Basis

- Letter grades [ ]
- Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory [ ]
- In Progress / Complete [ ]

#### Repeat for credit?

- Yes [ ] No [ ]

#### Total repeats allowed?

- 0

#### Repeat within a term?

- Yes [ ] No [ ]

#### Required course?

- Yes [ ] No [ ]

#### Final exam required?

- Yes [ ] No [ ]

#### Capstone course?

- Yes [ ] No [ ]

#### Combined with an undergrad course?

- Yes [ ] No [ ]

* If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

---

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.*
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Shafik Bhaloo, Kathleen Burke, Tom Culham, Kate Dilworth

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course.

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL

A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL

The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content.

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Check:</th>
<th>Academic Progress Units:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Attribute:</td>
<td>Academic Progress Units:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Attribute Value:</td>
<td>Financial Aid Progress Units:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Mode:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BUS 587: Applied Project

Course Description
This is an experiential course designed to provide a management challenge to students. The course provides the opportunity to apply student learning in the context of a management challenge outside of the classroom. This project builds on the knowledge gained in the Experiential Project at the start of the program. An emphasis is placed on the integration of learning across the core program and reflective practice. Students will integrate their knowledge across courses using an experience outside of the traditional classroom and work in a team to achieve a goal. The course serves as an opportunity to apply skills on a significant management challenge and to reflect on, and communicate about, students' management practices.

Objectives
The course objective is to apply management skills and integrate knowledge across the courses in the program core. Upon completion of this course, you will:

- Apply skills learned throughout the program to a management challenge
- Reflect on the use of the skills within a management context
- Provide peer assessment feedback to others about their practice

Subjects/Topics

Module 1: Project Introduction
Students will be introduced to the applied project. Example applied projects will adapt to each cohort and will include community partners. Applied projects may require students to work with community projects, not-for-profit partners or environmental projects.

Module 2: Applied Ethics
Consider the practical application of moral considerations in a workplace context. Students will consider real-world actions and their moral considerations. This topic will be considered throughout the project.

Module 3: Applying Reflective Practice
Students will apply reflective practice techniques introduced in earlier courses and complete a weekly reflection towards their online Learning Portfolio. The purpose of the portfolio is to have students reflect on their work within the project.

Module 4: Accepting and Providing Feedback
Feedback will be an important part of the project process. Students will learn to accept feedback and respond positively to concerns from others. Students will also be asked to provide feedback to others in a professional way.

Module 5: Interacting with Stakeholders
Students will be asked to work with stakeholders to adapt and pivot the projects as necessary. The importance of stakeholder communication and consultation will be demonstrated throughout the project.
Book and Materials

This is an experiential course. Course work and textbooks from previous courses will provide the material necessary to successfully complete the course.

Suggested Readings

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary

Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Reflective Learning Portfolio</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Feedback</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Experiential Collaboration Project</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Plan &amp; Team Agreement</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Final Presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Team Feedback Interview</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3
Ali Dastmalchian  
Dean  
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University  
500 Granville Street  
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6  

Dear Ali,  

The Beedie School of Business Advisory Board (BAB) exists to advise the Dean and members of the Beedie School of Business on strategic matters of the school, with the Masters in Management (MiM) being one of these matters. As you previously presented the concept of the MiM program at a Board meeting, it is great to see that the program has come to fruition through this proposal.

The foresight applied in the creation of a program that focuses on enhancing the employability of recent graduates by providing them with transferrable management skills and relevant experiential opportunities needed for employment in the future of work is both commendable and admirable. For these reasons and more, as the Chair of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board, I am happy to endorse the School's proposed Masters In Management (MiM) program on behalf of all of the members of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board.

The BAB comprises of members of the business, government, non-profit, association and alumni community, locally, nationally, and globally. As a group, we believe the Beedie School of Business has done a great job at identifying the gap in skills needed for the the future of work and new labour market entrants. As members of the BAB are also potential employers, we are encouraged by the education that SFU Beedie is bringing to the community and the opportunity to hire students with knowledge and skills in management and digital literacy.

A great deal of thought has gone into the creation and development of the Masters in Management program and it will not only contribute to the skills needed for the future of work but also in the advancement of the Schools achievement of its vision and calling. The Board will continue to support the MiM program through its purpose of providing a link to those individuals and organizations with the resources, knowledge and contracts the School requires to achieve its objectives and enact its calling.

The members of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board and I are excited by the potential of the Masters in Management graduates and I have no doubt that this program will be a great success. The resources the School will gain from this program will allow for the continued development of innovative program offerings such as the Masters in Management program.

Yours sincerely,  

Barry MacDonald, FCPA FCA, I.D.D  
SFU Beedie School of Business Advisory Board, Chair
February 19, 2020

RE: SFU Beedie School of Business - Master’s in Management

Dear Andrew Gemino,

I’m writing to offer strong support for your proposed Masters in Management (MiM) program at Simon Fraser University. I appreciate you sharing the proposal and discussing the benefits that it can provide to students at SFU. We have further discussed it within our Graduate Program Committee and find the proposed program to be highly compelling and strongly aligned with the needs of students and industry. We believe that the MiM program is an excellent opportunity for collaboration between the School of Interactive Arts and Technology (SIAT) and SFU Beedie.

As you know, SIAT offers the graduate certificate in visual analytics (VA) an interdisciplinary graduate program consisting of technology and theory courses that focus on four key aspects of visual analytics: cognition, technology, society, and integration. We strongly feel that the VA certificate would be ideal to integrate within the MiM program to provide students with training opportunities in visual analytics. This would provide graduates with skills highly sought after by industry. SIAT is committed to working with SFU Beedie to explore options for providing the VA certificate as part of the MiM program and as part of the MiM’s graduation requirements.

I look forward to further discussions about the MiM program and our collaborations within it. Best of luck with your proposal moving forward.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Carman Neustaedter
Director and Professor, School of Interactive Arts and Technology
Faculty of Communication, Art, and Technology
February 20, 2020

Ali Dastmalchian  
Dean  
Beedie School of Business

RE: Master’s in Management Proposal

Dear Ali,

I am writing in support of the Beedie School of Business’ proposed Master’s in Management (MiM) program at Simon Fraser University. The proposed program offers students the opportunity to build important professional skills that align with demands and current gaps in industry. I believe the MiM program is an excellent opportunity for interdisciplinary engagement and collaboration – a foundational principle of the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology, and something which adds value to the SFU experience – both for students and faculty. The program seems well differentiated and we join you in supporting the digital literacy and people skills learning outcome.

I understand that discussions are already underway with the School of Interactive Art and Technology and they are positive about the opportunity to collaborate, particularly with respect to Visual Analytics curriculum which could become a specialization or track area within your program.

Sincerely,

Owen Underhill  
Dean pro tem  
Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology

cc: Andrew Gemino, Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Beedie School of Business  
Philippe Pasquier, Associate Dean, Academic, Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology
Ali Dastmalchian  
Dean, Beedie School of Business  
Professor, Management and Organization Studies / International Business  
Beedie School of Business  
Simon Fraser University  
Email: beedie.dean@sfu.ca

December 8, 2019

RE: Letter of support for Proposed Masters in Management, Beedie School of Business

Dear Ali,

Thank you for sharing your proposal for the Masters in Management (MiM) program here at SFU. We have talked about the opportunity to work together, combining the strengths of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Beedie School of Business. I believe this program provides the platform for collaboration between our two faculties. It is particularly well suited for students in the health sciences who are looking for a career launch and developing their leadership and management skills in the health sector. As you know, the public health sector accounts for 11% of Canada’s GDP and Canada’s health innovation sector contributes over $8 billion annually to Canada’s economy, with tremendous growth potential. Both public, not-for-profit and private sector organizations seek employees suited to advancing patient care and the knowledge economy.

We endorse the proposed Master of Management program at SFU Beedie and would like to work with SFU Beedie to develop a graduate certificate in health sector leadership and management as part of the program in the future. As you are aware, it is difficult to commit resources to projects that are not yet approved, but the Faculty of Health Sciences would be interested in working with you to refine the design of this program for the benefit of our students. Our faculty is particularly interested in the emphasis the proposal has placed on the combination of digital literacy, leadership and management skills. In particular, the program will be an valued add on to our undergraduate program focused on health services, health data science, biostatistics, health economics, and epidemiology. We additionally have graduate-level courses in topics that set the context for leadership and management in the health sector and are ready to provide select offerings from our current Masters in Public Health program.

The Faculty of Health Science is very interested in partnering with the Beedie School, and I am personally excited about the potential for future collaborations. As you know, before I came to SFU, I was a Professor in the School of Public Health at the University of Alberta and an Adjunct Professor at Alberta Business. I taught in both MPH and MBA programs at the University of Alberta and am highly aware of their complementarity. I wish you all the best with the proposal and I look forward to further discussions on our partnership.

Sincerely,

Tania Bubela, BSc (Hons), PhD, JD, FCAHS, FRSC  
Professor and Dean
December 9, 2019

Degree Quality Assessment Board Secretariat
Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills & Training
PO Box 9177 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9H8

Re: SFU – Masters in Management

Dear Members of the DQAB Board:

I wish to express my support for the proposed SFU Beedie Masters in Management program. Coming from a School who has also proposed a new Master of Management program, we at UVic recognize the value of this type of programming to prepare students for careers in a rapidly changing work environment. Similar to our concept, SFU Beedie’s MiM aims to bridge the gap between the broad skills provided in post-secondary education with the management/digital literacy skills demanded in the labour market for new employees.

With our emphasis on partnerships with Vancouver Island-based organizations, the UVic MM is designed to serve this region’s organizations and students by offering a pathway for preparing students to remain within the region. Therefore, we do not believe there will be a cross-over in market demand between UVic’s MM and SFU Beedie’s MiM. In both cases we see the primary audiences for these programs as our own respective graduates.

Yours sincerely,

Saul Klein
Dean
February 4, 2020

Dr. Andrew Gemino  
Associate Dean Graduate Programs  
Beedie School of Business  
Simon Fraser University  
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6  
gemino@sfu.ca

RE: Proposed Master in Management Program

Thank you for the opportunity to review Simon Fraser University Beedie School of Business’ proposal for a Master in Management credential.

The proposal responds to an emerging demand for graduate management and business education for non-business undergraduate degree holders. There is significant evidence that liberal arts graduates who are pursuing careers in business, but with no formal management education, are limited in their career progression. The proposal is positioned to effectively respond to the demonstrated demand for business managers.

A clear strength of the proposal is that it will be accessible to an under-served population – that outside of the BC lower mainland and those who have career, care-giver and other related responsibilities.

I have reviewed the structure of the degree and feel as though the inclusion of the four-course elective specialization will give students the opportunity to take coursework directly related to their current career sector- or the sector where they want to pivot their careers.

I commend the Beedie School of Business for bringing forward this strong proposal and am pleased to provide my support.

Yours truly,

Michael Henry  
Dean, School of Business and Economics
December 17th, 2019

Dr. Ali Dastmalchian
Professor & Dean
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
President, GLOBE Project
Burnaby | Vancouver | Surrey
British Columbia, Canada

Emailed to: heedie_dean@sfu.ca

Dear Dr. Dastmalchian:

On behalf of Douglas College, I am writing to express our strong support for the proposed SFU Beedie School Masters in Management (MiM) program.

I note that the MiM aims to be globally recognized as a “pre-experience” graduate program focusing on management essentials for career launch. Moreover, I can see that this program will bridge a significant gap between the foundational education that students obtain in most undergraduate degrees and the specific management/digital literacy skills now demanded by the labour market. I agree with you that this program will be a very attractive to recent graduates from non-business disciplines who have less than three years of full-time work experience.

For its part, Douglas College aims to provide educational experiences to students that challenge, enlighten, and open doors to lives of passion and purpose. Importantly, our strategic goals are closely linked to our efforts to establish robust ‘pathways’ for Douglas degree graduates and university transfer students. SFU and Douglas College have a long and successful history of collaborations that support student transfer and degree completion. Consequently, we strongly endorse the proposed Masters in Management and are excited by the opportunities it will provide for our students to further their studies.

Please feel free to contact me if you have further questions or require more information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Thor Borgford, Ph.D.
Vice President Academic and Provost
Douglas College
604-527-5222
borgfordt@douglascollege.ca

cc: George Stroppa, Rachael Newton
January 31, 2020

Dr. Andrew Gemino,
Associate Dean, Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
500 Granville Ave, Vancouver, BC

Dear Dr. Gemino,

Re: Master in Management, Beedie School of Business

It is my pleasure to provide the following commentary on the proposed Master in Management to be offered by the Beedie School of Business at Simon Fraser University.

As a course-based, professional, ‘pre-experience’ degree, the Simon Fraser University Master of Management is designed to provide new graduates of non-business undergraduate programs the business skills needed to facilitate their job-readiness when commencing their professional careers. The full-time blended delivery will provide students with the opportunity to study in a flexible technology-enhanced environment.

Providing undergraduate students in non-business majors who have chosen to take business minors the opportunity to leverage their business minors as transfer credit or advanced standing into the Master in Management facilitates a timely and efficient way of providing new graduates of non-business undergraduate programs the opportunity to acquire business skills needed to assist them in launching their careers. The one-year duration of the program will no doubt be attractive to prospective participants.

The practicum and other experiential components of the program contribute to the breadth of student experience directly relevant to their future careers in business focused work environments. The movement away from concentration on the traditional functional areas of business in favour of a focus on a suite of integrative skills is designed to assist the students in developing the resilience and adaptability required to succeed in a dynamic and rapidly changing work environment.
The Simon Fraser University Master in Management, as a pre-experience masters program targeted at graduating undergraduate students in non-business programs, does not compete directly with graduate programs at Royal Roads University which are oriented more towards the mid-career professional and require varying periods of work experience for eligibility for admission.

Sincerely,

William R. Holmes, DBA, CPA, CMA, CGA, CPHR
Dean, Faculty of Management | Royal Roads University
T 250.391.2518 | F 250.391.2610
2005 Sooke Road, Victoria, BC Canada V9B 5Y2 | royalroads.ca
December 4, 2019

Ali Dastmalchian
Dean
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
500 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6

Dear Mr. Dastmalchian,

The proposed Masters in Management (MiM) at SFU Beedie School of Business is an important addition to the training and education of qualified personnel in Greater Vancouver in order for the city to hold its place as a vibrant hub for commerce, trade, travel, and free enterprise.

As Western Canada’s most active and influential business association, we’re aware of the current skills gap between the relevant competencies needed for the future labour market and the broad skills provided in undergraduate education. The MiM addresses these labour market needs by providing the skills necessary for young graduates to secure positions in the most demanded occupational categories, namely: Sales and Service; Business, Finance and Administration; and, Management.

As we look to the future, technological advancements will shape the future demand for new skills and competencies. SFU Beedie’s focus on people and management skills combined with digital literacy - embedded in business context - will equip students to deal with pressing global challenges affecting the economy and the environment as well as local and regional communities.

As a supporting sponsor of the Board of Trade’s Leaders of Tomorrow Program, the GVBO and SFU Beedie have a history of working together to support the professional and personal growth of emerging young leaders in the areas of Mentorship, Leadership, Networking and Volunteerism. We look forward to engaging with the students in SFU Beedie’s MiM program to support their successful career launch.

Sincerely,

Greater Vancouver Board of Trade, per

David Crawford
Vice President and Assistant Secretary - Treasurer
Greater Vancouver Board of Trade
December 3, 2019

All Daftmalchian,
Dean
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
500 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6

Re: Letter of Support for new SFU Beedie’s proposed Masters in Management (MIM)

Dear Ali Daftmalchian,

Greater Vancouver has entered a period of unprecedented economic and population growth, bringing a wealth of new opportunity to Vancouverites. However, to fully leverage these outcomes for a prosperous, inclusive and resilient region, we must be ready to act on in the context of our high-tech and creative economy and the climate emergency. As the economic development agency for the city of Vancouver, we feel these changes call for a global perspective and greater levels of education in emerging area of Innovation and social and environmental responsibility.

The Vancouver Economic Commission is building a prosperous, inclusive and resilient economy for Vancouver, its businesses and its residents. We work to strengthen Vancouver’s thriving economy by supporting companies, attracting high-impact investment and promoting international trade. VEC collaborates with business, academia and government organizations to position Vancouver as a global destination for innovative, creative and sustainable business.

As such, we support the creation of the proposed Master of Management program at SFU Beedie. Its focus on developing fundamental management skills with an emphasis on people skills and digital literacy will contribute to the development of skills in our early-graduate community—skills essential to sustaining and deepening the quality of our region’s growing workforce.

We would particularly encourage the exploration and development of interdisciplinary specializations noted in the proposal. We see them as providing management context for the climate emergency, personalization of healthcare, and smart city innovation for the region in the decades to come.

As a region, it is incumbent upon us to better understand the social, economic, and environmental impacts of these trends while seeking opportunities to develop local skills and expertise in innovation. Having worked with the Beedie School of Business on our Economic Transformation Lab, we have seen firsthand how the school has considered how these trends may affect the future workforce, especially young workers, and the skills gap.

The VEC has effectively partnered with the SFU Beedie School of Business to develop novel research for the region and we’re excited to extend this collaboration to provide our support in their plan to enhance the next generation of managers and innovators.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bryan Buggey
Director
Vancouver Economic Commission
December 16, 2019

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: SFU Masters in Management Program Proposal

RBC Future Launch is our commitment to help young people prepare for a new world of work. In developing Future Launch, we crisscrossed the country and spoke with students and workers in their early careers, with educators and policymakers, and with employers conducting one of the biggest labour force data projects in Canada. This effort uncovered high numbers of unemployed youth not trained for current job openings and young Canadians who feel they aren’t ready for the future of work. The report also suggests that the age of automation need not be a threat and if we apply our humanity — to be creative, critical and collaborative — it can be a competitive advantage.

Educating students from disciplines outside of business, with the combination of human skills and digital literacy is on point with the skill gaps identified in RBC’s report "Humans Wanted: How Canadian youth can thrive in the age of disruption". The skills framework underlying the proposed Master of Management program at SFU Beedie focused on developing fundamental management skills, with an emphasis on people skills and digital literacy is aligned with the skills gap identified in our report. We believe early career graduate education would contribute to the development of skills to support growth in Canada.

The proposed MiM program would open an educational pathway for students to support their undergraduate major with a graduate degree that focuses on collaboration and creativity in the context of management. The program’s focus on career launch and the importance placed on co-curricular experiences in career development should prepare students to successfully achieve their early career goals and their ability to adapt to the challenges in the future of work.

Sincerely,

Helena Gottschling
CHRO, RBC
December 17, 2019

To Whom it May Concern;

On behalf of Procter & Gamble, I am pleased to provide this letter of support for Simon Fraser University (SFU) Beedie School of Business’s proposal for the new Masters in Management (MiM) program aimed at developing business and management skills for non-business undergraduate students.

As a highly engaged organization, Procter & Gamble has collaborated with SFU Beedie for many years. We hire SFU Beedie's Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)/Masters of Business (MBA) students for various internship opportunities and full-time positions across a variety of functions—sales, brand, finance, HR, supply chain and IT. This partnership is extremely valuable to Procter & Gamble as it enables us to tap into significant expertise and diversify our team to broaden our capabilities.

We see tremendous benefit in the proposed MiM program for non-business undergraduates in developing business analytical skills. This will help expand the market for new graduates seeking management positions in the rapidly transforming and highly innovative labour market. There is an increasing need for more technical roles that require a strong technical understanding of key business concepts. MiM will provide candidates with leadership qualities to develop to be future managers and leaders.

I am delighted to support an initiative that will prepare future leaders with essential analytical thinking skills, project management, and business acumen. I look forward to the development of the proposed new MiM program.

Regards,

Lois Bruce
Director of Regional Sales
Procter & Gamble
Ali Dastmalchian  
Dean  
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University  
500 Granville Street  
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6

Dear Ali Dastmalchian,

As a member of the Beedie School of Business Governance Committee, I am involved in providing oversight and feedback on program design and development work. The Governance Committee considers and approves recommendations which match market needs to school requirements and program goals and structures. Therefore, we are involved in providing feedback to the Masters in Management Design Team on the program design and development.

Throughout the development process of the Masters in Management program, the Governance Team met with the Design Team to provide advice regarding responding to changing market needs, innovation being made by faculty and staff, upholding accreditation standards, developing new revenue, and aligning the School's programs with its vision. The Design Team was receptive to suggestions for improvement and were bold in their approach of the overall direction of the program and differentiating the Masters of Management program from its competition.

As an employer and member of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board, I am impressed with the proposed program and I would definitely hire graduates of the program. I would also recommend to my peers to hire from the program. MiM program focuses on practical and widely applicable skills for the new realities of organizations that must continually adapt and innovate. I believe there will be a strong demand for the program from recent graduates of arts and science degrees.

To conclude, the design and development process of the Masters in Management program was very well done and I look forward to the potential of the program graduates in the future of work. I fully support the proposed Masters in Management program as it opens up opportunities for students as well as employers.

Sincerely,

Jamie Gray-Donald  
SVP, QuadReal Property Group  
jamie.gray@quadreal.com  
604—975-9596
Curriculum Vitae

Andrew C. Gemino,
Associate Dean, Graduate Programs
Professor, Management Information Systems
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
E-mail: gemino@sfu.ca

Educational Background
1999 Ph.D. Management Information Systems, University of British Columbia, Canada
1993 M.B.A. Management Science/Management Information Systems, Simon Fraser University
1989 M.A. Economics, Simon Fraser University
1986 B.A. Economics, Simon Fraser University

Employment History
Sept. 2017 - current
Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Segal Graduate School, Beedie School of Business, SFU, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Sept. 2011 - current
Professor, Management Information Systems, Beedie School of Business, SFU, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

March 2006 – Aug. 2011
Associate Professor, Management Information Systems, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

July 1999 – March 2006
Assistant Professor, Management Information Systems, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Refereed Journal Articles
(https://scholar.google.ca/citations?user=1yFYrQwAAAAJ&hl=en&oi=ao)


Updated: December 1, 2019
Curriculum Vitae


Textbooks


Teaching Awards

- SFU Teaching Excellence Award, 2011, Simon Fraser University.
- TD/Canada Trust Teaching Award (1993; 2001), Beedie School of Business, SFU.
- MBA Teaching Excellence Award (1997) from Faculty of Commerce at UBC.
- PhD Outstanding Teaching Award (1996) from Faculty of Commerce at UBC.
- Teaching honor roll (awarded 15 times from 1999-2019) indicates top 10% in Beedie School.
Resume of  
Andrew S.G. Harries

aharries@sfu.ca  
Location: Vancouver BC Canada.

Summary

Andrew Harries is the Tom Foord Professor of Practice in Entrepreneurship and Innovation at Simon Fraser University's Beedie School of Business. At SFU Beedie Andrew blends the latest in theory and practice in his entrepreneurship and innovation, product management and rescourcing new venture programs. In his advisory practice Andrew works closely with companies on business strategy, leadership and governance and the creation of viable, high growth business models.

Andrew chairs the board of directors at Bsquare Corporation (NASDAQ: BSQR), which delivers enterprise Internet of Things software solutions and chaired the board at Contractually through its acquisition by Coupa Software in December 2015. He also serves on the advisory boards of the Beedie School of Business and Science World British Columbia, where he chaired the organization through the successful completion of a $38m renovation and expansion and a major capital campaign.

Andrew was a co-founder of Sierra Wireless Inc. (SW.TO, SWIR) where he served in a variety of executive roles. During his 11 years at Sierra Wireless the company grew from inception through IPO to over $200m in annual revenues. Subsequently Andrew co-founded Zeugma Systems Inc. where he served for six years as the President and CEO from its Initial funding to the revenue stage. Tellabs acquired substantially all of Zeugma Systems in November 2010. Prior to co-founding Sierra Wireless Andrew was a senior product line manager at Motorola Inc. He holds three US patents and an MBA from Simon Fraser University.

Executive History

May 2016 to present  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS  
Tom Foord Professor of Practice in Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Dec 2010 to present  
BUSINESS ADVISOR & CORPORATE DIRECTOR  
Serving clients in the Internet of things, connected health and enterprise software sectors.

Oct 2004 to Nov 2010  
ZEUGMA SYSTEMS INC.  
President & CEO  
Zeugma delivered service and subscriber management systems for next generation broadband networks. Tellabs Inc. acquired substantially all of Zeugma in Nov 2010.

May 1993 to Sept 2004  
SIERRA WIRELESS, INC. (SW.TO, SWIR)  
Senior Vice President, Sales, Marketing, Operations  
One of two founders of Sierra Wireless, Andrew architected its product and market strategies and was personally responsible for over $100m in sales and joint development agreements. The company grew from startup to over US$200m in revenue during Andrew's tenure and listed on two senior public exchanges.

July 1989 to Jan. 1992  
MOTOROLA INC.  
Wireless Data Division  
Business analyst, Senior Product Line Manager
Board and Advisory History

Nov 2012 to Present
**BSQUARE CORPORATION**
Bellevue, WA, USA
Bsquare's software and professional services solutions enable their enterprise customers to monitor device data, automate processes, predict events and produce better business outcomes that help make digital transformation a reality.
*Chair, Board of Directors and member of Audit and Compensation Committees.*

Jan 2013 to Dec 2015
**CONTRACTUALLY (Acquired by COUPA SOFTWARE INC.)**
Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Enterprise SaaS provider delivering the fastest, easiest way to negotiate, sign and manage contracts. Led the company's seed financing and advised the founder CEO on strategy and financing through the company's acquisition by Coupa in December 2015.
*Lead Investor and Chair, Board of Directors*

April 2014 to Present
**MOJO INC.**
Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Mojo is building the leading open applications platform for the connected car. Applications for business make fleets more productive and for consumers make driving informative and fun. As Executive Chair and Acting CEO, led Mojo through a Series A financing, the development of a strategic plan and recruitment of a new CEO.
*Currently an Advisor, formerly Executive Chair and Acting CEO April 2014-Oct 2015.*

2011 to 2014
**NORSAT INTERNATIONAL INC.**
Richmond, B.C., Canada
Satellite and microwave communications systems for use in harsh environments.
As chair of compensation committee completely revamped executive comp structure.
*Member, Board of Directors & Chair, Compensation Committee*

2004 to Present
**SCIENCE WORLD BRITISH COLUMBIA**
Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
World class Interactive Science and Technology Museum.
Advisory Council and formerly Chair of the Board of Directors 2010-2013.

2004 to Present
**SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**
Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Member and Past Chair, SFU Beedie Dean’s Advisory Board

Education

1987-1989
**Master of Business Administration, Simon Fraser University**
MBA Research Project: INFORM: A Forecasting Model for Technology Innovations

1999
**AEA/Stanford Executive Institute**
Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA
Executive leadership program, Stanford Graduate School of Business.

1983-1987
**Graduate Member of the Marketing Institute of Ireland**
College of Commerce, Dublin, Ireland.

Other

- Married with three children
- Active sports: golf, tennis
- 1999 Deloitte Fast 50: Winner (Sierra Wireless)
- 2000 EY Canada Pacific Entrepreneur of the Year
Academic CV

Dr. Blaize Horner Reich

RBC Professor of Technology and Innovation
Beedie School of Business, SFU

Educational Background

Ph.D. (1993) Business Administration, University of British Columbia, Canada
"Investigating the Linkage between Business and Information Technology Objectives: A Multiple Case Study in the Insurance Industry".

M.Sc. Business Administration, University of British Columbia, Canada
"The Use of Information Technology for Competitive Advantage in Canada"

B.A. Economics, University of British Columbia, Canada

Employment History

2009 - present RBC Professor of Technology and Innovation, Beedie School of Business, SFU
2014-2015 Dean, Beedie School of Business, SFU
2017-present Visiting Professor, Swinburne University, Australia
2003-2008 Visiting Associate, Templeton College, Oxford University
2000-2003 Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Beedie School of Business, SFU
1991-present SFU, Progressively more senior positions; currently Professor, Beedie School of Business
1978-1991 Founder and Principal; Strategic Data Planning Inc.
1970-1977 BC Hydro. Progressively more senior positions ending as corporate Data Administration

Publications - since 2014

Citations at: http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=zsFLJSAAAAJ&hl=en

Books and book chapters

Publications in Refereed Journals


Academic and Governance Leadership

Journal Editorial Board

- Editorial Board, International Journal of Managing Projects in Business
- Senior Editor, Journal of Information Technology
- Senior Editor, Journal of Strategic Information Systems
- Senior Editor, Information Systems Management
- Department Editor, Project Management Journal (2012-2015)

Supervisor and Examiner

- Head of Accreditation Team – Alberta School of Business, Business Technology Management Program (2018)
- Head of Accreditation Team– Laurier University Business Technology Management Program (2016)
- Senior supervisor of over 65 MBA projects.
- External examiner, 4 PhD dissertations.
Fereshteh Mahmoudian, Assistant Professor, PhD, CPA, CGA

Accounting Area, Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC Canada
V5A 1S6

Phone: 778-782-4068
Fax: 778-782-4920
Cell phone: 778-987-7875
Email: Mahmoudi@sfu.ca

EDUCATION
- PhD, Accounting, Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada, 2016
- Master of Economics - Specialized in Finance, Institute for Advance Education & Research on Management, Tehran, Iran, 2003
- Bachelor of Science in Applied Mathematics, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran, 2000

ACCOUNTING DESIGNATIONS & CERTIFICATIONS
- Chartered Professional Accountant/Certified General Accountant (BC, Canada), 2014
- Certified Sage ACCPAC Financial and Operational System Consultant (North America), 2007

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
- Assistant Professor, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2017-Present
- Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2015-2017
- Lab Instructor- Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, 2009-2013
- Instructor, Mount Royal University, Calgary, Alberta, 2008-2011

BUSINESS EXPERIENCE
- Certified Sage Accpac Financial and Operational System Consultant, Calgary Alberta, 2007-2009
- Supervisor of Training Department, ENbank, Tehran, Iran, 2002-2003
- Banking System Consultant Karafraim Bank Tehran, Iran, 2004-2005

RESEARCH

Publications
- Academic grants/Awards 13 (over $200,000)

**ACADEMIC CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS**

Have presented 24 academic papers at recognized accounting conferences from 2011-2019. Some of the papers have won best paper awards
- Canadian Academic Accounting Association (n=8)
- American Accounting Association (n=8)
- European Accounting Association (n=4)
- Other (n=4)

**SERVICE**

SFU Faculty Committees at Beedie School of Business
- Member of the Assurance of Learning Committee – Undergraduate
- Member of the Teaching and Learning Committee- Undergraduate
- Member of the Communications Initiative Action Committee
- Member of the Broad Based Undergraduate Admissions Committee

**Membership in the Academic Community**
- Canadian Academic Accounting Association
- American Accounting Association
- European Accounting Association

**Academic Reviews and Discussant**
- American Accounting Association Conference
- Canadian Academic Accounting Association Conference
- European Accounting Association
- Journal of Business Ethics
- Accounting, Auditing, and Accountability Journal
Jamal Nazari, PhD, CPA, CMA, CGA
Associate Professor of Accounting and Academic Director of KPMG Graduate Programs
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6
Email: inazari@sfu.ca
Phone #: 778-782-4604

EDUCATION

PhD, Accounting, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada, 2010
Dissertation Title: "An investigation of the relationship between components of intellectual
capital and firm's financial performance"
MA, Accounting, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran, 2001
BA, Accounting, University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran, 1998

PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS

CPA, Chartered Professional Accountant, Canada, 2014
CMA, Certified Management Accountant, Alberta, Canada, 2011
CGA, Certified General Accountant, Alberta, Canada, 2011

WORK HISTORY

Academic Experience

• Academic Director, KPMG Graduate, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, 2018- Present
• Associate Professor of Accounting, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, 2017- Present
• Assistant Professor of Accounting, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, 2013- 2017
• Associate Professor of Accounting, Mount Royal University, Calgary, 2010-2013
• Assistant Professor of Accounting, Mount Royal University, Calgary, 2007-2010
• Part time Professor of Graduate Programs, Sharif University, Iran, 2007-2009
• Sessional Instructor, University of Calgary, Alberta, 2006-2012

Business Experience

• CPA Facilitator, CPA Canada and CPA Western School of Business, 2013-2016
• CMA Instructor, CMA Alberta, Calgary, 2012-2013
• Chief Financial Officer, Respect General Trading Co., Dubai, UAE, 1999-2003
• Chief Financial and Administrative Officer, Bahman Investment Co, Iran, 2002
• Senior Finance Expert, Bahman Group, Mazda subsidiary in Tehran, 1999-2002
• Auditor, National Audit Organization, Tehran, Iran, 1998-1999
TEACHING

University Teaching Experience
Variety of courses from introductory to advanced financial and managerial accounting courses at the undergraduate, graduate and PhD levels at the University of Calgary, Mount Royal University, Sharif University, and Simon Fraser University.

Professional Teaching Experience
Facilitator and instructor for a number of modules and programs for CPA Canada, CPA Western School of Business, and CMA programs.

Recognition
Have continuously received one of the highest evaluations in the faculty and have been on teaching honor rolls (top 10%) continuously.

RESEARCH SUMMARY

Citation Impact as of December 2019

Google Scholar Profile:
https://scholar.google.ca/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Jamal+Nazari&btnG=

- Citations: 987; h-index: 15; i10-index: 16

Overall Research Output as of December 2019

- Peer Reviewed Book Chapter Publications: 4
- Peer Reviewed Journal Article Publications: 18
- Applied Journals and Magazines and Online Publications: 5
- Peer Reviewed Conference Proceedings/Presentations: 52
- Internal and Practitioner Presentations and Workshops: 16
- Internal Grants: 8 (Σ = $ 98,300)
- External Grants: 6 (Σ = $ 146,400)

Recognition
Publications appear in a variety of top and quality business and accounting journals. Several of the papers have received best paper awards at recognized accounting and business conferences.

SERVICE

- Several university and school level committees in Calgary and Vancouver
- Peer reviewed numerous accounting and business journal papers as well as conferences
- Supervised a number of graduate and undergraduate students
- Served on several professional organization committees including CPA Canada committees and national governmental grant agencies
- Active membership in Canadian Academic Accounting Association, American Accounting Association, and European Accounting Association.
Curriculum Vitae
Jan R. Simon

University Lecturer, Finance, Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Visiting Professor, IESE Business School, Barcelona, Spain

Education

1996 MBA IESE Business School, Spain.
1991 LLM Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium.
1988 LLB Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium.

Employment History

Sep 2013 – Present Senior Lecturer, Finance, Beedie School of Business, SFU.
Sep 2015 – Present Visiting Professor, Finance, IESE Business School and Associate Director International Search Fund Center
Sep 2011 – Aug 2013 Visiting Assistant Professor, Finance, Beedie School of Business, SFU.
Jan 2010 – Sep 2015 Assistant Professor, Finance, IESE Business School.
May 2003 – Dec 2019 Senior Lecturer, Finance, IESE Business School.
Oct 1988 – Jan 1990 Special Forces, 1 BN Para-Commando and NATO Rapid Intervention Force
Service

Academic Chairs

May 2014 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, MBA Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU.

May 2014 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, AMBA Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU.

Sep 2016 – Aug 2017 Academic Uber Chair America’s MBA (SFU-FIA-ITAM-Vanderbilt)

Feb 2014 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, MSc Finance Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU.

Feb 2014 – Aug 2017 Co-Academic Chair, Diploma Financial Engineering, Beedie School of Business-School of Actuarial Studies, SFU.

May 2013 – Aug 2014 Interim Academic Chair Master of Technology Program

Sep 2012 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, EMBA Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU


Committees

Sep 2018 – Aug 2019 Graduate Programs Review Task Force

Sep 2017 – Aug 2018 Executive Education Committee

Sep 2012 – Aug 2017 Planning and Priority Committee

Sep 2014 – Aug 2017 Graduate Programs Committee

Sep 2012 – Aug 2017 Assurance of Learning Committee

Sep 2015 – Aug 2016 Teaching & Learning Committee

Sep 2014 – Aug 2015 Executive Education Committee
Curriculum Vitae
Kamal Masri

Educational Background

2010 Ph.D.  Graduate School of Business (Management Information Systems), Simon Fraser University, Canada
Thesis Title: Conceptual Model Design for Better Understanding.

1994 M.B.A.  Graduate School of Business (Management Science), Simon Fraser University, Canada
Project Title: Improving Extrusion Efficiency at Alcan Aluminum Ltd Vancouver Works.

1990 B.A.Sc.  Faculty of Applied Science (Metals and Materials Engineering), University of British Columbia, Canada

Professional Experience

Academic Director, Undergraduate Programs, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2019-present)

Academic Director, MBA programs, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2017-2018)

Senior Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2018-Present)

Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2011-2018)

Faculty, School of Business, Kwantlen Polytechnic University (2008-2011)

Selected Research

Referred Journal Articles


Book Chapters


Conferences and Presentations

Received best paper award.

Academic Awards and Service
- “TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching” award at the Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2009, 2015. Awarded based on excellence and distinction in teaching and related activities.
- Six-time recipient of the Teaching Honor roll (2004 – 2005 and 2007 - 2010). Awarded to the top 10% of the faculty in the Beedie School of Business at Simon Fraser University.
- Recipient of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Doctoral Fellowship award in 2006. $40,000.
- Four-time recipient of SFU Graduate Fellowship award (2004 to 2007). $6,000 each.
- Reviewer, Management Information Systems Quarterly (MISQ 2011)
Kate C. Dilworth BScN R.N. MBA ICD.D
Vancouver Canada

dilworth@sfu.ca

011 604 306 1787

Career Profile
34 years health care clinical and consulting experience, teaching, learning and development design, focused on new program development, health service design, inter agency/system coordination, public and professional education, consultation and facilitation related to leadership development, governance and sustainability, transformative change, innovative models of care and professional practice. Specialist in custom designed learning and facilitation to address complex challenges and influence transformative change for interdisciplinary post-secondary and international learners, board directors, senior leaders, practice professionals, multi-stakeholder initiatives. Clinical background in mental health and addictions and health consulting on system design, quality and delivery.

EDUCATION
Institute of Corporate Directors- Rotman, Directors Education Program
Rotman School of Business, University of Toronto, Canada 2015

Master of Business Administration – Strategic Management
Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia – Vancouver, British Columbia 2001

Bachelor of Science, Nursing
University of British Columbia – Vancouver, British Columbia 1985

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS and DESIGNATIONS
BC College of Nursing Professionals (Registered Nurse R.N. 596925)
ICD.D - Institute of Corporate Directors, Canada
Nurses and Nurse Practitioners of BC
Canadian Nurses Association, Canada

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Adjunct Professor and Director Learning Design and Health Programs 2001 – Present

Executive Education, Beedie Simon Fraser University, Canada
- Design and facilitation of professional learning and development in areas of Governance Leadership, Sustainability, Change Leadership, Innovation and Value Creation, working with Boards of Directors, Senior Leadership Teams and practice leaders. (First nations, Physicians and Health Professionals, Resource Sector, Government and Civil Society)
- Health practice lead for development/design of customized interprofessional leadership development education for health professionals, physicians, executives). Providence HealthCare, Canadian Cancer Society, BC Children’s Hospital, Health Care Leaders Association, UBC Faculty of Medicine, Ministry of Health, Medical School Pediatric Chairs of Canada, General Practice Services Committee, , Alberta Primary Care, Resident Doctors of BC
- Teaching and Facilitation of healthcare clients-(physician leads, academics, senior executives)
- Faculty/Instructor Health Programming- "Service Excellence"- Process design, redesign and operations management- impact on professional roles and practice, patient experience, quality and patient safety, team-based care, Primary Care Networks. Leadership and Engagement- Certified DISC Assessment & Facilitation, Leading Teams, Change, Multi stakeholder Engagement. Governance, Strategy Innovation & Value Creation
- Program Design, Academic Direction and co-facilitation of program (10th year) supporting leadership and governance development for BC Primary Care Initiative (270 family medicine physician graduates to date)
- Co-Design and Facilitation- Industry Council for Aboriginal Business “Leadership Exchange”- A first in Canada, leadership intensive for pairings of First Nations Chiefs and Corporate CEO’s with a vision to build understanding and common ground for the purposes of economic and community development.
- Academic supervisor- EMBA Aboriginal Business and Leadership capstone projects.
- Mentor/Coach- SFU Entrepreneurship and Venture Connection interdisciplinary team
- BUS238- Introduction to Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Canadian International Resource Development Institute

Academic Director, Program Design Lead and Faculty 2016 – 2018 #LeadershipAQD, Arequipa Peru
- Design and delivery of an eight-day leadership program in Arequipa Peru for leaders, emerging leaders and professionals from community, NGOs, government, civil society and private sector working to create sustainable legacies within and beyond the resource sector.

Kate Dilworth dilworth@sfu.ca
December 2019
Colab Peru- SFU/University Catolica San Pablo Change Lab- Arequipa Peru. Facilitator of stakeholder and student sessions focused on change and innovation and coach for student entrepreneurship project teams.


Canadian International Resource Development Institute & Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research - Project Director, Designer and Faculty- 2014 – 2016

“Health Impact Assessment Learning and Development Program” South Gobi, Mongolia

- Co design and delivery of a twelve-day program for Mongolian government Inter-ministerial and World Health Organization officials
- Learning focus- Health Impact Assessment, resource governance, public health, and change leadership.

Dilworth and Associates Health Consulting- Select Engagements 2002 & Ongoing

British Columbia Cancer - Strategic Direction, Facilitation and Planning 2018- Provincial Primary Care Program- Family Practice Oncology Network to enhance the systems of care between specialist cancer care & urban & rural primary care system. Design & facilitation session “Building Bridges Strengthening Care” - BC Cancer, University and Primary Care System

Mental Health Commission of Canada- “At Home Chez Soi” Research Demonstration Project on Mental Illness and Homelessness

- Designed and facilitated strategy to engage Persons with Lived Experience (PWLE) to provide input to the research & Principle Investigators- a 4-year randomized control research demonstration project examining “Housing First” strategy with supports. Vancouver site research application- authored “An Invitation to Share in the Learning”
- Engaging PWLE with Homelessness and Mental Illness
- Consultative and practice support to Assertive Community Treatment Team- Service & Housing Leads, Research Team in development of roles/strategies to engage PWLE in peer support, research assistant, patient navigation and community education roles.

Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue Simon Fraser University- Dialogue Forum Associate- 2004 to 2012

- Dialogue Forum- examining the role of dialogue in advancing public health policy
- Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue. “Health & Care” Design & Delivery- Impact on Vulnerable Populations
- Action Canada Federal Leadership Program- “Sustainability In Health Care”
- Fraser Health Authority Hip Fracture Collaborative (Care Redesign- elder hip fracture patients) Dialogue as a systems approach to contribute to quality patient care & development of strong working relationships across care continuum. Co-facilitator Co-author of analysis paper.

Additional Health Clients and Consulting Engagements

- Provincial Health Services- HIV AIDS Care, Leadership Development
- Sunnyhill Centre for Children- Professional Practice and Care Delivery
- Vancouver Coastal Health- Riverview Hospital Redesign and $125 M new service design
- Fraser Health- Home and Community Care Strategy
- UBC Faculty of Medicine Department of Ophthalmology and Vancouver Hospital Eye Care Centre
- Health Canada and UBC Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences- Teleophthalmology
- Force Society for Kid’s Mental Health- Peer Models of Care

Governance, Advisory Volunteer and Special Projects

AEDES Asociacion Especializada Para El Desarrollo Sostenible, Arequipa Peru- Board Member, General Assembly- 2018 and ongoing

Institute of Families for Child and Youth Mental Health- Inaugural Advisory Committee 2010 to 2015

Minerva Foundation “Helping Women Work Program”- Steering Committee Member and Mentor (2004-2010)

St James Community Service Society and Foundation-Director (Finance, HR Committees) (2004-2007)

UBC Commerce Faculty Equity Committee (2000- 2002)

Positive Women’s Network- Director (1994-1995)

Volunteer

BC Innovation Council- New Ventures Competition- Jury Member- (2002 to Present)

UBC Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences Research Week - Presenter “Health Career Paths for Graduate Students”

Minerva Foundation- Women Leading the Way Program- Tutor and Coach

Student Biotechnology Network - Event Presenter and Mentor (2005- Ongoing)

College of Registered Nurses, BC- Practice Standards Volunteer Reviewer/Reader (1999 - 2010)

AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

Professional Development Customized Learning Development Design Portfolio Committee Involvement References

Kate Dilworth dilworth@sfu.ca December 2019
KATHLEEN M. BURKE
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, B.C.
Canada V5A 1S6
Ph: (778) 782-5605
Email: kburke@sfu.ca

EDUCATION

1992 - 1999
Doctor of Philosophy, Criminology
Simon Fraser University, B.C.

Dissertation: "Take it like a man:
The silencing of men's experiences
of sexual abuse during childhood."

1990 - 1992
Master of Arts, Criminal Justice
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

1982 - 1986
Bachelor of Arts (Cum Laude), Sociology
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

ACADEMIC/ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

Sept. 2019 - Present
University Lecturer
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University

Core Course Coordinator - BUS303

BUS303-3
"Business Society and Ethics"

Sept. 2012 - Aug. 2019
Senior Lecturer
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University

Course Coordinator - BUS303

BUS303-3
"Business Society and Ethics"
BUS 511-2
"Business Ethics"
Co-taught with Tom Brown
GDBA program

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/LEADERSHIP

2015 – present
Lead, Curriculum Developer, Instructor
Envision Financial Community Leaders Igniting Change
- 12-week leadership development program to promote community
  engagement and support in the Fraser Valley.
- Joint partnership of Envision Financial, SFU Surrey, Surrey
  Poverty Reduction Coalition
- 6 cohorts (73 participants) have completed to-date
- 7th cohort scheduled for January 2020

GRANTS

2018
Principal Applicant – SFU Teaching and Learning Development grant
Course Design Project
"The darkness around us is deep": Using narrative to model reflection and
promote engagement in business ethics education.

2015
Co-Applicant with Stephen Dooley, Executive Director SFU Surrey
SFU Community Engagement Initiative Program grant
- Funding for pilot launch of the Community Leaders Igniting
  Change 12-week community leadership program.

PUBLICATIONS

2019
Burke, K. & Bhalloo, S. “‘I am in room 523’: Sexual harassment in the
context of #MeToo and #timesup.” Journal of Business Ethics
Education Case, 16.

2019
Burke, K. & Bhalloo, S. “‘I am in room 523’: Sexual harassment in the
context of #MeToo and #timesup.” Journal of Business Ethics
Education Teaching Note, 16.

2019
Bhalloo, S. & Burke, K. “Falsifying expense receipts: Everybody does it!”
Journal of Business Ethics Education Case, 16.

2019
Bhalloo, S. & Burke, K. “Falsifying expense receipts: Everybody does it!”
Journal of Business Ethics Education Teaching Note, 16.

2017
LILY LIN

Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, BC Canada V5A 1S6

Tel: 778-782-9729
Email: lily_lin@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC POSITION

2017 - present Assistant Professor, Marketing
Simon Fraser University

2013 - 2016 Assistant Professor, Marketing
California State University, Los Angeles

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Business Administration (Marketing), May 2013
Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

M.Sc., Psychology (Social Psychology), May 2008
Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada

B.A. (1st class), Psychology (Major), Commerce (Minor), May 2004
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

PUBLICATIONS (PEER REVIEWED)


**TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

*Assistant Professor, Marketing Area, Simon Fraser University*
- Introduction to Marketing, Summer 2017 (1 Section); Summer 2018 (2 Sections); Summer 2019 (2 Sections)
- New Product Development & Design, Fall 2017 (1 Section); Fall 2018 (2 Sections); Fall 2019 (2 Sections)

*Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing, California State University, Los Angeles*
- Principles of Marketing - Honours Program, Fall 2016 (1 Section)
- Principles of Marketing, Fall 2013 (1 Section); Winter 2014 (1 Section); Spring 2014 (1 Section); Fall 2014 (2 Sections); Winter 2015 (2 Sections); Spring 2015 (1 Section); Fall 2015 (1 Section); Winter 2016 (1 Section); Spring 2016 (1 Section); Fall 2016 (1 Section)
- Marketing Management in the Global Environment (MBA Core), Spring 2015 (1 Section)
- International Business, Spring 2014 (1 Section); Spring 2015 (1 Section)

*I Instructor, Marketing Division, University of British Columbia*
- Buyer Behavior, 2010 (1 Section)

**TEACHING DEVELOPMENT & TRAINING**

- Attendance at Teaching & Learning Luncheon (SFU), March 2017, April 2018, April 2019
- Attendance at Case Teaching Workshop (SFU), May 2018
- Attendance and Participation at California State University (CSU) Course Development & Redesign Workshops (CSULA), June 2015-January 2016
- Attendance at CSU Teaching Conference (CSULA), March 2015
Dr. Michael R. Johnson  
Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae

Employment History at Academic Institutions

September 2010 – Present  Senior Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University

September 2014 – 2017  Academic Director, Management of Technology (MOT) MBA Program, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University

September 1998 – 2010  Faculty, School of Business, Operations Management, BCIT

Other Employment History

June 2003 – 2004  Insight Engineering, Principal Consultant  
Vancouver, BC.

Toronto, Ontario.

September 1998 – 2001  Research Engineer, Vehicle Recycling Partnership (VRP),  
Highland Park, Michigan

June 1997 – 1998  Principal, Yellow Creek Consulting,  
Toronto, Ontario

February 1996 to Aug/96  Production Supervisor, Pirelli Cables Inc.  
Surrey, BC

November 1994 to Aug/95  Industrial Engineer, Seanix Technology  
Richmond, B.C.

Educational Background

Dept. of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering

M.A.Sc. (1994) University of Windsor, Windsor, Canada.  
Dept. of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering

Dept. of Industrial Engineering (Management Science Option).

Teaching History

Courses Taught at SFU:  
BUEC 232: Data and Decisions I (Business Statistics)  
BUS 336: Data and Decisions II (Introduction to Management Science)  
BUS 474: Supply Chain Management  
BUS 553: Business Analytics  
BUS 758: Business Operations Design  
BUS 831: Analyzing and Visualizing Data
Courses Taught at BCIT:
Business Statistics (OPMT 1130, 1208 and 1211)
Quantitative Methods for Business (OPMT 3301 and 3308)
Management Science (BUSP 3500, BUSA 3515, OPMT 2197)
Math Models for Business (OPMT 5751 and OPMT 4408)
Business Mathematics (OPMT 1110 and 1510)
Introduction to Operations Management (OPMT 1100)
Topics in Operations Management – Environmental Management (OPMT 4442)
Information Technology (OPMT 3344) / E-Commerce I (OPMT 4344)
Project Management (OPMT 1170)
Problem Solving and Process Improvement (OPMT 2201)
Synchronous Systems (OPMT 4465)
Total Quality Management (OPMT 1182)
Industrial Engineering (OPMT 1184)
Reliability Principles (OPMT 4446)
Advisor – Applied Industry Project (OPMT 4449)
Advisor – Process Improvement Project (OPMT 3341)

Selected Works


Notable Awards

TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching Award - Beedie School of Business, 2011.
Beedie School of Business – Teaching Honour Roll (9 years)
BCIT’s Excellence in Teaching Award – The School of Business, British Columbia Institute of Technology (1999).
Miremad Soleymanian

Contact Information
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Dr
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6
Phone Number: +1(778) 990 5241

Employment
Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada
Beedie School of Business
- Assistant Professor of Marketing

Education
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
Business Administration (Marketing)
- Doctor of Philosophy (P.h.D)

University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA
Statistics
- Master of Science

Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
Industrial Engineering
- Master of Science

Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
Industrial Engineering
- Bachelor of Science

Research Interests
- Insurtech Industry
- Machine Learning
- Dynamic Structural Modeling
- Bayesian Statistics
- Privacy issues

Honors and Achievements
- AMA-Sheth Doctoral Consortium Fellow, University of Leeds, 2018
- Quantitative Marketing and Structural Econometric Workshop Fellow, Northwestern University, 2015
- Research and Graduate Program Fellowship (also known as Grinter Award), Department of Statistics, University of Florida, 2012-2014

Publications in Referred Journals


Working Papers


• Saeed Kαrimifαrd, Miremαд Soleymanniaנ, Mehrdad Ghoṁi, “Comparision of Machine Learning Methods for Morphological Heart Arrhythmia.”

Non-Referred Publications


Conference Presentations

• Empirical and Theoretical (ET) Symposium, Guelph, ON
  “Usage-Based Auto Insurance: Savings vs. Privacy Considerations.” (Poster) 2018

• Marketing Science Conference, Los Angeles, CA
  “Sensor Data, Privacy, and Behavioral Tracking: Does Usage-Based Auto Insurance Benefit Drivers?” 2017

• Quantitative Marketing and Economics (QME) Conference, Evanston, IL
  “Sensor Data, Privacy, and Behavioral Tracking: Does Usage-Based Auto Insurance Benefit Drivers?” 2016

• Empirical and Theoretical (ET) Symposium, Lake Louise, Alberta

Academic Experiences

University of British Columbia
  • “Marketing Research COMM 365” (Undergrad), (Spring 2017)

University of Florida
  • “Engineering Statistics STA 3032” (Undergrad), (Spring 2014)
MISSION

Education can be entertaining.

My mission is to provide high quality instruction to students by utilizing humor, popular media, real world examples, and my own personal experiences to enhance engagement and retention of complex topics.

CONTACT

📞 +1 604 265 5542
✉️ scott_maceachorn@sfu.ca

SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS Office</th>
<th>SimpleTax</th>
<th>Quickbooks</th>
<th>VBA</th>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Freshbooks</th>
<th>Sage</th>
<th>Netsuite</th>
<th>Taxprep</th>
<th>CaseWare</th>
<th>Xero</th>
<th>Power BI</th>
<th>Mindbridge</th>
<th>Tableau</th>
<th>Relativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| English   | 100%      |            |     |         |            |      |          |         |          |      |          |            |         |            |
| French    | 50%       |            |     |         |            |      |          |         |          |      |          |            |         |            |
| Portuguese (BR)| 40%       |            |     |         |            |      |          |         |          |      |          |            |         |            |

EDUCATION

CPA, CA DESIGNATION
2008 - 2011
CA School of Business

BACHELOR OF COMMERCE
WITH DISTINCTION
2003 - 2007
University of Victoria

EXPERIENCE

VISITING LECTURER
Simon Fraser University
2018 - Present

PARTNER
Ledger/ Liberty Solutions Inc. - Accounting & Education Firm
2013 - Present
Develops unique courses and apps for CPAs. Formerly serviced the full accounting cycle needs for companies of all sizes, with an emphasis on small public companies.

EDUCATOR
2011 - Present
UBC Sauder Executive Education (ongoing)
Co-teach self-developed course ‘Building a Business Case’.

CPA Western School of Business (ongoing)
Session Leader for Capstone 1 & Associate Session Leader for Capstone 2.

Densmore Consulting Services Inc.
Trainer for Common Final Examination (CFE) & Uniform Final Evaluation (UFE) programs.

Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants
Marker of the Comprehensive portion of the 2012, 2013, and 2014 UFES. Multiple choice question developer for the CPA training program.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
2015 - 2018
Lite Access Technologies Inc. - Fibre Optic Cable Deployment Multinational
Responsible for initial public filings during the go public process, transition to TSX-V, three rounds of financing, expansion to United Kingdom, business strategy, tax strategies, subsidiary acquisitions, issuance of financial information, and cash management.

CONTROLLER
2011 - 2013
Canadian Nexus Ventures Ltd. - Junior Mining Management Company
Contracted to act as Controller for companies listed on the TSX and TSX-V within the junior mining and investment industries.

SENIOR STAFF ACCOUNTANT - ASSURANCE AND FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING
2006 - 2011
Ernst & Young LLP
Clients included mining companies in the exploration, development, and operational stages, as well as companies in the telecommunications and investment industries. Provided audit, T1 personal tax and T2 corporate tax services.
SHAFIK BHALLOO
1100-505 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C.
Email: Sbhalloo@sfu.ca  sbhalloo@kornfeldllp.com

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS

2004  York University, Osgoode Hall Law School
Graduated with an LL.M. in eBusiness Law

1996  Continuing Legal Education
Attained certification in Advanced Mediation

1986 to 1989  University of British Columbia, Law School
Graduated with LL.B. in 1989

1981 to 1985  Simon Fraser University
Completed B.A. (Honours) in Criminology

EXPERIENCE

2016 (May) to current  Associate Professor of Practice, Simon Fraser University
Teaching, researching and writing in the areas of Commercial law, Employment law and Business Ethics at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the Beedie School of Business. Involved in course designing of law and ethics courses.

Legal Counsel, Kornfeld LLP

2000 to May 2016  Partner, Kornfeld LLP
Practicing in the areas of Human Rights law, Administrative law, Civil litigation, Labour and Employment law, Commercial litigation and Insurance and Real Estate litigation. Acting as an adjudicator on the Employment Standards Tribunal (2006 to date). Adjunct Professor in the Beedie School of Business (2009 to date) and the School of Criminology (2005 to 2008) at SFU

1997 to 1999  Associate, Kornfeld Mackoff Silber LLP
Practicing in the areas of Labour and Employment law, Human Rights law, Corporate/Commercial litigation, General Civil litigation, Insurance law and Real Estate litigation. Participating as counsel in Labour and Commercial Mediations and Arbitrations.
1990 to 1996
Associate lawyer with Harris & Co, Freeman and Co and Miller Thompson
Practiced in the areas of Commercial and Civil litigation, Insurance law, Labour law, Employment law, Human Rights law. Appeared before the Supreme Court of British Columbia, British Columbia Court of Appeal, the Labour Relations Board and BC Human Rights Tribunal. Participated in Arbitrations and Mediations in civil and commercial as well as labour and employment matters.

ADJUDICATOR EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS TRIBUNAL

2006 to present
Tribunal Member on the Employment Standards Tribunal- Authored over 350 appeal decisions in employment disputes

TEACHING AWARDS

2018
Awarded TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching Award in the Beedie School of Business at SFU

2013
Awarded TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching Award in the Beedie School of Business at SFU

APPOINTMENTS AND MEMBERSHIPS

2006 to present
Appointed Adjudicator on the Employment Standards Tribunal

2014 to present
West Vancouver Police Board- Co-Chair on the Board and Chair of the Governance and HR Committees

2005 to 2007
Member, the Judicial Advisory Committee, Provincial Court of British Columbia

2003 to 2005
Member of the Vancouver Police Department’s Chief Constable’s Diversity Advisory Committee

1999 to 2002
Mediator – Conciliation and Arbitration Board, Ismaili Council for British Columbia

1998 to 1999
Legal Officer on the Ismaili Council for British Columbia

REFERENCES
Available upon request

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS
Available upon request
SRINI KRISHNAMOORTHY
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6, Canada
Srinivas.Krishnamoorthy@sfu.ca, 504.228.5261 (C)

EDUCATION
• PhD – Decision, Risk & Operations, 2005
  Columbia Business School, Columbia University, New York
• PGDM (MBA) - Finance, Operations & Information Systems, 1996
  Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow, India
• B.Tech – Mechanical Engineering, 1994
  Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India

ACADEMIC & PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
• Lecturer - Technology & Operations Management
  Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
  April 2017 – present
• Sessional Lecturer
  Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto
  Jan 2017 – April 2017
• Visiting Assistant Professor - Management Science
  A.B. Freeman School of Business, Tulane University
  July 2014 – Dec 2016
• Assistant Professor - Management Science
  Ivey Business School at Western University
  July 2005 – June 2014
• Research Analyst - Deming Center, Columbia Business School, Columbia University,
  2003-05
• Manager of Investments, Unit Trust of India, Mumbai, 1996-1998

TEACHING & RESEARCH INTERESTS
• Analytics of Winner-Take-All Markets
• Sports & Entertainment Analytics
• Revenue Management & Pricing Analytics

PEER REVIEWED ARTICLES
1. Pricing of Excess Inventory on Groupon
2. Pricing Strategies with Reference Effects in Competitive Industries
3. Writing ORMS/Analytics cases
4. Teaching ORMS/Analytics with cases
5. Competitive Revenue Management with Forward and Spot Markets
6. Dynamic Revenue Management Games with Forward and Spot Markets
PUBLISHED CASES
2. The Cascade on Broadway (Maclean K. and Krishnamoorthi S.), 2013, Ivey Publishing
4. The Fab Four of Tennis (Krishnamoorthi S. and Pinto J.), 2013, Ivey Publishing

INVITED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS
- AWOL – The Analytics Concepts Missing in our Courses
  1. INFORMS Annual Conference, Seattle, Oct 2019
  2. CORS Annual Meeting, Halifax, June 2018
- Glitz Investments
  3. INFORMS Case and Teaching Materials Competition at Annual Conference, Houston, Oct 2017
- Broadway Blockbuster Strategy - The Role of Stars and Musicals
  1. DSI Annual Meeting, Washington DC, Nov 2017
  2. POMS 2017, Seattle, May 2017

TEACHING AWARDS/HONOURS
1. Winner of 2017 INFORMS case competition for the case: Glitz Investments – Predicting a Blockbuster, Bajaj S., Bandyopadhyay S. and Krishnamoorthi S.
2. Dean’s Teaching Honour Roll, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2017-18, 2018-19)
3. Rotman School of Management Teaching Award of Excellence, University of Toronto (2016-17)
5. David G. Burgoyne Award for Outstanding Commitment to Student Development, Ivey Business School, 2006

EXTERNAL SERVICE
1. Chair for Education Session at DSI Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Nov 2019
2. Chair of the Education Cluster for CORS (Canadian Operations Research Society) Annual Meeting, Halifax, June 2018
5. Chair for Education Cluster at CORS Annual Meeting – Niagara Falls, 2012
6. Chair for Pricing and Revenue Management Session at CORS - INFORMS International Conference – Toronto, June 2009
7. Chair for Pricing and Revenue Management Session at INFORMS Annual Conference – Washington DC, October 2008
8. Judge for INFORMS Case Competition – Seattle, November 2007
9. Reviewer for Interfaces, INFORMS Transactions on Education, Naval Research Logistics, International Transactions in Operational Research, Socio-Economic Planning Sciences

PASTIMES
Playing squash, tasting wine, creating comedy, cooking, reading
Tom Culham P. Eng., MA. Sc, Ph. D.

CAREER PROFILE

An education professional with experience researching, teaching and managing in a postsecondary business environment. A former member of Weldwood of Canada Ltd. executive management team with proven effectiveness in implementing strategic organizational change, negotiating complex supply contracts and reducing total supply chain costs.

Research Interests

Currently conducting action research in postsecondary classes to evaluate the effectiveness of ethics pedagogy and evaluating the contribution of contemplative exercises to ethics education.

Education

Ph. D. awarded March 14, 2012; accepted without revisions Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University. Dissertation Title: Ethics Education of Business Leaders.

M.A.Sc. Transportation Engineering UBC Thesis Title: An Analytical Methodology for Short Run Urban Transportation Policy Questions

B.A.Sc. Civil Engineering University of Waterloo, Ontario

University Teaching and Management Experience 2005 - Present

SFU Beedie School of Business, Lecturer in Strategy, 2019 - Present

SFU Beedie School of Business, Visiting Lecturer 2014 to 2019

• 2014 to present BUS 303 Business Society and Society
• 2017 BUS 707 Business Ethics

city University of Seattle in Vancouver, Professor, Program Director School of Management commencing May 2017

• Responsible for management of the School of Management program in Vancouver including faculty hiring and management, & program quality

UBC Sauder School of Business, Sessional Faculty 2008 to 2017

• Teaching in the Operations and Logistics Division, undergraduate 3rd - 4th year and MBA level supply chain management and operations management courses.
• Teaching in the Organizational Behaviour and Human Resources Division, undergraduate 3rd - 4th year courses on ethics, critical thinking, and diversity management.

TRU (Thompson Rivers University) School of Business and Economics, Sessional Faculty, 2010-15

• On behalf of Thompson Rivers University delivered undergrad operations management course at Shanghai Institute of Technology June 2011-13.
• On behalf of Thompson Rivers University delivered undergrad operations management course at Tianjin University of Technology June 2010 and 2015

City University of Seattle in Vancouver School of Management, Senior Faculty, 2005-7

• Responsible for management of the School of Management program in Vancouver including faculty hiring and management, & program quality 2005-7

Research Funding Awards

2018-20 Morrison Foundation Award, Admin. by City University of Seattle in Canada

2017-18 Morrison Foundation Award, Admin. by City University of Seattle in Canada

2016 Morrison Foundation Award Admin. by UBC Maurice Young Center for Ethics

2013 –14 Clement Fung Chair of Asia Standard Hong Kong Administered by UBC Maurice Young Center for Applied Ethics

2008, 2009, 2010 Graduate Fellowship, Simon Fraser University

Recognition Awards

2012 Simon Fraser University Dean’s Convocation Medal:

2010 Paul Tai Yip Ng Memorial Award, best graduate student paper:
Refereed Contributions

Journal Articles


Books


Chapter Publications


Victor Song CV
(Short Version)

Employment
Lecturer in Finance, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, since Sept 2015

Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>BUS 418 D1/D2</td>
<td>3.84/4 and 3.79/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>BUS 418 D1/D2</td>
<td>3.89/4 and 3.75/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/D3</td>
<td>3.88/4 and 3.85/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/D3</td>
<td>3.86/4 and 3.73/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/BUS 418 D1</td>
<td>3.9/4 and 3.76/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/E1</td>
<td>3.85/4 and 3.9/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Evaluation Average: 3.85/4

Excellent Teaching Awards:
- Teaching Honor Roll, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2017.
- Teaching Honor Roll, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2016.
- Teaching Recognition Letters, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, Fall 2017, Spring 2017, Summer 2019.
- Teaching Excellence Award, Department of Economics, University of Calgary, 2012.
- Teaching Excellence Award, Graduate Students’ Association, University of Calgary, 2009.

Research

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles
Peer-Reviewed Policy Papers

Book Chapters

Working Papers
2. “Social Trust and Stock Price Crash Risk: Evidence from China,” with Kun Su. (Submitted)
4. “Puppy-Dog and Fatter Fat-Cat under Price-Matching,” with Kent Fellows

Services

Committees
- Design Committee for Master in Management program, Simon Fraser University, 2019.
- Beedie Finance Field School Director, since 2019.
- Beedie International Programs Committee, Simon Fraser University, 2018.
- Beedie Committee Teaching & Learning Committee, Simon Fraser University, 2016, 2017.
- Beedie Committee Communications Initiative Action Committee, Simon Fraser University, 2016, 2017.
- University Committee Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning, Simon Fraser University, 2016, 2017.

Student Supervision
- Serve as a main supervisor for Master of Science in Finance projects (2 projects)
- Serve as a second reader for Master of Science in Finance projects (30 projects)
Curriculum Vitae
Shauna Jones, MA

Work: 778-782-5568
EMAIL: SHAUNAJ@SFU.CA

Profile

Senior lecturer, facilitator, and coach with over twenty years’ experience developing and implementing curricula that focus on helping learners develop themselves into self-reliant, resilient and highly employable individuals. Proven track record delivering education related to collaboration, business communications, leadership, faculty development, and career management. Conduct Scholarship of Teaching and Learning research on teaching teamwork in post-secondary education.

Post-Secondary Teaching Experience

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
Burnaby, BC

Senior Lecturer, Faculty Teaching Fellow
September 2015 - present
Faculty Lecturer
2006-present
Visiting Lecturer
2003, 2005, 2006

- Collaboratively develop and teach the curriculum for BUS 202: Foundations in Collaborative Work Environments
  - Instruct and facilitate up to 90 students per section in this experiential course focusing on developing students’ self-awareness, awareness of others, and abilities to work in teams
  - Implement Explicit Team Learning to ensure students learn who best to work in teams while working on a team project
  - Supervise two teaching assistants per section
- Instruct students in a 13-week, 3rd-year mandatory, business communication course which focuses primarily on writing
  - Partner with industry professionals to create experiential learning for a semester-long student team assignment
  - Developed a peer-review component to the course in partnership with SFU’s Student Learning Commons to improve students learning and develop skills in providing constructive feedback
  - Supervise one teaching assistant per section each semester
- Design and update course material, assessments and lessons each semester taking a student-centred approach and using backward design
- Mark and grade student papers

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
Burnaby, BC
Instructor, Certificate Program in University Teaching and Learning
September 2013 - present

- Co-instruct this 13-week program for graduate students from multi disciplines to develop and refine their course design and teaching practice
- Provide feedback on students’ lesson plans and delivery, teaching philosophies and course design
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (CON’T)
Facilitator, Rethinking Teaching

- Facilitate small groups within this course for faculty designing or redesigning their courses
- Provide feedback and support to participants in this 4-day workshop

Spring 2015 & 2016

Service to the University

SENATE

Senate Appeals Board for Withdraws with Extenuating Circumstances (Alternate) 2018
Senate Appeals Board for Withdraws with Extenuating Circumstances (Member) 2015-2017

BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Member, Master of Management (MIM) Design Team present

- Contribute to the design of the MIM program, including proposal and course design

Member, Undergraduate Program Review Committee present

- Contribute to the review of the Undergraduate Program, including redesigning the program goals in collaboration with other members

Faculty Teaching Fellow & Member, Teaching and Learning Council present

- Support the transition from Committee to Council for teaching and learning at Beedie

Faculty Teaching Fellow & Chair/Co-chair, Teaching and Learning Committee September 2014 - present

- Lead this committee focused on supporting teaching and learning at Beedie
- Work closely with the Associate Deans and Dean to meet the teaching and learning priorities for the school
- Co/design, coordinate, and co/deliver professional development opportunities for faculty and sessionals

Coordinator, Teaching and Learning Group (TLG) December 2011 - present

- Coordinate TLG workshops that include acting as liaison with workshop presenters and ensuring the promotion of the workshops
- Collaborate with Teaching Fellow, Admin staff, and Associate Dean to produce the Teaching Newsletter
- Design, organize and coordinate, in cooperation with the Associate Deans, Educational Consultant and the presenters, Beedie’s annual Teaching and Learning Luncheon

TEACHING AND LEARNING CENTRE

Academic Planning Committee Member, STLHE Annual Conference, June 2015

Relevant Research Project

The Where and How Teams are Used, Taught, and Assessed Across Core Courses in a Business Undergraduate Curriculum. [Work In Progress], SFU Teaching and Learning Development Grant (Started January 2018 – work in progress) Collaborators: Shauna Jones and Anirban Kar

Education

Master of Arts in Leadership and Training 2002
ROYAL ROADS UNIVERSITY, Victoria, BC
Terri L. Griffith

Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
500 Granville Street
Vancouver BC V6C 1W6
Canada

+1 (650)-861-1961
+1 (236)-333-2311
TerriGriffith.com

Email: terri@terrigriffith.com

Education

Carnegie Mellon University
Graduate School of Industrial Administration (now the Tepper School of Business)

PhD Organizational Psychology & Theory (Focus: Technology Management) 1989

MS Organizational Psychology & Theory 1986

University of California, Berkeley

BA Psychology (Focus: Industrial/Organizational) 1983

Professional Employment

Simon Fraser University - Beedie School of Business
Keith Beedie Chair in Innovation and Entrepreneurship 2019-pres
Professor of Innovation and Entrepreneurship 2019-pres

Santa Clara University — Leavey School of Business
Professor of Management & Entrepreneurship 2001-2019
Associate Dean, Leavey School of Business 2015-2018
Chair, Department of Management & Entrepreneurship 2013-2015
Chair, University Coordinating Committee 2013-2014
Entrepreneurship Leadership Team, Leavey School of Business 2010-2017
Chair-Elect, University Coordinating Committee 2012-2013
Chair, University Taskforce on Communication & Collaboration 2011-2012

Hyperloop Transportation Technologies, Inc.
Crowd Advisor and Contributor 2016-Pres

Washington University - John M. Olin School of Business
Associate Professor of Org. Behavior & Technology Management 1998-2000

Visiting Positions & Affiliations

Center for Effective Organizations, USC: Affiliated Faculty 2018-Pres
Constellation Research, Inc.: Affiliate 2014-Pres
University of California, Berkeley, Haas School of Business 2000-2001
Editorial Positions

Senior Editor:

Associate Editor:
Group Decision & Negotiation (1996 to present)
ICIS (2000, 2010)

Guest Editor:

Panel Member:
National Science Foundation (multiple years)

Special Issue Editor:
Organization Science: Information Technology and Organizational Form and Function (2007, with Ray Zammuto, Ann Majchrzak, Deborah Dougherty, and Samer Fera)

Selected Publications


Jason Yiu Chung Ho

Associate Professor
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby BC Canada V5A 1S6

Email: jason_ho_3@sfu.ca
Phone: (778) 782-5836

Education:

Doctor of Philosophy in Marketing, 2005
The University of British Columbia, Canada

Master of Philosophy in Marketing, 2000
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Bachelor of Business Administration (First Class degree with Honors), 1995
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Research Publications


"Segmenting Consumers of Pirated Movies" (with C. Weinberg), Journal of Consumer Marketing, 28(4), 2011, p.252-260

"Viral Marketing: Motivations to forward electronic content" (with M. Dempsey), Journal of Business Research, 63, 2010, p.1000-1006


University and Post-secondary Teaching Experiences:

Simon Fraser University, Canada, 2007 - Present
Courses taught:
- Introduction to Marketing
- Marketing Research
- Customer Analytics
- Web Analytics
- Analytics Project (Business Analytics & Decision Making Certificate capstone course)
- Directed Studies: Bayesian Statistics (Jose D. Mora, doctoral student)


Ryerson University, Canada, 2005 – 2007
Course taught: e-Marketing

The University of British Columbia, Canada, 2003
Course taught: Introduction to Marketing

Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education, Hong Kong, 1998 – 2000
Course taught: Marketing and Professional Practice (Interior Design)

University and Academic Community Services:

Organizer, SFU Business Analytics Hackathon, Beedie School of Business, SFU, 2016-2019

Member, Steering Committee, Data Science Major, SFU, 2017-2020

Area Coordinator, Marketing Area, Beedie School of Business, SFU, 2011-2014


Coach of SFU marketing team in JDC West Business Competition 2009 & 2010

Member, Editorial Board, Journal of Interactive Marketing, 2014-Present

Member, Editorial Board, Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 2012-Present

Industry Experiences:

Carlsberg Brewery Hong Kong Ltd., Marketing Officer, Hong Kong, 1997 - 1998

Miller Brewing International Inc. / Dah Chong Hong Ltd., Marketing Officer, Hong Kong, 1995 - 1996
Susan Christie-Bell
38347 Peaks Place, Squamish, BC, V8B 0V9
Cell: 778-970-0234 / Email: susan_christie-bell@sfu.ca

ACHIEVEMENTS
Teaching Honour Roll, SFU Beedie School of Business
20-year Teaching Appreciation Award, Capilano University

EDUCATION
Master of Education Degree
Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC
2006

Business Administration Studies
Capilano University, Squamish, BC
1999

Tourism and Travel Certificate
Lasalle College, Montreal, QC
1985

Communications Studies
Concordia University, Montreal, QC
1984

Creative Arts Diploma
Marianopolis College, Montreal, QC
1981

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Teaching / Curriculum Development / Program Management


• Member of the development team for the BUS217W course; successfully piloted the course in Fall 2017, and have continued to develop the course since.

• Course lead responsible for the BUS217W and BUS201 courses for 2019-2020 academic year. Responsibilities include mentorship of instructional team and course administration.

• Experience in curriculum design and development of writing assessment tools. Active in learning and impact assessment at course and credential levels.

• Dedicated to continuous development and use of active and experiential learning strategies.

• Member of Capilano University Senate Curriculum Committee for five years, past Chair for School of Tourism Management Curriculum Committee, Convenor/Coordinator over 14 years within the School of Business, School of Communication, and the School of Tourism Management.

• Developed and delivered internationally recognized WorldHost customer service programs for 11 years with Destination BC: Service Fundamentals, Frontline Management Solutions, Japanese Service Expectations, Service Across Cultures, Customers with Disabilities, Service in Health Care.

• Trained, evaluated, and certified new instructors throughout Canada for Destination BC.

• Developed and conducted Human Resource Development Canada Employment Assistance Service programs and workshops for nine years - included Life Skills, Career Exploration, Job Search Strategies, and Project Management.

• Developed and delivered training seminars for airline and travel industry personnel, three travel information computer systems (Sabre, Apollo, Reservec)
Cross Cultural Communication / English as an Additional Language & International Education

- Conducted intense teacher training and cross-cultural initiation sessions for new instructors in Japan, including customer service expectations, classroom dynamics, principles of adult learning, and public speaking. Provided the Japanese executive management team with a personal evaluation of each trainee instructor's teaching skill, professionalism, and potential to be a valuable employee and effective instructor.
- Conducted cross-cultural communication skills classes for major Japanese corporations in Japan.
- Taught English as an Additional Language classes (private, group, corporate sessions) for beginner to advanced level students in Kobe, Osaka, Kyoto, and Tokyo, Japan.
- Conducted *English for International Business* classes for major Japanese corporations, including Nissho Iwai, Mitsubishi Bank, Eli Lilly Pharmaceuticals, and Daimaru Department Stores.

Business / Entrepreneurship

- Small business owner in the Sea to Sky corridor for seven years; experience with design and implementation of business and marketing plans.
- Administered Human Resource Development Canada (HRDC) Employment Assistance Service training programs through the Sea to Sky corridor.
- Experience in business management relating to planning, organizing, marketing, human resources, communications, and financial management.
- Extensive experience with written forms of business communication, including proposals, reports, and business letters.

**EMPLOYMENT HISTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>2011-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Capilano University</td>
<td>North Vancouver, BC</td>
<td>2001-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>TriUnity Learning Centre</td>
<td>Squamish, BC</td>
<td>1993-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Trainer (Contract)</td>
<td>Destination BC</td>
<td>Victoria, BC</td>
<td>1994-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Instructor (Contract)</td>
<td>L.I.N.C., Squamish</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1994-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer / Instructor</td>
<td>BIlingual Language Institute</td>
<td>Kobe/Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>1991-1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Gemini Group of Air Canada</td>
<td>Montreal, QC</td>
<td>1988-1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, UNIVERSITY**

**Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University**

- BUS201 Introduction to Business
- BUS217W Critical Thinking in Business
- BUS360W Business Communication

**School of Communication, Faculty of Business and Professional Studies, Capilano University**

- CMNS154 Communications in Outdoor Recreation and Tourism
- CMNS164 Advanced Communication and Interactions for Tourism Management International
- CMNS220 Advanced Business Writing and Editing
- CMNS250 Technical Writing
- CMNS305 Advanced International Interactions
- NABU335 North American Law and Effective Business Communication
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate
FROM: Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and Provost pro tem, and Chair, SCUP
RE: Full Program Proposal for Master in Management (SCUP 20-15)

DATE: April 28, 2020
PAGES: 1 of 1

At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the full program proposal for the Master in Management in the Beedie School of Business, effective Fall 2021.

Motion:

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the full program proposal for the Master in Management in the Beedie School of Business, effective Fall 2021.

C:
A. Gemino
A. Dastmalchian
Master in Management

Full Program Proposal

February 5, 2020
Beedie School of Business
SUMMARY

1) Proposed credential to be awarded

The proposed Master in Management (MiM) program is intended for recent university graduates with less than three years of relevant full-time work experience. The MiM program credential was chosen to clearly differentiate this program from MBA programming and to mirror established global MiM programs as demonstrated in the 2019 Financial Times MiM Program ranking. The Master in Management (MiM) is globally recognized as a pre-experience graduate program focused on management essentials for career launch. The growing importance of this credential is supported by an external report of MiM offerings by Hanover Research in Appendix D.

MiM students will come from non-business major undergraduate programs. The target market will be students from Simon Fraser University (SFU). Last year, 3,394 students graduated from non-business major SFU programs\(^1\). Demand for business education from non-business majors at SFU has been demonstrated through the Business Minor program, which currently serves 400 students. Business Minor graduates will also be admissible into the MiM program, providing them with additional business curriculum and the business-related co-curricular experience and career management services that the minor does not provide. Non-business major students are ideal candidates for the MiM as the program aims to bridge the gap between important critical thinking, research and communication skills provided in non-business major undergraduate education and the management/digital literacy skills demanded by employers for new labour market entrants.

The MiM will feature a core that combines people and performance enabling skills with digital literacy in the context of management and will culminate with a Strategic Applied Project. The management core will be complemented by career management services, co-curricular experiences and a stream made up of four courses. This structure is an educational platform that will complement students’ non-business major four-year undergraduate degree with a one-year graduate (4+1) experience designed to prepare students to more successfully enter the workforce. As the program grows, the intent is for the business school to work closely with other faculties at SFU to offer interdisciplinary streams that enable students to access expertise and graduate-level education across the university that will help them successfully leverage their undergraduate education and more effectively launch their careers (letters of intent have been received from the Faculty of Health Sciences; Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology; and, meetings have taken place with the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences).

2) Location of program

The program will initially be offered at the Burnaby campus using a blended approach that incorporates face-to-face and on-line components. This will allow for flexibility and the potential for the program to be offered in more locations as it grows. A benefit of designing the program around on-line components is to enable the program to be offered in locations outside of the Greater Vancouver Regional District, for example in Northern B.C.

3) Academic unit(s) offering proposed program

The Beedie School of Business (SFU Beedie).

---

\(^1\) The number of undergraduate degrees awarded in the 2018/19 academic year included 2,143 from the Faculty of Arts and Science, 714 degrees from the Faculty of Science and 537 degrees from the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology.
4) Anticipated program start date
Fall 2021.

5) Anticipated completion time
3 terms.

6) Contact information
Andrew Gemino, Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Beedie School of Business,
gemino@sfu.ca, 778-782-3653.

PROGRAM DETAILS

7) Aims, goals and/or objectives of the proposed program
The goals of the program are to enhance the employability of recent graduates from non-business undergraduate majors by providing them with transferrable management skills, co-curricular experiential opportunities and the relevant career management services needed to help launch their careers.

In considering the aims of the program, we first considered the need in the B.C. labour market. The British Columbia Labour Market Outlook: 2018 edition (Table 2.1, p. 12) notes that BC residents aged 29 or younger entering the labour force are expected to fill 50% of the 903,000 future job openings in BC over the next 10 years. Further, in considering the major occupational groups, the BC Labour Market Outlook (Table 2.6, p. 17) suggests:

"Within the 10 major occupational groups that are defined by Canada’s National Occupational Classification, more than half (51 percent) of the projected job openings in BC over the next 10 years will come from the top three occupational categories (Sales and Service, Business, Finance and Administration and Management)."


We identified four interdependent skill/knowledge categories that serve as the pillars of the program’s design foundation. These categories are Digital Literacy, People and Teams, Performance Enablers and Management Knowledge (Figure 1). Note that these should be viewed as interdependent categories as the knowledge and skills naturally blend and diffuse across each other.

Figure 1: MiM Program Skills Framework
Program learning goals were then developed from this skills framework. The learning goals combine the knowledge and skill categories within a management context. The highlighted words in the learning goals below are intended to bring attention to key objectives in the school’s mandate. These learning goals serve as the basis for course designs, learning assessments, career management, and co-curricular experiences. The program learning goals are:

1. Communicate an organization’s position and understand how natural, social, and cultural systems create opportunities and constraints for delivering on its mission.
2. Identify opportunities, develop a plan, create a budget and collaborate effectively to achieve complex innovation objectives in a team-based project environment.
3. Generate sustainable alternatives through global research and data analysis and apply multiple criteria to make evidence-based recommendations.
4. Use a systems approach to analyze an organizational process and propose an innovation that could create sustainable stakeholder and shareholder value.
5. Identify key messages, develop persuasive stories and create impactful visuals using technology that effectively communicates trends and recommendations to stakeholders.
6. Demonstrate emotional intelligence, an awareness of human behavior and the need for equity, diversity, and inclusion to collaborate and lead in global work environments.

8) How does the proposed program fit within the mandate of the institution?

The program aligns with SFU’s mission: "To be the leading engaged university, defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting edge research, and far-reaching community engagement. Equipping students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences that prepare them for life in an ever-changing and challenging world."

SFU’s support showcases its commitment to offer innovative education that features applied projects that engage the community. In particular, the program supports the mission by equipping post-secondary students with knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary in the future of work. The program learning goals align with the socially responsible, innovative and global perspective elements made explicit in the Beedie School of Business’ (SFU Beedie) calling: "We develop innovative and socially responsible business leaders with a global perspective through education, inspired by research and grounded in practice."

9) How does the proposed program support the current academic and strategic plan of the institution?

The MiM program aligns with SFU’s Academic Plan 2019-24 by addressing 4 of the 5 challenges identified within the plan. Specifically, the MiM program addresses the following challenges:

- **Academic Quality/Curriculum**: Innovating program delivery including blended on-line and face to face programming and flipped classroom instruction.
- **Engagement**: Placing an emphasis on experiential learning with the inclusion of community-integrated learning projects, possible international partnership opportunities, and optional community-based internships.
- **Bridging Divides**: A single stream has been detailed in this proposal, but the intention is to build multiple streams that incorporate faculties other than Business. We have already sought interest from other faculties around this opportunity. The streams provide a mechanism for partnerships with other faculties across interdisciplinary boundaries. The School of Interactive Arts and Technology (SIAT) is committed to working with Beedie to include the Graduate Certificate in Visual Analytics as a stream within the MiM.
- **Faculty Renewal**: Providing opportunities for faculty to further develop graduate program/course design and instructional skills as well as increasing the tuition revenue to support the faculty complement.

10) **Target Audience**

MiM students will be recently graduated, non-business undergraduate majors, including those that have completed a Business Minor, from Simon Fraser University (SFU) or students working through a non-traditional pathway. The program will be of special interest to those who wish to obtain more management knowledge and career management experience post-graduation so that they can be better prepared to enter the changing labour market.

To better understand the target audience, we have relied on information from the BC Student Outcomes, collected in the Annual Surveys for BC Baccalaureate Studies by program area. In the 2018 survey of 2016 graduates, Q. 24 (p. 4) indicated 41% of Arts and Science graduates categorized their main job 2 years after graduation as Business, Finance & Administration or Sales and Services, but Q. 21 (p. 4) shows that 45% of these students indicated their main job was not very related, or not at all related, to their program of study. In contrast, students in the Business and Management program area, Q. 24 (p. 4) shows that 82% of students indicated their main job was Business, Finance & Administration or Sales and Services and Q. 21 (p.4) shows that 84% of students indicated their main job was either somewhat or very related to their program.

To gain further insight into our target audience, we surveyed non-business major students (including active Business Minor students) from SFU who expressed interest in the program. Respondents were asked a series of survey questions to better understand: why they pursued their degree of study; what their career goals are; how they feel about graduation and their career prospects; and, if they have plans to further their education. The respondents also provided their initial feedback on the proposed MiM. Appendix I includes the survey questions.

Survey responses included participants from the Faculty of Arts and Social Science, (47.1%), Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (35.3%), and other faculties (17.6%). Although there was a relatively equal split between students who expressed positive emotions about graduation and students who felt neutral or negative about it, about 40% of respondents did not feel their current experiences would help them in their future career pursuits. These results closely mirror the BC Student Outcome statistics. After the respondents were provided with a brief description of the proposed program, approximately 82% indicated their interest in the MiM program stating reasons such as: obtaining foundational management knowledge; more education in project and team management; practical knowledge; and, the benefits of an internship or co-op experience.

11) **Related programs in the institution or other British Columbia post-secondary institutions and outside of British Columbia**

The growth of MiM programs has increased over the past 20 years, originating in Europe and then expanding to North America and Asia. According to the 2019 Graduate Management Admissions Council Application Trends Report (p.28) "among programs that accept GMAT scores the number of business Master’s (3,389) exceeded that of MBA programs (3,283)." A comparative analysis of Master in Management programs was conducted by Hanover Research (Appendix D) which highlighted industry trends among 10 comparable institutions in North America and Europe.

Related programs include the Master of Management program offered by UBC (MM), and the proposed Master of Management at University of Victoria (MM) as well as the Master of International Business (Queen's University), Master of Management (York University, Schulich School of Business) and the Master of Management at the University of Calgary, Haskayne.
School of Business. All related programs in Canada fall into the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code 52 -Business, management, marketing, and related support services. The subcategory for the MM at UBC, for example, is 52.02- Business administration, management, and operations. The local programs primarily, but not exclusively, attract students who are internal to their University. These students are often pre-experience, non-business major students. On a national scale, SFU’s proposed MiM is differentiated by its focus on the future of work skills as described earlier in Section 7.

On an international scale, there are a large number of global options for MiM as noted in the 2019 Financial Times MiM Ranking. Top schools include: HEC Paris; London Business School; Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University; IE Business School; and, Università Bocconi. This suggests that top business schools have recognized the need to add MiM programs as an important part of their graduate offerings.

12) What differentiates the proposed program from all other related programs in the province?

The first differentiator is the curriculum. Both the UBC MM and the UVic MM and other graduate programs within SFU Beedie have a curriculum designed around business functional areas (finance, accounting, operations, etc.). This is an accepted design principle underlying the majority of business graduate programs. The SFU Beedie MiM program takes a less traditional design path. Having conducted an extensive review of needs for future labour market skills (Appendix E) we incorporated digital literacy and people skills at the center of the design for this program. This is evident in the program learning goals provided on page 4. Digital literacy is essential for students to be successful in the future and, in parallel, people skills and the ability to collaborate are at the forefront of the digital age; these skills often drive automation and technological innovation. By having a program that integrates people skills with digital literacy, and focusing these skills through performance enabling techniques in the context of management, the program will more uniquely equip students to be successful in the workforce and tackle emerging challenges integrating technology and automation.

The second differentiator of the proposed program is the target market. A large number of UBC Master of Management (MM) students complete the MM degree as a continuation of their bachelor degrees and the proposed UVic MM requires students to complete prerequisites offered in UVic's undergraduate programs. These programs offer education largely, but not exclusively, to students within their institution. The SFU Beedie MiM will similarly recruit primarily from within SFU's current pool of non-business major undergraduate students. The BC Labour Market Outlook suggests a large number of potential jobs in this area, considering that half of the over 900,000 jobs in B.C. will be filled by people under 29 and half of these jobs will be in NOC’s associated with management.

The MiM curriculum is additionally differentiated from other programs, such as an undergraduate business minor, through a design focus on the reinforcement and application of management skills at a graduate level; specifically, through the graduate stream that is required in the program that a business minor does not provide. As an example, The Business Minor program at SFU offers only 4 courses in 300 or 400 level and does not offer integrated career management services or co-curricular support for Minor students, whereas, the MiM design specifically integrates career management and co-curricular services and hence must charge graduate business tuition to provide
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2 This series comprises instructional programs that prepare individuals to perform managerial, technical support, and applied research functions related to the operation of commercial and non-profit enterprises and the buying and selling of goods and services.
the services. The experiential components and graduate cohort experience present a different level of training than a traditional undergraduate Business Minor program can provide.

It is important to note that as the program grows, the intent is to increase the number of streams in the program. For simplicity, we have started with a single stream from Business, but we expect future streams will be offered by faculties other than Business. Letters of support from other faculties suggest that the streams are possible and desirable. This interdisciplinary potential would also differentiate the program and we have worked to create the structural platform necessary to work collaboratively with other faculties in offering this program. The number of streams will be determined by the success of recruitment for the program.

The final differentiator is the opportunity to offer the program on-line to non-traditional students outside of the lower mainland; for example, Northern BC Communities as noted earlier. Combined with a non-traditional pathway that prepares students for graduate management education, the MiM could deliver education to communities historically underserved by graduate education. SFU Beedie has a 20-year history of offering the Graduate Diploma in Business Administration (GDBA) completely on-line demonstrating our success in providing the technological platform to deliver on-line graduate management education. Moreover, given SFU Beedie’s experience in delivering the EMBA in Indigenous Business Leadership, the MiM program could enable increased access to graduate management education to indigenous and non-indigenous community members outside of the lower mainland to better support the career transitions, digital literacy and management expectations associated with the future of work in Northern communities.

13) An overview of the level of support and recognition from other post-secondary institutions, and relevant regulatory or professional bodies

Active consultation within the community has occurred throughout the design of this program. Feedback has already been incorporated into iterations of the design and will continue as the development of the program continues. Letters of support for the program can be found in Appendix C. Letters include those from SFU’s Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology and Faculty of Health Sciences, the University of Victoria’s Gustavson School of Business, Royal Roads University’s School of Management, Thompson Rivers University’s School of Business and Economics, the Vancouver Economic Commission, Proctor and Gamble, the Greater Vancouver Board of Trade, the Royal Bank of Canada as well as others.

As a regulatory body, the Beedie School of Business is accredited by both the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the European Federation for Management Development’s Quality Improvement System (EQUIS). As part of the accreditation mandate, SFU Beedie undergoes continuous improvement reviews through the Assurance of Learning (AoL) process to ensure that we have the resources, processes, policies, and programs in place to deliver the highest possible standard in business education.

14) What added value will the proposed program offer graduates in terms of employment opportunities?

Added value from the program first comes from closing the skills gap and increasing knowledge and skills that are needed in the labour market. The BC Student Outcome annual baccalaureate survey 2018 suggests Arts and Science students could benefit from more skill development associated with the NOC’s for Business, Finance & Administration and Sales and Services.

Added value also comes from the set of experiences and applied projects that will enable students to not only reinforce their knowledge and skills, but also demonstrate these competencies for employers. Career management is tightly integrated within the program to ensure students can clearly communicate their MiM competencies and experiences in job interviews. The program will
also provide optional internships that are offered competitively as part of the career management services. We expect employers will be attracted by the potential for internships with these graduating students.

Finally, the added value of personal and professional connections that the students will develop within their cohort and alumni network will be of significant importance as the program grows. Alumni of business programs regularly note how vital these network connections are as they develop their careers.

15) Do potential employers require a degree for graduates to gain employment in the field?

According to the BC Labour Market Outlook (2018), as well as current employers that we have consulted with, there is an increasing requirement to have a graduate degree to gain employment. In the next 10 years, it is expected that 36% of job openings will require a bachelor’s, graduate or professional degree while 77% of job openings will require some level of post-secondary education or training (BC Labour Market Outlook, 2018). It is anticipated that the supply of jobs will outweigh the demand for those entering the market and “a moderate increase in the percentage of young people in post-secondary education will be required to match people to the projected job openings” (BC Labour Market Outlook, 2018, p. 15). The changing demographics suggest that a higher participation rate in graduate education will also be required to adequately fulfill demand.

16) Potential areas/sectors of employment for graduates and/or opportunities for further study in the field

In the emerging labour market, there is a shift toward recognizing the value of a more diverse set of career skills. Through our interviews with relevant employers, this became more apparent. Below are some sample interview responses we received regarding the concept of the MiM:

**Seaspan:** “There is an increasing need for more technical roles to understand the business function and process. We are seeing this a lot more in Business Analyst capacities, where we require a strong technical understanding of certain concepts and the ability to tie it all together from a meaningful business acumen.”

**SAP Canada:** “I think [the instruction of the MiM] will be a key differentiating factor as it is easy to be a developer who just codes, but it is a lot harder to be a developer who not only codes, but can see why he/she codes what she/he codes, can communicate well and articulate what he/she is doing, can think end to end ... [and] shows critical thinking skills and understanding of the business as well.”

**Proctor & Gamble:** “P&G is interested in recruiting diverse talent and we often get different skill sets from different disciplines.”

With these results in mind, the career programming throughout the program as well as the program curriculum will aim at preparing students to launch their careers in diverse areas. As students gain years of experience in the workforce, there is the potential for them to transition into higher level or more in-demand jobs or return to university for additional education in either a Master of Business Administration or Executive MBA. These programs require particular levels of management experience, not initially accessible by MiM students, but represent established opportunities for further studies with career experience.

17) Does the proposal lead to a specific occupation?

The program will focus on providing general management knowledge and skills integrated with digital literacy and people skills needed for a wide variety of future of work positions. The MiM
occupational outcomes are directed toward the NOC's with the largest projected job openings over the next 10 years.

18) What labour market needs would the proposed program meet for the province?

As noted earlier, the British Columbia Labour Market Outlook: 2018 edition (Table 2.1, p. 12) suggests that BC residents aged 29 or younger entering the labour force are expected to fill 50% of the 903,000 future job openings in BC over the next 10 years. Further, in considering the major occupational groups, the BC Labour Market Outlook (Table 2.6, p. 17) suggests: "more than half (51 percent) of the projected job openings in BC over the next 10 years will come from... Sales and Service, Business, Finance and Administration and Management."

Therefore, these foundational skills are the focus of the program’s curriculum and will influence future employment in the following areas:

NOC 1122 Professional occupations in business management consulting
NOC 2171 Information systems analysts and consultants
NOC 4163 Business development officers and marketing researchers and consultants
NOC 6411 Sales and account representatives – wholesale trade (non-technical)

In combination with the BC Students Outcomes Annual Survey for BC Baccalaureate Studies report, there is a clear opportunity to close the skills and expectation gaps for Arts and Science majors by providing graduate management skill education for recent graduates. This education should better prepare a larger number of students for the top three National Occupation Classification (NOC) categories requiring over 461,000 jobs in BC over the next 10 years.

19) Plans for admissions and transfer within the British Columbia post-secondary education system

An Undergraduate Degree with a Business Minor provides a strong foundation for admissions to the MiM. For applicants outside of the Business Minor, other equivalent coursework may be required for admissions, in addition to an Undergraduate Degree.

20) Enrolment Plan

Enrolment in the program is estimated at 40 students per cohort with approximately 70% domestic and 30% international students. With a 12-month program, all students are expected to be full-time. No part-time students are anticipated. As SFU maintains a 3-term system, the program has the potential to start in any of the 3 terms. Student demand and preferences will determine which term the program will begin.

SFU Beedie has maintained an average graduation rate of 92% in graduate programs over the past decade and the faculty would anticipate similar retention/graduation rates with the MiM program. As the program is planned for 3 terms, we estimate 92% retention rates and hence, high graduation rates. We would then estimate approximately 37 students would complete the program from an initial cohort of 40. Table 1 provides a summary of the expected enrolment for the MiM.

Table 1: Enrolment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
<th>2023/24</th>
<th>2024/25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Students Completing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial students in cohort</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students per cohorts</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cohorts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sections /cohort</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Course Sections</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first year of the program (anticipated in Fall 2021) will feature 1 cohort. The program is expected to grow one cohort per year over the next 4 years. This would suggest that the MiM Program would grow to a total of 4 cohorts by 2024/25 with the expectation that the number of credentials awarded in 2021/22 through to 2024/25 would be 37, 74, 112 and 149 respectively. It is expected that one of these four cohorts could be offered on-line if the opportunity arises.

Due to the high expected costs arising from career management services, experiential learning and applied community projects, the minimum viable cohort size is estimated at 24 students. This includes an analysis of direct, administrative and faculty costs. Cohorts smaller than 24 students will result in net losses to the program and should not be run.

21) Delivery methods

Courses will use a blended approach incorporating face-to-face and on-line components enabling the program to be offered at any of the three SFU campuses (Burnaby, Surrey, and Vancouver) to promote the efficient use of existing University resources.

The program will be supported by Canvas - SFU’s learning management system - as well as in-class instruction. The MiM cohort offered on-line would feature technology-enhanced courses designed to maximize student engagement. It is anticipated that the on-line program will feature some face-to-face opportunities to orient the students and build personal networks. The program will feature high levels of instructor and peer feedback delivered with a blend of asynchronous and synchronous activities.

In addition to core course requirements, there will be consistent career programming, an applied project component, and an optional internship or exchange offerings. We will not offer guaranteed internships for all MiM students so that students face the competitiveness of the job market they will soon be entering.

In preparation for a diverse applicant pool, a small set of on-line admission pathway courses are envisioned to prepare students from various undergraduate backgrounds to ensure they can successfully complete the MiM core requirements. This preparatory pathway may include courses in communications, financial literacy, accounting, digital literacy, and personal productivity. Some of these courses could be waived for students with previous work experience or evidence of existing skills. These preparatory courses will provide an avenue for non-traditional students to be admitted with confidence from different educational and life-experience backgrounds.

22) Eligibility for scholarships, awards, and financial aid

MiM students will not be able to apply for scholarships and awards associated with BASS funding. Students may be eligible for external and donor funded internal scholarships, awards, and financial aid, so long as they meet the other eligibility criteria.

23) Does the proposed program offer an alternative exit, if appropriate?

Students facing unplanned events or circumstances will be able to exit the program with a Graduate Diploma in Management after completing 24 units of the program.

24) Resources required and/or available to implement the program

This program will require additional staff and faculty and have delivery costs similar to other graduate program offerings.

The additional recruitment, admission, career services, and operational staff will be completely supported by the share of tuition provided by SFU to the program. As the program matures, economies of scale can be found by building on existing staff operations.
The additional instructional costs, estimated at 12 sections\(^5\) in year 1 and moving to 56 sections in year 3, will be covered by new faculty and temporary instructors. These additional faculty costs, including benefits, will also be covered by a share of tuition but only in cohorts larger than 24. Teaching loads will initially be impacted as the Beedie School continues to push to recruit more faculty over the next five years as indicated in Beedie’s 2018-2023 Five-Year Academic Plan. The goal is to move to an increased number of faculty members by 2023 as it will provide the increase in teaching load necessary to offer the MiM program.

To implement the program, startup costs will be allocated for an Academic Director, program designer, project manager and learning management technician. These startup costs will be covered by the Beedie School of Business as an investment that will be recovered by the School through tuition revenue over the first four years of the program.

25) Program evaluation and academic/administrative oversight

Program oversight will be provided by the appointed Academic Director as well as three SFU Beedie graduate committees: The Graduate Programs Committee (GPC), the Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) and the Graduate Assurance of Learning Committee (GALC).

GPC is an operational committee made up of the Associate Dean, Academic Directors and senior staff that establishes and manages graduate program guidelines and procedures; whereas, the GCC is a decision-making body concerning graduate curriculum, defined as: learning objectives and the overall outline of a course and its content. As a general guideline, one faculty member from each area of concentration is assigned to the GCC to allow for a holistic and robust review of the curriculum. The GALC is responsible for ensuring that all Graduate programs specify and adopt learning goals, objectives and rubrics that allow for the measurement of student learning. This supports accreditation and program quality.

26) Faculty member’s teaching/supervision

The MiM will feature team-based applied projects rather than thesis-based project work. This provides students with an important applied experience while reducing individual faculty supervision requirements and the impact on faculty resources that is necessary in thesis-based programs. An academic director for the MiM will serve as the graduate supervisor for students in the program.

As identified in Beedie’s 2018-2023 Five-Year Academic Plan, faculty hiring is a strategic priority. The goal is to increase the core faculty numbers through 2022/23. Another part of the faculty renewal planning includes consideration of the appropriate mix of rank/position for our continuing faculty members. Based on internal financial modeling, balanced with consideration of research output, it is suggested to utilize a combination of tenure track faculty and teaching faculty (lecturers, senior lecturers, and university lecturers). It is also expected that the MiM program will need to integrate practitioner faculty in the program. The ties to industry professionals provided by practitioners are essential in a program focused on career development and community engagement. Given the practical focus of the MiM, Professors of Practice will naturally be utilized more directly.

Additional faculty will be needed as the program grows. It is also expected that program revenues will fund additional faculty needs. The program will also serve as a means for developing graduate

\(^5\) Sections refers to the number of classes offered with different professors and time slots. There may be several sections (Section D100, E200, E100) of the same course (BUS 201)
instructional skills for faculty members and serve as a bridge for further development of graduate teaching abilities that will benefit all graduate programs within SFU Beedie.

27) Is the program focus primarily on meeting social benefit(s) or economic benefit(s)?

The program will provide both social and economic benefits by aligning movements in labour demand with student knowledge and skills that directly support these changing needs. This will bridge the gap between academic skills provided in the students’ post-secondary education and the more practical management skills that are demanded in the job market today. Students will be able to professionalize their undergraduate major knowledge with management skills needed for the future labour market, become more competitive in the job market through career management services, and make their resumes more attractive to potential employers by highlighting demonstrated competencies related to the future of work.

Regarding economic benefits, we recognize that students and their families make large investments of time and money to complete any degree, and particularly for Masters degrees. The potential earnings associated with these degrees are of key importance to students making decisions about their education.

A report from Statistics Canada regarding the payoff of a graduate degree indicates that “women and men with a master’s degree in business and related studies earned 28% and 27% more, respectively, than those with a bachelor’s degree in the same field (p. 7).” The report also notes that students with a master’s degree in business and related studies were more likely to work as senior and specialized managers (38%) than those with a bachelor’s degree in the same field (24%). The report also suggests that “These students also had higher earnings than bachelor’s degree holders in these occupations; for example, among men, specialized managers with a bachelor’s degree in business and related studies earned $108,000, while those with a master’s degree earned $126,400 (p. 7).” These results provide evidence that the investment in Master level education in the proposed program has the potential to bring significant economic benefits over time that normally far exceed the initial tuition invested in the program.

28) How would the proposed program advance social goods or government priorities?

The program can initially support two strategies initiated by the BC government: 1) the Creative Economy initiative; and 2) the Emerging Economy Task Force. The Creative Economy initiative is an important economic driver in BC and includes arts and culture, film, television, music, publishing, and the interactive and digital media industries. Recently graduated undergraduate majors in the Arts with additional skills in digital literacy and management, would be an important source of human resources, entrepreneurship, and growth for the creative economy. Streams within the MiM program featuring the creative economy would provide an excellent source of future management leaders for the creative economy.

The Emerging Economy Task Force for BC could also benefit from the education provided by the MiM program. Several of the program learning goals for the MiM include considerations of environment issues and technological innovation. These skills are particularly relevant to the emerging economy. The MiM program is designed for students who are interested in developing
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4 Wall, Katherine; Zhao, John; Ferguson, Sarah-Jane and Rodriguez, Carlos. (2018). “Results from the 2016 Census: Is field of study a factor in the payoff of a graduate degree?” Catalogue no. 75-006-X, ISSN 2291-9840
skills for the future of work include the ability to analyze and implement transformative technologies and innovations that will change business and society over the coming decades.

The skills development proposed in the MiM program generally supports the strategic direction of the Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training by providing students in BC with the skills and competencies needed to enter the workforce and access well-paid, in-demand jobs to support an inclusive economy.

29) What social, cultural, regional, community, environmental, institutional and/or intellectual benefit would the proposed program provide?

The “Calling” of the Beedie School of Business supports the vision of innovative and socially responsible business leaders with a global perspective. The values underlying this vision suggest that business education has the potential to spark new ideas, fuel social innovations, and advance society as a whole. Through teaching and learning powered by world-class research, meaningful community engagement, and a global outlook, SFU Beedie has the potential to take business education beyond the traditional academic environment and empower people from diverse, non-traditional backgrounds and perspectives to reimagine the role of management in tackling society’s most significant challenges.

This program will use innovations in pedagogy and technology to create the potential for graduate interdisciplinary programming for students to meet future labour market demands. As noted earlier, the on-line options suggested in the MiM program may provide a platform for extending further graduate education options to Northern BC. This will help provide the people in these communities with the skills necessary to generate sustainable economic growth that continues the development of the emerging economies in BC. The MiM has the potential to prepare more students for their careers and connect them to current and emerging opportunities in BC’s economy and beyond.

30) How would the proposed program support economic growth and/or government economic priorities?

The program will support sustainable economic growth in BC by educating a larger number of post-secondary students with skills that better match the emerging skills being demanded in the BC economy. In addition, the program may provide increased graduate education options to communities that have traditionally received fewer opportunities for graduate education so that these communities can also participate in the jobs resulting from the changes in labour demand. Graduate post-secondary education will be essential for access to these emerging jobs and this program provides additional graduate post-secondary opportunities.

31) What direct and/or indirect economic, industrial or labour market benefits would the program offer the student, community, region or province?

The program provides direct economic, industrial and labour market benefits in better meeting forecasted gaps in labour market demand with targeted post-secondary education. As noted earlier, the 3 largest NOC’s (BC Labour Market Outlook, 2018) include Sales and Services, Business, Finance and Administration and Management which represent over 50% of job openings of the next 10 years. The MiM program targets the skills essential in these NOC’s. As an example, the 2018 BC Baccalaureate Studies in the program area of Arts and Science indicated 41% of 2016 graduates categorized their main job as Business, Finance & Administration or Sales and Services but Q. 21 (p. 4) shows 45% these students indicated their main job was not very related, or not at all related, to their program of study. The benefit would be to reduce the skills gap identified by graduates in the BC Baccalaureate Study and to increase the successful transition of early-career non-business undergraduate majors into emerging labour markets. This should, in turn, create more
successful hiring, more rapid progression through the ranks and more successful and diverse organizations that could further contribute to environmentally sustainable, socially responsible economic growth.
APPENDICES

Master in Management
Full Program Proposal
APPENDIX A

Calendar Entry
MiM
Master in Management

Description of Program
The Master in Management (MiM) will enhance the employability of recent graduates from non-business undergraduate majors by providing them with transferrable management skills, career management services and relevant experiential opportunities needed for employment. The program will feature a core of management courses that combine people skills with digital literacy and performance enablers all grounded in the context of management.

Admission Requirements
Applicants must satisfy the University admission requirements as stated in Graduate General Regulation 1.3 in the SFU Calendar. Admission into this program is competitive. Meeting the minimum University requirements does not guarantee acceptance. Applicants will be assessed on their work, volunteer and community experience, other achievements, and letters of reference.

For more information or to discuss program fit, contact Beedie School of Business.

Program Requirements
This program consists of course work and an optional internship for a minimum of 42 units. Course work may be substituted at the discretion of the academic director.

Students must complete all of

- BUS 580- Enabling Results Through Collaboration (3)
- BUS 581- Making Decisions with Data (3)
- BUS 582- Accounting Literacy in Organizations (3)
- BUS 583- Creating Value in Organizations (3)
- BUS 584- Managing Projects (3)
- BUS 585- Financial Literacy in Organizations (3)
- BUS 586- Marketing and Sales (3)
- BUS 587- Applied Project (3)
- BUS 591- Strategic Applied Project (6)

and the requirements from the stream below

Digital Innovation Stream

- BUS 588- Strategic Consulting and Advising (3)
- BUS 589- Business Solutions Design (3)
- BUS 590- Innovation and Change Management (3)
- BUS 592- Special Topics (3)

Program Length
Students are expected to complete the program in three terms.
Other Information

**Internship**
Students may take an optional internship after the completion of all course requirements.

**Strategic Applied Project**
Strategic applied project does not need to be deposited to the library.

**Academic Requirements within the Graduate General Regulations**
All graduate students must satisfy the academic requirements that are specified in the graduate general regulations, as well as the specific requirements for the program in which they are enrolled.
APPENDIX B

New Courses
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>580</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling Results Through Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results Through Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as “This course will...” or “The purpose of this course is...” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop ability to harness talents and expand personal and team capacity to solve a complex organizational problem. Students will work to develop themselves as a high performing team. Students will deepen their existing knowledge about teaming and collaboration while working to solve an organizational problem. As part of the process, they will also continue to increase their awareness of self and others. By the end of this course, students should know how to develop and support a high-performing team in their organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale for Introduction of this course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See attached Masters in Management proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35 hrs of blended instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of offerings/year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated enrollment per offering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prerequisite and/or Corequisite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal record check required?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes is selected, add this as prerequisite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional course fees?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus where course will be taught</strong></td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Northern Way</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Components</strong></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading Basis</strong></td>
<td>Letter grades</td>
<td>Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>In Progress / Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeat for credit?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total repeats allowed?</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeat within a term?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required course?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final exam required?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capstone course?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined with a undergrad course?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.*
**RESOURCES**

If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Shauna Jones, Susan Christie-Bell, Kathleen Burke, Kate Dilworth, Tom Culham

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

---

**CONTACT PERSON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL**

A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FACULTY APPROVAL**

The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content.

Overlap check done?  ✔ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commit to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

---

**SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)**

Library Check:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Attribute</th>
<th>Course Attribute Value</th>
<th>Instruction Mode</th>
<th>Attendance Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If different from regular units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Progress Units</th>
<th>Financial Aid Progress Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
BUS 580: Enabling Results Through Collaboration

Course Description
In a world of uncertainty, complexity, volatility, and ambiguity, organizations are faced with increasing challenges. Harnessing the power of high-performance teamwork, and understanding your strengths and weaknesses as a team player, will be crucial to solving complex and meaningful problems. CEOs, CPOs and NGOs state that we need to "increase our capacity to collaborate" not just in our institutions, but also across institutional boundaries and sector boundaries if we are to make a difference in the world (Scharmer, 2019).

Enabling Results Through Collaboration develops students’ ability to manage oneself and others: to expand capacity within and for themselves and others to solve a complex organizational problem. Research shows that the best way to learn about collaboration is to collaborate. Drawing on recent and pivotal team research, students will work to develop themselves as a high performing team. Students will deepen their existing knowledge about teaming and collaboration while working to solve an organizational problem. As part of the process, they will also continue to increase their awareness of self and others. By the end of this course, students should know how to develop and support a high-performing team in their organization.

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:

- Reflect on your own management strengths and weaknesses
- Recognize and define the characteristics of collaborative teams and know when it is advantageous to use teams
- Demonstrate empathy and emotional, social and cultural intelligence in working with their teams and organizational partner
- Discuss and recognize the organizational context of teams
- Apply the processes of teamwork including stages of development, cycles, cooperation and competition, and communication to achieve desired results
- Experience, work through and reflect on issues teams face, such as conflict, power and social influence, decision-making, leadership, problem-solving, creativity and diversity
- Harness the power of individuals and critical thinking to create high-performing teams for the purpose of achieving organizational objectives

Subjects/Topics
In each module students will have a theoretical and practical component. The theoretical components are listed below. The practical components will have students' complete tasks and processes for to their team development.

Module 1: Characteristics of High Performing Teams
Module 2: The processes of Teamwork through 5 Lenses
Module 3: A Deeper Dive into Relationship Theory
Module 4: Decision Making, Communication & Meetings
Module 5: Cooperation and Competition
Module 6: Hosting Productive Conflict 1
Module 7: Hosting Productive Conflict 2
Module 8: Problem Solving
Module 9: Power & Social Influence
Module 10: Organizational Context of Teams

Book and Materials
   - ISBN# 978-1-4833-7834-3
2. Selected readings may also be provided on Canvas or through external links

Learning and Assessments

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENTS – 40%

Reflective Learning Portfolio – 25%
Students will complete a weekly reflection and submit to their online Learning Portfolio. The purpose of the portfolio is to have students reflect on their learning and what it means to them. They will learn as part of this assessment. The instructor will pose questions and make comments to prompt more thinking and expand the students learning about teaming and collaboration and the part they play as an individual: what works, what doesn't, what they still grapple with, and "aha" moments, to name a few.

Case Analysis – 15%
Students will be provided with a team case where they respond to questions to demonstrate how they might apply their semester long learning to another organizational situation.

TEAM ASSESSMENTS – 60%

Experiential Collaboration Project – 40%
Students will collaborate in teams of 4-5 members in an experiential project with an NGO to solve an organizational issue or challenge. They will develop their skills in collaboration while solving a complex problem that could not be solved individually. Students will report to the organization’s representatives as well as their instructor. Students will submit:

1. A project plan and team agreement (5%) which outlines the team’s understanding of and goals for the project, their norms, agreed on guidelines for working together, and performance criteria on which each member will be evaluated.

2. An assessment and project update (15%) presenting their findings mid-point through the project to ensure they are on the right track with their organizational partner. This will be presented to and followed by a discussion with the organizational partner. The team will use the feedback to move forward with the project.

3. A final presentation (20%) offering their findings and recommendations to the organizational partner. Teams will draw on the learning from previous courses on how to present data and recommendations in a purposeful and persuasive manner.

Final Team Debrief Interview – 20%
Your team will meet with your instructor and one other person (a TA or organizational partner) where you reflect on your process, learning, and application around collaboration and how you have met the course learning objectives. This debrief will be more of a conversation or question period than an actual "oral report" or "presentation". You will be asked questions to see how you applied the course content to effectively collaborate on the experiential collaboration project. All members must be present to receive a grade.
**Assessment summary**

**Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Reflective Learning Portfolio</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Experiential Collaboration Project</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Plan &amp; Team Agreement</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment &amp; Project Update</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Final Presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Team Debrief Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Note on Grading:** 40% of a student's team grade is subject to his/her contribution to the entire team project. All team members will assess his/her contribution to the overall project, and they will provide a percentage reflective of this contribution. The instructor will assign the contribution score based on submissions by team members using the Team Agreement as a reference.
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg, PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg, 810)</th>
<th>581</th>
<th>Units (eg, 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Making Decisions with Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course title (max. 100 characters)</th>
<th>Making Decisions with Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is..." If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)

The fundamentals of statistical analysis, data visualization and business analytics with an emphasis on how to communicate effectively with data in a collaborative team environment. Working with a variety of data sources and software, work in teams to learn how to conduct descriptive and inferential statistics and apply it to business decision making. Understand tools for cleaning and preparing data sets in order to investigate relationships between variables, and to create visualizations to derive meaningful insights. More advanced topics will investigate modelling business decisions using analytical tools such as predictive analytics, multiple regression and decision analysis. Work in teams to develop and interpret models in a variety of applications to business decision making.

Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg, Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of offerings/year</td>
<td>Twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course delivery (eg, 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>35 hours of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

n/a

Prerequisite and/or Corequisite

n/a

Criminal record check required? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Additional course fees? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Campus where course will be taught

[ ] Burnaby [ ] Surrey [ ] Vancouver [ ] Great Northern Way [ ] Off campus

Course Components

[ ] Lecture [ ] Seminar [ ] Lab [ ] Independent [ ] Capstone [ ]

Grading Basis

[ ] Letter grades [ ] Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory [ ] In Progress / Complete

Repeat for credit?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Total repeats allowed? 0

Repeat within a term?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Required course?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Final exam required?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Capstone course?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Combined with a undergrad course?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Michael Johnson, Srini Krishnamoorthy, Jason Ho, Miremad Soleymanian

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

Academic Unit / Program Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair) Email
Beedie Graduate Programs Stephanie Reimer stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

Graduate Program Committee Signature Date
Department Chair Signature Date

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by PGSC to the chairs of each PGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

Faculty Graduate Studies Committee Signature Date
Andrew Gemino 

January 8, 2020

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Senate Graduate Studies Committee Signature Date
Jeff Derksen 

MAR 16 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check:
Course Attribute: __________________________
Course Attribute Value: _____________________
Instruction Mode: __________________________
Attendance Type: __________________________
If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units: ___________________
Financial Aid Progress Units: _______________
BUS 581: Making Decisions with Data

Course Description
In this course, students will learn the fundamentals of statistical analysis, data visualization and business analytics with an emphasis on how to communicate effectively with data in a collaborative team environment. Working with a variety of data sources and software, students will work in teams to learn how to conduct descriptive and inferential statistics and apply it to business decision making. This course presents tools for cleaning and preparing data sets in order to investigate relationships between variables, and to create visualizations to derive meaningful insights. More advanced topics will investigate modeling business decisions using analytical tools such as predictive analytics, multiple regression and decision analysis. Students will work in teams to develop and interpret models in a variety of applications to business decision making. A capstone assignment will require student teams to communicate statistical findings using visualization and storytelling techniques.

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:

- Work with team members to solve complex real-life business issues using sophisticated and real data sets.
- Apply basic data cleansing and preparation techniques. Conduct exploratory data analysis to visualize data using a variety of perspectives.
- Understand the use of descriptive and inferential statistics in the context of business decision making.
- Apply critical thinking, judgement and creativity in the context of data and statistical interpretation.
- Apply an analytics mindset to ask the right questions, collect data, prepare it and conduct statistical analysis.
- Apply statistical and analytical techniques to develop business intelligence insights, and present them in a compelling way to enable smart and sustainable business decisions.
- Develop and evaluate decision models related to risk, capital investments and strategic business decisions.
- Conduct predictive analytics using time-series methods to forecast business data.
- Develop a multivariate predictive model that demonstrates reliable predictors. Understand the context of qualitative (or categorical information) and how it can be modeled using regression analysis.
- Communicate findings within individual and team-based environments using visualization and storytelling techniques.

Subjects/Topics
Module 1: Descriptive Statistics
Descriptive statistics, appropriate use and application. Interpret statistics (including strengths and limitations) in the context of business decisions.

Module 2: Visualization I
Data preparation, cleansing techniques and the identification of outliers and their potential consequences. Exploratory data analysis using visualization tools. Create a variety of visualizations to explore relationships and develop meaningful insights.

Module 3: Visualization II
Advanced topics in visualization including using multiple data sources and cross-joins, calculated fields and the creation of interactive dashboards and story boards. Topics in storytelling with data with applications and examples.

Module 4: Hypothesis testing for comparative groups
Hypothesis testing for comparative groups. Independent and dependent t tests for comparative analysis. Create visualizations that support the investigation of relationships between two variables.

Module 5: Simple Linear Regression
Development of a simple linear regression model to investigate relationships between data and the development of a predictive tool. Interpretation and validation of key properties of the statistical model. Transformations and non-linear relationships.

Module 6: Multiple Regression
Multiple regression. Interpretation and validation of key properties of the statistical model.

Module 7: Predictive Analytics I
Time-series methods for forecasting and prediction including stationary, trend and seasonal effects.

Module 8: Predictive Analytics II
Advanced methods for predictive analytics. Apply methods to evaluate the accuracy of comparative predictive models.

Module 9: Decision Analysis I
Decision Analysis applied to managerial problem solving. A variety of approaches will be investigated to model and evaluate business decisions (payoff tables, tree diagrams and decision trees).

Module 10: Decision Analysis II
Sensitivity analysis to understand uncertainty and risk associated business decisions (Monte Carlo simulation, data tables).

Book and Materials

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

** Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Final Exam</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Assignment #1: Descriptive Statistics Case Study</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment #2: Vizathon Competition</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment #3: Predictive Analytics Case Study</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New Graduate Course Proposal

**Course Subject (eg. PSYC)**  BUS  
**Number (eg. 810)** 582  
**Units (eg. 4)** 3  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course title (max. 100 characters)</th>
<th>Accounting Literacy in Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)</td>
<td>Accounting Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as “This course will...” or “The purpose of this course is...” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)

An understanding of generally accepted accounting principles and the ability to use and interpret financial reports. Business drivers, analysis techniques and a deeper understanding of organizational opportunities and challenges to effectively use financial data to support management decisions and planning.

Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>35 hours of blended instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of offerings/year</td>
<td>twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses) | n/a |

| Prerequisite and/or Corequisite | n/a |

| Criminal record check required? | Yes |
| Additional course fees? | Yes  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus where course will be taught</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Surrey</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Components**

- ✔ Lecture
- ✔ Seminar
- ✔ Lab
- ✔ Independent
- ✔ Capstone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Basis</th>
<th>✔ Letter grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Progress / Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeat for credit?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total repeats allowed?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat within a term?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final exam required?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone course?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Combined with a undergrad course? | Yes |

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course
Scott MacEachern, Fereshteh Mahmoudian, Jamal Nazari
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done?  ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check: 
Course Attribute: 
Course Attribute Value: 
Instruction Mode: 
Attendance Type: 
If different from regular units
Academic Progress Units:
Financial Aid Progress Units:
BUS 582: Accounting Literacy in Organizations

Course Description
This course assumes no prior knowledge of accounting or exposure to accounting courses. Students will be provided with basic accounting and financial knowledge to strengthen decision-making with respect to resource allocation for value-creation.

Students will be provided with the knowledge and capabilities needed to work with accounting and finance departments of various companies. This includes an understanding of generally accepted accounting principles and the ability to use and interpret financial reports. Business drivers, analysis techniques and a deeper understanding of organizational opportunities and challenges will feed into preparing students to effectively use financial data to support management decisions and planning.

Objectives
The course objective is to enhance a business professional's use and understanding of accounting tools and processes, and enhance cross-collaboration with Finance colleagues. By the end of this course, students will:

- Demonstrate an understanding of core accounting principles (e.g. accrual accounting, historic cost, etc.) and the reasoning behind these,
- Critically evaluate financial statements and relationships between financial statement accounts,
- Demonstrate an understanding of the informational content within management reporting,
- Demonstrate a deeper understanding of management reports and cost analysis, leading to more insightful management decision-making,
- Apply enhanced use of budgeting and forecasting techniques for planning and monitoring of performance against plans, and
- Demonstrate an understanding of how to manage working capital to maximize cash flows.

Subjects/Topics

Module 1: Introduction to Accounting
What is accounting and how useful is accounting information? Who are the users of accounting information, what are their needs and what are the costs and benefits of meeting these needs? What is the difference between management accounting and financial accounting? What are the different forms of businesses that require accounting?

Module 2: Measuring and Reporting Financial Position
An overview of the three major financial statements and the relationships between them, followed by a comprehensive introduction to the statement of financial position. Identification and classification of assets and liabilities. Valuation and impairment of assets. Business entity, historic cost, prudence, going concern and dual aspect accounting conventions.

Module 3: Measuring and Reporting Financial Performance
An introduction to the income statement, revenues, cost of sales, gross profit, expenses, and net income. Accrual accounting concepts including revenue recognition criteria, the impact of long-term contracts, and situations where expense may be greater or less than cash outflows. Depreciation via the straight-line and reducing balance methods. How the costing of inventories impacts cost of sales and how difficulties collecting accounts receivable can impact the income statement.
Module 4: Analysing and Interpreting Financial Statements
Using financial ratios to examine the financial health of a company. Identification of primary financial ratio classifications, including profitability efficiency, and liquidity. Focus on key ratios including the current ratio, acid test ratio, earnings per share, and P/E ratio.

Module 5: Relevant Costs for Decision Making
What is meant by 'cost', relevant cost, opportunity cost, and sunk cost. Performing cost-benefit analysis with consideration of these costs.

Module 6: Cost-Volume-Profit Analysis
Cost behaviour of fixed, variable and semi-fixed costs. Finding the break-even point when a company shifts from a loss position to profitability. The contribution margin ratio, margin of safety, and achieving a target profit. Using marginal analysis to consider only costs and revenues that vary with a decision to assess opportunities including: entering contracts, efficient use of scarce resources, make-or-buy decisions, and closing or continuation decisions.

Module 7: Full Costing

Module 8: Managing Working Capital
The importance of working capital and its component parts. Establishing policies to control working capital by managing inventories, cash, trade receivables and trade payables.

Module 9: Budgeting
How budgets link with strategic plans and objectives. Time horizons, importance of budgeting, how budgets link to one another, and the budget-setting process. Incremental versus zero-base budgeting. Preparation of static and activity-based budgets.

Module 10: Accounting for Control
Using a budget to exercise control over the business. Variances in sales, materials, labour and overhead, with explanations for these variances. Standard quantities and costs and setting these standards.

Book and Materials
   • ISBN# 978-129-2183-763
2. https://www.myaccountinglab.com
3. Selected readings may also be provided on Canvas or through external links

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.
** Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Weekly Quizzes</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Assignment</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>583</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Creating Value in Organizations**

**Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)**  
Creating Value

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is...) If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description:

Analyzing how organizations create value, or impact, is a foundational skill for management. The analysis begins with an understanding of an organization's value chain and the processes it uses to achieve value and extends to the Business Model Canvas to explore an organization's model for value creation. Develop skills in analyzing processes from a customer perspective using a design thinking approach and explore customer experience using customer journey maps. Design process innovations using a service design approach. Develop skills in product life-cycle assessment using a systems perspective, and use a design thinking approach to propose reductions in environmental impacts within a product life-cycle.

Rationale for introduction of this course:
See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of offerings/year</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)  
35 hrs of blended instruction

Estimated enrollment per offering  
40

Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses):

Prerequisite and/or Corequisite  
n/a

Criminalrecord check required?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No  
If yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

Additional course fees?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Campus where course will be taught  
[ ] Burnaby  
[ ] Surrey  
[ ] Vancouver  
[ ] Great Northern Way  
[ ] Off campus

Course Components *  
[ ] Lecture  
[ ] Seminar  
[ ] Lab  
[ ] Independent  
[ ] Capstone

Grading basis  
[ ] Letter grades  
[ ] Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory  
[ ] In Progress / Complete

Repeat for credit?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No  
Total repeats allowed?  
0

Repeat within a term?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Required course?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No  
Final exam required?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No  
Capstone course?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Combined with a undergrad course?  
[ ] Yes [ ] No  
If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

*See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES

If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Andrew Gemino, Andrew Harries, Kate Dilworth, Sarah Lubik

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL

A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL

The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content.

Overlap check done? Yes

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)

Library Check:
Course Attribute:
Course Attribute Value:
Instruction Mode:
Attendance Type:

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:
Financial Aid Progress Units:
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BUS 583: Creating Value in Organizations

Course Description
Analyzing how organizations create value, or impact, is a foundational skill for management. The analysis begins with an understanding of an organization's value chain and the processes it uses to achieve value and extends to the Business Model Canvas to explore an organization's model for value creation. You will develop skills in analyzing processes from a customer perspective using a design thinking approach and explore customer experience using customer journey maps. From this foundation you will be able to design process innovations using a service design approach. Finally, you will develop skills in product lifecycle assessment using a systems perspective. This integrated perspective will enable you to propose reductions in environmental impacts within a product lifecycle.

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:
- Describe an organization's value chain
- Analyze value creation using a business model canvas
- Analyze a customer's experience using customer journey map
- Use service design framework to redesign a process
- Create a life cycle assessment of a product or service
- Design an innovation that address an environmental issue in a life cycle assessment

Subjects/Topics
Module 1: Strategic Analysis and the Value Chain
Introduces strategic analysis using competitive advantage and the value chain. Considers the global supply chain and value generation.

Module 2: Business Model Canvas
Explore an organization's value creation model using the Business Model Canvas. Use the idea of minimum viable product and challenge yourself to identify the smallest element of a product that could provide value to the customer.

Module 3: Design Thinking
Work through the 5 stages of design thinking and understand the importance of empathy, ideation, defining, prototyping and testing ideas.

Module 4: Customer Experience Mapping
Introduces the customer experience map that expresses the customers level of engagement/frustration with an existing process. Develop skills in customer journey mapping and analysis. Understand the importance of the customer/stakeholder perspective.

Module 5: Service Design
Explore the activity of planning and organizing components of a service to improve its quality and the interaction provider and customers. Service design uses a design thinking approach to enact a process of change for an existing service.

Module 6: Lean Management
Define a value stream and develop an experiment intended to improve value for customers for the value stream. Suggest how the value can be pulled through the system by the customer.
Module 7: Systems Thinking and Life Cycle Assessment
Introduces basic foundations of general systems theory and open systems. Uses Life Cycle Assessment as a systems technique to assess environmental impacts across stages of a product's life from raw materials through processing, manufacture, distribution, use, repair and disposal/recycling.

Module 8: Process Innovation
Apply the tools you have learned (design thinking, journey mapping, lifecycle assessment) to translate an idea into an innovation that creates value or impact. Identify an opportunity in your life cycle assessment and suggest a process innovation that can make an environmental impact.

Module 9: Presenting your Innovation
Reinforce your learning by presenting your group innovation proposal that describes an environmental impact on an existing produce or service.

Module 10: Reflecting on Creating Value
Discuss what is meant by "value" in organizations. Consider your role in value creation and the role of intellectual property in value creation. Consider the difference between intreprenuers and entreprenuer.

Book and Materials
10. Selected readings may be provided on Canvas or through external links.

Videos and External Links
Innovation Overview
Guy Kawasaki – Art of Innovation
Leyla Acaroglu, Paper beats Plastic - Ted Talk 2013
Service Design – A Tale of Two Coffee Shops

- Why is innovation the buzzword right now? (Links to an external site.)
- 5 steps to creating an innovation mindset (Links to an external site.)
- 5 ways to master the new innovation game (Links to an external site.)
- 3 ways that new technologies are accelerating innovation

Learning and Assessments
**Assessment summary**

Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

"Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1: Business Model Canvas</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2: Customer Journey Mapping</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Assignment 3: Group Lifecycle Assessment</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment 4: Group Innovation Presentation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>584</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course title (max. 100 characters)</strong></td>
<td>Managing Projects</td>
<td><strong>Managing Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course description for SFU Calendar (course description should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is..." If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description):**

Project management skills will be developed using both plan-based and agile approaches. Agile methods will include SCRUM techniques. Project management techniques are reinforced with development of a business case using data from enterprise systems. Data integration skills, including structured query language, are introduced and used to develop and present a business case.

**Rationale for introduction of this course:**

See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</th>
<th>35 hours of blended instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of offerings/year</td>
<td>twice a year</td>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Equivalent courses (courses that replicate the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses) | n/a |

| Prerequisite and/or Corequisite | n/a |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal record check required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional course fees?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus where course will be taught</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Great Northern Way</th>
<th>Off campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Components</th>
<th>☑ Lecture</th>
<th>☐ Seminar</th>
<th>☐ Lab</th>
<th>☐ Independent</th>
<th>☐ Capstone</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Basis</th>
<th>☑ Letter grades</th>
<th>☐ Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>☐ In Progress / Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeat for credit?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>☑ No</th>
<th>Total repeats allowed?</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Repeat within a term?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>☑ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>☑ No</th>
<th>Final exam required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>☑ No</th>
<th>Capstone course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>☑ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined with an undergraduate course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>☑ No</th>
<th>If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course
Kamal Masri, Andrew Gemino, Blaize Reich
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
Academic Unit / Program
Beedie Graduate Programs
Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)
Stephanie Reimer
Email
stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.
Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each PGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check:________________________
Course Attribute:______________________
Course Attribute Value:_______________
Instruction Mode:_____________________
Attendance Type:______________________

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:_____________
Financial Aid Progress Units:_________
BUS 584: Managing Projects

Course Description
Getting things done requires vision, planning, analysis, coordination, determination, and the foresight/courage to pursue opportunities when they emerge. Project management skills will be developed using both plan-based and agile approaches. Agile methods will include SCRUM techniques. Project management techniques are reinforced with development of a business case using data from enterprise systems. Data integration skills, including structured query language, are introduced and used to develop and present a business case.

Pre-Requisites

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:
- Create a work breakdown structure to plan a project
- Use agile methods to define and work towards project objectives
- Develop data skills to integrate data across enterprise systems.
- Reinforce data skills by creating a business case for a proposed change.
- Create presentation on the business case and make a recommendation.

Subjects/Topics
Module 1: Project Management I
Develop skills in work breakdown structures, activity dependencies and work package constraints to create a project plan with cost estimates and timelines.

Module 2: Agile Project Management
Use techniques from SCRUM methods to design a series of weekly sprints that will result in successfully completing the final project in the course. Participate in a stand-up meeting.

Module 3: Project Management II
Develop a simple communication plan to support coordination. Use a risk management framework to estimate project risk and suggest mitigation activities to manage risk.

Module 4: Creating a Business Case
Explore the elements of a business case and understand the important of storytelling in developing an effective business case.

Module 5: Enterprise Systems
Understand enterprise systems using the context of global supply chains and the importance of the supply chain in BC economy.

Module 6: Enterprise Data Overview
Introduce enterprise data integration, the foundations of relational database and accessing data. Use the contexts of global supply chain to show integration challenges.

Module 7: SQL Skills and Data Integration
Develop introductory skills in SQL and basic scripting to create data to integrate data from multiple systems around an operational issue.
Module 8: SQL Skills and Business Case Support
Reinforce data skills by integrating and using data to support a business case around an opportunity for improvement.

Module 9: Applying Data Skills
Work in team environment to complete a business case for opportunity.

Module 10: Presentations: Business Case
Reinforce learning and integrate aspects across Modules 1 - 9 by presenting the development of a business case.

Book and Materials
5. Selected readings may be provided on Canvas or through external links

Videos and External Links
Work Breakdown Structure
Dan Pink: The Puzzle of Motivation
Yves Morieux: 6 Rules
What is a business case?
Using SQL

Learning and Assessments
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

** Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assignment #1: SQL Data Integration Assignment</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment #2: Business Case Vision Statement</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Assignment 3: Agile Sprints Definition</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment 4: Business Case Presentation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>585</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Course title (max. 100 characters)**

**Financial Literacy in Organizations**

**Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)**

**Financial Literacy**

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as “This course will…” or “The purpose of this course is…” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)

Economic models that influence and affect business management. Understand how consumers and firms make economic and business decisions and how they interact in markets. Understand major decision-making areas confronting modern financial managers today. A general understanding of financial markets and how they can be used for personal finance. Covers traditional subjects such as capital budgeting, net present value, risk/return, capital structure and corporate governance.

Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

**Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Frequency of offerings/year**

twice a year

**Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)**

35 hrs of blended instruction

**Estimated enrollment per offering**

40

**Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)**

n/a

**Prerequisite and/or Corequisite**

n/a

**Criminal record check required?**

Yes [ ] if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

Additional course fees?

Yes [ ] No [x]

**Campus where course will be taught**

Burnaby [x] Surrey [x] Vancouver [x] Great Northern Way [ ] Off campus

**Course Components**

[ ] Lecture [ ] Seminar [ ] Lab [ ] Independent [ ] Capstone

**Grading Basis**

[ ] Letter grades [ ] Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory [ ] In Progress / Complete

**Repeat for credit?**

Yes [ ] No [x]

Total repeats allowed? 0

Repeat within a term?

Yes [ ] No [x]

**Required course?**

Yes [x] No [ ]

Final exam required?

Yes [ ] No [x]

**Capstone course?**

Yes [ ] No [x]

**Combined with a undergrad course?**

Yes [ ] No [x]

If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

| * See important definitions on the curriculum website. |
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RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

**Victor Song, Jan Simon**

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content.

Overlap check done?  ✔ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check: __________________
Course Attribute: __________________
Course Attribute Value: __________________
Instruction Mode: __________________
Attendance Type: __________________

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units: __________________
Financial Aid Progress Units: __________________
BUS 585: Financial Literacy in Organizations

Course Description
The objective of the first part of this course is to introduce students to economic models that influence and affect business management and students will learn how consumers and firms make economic and business decisions and how they interact in markets.

The focus of the second part is the major decision-making areas confronting modern financial managers today. Provides a general understanding of financial markets and how they can be used for personal finance. Covers traditional subjects such as capital budgeting, net present value, risk/return, capital structure and corporate governance.

Objectives
By the end of this course, students will:

- Utilize key economics concepts of the theory of the firm in practice
- Identify different market settings and their impact on firms
- Employ economic tools and theories in resource allocation problems
- Utilize key financial analysis tools
- Understand the relationships between investment, operational and financing decisions
- Interpret financial statements and analyze corporate financial performance
- Set appropriate internal financial targets and evaluate a company’s capital structure
- Understand how capital structure affects firm valuation
- Understand the role of corporate governance in practice

Subjects/Topics
Module 1: Consumer behavior
Introduce and explain preferences and utility; budget sets; optimal choice and derivation of a demand function.

Module 2: Firm behavior
Introduce opportunity costs, sunk costs, depreciation, the user cost of capital and economic profit; profit maximization; cost minimization.

Module 3: Market structure
Introduce and explain monopoly, oligopoly, imperfect competition, Nash equilibrium and other pricing strategy.

Module 4: Measuring a Nation’s Income and Cost of Living: GDP and CPI
Introduce key macroeconomic variables of interest, national income, unemployment, inflation, interest rates, growth rates, and exchange rates.

Module 5: Financial Markets and Net Present Value
Introduce the basic concept of financial market in a perfect competitive environment and explain the concept of net present value.

Module 6: The Time Value of Money
Introduce the concept of opportunity cost and how to measure the time value of money by using the concept of opportunity cost.

Module 7: Net Present Value and Other Investment Rules
Introduce why NPV rule is the dominant rule for financial forecast, and explain why the other investment rules serve as complements.

**Module 8: Net Present Value and Capital Budgeting**
Introduce the projected earnings generated by a project or investment as part of a business plan.

**Module 9: Capital Structure: Basic Concepts and Limits to the Use of Debt**
Introduce the interaction between equity and debt and explain the benefits and cost for the use of debt financing.

**Module 10: Corporate Governance**
Introduce the importance of corporate governance for the firm valuation and the basic mechanisms of corporate governance.

**Book and Materials**

**Learning and Assessments**

**Assessment summary**
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

**Please remember that as per graduate grading policies, group assignments should not add up to more than 50% of the total grade.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class participation</th>
<th>Midterm Exam</th>
<th>Final Exam</th>
<th>Assignment #1</th>
<th>Assignment #2</th>
<th>Assignment #3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>586</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Marketing and Sales**

**Course title (max. 100 characters)**

**Marketing and Sales**

**Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)**

**Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is...")**

Progress within organizations and society depends not only on innovative ideas but also on persuasion—the ability of innovators to get others to accept these ideas. This course is designed to provide students with a road-map from understanding organizations' and consumers' marketing environments, to collecting and interpreting marketing data, to creating innovative marketing strategies, to effectively communicating these strategies and ideas. The foundations of the course include: (1) an introduction to marketing concepts and research (including digital marketing), (2) the development of a brand (for products, services or people including yourself), (3) presentation design and delivery, and (4) strategic selling and storytelling.

**Rationale for introduction of this course**

See attached Masters in Management Proposal

**Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)**

35 hours of blended instruction

**Estimated enrollment per offering**

40

**Frequency of offerings/year**

twice a year

**Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)**

**Prerequisite and/or Corequisite**

**Criminal record check required?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

**Additional course fees?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Campus where course will be taught**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Great Northern Way</th>
<th>Off campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Course Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grading Basis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter grades</th>
<th>Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>In Progress / Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Repeat for credit?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total repeats allowed?**

0

**Repeat within a term?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Required course?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Final exam required?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Capstone course?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Combined with a undergrad course?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Lily Lin, Andrew Harries, Miredad Soleymanian
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)

Library Check:
Course Attribute:
Course Attribute Value:
Instruction Mode:
Attendance Type:
If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:
Financial Aid Progress Units:
BUS 586: Marketing and Sales

Course Description

Progress within organizations and society depends not only on innovative ideas but also on persuasion – the ability of innovators to get others to adopt these ideas. This course is designed to provide students with a roadmap from understanding organizations’ and consumers’ marketing environments, to collecting and interpreting marketing data, to creating innovative marketing strategies, to effectively communicating these strategies and ideas.

The foundations of the course include: (1) an introduction to marketing concepts and research (including digital marketing), (2) the development of a brand (for products, services or people including yourself), (3) presentation design and delivery, and (4) strategic selling and storytelling.

Objectives

The overall objective of this course is to provide students with a set of skills that will enable them to position, promote and sell ideas, services and products to colleagues, partners and customers. These skills are essential in the rapidly evolving workplaces of the future.

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:
- Identify innovative ideas and marketing opportunities through market research
- Simplify ideas and build compelling vision for products or services
- Segment markets and define personas at the centre of those segments
- Build effective branding and marketing strategies
- Develop and enhance their personal brand (some employers are now expecting their recruits to have a strong personal brand: https://www.forbes.com/sites/glennllopis/2013/04/03/personal-branding-is-a-leadership requirement-not-a-self-promotion-campaign/#49abe8ae2261)
- Develop the ability to communicate knowledgeably and persuasively about marketing communications and professional presentation skills.

Subjects/Topics

1. Defining Your Offer
   What problem are you solving, for whom, what alternative ways can they solve the problem, why would they find your offer more compelling that the alternatives

2. Personas, Segments and Positioning
   Defining Personas. What binds them together to form segments? What criteria do they use most heavily to make a purchase decision? Positioning statements and maps.

3. Brand Development

4. The Marketing Mix: An Introduction (Part 1)
   Building your go-to-market plan. Introduction to the 4 P’s.

5. The Marketing Mix (Part 2) & Digital Marketing
   Integrate the three components of marketing planning, namely situational analysis, STP, and the marketing mix in a non-traditional marketing context. Guest lecture from digital/social marketer on the state of the art in maximizing the effectiveness of your marketing spend.
6. The Marketing Mix (Part 3) & Integrated Marketing Communications
Putting integrated marketing communications into practice. Designing effective marketing campaigns for local companies.

7. Highly Effective Presentations & Storytelling
How to build and deliver highly effective presentations. Presenting marketing campaign to local businesses.

8. Strategic Selling: An Introduction (Part 1)
An introduction to personal and team selling. General overview of concepts and strategies for selling in different industries.

9. Strategic Selling (Part 2)
Apply knowledge to real-cases. A hands-on primer on consultative selling.

10. Strategic Selling (Part 3)
Sales training in the field and an interactive engagement with potential customers.

Book and Materials
4. Selected readings may also be provided on Canvas or through external links

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Branding Assignment</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Strategic Selling Exercise</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# New Graduate Course Proposal

## Course Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (eg. 810)</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units (eg. 4)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Course title (max. 100 characters)

Applied Project

## Course Description

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is..." If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description).

The opportunity to apply student learning in the context of a management challenge outside of the classroom. An emphasis is placed on the integration of learning across the core program and reflective practice. Student will integrate their knowledge across courses using an experience outside of the traditional classroom and work in a team to achieve a goal. The course serves as an opportunity to apply skills in a significant management challenge and to reflect on, and communicate about, students' management practices.

## Rationale for introduction of this course

See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

## Term of Initial Offering (eg. Fall 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Course Delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)

| 35 hrs of blended instruction |

## Frequency of offerings/year

| twice a year |

## Estimated enrollment per offering

| 40 |

## Equivalent courses (courses that replicate the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

| n/a |

## Prerequisite and/or Corequisite

| n/a |

## Criminal record check required?

| Yes ☑ | if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite |

## Additional course fees?

| Yes ☑ | No |

## Campus where course will be taught

| ✔ Burnaby | ✔ Surrey | ✔ Vancouver | ☐ Great Northern Way | ✔ Off campus |

## Course Components *

| ✔ Lecture | ☐ Seminar | ☐ Lab | ☐ Independent | ☐ Capstone |

## Grading Basis

| ✔ Letter grades | ☐ Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory | ☐ In Progress / Complete |

## Repeat for credit?

| ☐ Yes ☑ No | Total repeats allowed: 0 | Repeat within a term? ☐ Yes ☑ No |

## Required course?

| ✔ Yes ☑ No | Final exam required? ☐ Yes ☑ No | Capstone course? ☐ Yes ☑ No |

## Combined with a undergrad course?

| ☐ Yes ☑ No | If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students |

---

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Shafik Bhaloo, Kathleen Burke, Tom Culham, Kate Dilworth

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL

A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL

The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)

Library Check: ____________________________
Course Attribute: __________________________
Course Attribute Value: ____________________
Instruction Mode: __________________________
Attendance Type: __________________________

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units: __________________
Financial Aid Progress Units: ______________
BUS 587: Applied Project

Course Description
This is an experiential course designed to provide a management challenge to students. The course provides the opportunity to apply student learning in the context of a management challenge outside of the classroom. This project builds on the knowledge gained in the Experiential Project at the start of the program. An emphasis is placed on the integration of learning across the core program and reflective practice. Student will integrate their knowledge across courses using an experience outside of the traditional classroom and work in a team to achieve a goal. The course serves as an opportunity to apply skills on a significant management challenge and to reflect on, and communicate about, students’ management practices.

Objectives
The course objective is to apply management skills and integrate knowledge across the courses in the program core. Upon completion of this course you will:
- Apply skills learned throughout the program to a management challenge
- Reflect on the use of the skills within a management context
- Provide peer assessment feedback to others about their practice

Subjects/Topics
Module 1: Project Introduction
Students will be introduced the applied project. Example applied projects will adapt to each cohort and will include community partners. Applied projects may require students to work with community projects, not-for-profit partners or environmental projects.

Module 2: Applied Ethics
Consider the practical application of moral considerations in a workplace context. Students will consider real-world actions and their moral considerations. This topic will be considered throughout the project.

Module 3: Applying Reflective Practice
Students will apply reflective practice techniques introduced in earlier courses and complete a weekly reflection towards their online Learning Portfolio. The purpose of the portfolio is to have students reflect on their work within the project.

Module 4: Accepting and Providing Feedback
Feedback will be an important part of the project process. Students will learn to accept feedback and respond positively to concerns from others. Students will also be asked to provide feedback to others in a professional way.

Module 5: Interacting with Stakeholders
Students will be asked to work with stakeholders to adapt and pivot the projects as necessary. The importance of stakeholder communication and consultation will be demonstrated throughout the project.
Book and Materials

This is an experiential course. Course work and textbooks from previous courses will provide the material necessary to successfully complete the course.

Suggested Readings

Learning and Assessments

**Assessment summary**

Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Reflective Learning Portfolio</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Feedback</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Experiential Collaboration Project</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Plan &amp; Team Agreement</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Final Presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Team Feedback Interview</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg, PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>588</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Strategic Consulting and Advising**

**Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)**

Strat. Consulting & Advising

**Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as “This course will…” or “The purpose of this course is…” If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)**

Uses case studies to reinforce techniques for problem identification, data collection, strategic analysis, aligning objectives, establishing key requirements, determining scope, presenting recommendations and developing time and material estimation for initiatives. Provides the tools and techniques that are important in relationship management and serving in the role as a trusted advisor for an organization.

**Rationale for introduction of this course**

See attached Masters in Management Proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg, Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Course delivery (eg, 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</th>
<th>35 hours of blended instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of offerings/year</th>
<th>twice a year</th>
<th>Estimated enrollment per offering</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prerequisite and/or Corequisite</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal record check required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus where course will be taught</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Great Northern Way</th>
<th>Off campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Components *</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Basis</th>
<th>Letter grades</th>
<th>Satisfactory / Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>In Progress / Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeat for credit?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total repeats allowed?</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Repeat within a term?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Final exam required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Capstone course?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Combined with a undergrad course? | Yes | No | If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|----------------------|-----|------------------|-----|----|

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES

If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Blaize Reich

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL

A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL

The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? [Y]ES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 14 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUS 588: Strategic Consulting and Advising

Course Description

Uses case studies to reinforce techniques for problem identification, data collection, strategic analysis, aligning objectives, establishing key requirements, determining scope, presenting recommendations and developing time and material estimation for initiatives. Provides the tools and techniques that are important in relationship management and serving in the role as a trusted advisor for an organization.

Objectives

By the end of this course, students will:

- Utilize frameworks to analyze challenges to an organization from a strategic perspective.
- Collect data that contributes to establishing scope and key requirements.
- Present a compelling set of aligned recommendations relating to an initiative.
- Develop a proposal, including resource requirements (time, budget) for an initiative.
- Create a communication plan to support relationship management.

Subjects/Topics

Module 1: Problem Identification
Uses the case study approach to search beyond symptoms to find the root cause for strategic problems that an organization is facing.

Module 2 and 3: Using Frameworks for Strategic Analysis
Working through a history of strategic frameworks, students will develop an understanding of the latest approaches to strategy and strategic thinking. Uses a variety of strategic frameworks to explore an organizational issue.

Module 4 and 5: Managing Relationships: Conversations and Interviews
Use techniques to prepare for data collection and more successfully conduct conversations and personal interviews by applying these techniques to an analysis. Create a communication plan to support relationship management.

Module 6 and 7: Aligning Operations with Strategy
Learn the essentials of social alignment in strategically aligned organizations. Identify gaps between strategic objectives and operations and seek ways to adapt operations to narrow the gaps. Understand the negotiating process and some negotiating tactics for change management.

Module 8 and 9: Estimation and Initiatives
Use a proposal template to outline the purpose of a change initiative, highlight key requirements and estimate schedule, time and material costs for the initiative. Identify different pricing strategies and their strengths and weaknesses.

Module 10: Presenting Recommendations
Create a compelling visual presentation that outlines the purpose of an initiative, its key requirements with a proposed schedule and cost analysis.
Book and Materials

The course will use case studies from a variety of organizations to provide opportunities for students to hone their skills in problem identification, strategic analysis and project estimation. In addition to case studies (that will change regularly) a selection of articles will be provided for a wider view of consulting and relationship management. Example articles are provided below.

Articles


Additional selected readings may be provided on Canvas or through external links.

Cases Studies:


Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case Analysis #1: Problem Statement Assignment: Business Model Canvas</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Analysis #2: Strategic Analysis</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Analysis #3: Estimation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>Interview Assignment: Peer Assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment 4: Visual Group Presentation</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Course Proposal

| Course Subject (eg. PSYC) | BUS | Number (eg. 810) | 589 | Units (eg. 4) | 3 |

**Course title** (max. 100 characters)

**Business Solutions Design**

**Short title** (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)

**Business Solutions Design**

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is..." If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description).

The support of business solutions through Client Server Architecture (CSA), Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and cloud computing is introduced. These architectures are contrasted with a management perspective in different industries and technical environments. Business perspectives on system development methodologies including traditional, agile and hybrid methods are discussed. Transforming organizations by aligning technical infrastructure with strategic directives is considered in the overall context of service design.

**Rationale for introduction of this course**

See attached Masters in Management Proposal

| Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019) | Fall 2021 |
| Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks) | 35 hours of blended instruction |
| Estimated enrollment per offering | 40 |

Frequency of offerings/year

**twice a year**

Equivalent courses (courses that replicate the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

**Prerequisite and/or Corequisite**

| Criminal record check required? | ☑ Yes | ☑ if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite |
| Additional course fee? | ☑ Yes | ☑ No |

| Campus where course will be taught |
| ☑ Burnaby | ☑ Surrey | ☑ Vancouver | ☑ Great Northern Way | ☑ Off campus |

**Course Components**

| ☑ Lecture | ☑ Seminar | ☑ Lab | ☑ Independent | ☑ Capstone |

Grading Basis

| ☑ Letter grades | ☑ Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory | ☑ In Progress/Complete |

Repeat for credit?

| ☑ Yes | ☑ No |

Total repeats allowed?

| 0 |

Repeat within a term?

| ☑ Yes | ☑ No |

Required course?

| ☑ Yes | ☑ No |

Final exam required?

| ☑ Yes | ☑ No |

Capstone course?

| ☑ Yes | ☑ No |

Combined with a undergraduate course?

| ☑ Yes | ☑ No | If yes, Identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students |

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Check:</th>
<th>Course Attribute:</th>
<th>Course Attribute Value:</th>
<th>Instruction Mode:</th>
<th>Attendance Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If different from regular units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Progress Units:</th>
<th>Financial Aid Progress Units:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUS 589: Business Solutions Design

Course Description

The support of business solutions through Client Server Architecture (CSA), Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) and cloud computing is introduced. These architectures are contrasted with a management perspective in different industries and technical environments. Business perspectives on system development methodologies including traditional, agile and hybrid methods are discussed. Transforming organizations by aligning technical infrastructure with strategic directives is considered in the overall context of service design.

Objectives

By the end of this course, students will:

- Analyze technical infrastructure needs for an organization and outline implications on business processes resulting from this choice.
- Use techniques from the agile approach to achieve a project’s objectives.
- Analyze and recommend an infrastructure for an organization and provide analysis on the long-term implication for scale and adaptability.
- Use a service design approach, in a team environment, to design the technical support for a service process.

Subjects/Topics

Module 1 and 2: Solution Architectures for Business
Introduce client-server architecture, service-oriented architecture and cloud computing. Discuss costs and benefits of each architectural approach. Discuss the major technical building blocks for each from a management perspective. Demonstrate use of architectures across different industries and organizations.

Module 3 and 4: System Development Approaches and Methods
Introduce system development approaches and the methods and techniques associated with these approaches. Focus will be placed on agile/hybrid methods and how organizations and consulting firms utilize these approaches to support business solution design.

Module 5 and 6: Service Design and DevOps
Build on the prior design thinking knowledge and introduce service design approach to business solution development. Utilize a service design approach to develop recommendations for a simple business process. Suggest technical architecture that would best support the recommendations. Introduce the DevOps approach to operational development.

Module 7 and 8: Applied Business Solution Design
Utilize knowledge of solution architectures and systems development approaches to develop a business solution proposal using a service design approach. Work through alternatives, in a team environment, for supporting a complex business process and provide recommendations for final design, including long-term implications for scale and adaptability.
Module 9 and 10: Solution Assessment and Presentation
Provide a peer assessment of 2 other team's proposed business solution. Provide at least three areas for further research or improvement. Use the peer feedback to develop a presentation for a client, supported by a proposal, for the business solution design that your team has developed.

Book and Materials

Required Textbooks

Supporting Articles and Books

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of group and individual work. As in all large courses in the Beedie School of Business, grading norms will be observed. In other words, students with the top marks relative to the class average will receive the top grades.

| Individual | Architecture Assignment #1: Outline a working business solution architecture | 25% |
| Methodology Assignment #2: Recommend a method based on the industry situation | 15% |
| Peer Assessment: Provide feedback on 2 other team's proposals | 10% |
| Group | Group Plan: Develop a Plan using the Agile Method | 20% |
| Group Presentation: Service Design Proposal | 30% |

Total | 100% |
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>590</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Innovation and Change Management**

**Course title (max. 160 characters)**

**Innovation & Change Management**

**Course description for SFU Calendar** (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is...") If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description.

As digital technologies advance, an organization's ability to innovate will be key to delivering value through technological change. Key skills supporting this innovation include identifying opportunities, assessing their net impact and, if potential is identified, initiating and managing positive organizational change. A focus will be placed on developing creativity skills, supported with feedback and critical assessment skills, in a team environment. Models for managing change within organizations will be examined to identify important factors impacting change within organizations. These skills should develop your ability to positively contribute to organizational change.

**Rationale for introduction of this course**

See attached Masters in Management Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>35 hours of blended delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of offerings/year</td>
<td>Twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated enrollment per offering</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equivalent courses** (courses that replicate the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

**Prerequisite and/or Corequisite**

- Criminal record check required? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If yes is selected, add this as prerequisite
- Additional course fees? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Campus where course will be taught: [ ] Burnaby [ ] Surrey [ ] Vancouver [ ] Great Northern Way [ ] Off campus
- Course Components:
  - [ ] Lecture
  - [ ] Seminar
  - [ ] Lab
  - [ ] Independent
  - [ ] Capstone
  - [ ] Other
- Grading Basis:
  - [ ] Letter grades
  - [ ] Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory
  - [ ] In Progress / Complete
- Repeat for credit?: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Total repeats allowed?: 0
- Repeat within a term?: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Required course?: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Final exam required?: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Capstone course?: [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Combined with a undergrad course?: [ ] Yes [ ] No

*If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Terri Griffith, Andrew Harries
Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
Academic Unit / Program  Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)  Email
Beedie Graduate Programs  Stephanie Reimer  stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

Graduate Program Committee  Signature  Date
Department Chair  Signature  Date

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each FGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done?  ✔  YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

Faculty Graduate Studies Committee  Signature  Date
Andrew Gemino  January 8, 2020

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Senate Graduate Studies Committee  Signature  Date
Jeff Derksen  MAR 16 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check:  
Course Attribute:  
Course Attribute Value:  
Instruction Mode:  
Attendance Type:  
If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units:  
Financial Aid Progress Units:  
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BUS 590: Innovation and Change Management

*There is immense power when a group of people with similar interests gets together to work toward the same goals.*

Idowu Koyenikan, *Wealth for All: Living a Life of Success at the Edge of Your Ability*

Course Description

As digital technologies advance, an organization’s ability to innovate will be key to delivering value through technological change. Key skills supporting this innovation include identifying opportunities, assessing their net impact and, if potential is identified, initiating and managing positive organizational change. A focus will be placed on developing creativity skills, supported with feedback and critical assessment skills, in a team environment. Models for managing change within organizations will be examined to identify important factors impacting change within organizations. These skills should develop your ability to positively contribute to organizational change.

Objectives

By the end of this course, students will:

- Use a variety of creative thinking techniques to identify opportunities
- Work in a team environment to develop an assessment rubric to evaluate the net impact of a proposed change
- Estimate the impact of an opportunity using multiple scenarios
- Use a change management framework to determine success factors and risks for a change initiative
- Create a change management plan to support a change initiative

Subjects/Topics

**Module 1 and 2: Creativity in Organizations**
Introduce Amabile’s model for creativity in organizations. Demonstrate creative problem-solving techniques and use to generate ideas in individual and team environment. Discuss barriers to creativity in organizations and how these barriers can be addressed through management.

**Module 3 and 4: Evaluating Creative Ideas**
Introduce system 1 and 2 thinking and the cognitive biases inherent in human decision making. Discuss qualitative and quantitative evaluation rubrics and create a rubric to assess the net impact of an opportunity. Evaluate opportunities on an individual basis and within a team environment to demonstrate the importance of diversity in evaluation. Utilize multiple scenarios to add sensitivity to evaluation.

**Module 5**
Teams will present their opportunities and receive feedback from multiple teams. The team will have the opportunity to pivot their ideas on the basis of feedback.

**Module 6 and 7: The Challenges of Change Management**
Introduce the historic difficulties of making change in organizations. Introduce the history of change management models and reasons for the adaptations. Use Case studies to reinforce the important factors in successful organizational change.
Module 8 and 9: Change Management Planning
Introduce change management planning. Identify the importance of providing individual reasons for participating in change. Use knowledge of change management frameworks to develop a change management plan for the opportunity that the team has recognized.

Module 10: Change Management Plan Presentation
Each team present their change management plan and provides feedback and advice on 2 other plans. Team should incorporate the peer feedback provided in Module 5 and demonstrate how they pivoted based on feedback.

Learning and Assessments

Assessment summary
Evaluation in the course will be based on a combination of individual and team-based assignments. There are no exams. The table below shows the breakdown of assignments and marks allocated. You will note there are activities and Assignments. Assignments are marked. Activities should be posted to the discussion board and students are expected to provide comments on others work in the discussion. These comments will form a part of your participation grade. The assignment will generally take more time and you should note this in planning your time allocation for the course. Please also make sure to follow the format of the assignments with regard to how many students are to work together on any given assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Assignment #1: Individual Creativity Assignment</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment #2: Case Study Analysis</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Assessment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback on 2 other team’s creative ideas</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Team Presentation: Evaluating Creative Ideas</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Presentation: Organizational Change</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Review
For peer reviewed assignments, you will be asked to provide reviews for two other students in the course. These should be placed in the assignment discussion. You will not be able to comment on another student's assignment unless you have already submitted your assignment.

The instructor will assess the peer reviews. Each student/group should receive 2 student reviews, so please choose to review students who do not already have 2 assessments. I suggest you seek to review different people during the modules to get a better feeling for the class and their contribution. You should provide your comments on the student assignment. Your peer assessments will themselves be assessed by the instructor as part of the overall participation mark.
Book and Materials

Resources


Supporting Articles and Books


Case Studies


Academic Honesty

Plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of other people's ideas or work. Plagiarism is often unintentional and can be avoided through careful work habits and familiarity with academic conventions. But whether intentional or unintentional, plagiarism is recognized as a serious academic offence. The university's strong stance against plagiarism reflects our shared commitment to intellectual honesty, and the original contributions of each student and faculty member validate and sustain the university as a vital centre of knowledge and research. It is your responsibility, as a student and a member of the academic community, to ensure that you have correctly acknowledged and cited all the resources you have used in writing your work.

The following examples are representative but not exhaustive of activities constituting academic dishonesty:

- Plagiarism (presenting the work of another person as your own)
- Submitting the same work more than once without prior approval
- Translating a work from one language to another without complete and proper citation.
- Cheating
- Impersonation (having someone else write your exam)
- Submitting false records or information (forged medical notes)
- Stealing or destroying the work of another student
- Unauthorized or inappropriate use of computers, calculators and other forms of technology in course work, assignments or examinations.

You are expected to post comments, and write reports and exams in your own words. Whenever you take an idea or passage from another author, you must acknowledge it by appropriately citing the source. If you are struggling to complete an assignment please see your instructor or the program office for additional assistance.

For more information you will find the SFU policy on Academic Honesty at: http://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette/student.html
New Graduate Course Proposal

Course Subject (eg. PSYC) BUS
Number (eg. 810) 591
Units (eg. 4) 6

Course title (max. 100 characters)
Strategic Applied Project

Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters) Strategic Applied Project

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is..." If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description)

Undertake a team-based strategic business analysis and develop a document with supporting appendices. The student teams will be supported by the instructor and an industry partner. The instructor will negotiate the purpose, content and deliverables of each project with the students and the sponsoring organization. Common topics include a process innovation proposal, in-depth analysis of a business solution, or a detailed project plan.

Rationale for introduction of this course:
See attached Masters in Management Proposal

Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019) Fall 2021
Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks) 35 hours of Blended Instruction

Frequency of offerings/year Twice per year
Estimated enrollment per offering 40

Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

Prerequisite and/or Corequisite n/a

Additional course fees? Yes No

Criminal record check required? Yes No

If yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

Campus where course will be taught

Burnaby Yes
Surrey Yes
Vancouver Yes
Great Northern Way No
Off campus Yes

Course Components*

Lecture Yes
Seminar No
Lab No
Independent No
Capstone No

Grading Basis

Letter grades Yes
Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory No
In Progress / Complete No

Repeat for credit? Yes No

Total repeats allowed? 0

Repeat within a term? Yes No

Required course? Yes No

Final exam required? Yes No

Capstone course? Yes No

Combined with a undergrad course? Yes No

If yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students:

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Andrew Gemino, Blaize Reich

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit / Program</th>
<th>Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair)</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beedie Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Stephanie Reimer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca">stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.
Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by FGSC to the chairs of each PGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gemino</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Graduate Studies Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Derksen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR 16 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check: 
Course Attribute: GCAP
Course Attribute Value: Project
Instruction Mode:
Attendance Type:

If different from regular units:
Academic Progress Units: 
Financial Aid Progress Units: 
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BUS 591- Strategic Applied Project

Course Description

Students will undertake a team-based strategic business analysis and develop a document with supporting appendices. The student teams will be supported by the instructor and an industry partner. The instructor will negotiate the purpose, content and deliverables of each project with the students and the sponsoring organization. Common topics include process innovation proposal, in-depth analysis of a business solution, or a detailed project plan.

Objectives

The applied project provides students with an opportunity to comprehensively integrate the various subjects studies during the MIM program. Collaborative learning is facilitated through a final presentation to the industry partner organization. Success in this course is predicated on:

- Consolidating knowledge gained over the two-year MSc to develop well-reasoned solutions to problems currently faced by industry partner.
- Delivering a clear, compelling and well-rehearsed presentation
- Delivering a detailed, well-written report
- Working effectively with your team
- Demonstrating professionalism in all aspects of your relationship with the organization and its management
- Evaluating the performance of your peers in a fair and objective fashion
- At the end of the course, preparing a concise self-reflection summarizing your key learning outcomes

Course Expectations

During the semester, students can expect at least 10 hours of out-of-class work weekly for the course. These out-of-class activities may include participating in on-line discussions with your team or industry contacts, preparing readings from research or cases, writing, coding interviews and other activities.

Assessments

Each assignment is assessed on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis and will be approved only after it meets a minimum quality threshold by the course instructor. Students will be expected to revise their work until that threshold is met. The quality threshold is a function of content including analytical processes and conclusions and University standards for oral and written communication. The relative weights for each assignment are provided in the table below. As all assignment are marked on a S/U basis, the weights only suggest the proportion of time that should be spent on each requirement.
Self-Report – Final report
A final self-report will be collected for each team member. This reflective self-report should consider the experiences and knowledge gained in completing the project proposal plan. Students are asked to demonstrate how they have improved their ability to team and participate in project-based work. Students are asked to integrate readings and other experiences and include specific examples whenever possible. Students will be evaluated on the breadth and depth of the narrative and the quality of the writing provided in the document.

Group Project Presentation
Students will work in teams to make a time-restricted, business presentation of this proposal to industry partners. This presentation should integrate their learning across the MIM. The presentation should be formatted for a business executive audience. Teams will be assessed on their ability to effectively visualize and communicate the quality of the project that emerges from their teamwork.

Group Project Proposal (written)
Each team will be required to deliver a report to accompany the presentation. The report should include detailed charts, projections, figures and analysis that might be not be appropriate to include for the presentation but are necessary to develop a complete picture of your team’s proposed solution. Each team should also provide the slide deck used in the presentation with the document.

Peer Review
For peer reviewed assignments, you will be asked to provide reviews for two other students in the course. These should be placed in the assignment discussion. You will not be able to comment on another student’s assignment unless you have already submitted your assignment.

Book and Materials
There are no required reading for the course. A canvas page will provide you with:

- Detailed information and schedule deadlines
- Selected readings and information about resources
- Submission requirements information
Academic Honesty

Plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of other people's ideas or work. Plagiarism is often unintentional and can be avoided through careful work habits and familiarity with academic conventions. But whether intentional or unintentional, plagiarism is recognized as a serious academic offence. The university’s strong stance against plagiarism reflects our shared commitment to intellectual honesty, and the original contributions of each student and faculty member validate and sustain the university as a vital centre of knowledge and research. It is your responsibility, as a student and a member of the academic community, to ensure that you have correctly acknowledged and cited all the resources you have used in writing your work.

The following examples are representative but not exhaustive of activities constituting academic dishonesty:

- Plagiarism (presenting the work of another person as your own)
- Submitting the same work more than once without prior approval
- Translating a work from one language to another without complete and proper citation.
- Cheating
- Impersonation (having someone else write your exam)
- Submitting false records or information (forged medical notes)
- Stealing or destroying the work of another student
- Unauthorized or inappropriate use of computers, calculators and other forms of technology in course work, assignments or examinations.

You are expected to post comments, and write reports and exams in your own words. Whenever you take an idea or passage from another author, you must acknowledge it by appropriately citing the source. If you are struggling to complete an assignment please see your instructor or the program office for additional assistance.

For more information you will find the SFU policy on Academic Honesty at: http://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette/student.html
New Graduate Course Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Subject (eg. PSYC)</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>Number (eg. 810)</th>
<th>592</th>
<th>Units (eg. 4)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Course title (max. 160 characters)**

**Special Topics**

Short title (for enrollment/transcript - max. 30 characters)

**Special Topics**

Course description for SFU Calendar (course descriptions should be brief and should never begin with phrases such as "This course will..." or "The purpose of this course is..."). If the grading basis is satisfactory/unsatisfactory include this in the description.

Rationale for introduction of this course:

See attached Masters in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of initial offering (eg. Fall 2019)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35 hours of blended instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of offerings/year</th>
<th>twice a year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course delivery (eg. 3 hrs/week for 13 weeks)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Estimated enrollment per offering | 40 |

Equivalent courses (courses that replicates the content of this course to such an extent that students should not receive credit for both courses)

Prerequisite and/or Corequisite:

Criminal record check required? Yes if yes is selected, add this as prerequisite

Additional course fees? Yes No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus where course will be taught</th>
<th>Burnaby</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Great Northern Way</th>
<th>Off campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Course Components:

- Lecture
- Seminar
- Lab
- Independent
- Capstone

Grading Basis:

- Letter grades
- Satisfactory/ Unsatisfactory
- In Progress / Complete

Repeat for credit?

- Yes
- No

Total repeats allowed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Repeat within a term?

- Yes
- No

Required course?

- Yes
- No

Final exam required?

- Yes
- No

Capstone course?

- Yes
- No

Combined with a undergrad course? Yes if yes, identify which undergraduate course and the additional course requirements for graduate students.

* See important definitions on the curriculum website.
RESOURCES
If additional resources are required to offer this course, provide information on the source(s) of those additional resources.

Faculty member(s) who will normally teach this course

Additional faculty members, space, and/or specialized equipment required in order to offer this course

CONTACT PERSON
Academic Unit / Program: Beedie Graduate Programs
Name (typically, Graduate Program Chair): Stephanie Reimer
Email: stephanie_reimer@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC UNIT APPROVAL
A course outline must be included.

Non-departmentalized faculties need not sign.

Graduate Program Committee

Signature

Date

Department Chair

Signature

Date

FACULTY APPROVAL
The course form and outline must be sent by PGSC to the chairs of each PGSC (fgsc-list@sfu.ca) to check for an overlap in content.

Overlap check done? ☑ YES

This approval indicates that all the necessary course content and overlap concerns have been resolved. The Faculty/Academic Unit commits to providing the necessary resources.

Faculty Graduate Studies Committee

Andrew Gemino

Signature

Date: January 8, 2020

A library review will be conducted. If additional funds are necessary, DGS will contact the academic unit prior to SGSC.

SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE APPROVAL
Senate Graduate Studies Committee

Jeff Derksen

Signature

Date: MAR 16, 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SECTION (for DGS office only)
Library Check: __________________________
Course Attribute: __________________________
Course Attribute Value: __________________________
Instruction Mode: __________________________
Attendance Type: __________________________

If different from regular units
Academic Progress Units: __________________________
Financial Aid Progress Units: __________________________
APPENDIX C

Letters of Support
Ali Dastmalchian  
Dean  
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University  
500 Granville Street  
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6

Dear Ali,

The Beedie School of Business Advisory Board (BAB) exists to advise the Dean and members of the Beedie School of Business on strategic matters of the school, with the Masters in Management (MiM) being one of these matters. As you previously presented the concept of the MiM program at a Board meeting, it is great to see that the program has come to fruition through this proposal.

The foresight applied in the creation of a program that focuses on enhancing the employability of recent graduates by providing them with transferrable management skills and relevant experiential opportunities needed for employment in the future of work is both commendable and admirable. For these reasons and more, as the Chair of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board, I am happy to endorse the School’s proposed Masters in Management (MiM) program on behalf of all of the members of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board.

The BAB comprises of members of the business, government, non-profit, association and alumni community, locally, nationally, and globally. As a group, we believe the Beedie School of Business has done a great job at identifying the gap in skills needed for the the future of work and new labour market entrants. As members of the BAB are also potential employers, we are encouraged by the education that SFU Beedie is bringing to the community and the opportunity to hire students with knowledge and skills in management and digital literacy.

A great deal of thought has gone into the creation and development of the Masters in Management program and it will not only contribute to the skills needed for the future of work but also in the advancement of the Schools achievement of its vision and calling. The Board will continue to support the MiM program through its purpose of providing a link to those individuals and organizations with the resources, knowledge and contracts the School requires to achieve its objectives and enact its calling.

The members of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board and I are excited by the potential of the Masters in Management graduates and I have no doubt that this program will be a great success. The resources the School will gain from this program will allow for the continued development of innovative program offerings such as the Masters in Management program.

Yours sincerely,

Barry Macdonald, FCPA FCA, C.D.D  
SFU Beedie School of Business Advisory Board, Chair
February 19, 2020

RE: SFU Beedie School of Business - Master’s in Management

Dear Andrew Gemino,

I’m writing to offer strong support for your proposed Masters in Management (MiM) program at Simon Fraser University. I appreciate you sharing the proposal and discussing the benefits that it can provide to students at SFU. We have further discussed it within our Graduate Program Committee and find the proposed program to be highly compelling and strongly aligned with the needs of students and industry. We believe that the MiM program is an excellent opportunity for collaboration between the School of Interactive Arts and Technology (SIAT) and SFU Beedie.

As you know, SIAT offers the graduate certificate in visual analytics (VA) an interdisciplinary graduate program consisting of technology and theory courses that focus on four key aspects of visual analytics: cognition, technology, society, and integration. We strongly feel that the VA certificate would be ideal to integrate within the MiM program to provide students with training opportunities in visual analytics. This would provide graduates with skills highly sought after by industry. SIAT is committed to working with SFU Beedie to explore options for providing the VA certificate as part of the MiM program and as part of the MiM’s graduation requirements.

I look forward to further discussions about the MiM program and our collaborations within it. Best of luck with your proposal moving forward.

Sincerely,

Dr. Carman Neustaedter
Director and Professor, School of Interactive Arts and Technology
Faculty of Communication, Art, and Technology
February 20, 2020

Ali Dastmalchian
Dean
Beedie School of Business

RE: Master’s in Management Proposal

Dear Ali,

I am writing in support of the Beedie School of Business’ proposed Master’s in Management (MiM) program at Simon Fraser University. The proposed program offers students the opportunity to build important professional skills that align with demands and current gaps in industry. I believe the MiM program is an excellent opportunity for interdisciplinary engagement and collaboration – a foundational principle of the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology, and something which adds value to the SFU experience – both for students and faculty. The program seems well differentiated and we join you in supporting the digital literacy and people skills learning outcome.

I understand that discussions are already underway with the School of Interactive Art and Technology and they are positive about the opportunity to collaborate, particularly with respect to Visual Analytics curriculum which could become a specialization or track area within your program.

Sincerely,

Owen Underhill
Dean pro tem
Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology

cc: Andrew Gemino, Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Beedie School of Business
    Philippe Pasquier, Associate Dean, Academic, Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology
Ali Dastmalchian  
Dean, Beedie School of Business  
Professor, Management and Organization Studies /  
International Business  
Beedie School of Business  
Simon Fraser University  
Email: beedie_dean@sfu.ca  

December 8, 2019  

RE: Letter of support for Proposed Masters in Management, Beedie School of Business  

Dear Ali,  

Thank you for sharing your proposal for the Masters in Management (MiM) program here at SFU. We have talked about the opportunity to work together, combining the strengths of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Beedie School of Business. I believe this program provides the platform for collaboration between our two faculties. It is particularly well suited for students in the health sciences who are looking for a career launch and developing their leadership and management skills in the health sector. As you know, the public health sector accounts for 11% of Canada’s GDP and Canada’s health innovation sector contributes over $8 billion annually to Canada’s economy, with tremendous growth potential. Both public, not-for-profit and private sector organizations seek employees suited to advancing patient care and the knowledge economy.  

We endorse the proposed Master of Management program at SFU Beedie and would like to work with SFU Beedie to develop a graduate certificate in health sector leadership and management as part of the program in the future. As you are aware, it is difficult to commit resources to projects that are not yet approved, but the Faculty of Health Sciences would be interested in working with you to refine the design of this program for the benefit of our students. Our faculty is particularly interested in the emphasis the proposal has placed on the combination of digital literacy, leadership and management skills. In particular, the program will be an valued add on to our undergraduate program focused on health services, health data science, biostatistics, health economics, and epidemiology. We additionally have graduate-level courses in topics that set the context for leadership and management in the health sector and are ready to provide select offerings from our current Masters in Public Health program.  

The Faculty of Health Science is very interested in partnering with the Beedie School, and I am personally excited about the potential for future collaborations. As you know, before I came to SFU, I was a Professor in the School of Public Health at the University of Alberta and an Adjunct Professor at Alberta Business. I taught in both MPH and MBA programs at the University of Alberta and am highly aware of their complementarity. I wish you all the best with the proposal and I look forward to further discussions on our partnership.  

Sincerely,  

Tania Bubela, BSc (Hons), PhD, JD, FCAHS, FRSC  
Professor and Dean  

BLUSSON HALL, ROOM 11300  
8888 UNIVERSITY DRIVE  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, BURNABY BC  
CANADA, V5A 1S6
December 9, 2019

Degree Quality Assessment Board Secretariat  
Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills & Training  
PO Box 9177 Stn Prov Govt  
Victoria, BC V8W 9H8

Re: SFU – Masters in Management

Dear Members of the DQAB Board:

I wish to express my support for the proposed SFU Beedie Masters in Management program. Coming from a School who has also proposed a new Master of Management program, we at UVic recognize the value of this type of programming to prepare students for careers in a rapidly changing work environment. Similar to our concept, SFU Beedie’s MiM aims to bridge the gap between the broad skills provided in post-secondary education with the management/digital literacy skills demanded in the labour market for new employees.

With our emphasis on partnerships with Vancouver Island-based organizations, the UVic MM is designed to serve this region’s organizations and students by offering a pathway for preparing students to remain within the region. Therefore, we do not believe there will be a cross-over in market demand between UVic’s MM and SFU Beedie’s MiM. In both cases we see the primary audiences for these programs as our own respective graduates.

Yours sincerely,

Saul Klein  
Dean
February 4, 2020

Dr. Andrew Gemino  
Associate Dean Graduate Programs  
Beedie School of Business  
Simon Fraser University  
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6  
gemino@sfu.ca  

RE: Proposed Master in Management Program

Thank you for the opportunity to review Simon Fraser University Beedie School of Business’ proposal for a Master in Management credential.

The proposal responds to an emerging demand for graduate management and business education for non-business undergraduate degree holders. There is significant evidence that liberal arts graduates who are pursuing careers in business, but with no formal management education, are limited in their career progression. The proposal is positioned to effectively respond to the demonstrated demand for business managers.

A clear strength of the proposal is that it will be accessible to an under-served population – that outside of the BC lower mainland and those who have career, care-giver and other related responsibilities.

I have reviewed the structure of the degree and feel as though the inclusion of the four-course elective specialization will give students the opportunity to take coursework directly related to their current career sector- or the sector where they want to pivot their careers.

I commend the Beedie School of Business for bringing forward this strong proposal and am pleased to provide my support.

Yours truly,

Michael Henry  
Dean, School of Business and Economics
December 17th, 2019

Dr. Ali Dastmalchian  
Professor & Dean  
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University  
President, GLOBE Project  
Burnaby | Vancouver | Surrey  
British Columbia, Canada

Emailed to: beedie_dean@sfu.ca

Dear Dr. Dastmalchian:

On behalf of Douglas College, I am writing to express our strong support for the proposed SFU Beedie School Masters in Management (MiM) program.

I note that the MiM aims to be globally recognized as a “pre-experience” graduate program focusing on management essentials for career launch. Moreover, I can see that this program will bridge a significant gap between the foundational education that students obtain in most undergraduate degrees and the specific management/digital literacy skills now demanded by the labour market. I agree with you that this program will be a very attractive to recent graduates from non-business disciplines who have less than three years of full-time work experience.

For its part, Douglas College aims to provide educational experiences to students that challenge, enlighten, and open doors to lives of passion and purpose. Importantly, our strategic goals are closely linked to our efforts to establish robust ‘pathways’ for Douglas degree graduates and university transfer students. SFU and Douglas College have a long and successful history of collaborations that support student transfer and degree completion. Consequently, we strongly endorse the proposed Masters in Management and are excited by the opportunities it will provide for our students to further their studies.

Please feel free to contact me if you have further questions or require more information.

Sincerely,
Thor Borgford, Ph.D.
Vice President Academic and Provost
Douglas College
604-527-5222
borgfordt@douglascollege.ca

cc: George Stroppa, Rachael Newton
January 31, 2020

Dr. Andrew Gemino,
Associate Dean, Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
500 Granville Ave, Vancouver, BC

Dear Dr. Gemino,

Re: Master in Management, Beedie School of Business

It is my pleasure to provide the following commentary on the proposed Master in Management to be offered by the Beedie School of Business at Simon Fraser University.

As a course-based, professional, 'pre-experience' degree, the Simon Fraser University Master of Management is designed to provide new graduates of non-business undergraduate programs the business skills needed to facilitate their job-readiness when commencing their professional careers. The full-time blended delivery will provide students with the opportunity to study in a flexible technology-enhanced environment.

Providing undergraduate students in non-business majors who have chosen to take business minors the opportunity to leverage their business minors as transfer credit or advanced standing into the Master in Management facilitates a timely and efficient way of providing new graduates of non-business undergraduate programs the opportunity to acquire business skills needed to assist them in launching their careers. The one-year duration of the program will no doubt be attractive to prospective participants.

The practicum and other experiential components of the program contribute to the breadth of student experience directly relevant to their future careers in business focused work environments. The movement away from concentration on the traditional functional areas of business in favour of a focus on a suite of integrative skills is designed to assist the students in developing the resilience and adaptability required to succeed in a dynamic and rapidly changing work environment.
The Simon Fraser University Master in Management, as a pre-experience masters program targeted at graduating undergraduate students in non-business programs, does not compete directly with graduate programs at Royal Roads University which are oriented more towards the mid-career professional and require varying periods of work experience for eligibility for admission.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William R. Holmes, DBA, CPA, CMA, CGA, CPHR
Dean, Faculty of Management | Royal Roads University
T 250.391.2518 | F 250.391.2610
2005 Sooke Road, Victoria, BC Canada V9B 5Y2 | royalroads.ca
December 4, 2019

Ali Dastmalchian
Dean
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
500 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6

Dear Mr. Dastmalchian,

The proposed Masters in Management (MiM) at SFU Beedie School of Business is an important addition to the training and education of qualified personnel in Greater Vancouver in order for the city to hold its place as a vibrant hub for commerce, trade, travel, and free enterprise.

As Western Canada's most active and influential business association, we're aware of the current skills gap between the relevant competencies needed for the future labour market and the broad skills provided in undergraduate education. The MiM addresses these labour market needs by providing the skills necessary for young graduates to secure positions in the most demanded occupational categories, namely: Sales and Service; Business, Finance and Administration; and, Management.

As we look to the future, technological advancements will shape the future demand for new skills and competencies. SFU Beedie's focus on people and management skills combined with digital literacy - embedded in business context - will equip students to deal with pressing global challenges affecting the economy and the environment as well as local and regional communities.

As a supporting sponsor of the Board of Trade's Leaders of Tomorrow Program, the GVBOT and SFU Beedie have a history of working together to support the professional and personal growth of emerging young leaders in the areas of Mentorship, Leadership, Networking and Volunteerism. We look forward to engaging with the students in SFU Beedie's MiM program to support their successful career launch.

Sincerely,

Greater Vancouver Board of Trade, per

David Crawford
Vice President and Assistant Secretary - Treasurer
Greater Vancouver Board of Trade
Dear Ali Dastmalchian,

Greater Vancouver has entered a period of unprecedented economic and population growth, bringing a wealth of new opportunity to Vancouverites. However, to fully leverage these outcomes for a prosperous, inclusive and resilient region, we must be ready to act on in the context of our high-tech and creative economy and the climate emergency. As the economic development agency for the city of Vancouver, we feel these changes call for a global perspective and greater levels of education in emerging area of innovation and social and environmental responsibility.

The Vancouver Economic Commission is building a prosperous, inclusive and resilient economy for Vancouver, its businesses and its residents. We work to strengthen Vancouver’s thriving economy by supporting companies, attracting high-impact investment and promoting international trade. VEC collaborates with business, academia and government organizations to position Vancouver as a global destination for innovative, creative and sustainable business.

As such, we support the creation of the proposed Master of Management program at SFU Beedie. Its focus on developing fundamental management skills with an emphasis on people skills and digital literacy will contribute to the development of skills in our early-graduate community—skills essential to sustaining and deepening the quality of our region’s growing workforce.

We would particularly encourage the exploration and development of interdisciplinary specializations noted in the proposal. We see them as providing management context for the climate emergency, personalization of healthcare, and smart city innovation for the region in the decades to come.

As a region, it is incumbent upon us to better understand the social, economic, and environmental impacts of these trends while seeking opportunities to develop local skills and expertise in innovation. Having worked with the Beedie School of Business on our Economic Transformation Lab, we have seen firsthand how the school has considered how these trends may affect the future workforce, especially young workers, and the skills gap.

The VEC has effectively partnered with the SFU Beedie School of Business to develop novel research for the region and we’re excited to extend this collaboration to provide our support in their plan to enhance the next generation of managers and innovators.

Sincerely,

Bryan Buggey
Director
Vancouver Economic Commission
December 16, 2019

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: SFU Masters in Management Program Proposal

RBC Future Launch is our commitment to help young people prepare for a new world of work. In developing Future Launch, we crisscrossed the country and spoke with students and workers in their early careers, with educators and policymakers, and with employers conducting one of the biggest labour force data projects in Canada. This effort uncovered high numbers of unemployed youth not trained for current job openings and young Canadians who feel they aren't ready for the future of work. The report also suggests that the age of automation need not be a threat and if we apply our humanity — to be creative, critical and collaborative — it can be a competitive advantage.

Educating students from disciplines outside of business, with the combination of human skills and digital literacy is on point with the skill gaps identified in RBC's report "Humans Wanted: How Canadian youth can thrive in the age of disruption". The skills framework underlying the proposed Master of Management program at SFU Beedie focused on developing fundamental management skills, with an emphasis on people skills and digital literacy is aligned with the skills gap identified in our report. We believe early career graduate education would contribute to the development of skills to support growth in Canada.

The proposed MiM program would open an educational pathway for students to support their undergraduate major with a graduate degree that focuses on collaboration and creativity in the context of management. The program's focus on career launch and the importance placed on co-curricular experiences in career development should prepare students to successfully achieve their early career goals and their ability to adapt to the challenges in the future of work.

Sincerely,

Helena Gottschling
CHRO, RBC
To Whom it May Concern;

On behalf of Procter & Gamble, I am pleased to provide this letter of support for Simon Fraser University (SFU) Beedie School of Business’s proposal for the new Masters in Management (MiM) program aimed at developing business and management skills for non-business undergraduate students.

As a highly engaged organization, Procter & Gamble has collaborated with SFU Beedie for many years. We hire SFU Beedie’s Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)/ Masters of Business (MBA) students for various internship opportunities and full-time positions across a variety of functions – sales, brand, finance, HR, supply chain and IT. This partnership is extremely valuable to Procter & Gamble as it enables us to tap into significant expertise and diversify our team to broaden our capabilities.

We see tremendous benefit in the proposed MiM program for non-business undergraduates in developing business analytical skills. This will help expand the market for new graduates seeking management positions in the rapidly transforming and highly innovative labour market. There is an increasing need for more technical roles that require a strong technical understanding of key business concepts. MiM will provide candidates with leadership qualities to develop to be future managers and leaders.

I am delighted to support an initiative that will prepare future leaders with essential analytical thinking skills, project management, and business acumen. I look forward to the development of the proposed new MiM program.

Regards,

Lois Bruce
Director of Regional Sales
Procter & Gamble
Ali Dastmalchian  
Dean  
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University  
500 Granville Street  
Vancouver, BC V6C 1W6

Dear Ali Dastmalchian,

As a member of the Beedie School of Business Governance Committee, I am involved in providing oversight and feedback on program design and development work. The Governance Committee considers and approves recommendations which match market needs to school requirements and program goals and structures. Therefore, we are involved in providing feedback to the Masters in Management Design Team on the program design and development.

Throughout the development process of the Masters in Management program, the Governance Team met with the Design Team to provide advice regarding responding to changing market needs, innovation being made by faculty and staff, upholding accreditation standards, developing new revenue, and aligning the School's programs with its vision. The Design Team was receptive to suggestions for improvement and were bold in their approach of the overall direction of the program and differentiating the Masters of Management program from its competition.

As an employer and member of the Beedie School of Business Advisory Board, I am impressed with the proposed program and I would definitely hire graduates of the program. I would also recommend to my peers to hire from the program. MIM program focuses on practical and widely applicable skills for the new realities of organizations that must continually adapt and innovate. I believe there will be a strong demand for the program from recent graduates of arts and science degrees.

To conclude, the design and development process of the Masters in Management program was very well done and I look forward to the potential of the program graduates in the future of work. I fully support the proposed Masters in Management program as it opens up opportunities for students as well as employers.

Sincerely,

Jamie Gray-Donald  
SVP, QuadReal Property Group  
Jamie.gray@quadreal.com  
604—975-9596
APPENDIX D

Hanover Research
Master in Management Market Analysis
Market Analysis: Master’s in Management

Prepared for Simon Fraser University

May 2019

In the following report, Hanover Research presents the results of a market analysis of Master’s in Management programs, specifically highlighting industry trends among 10 comparable institutions in North America and Europe.
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Executive Summary
Market Analysis: Master's in Management

Recommendations
Based on an analysis of literature and 10 "double-accredited" Master's in Management (MIM) programs in North America and Europe, Hanover recommends that Simon Fraser University (SFU):

1. Offer a one-year program that includes experiential learning as well as a team-based capstone project with an employer. Other dual-accredited MIM programs in Canada offer either internships or study abroad programs, typically at the end of the program. Additionally, they all require a team-based, consulting project as the capstone of the program.

2. Offer dual degree options with other SFU faculties and institutions such as study abroad destinations for MIM students. Four of the ten dual accredited MIM programs analyzed in this report offer specializations, but they are only offered in business fields. Four of the ten also offer dual degree options with partner institutions for study abroad options and within their institution. SFU's non-business faculty specializations may provide distinction in the market.

3. Strategically set international tuition relative to other Canadian and UK competitors. While Canadian MIM programs have relatively less expensive domestic tuition compared to most competitors, international tuition is often higher than top ranked MIM programs in the UK, such as those at Imperial College and City, University of London. SFU may be able to boost international enrollments by competitively setting international tuition relative to these institutions.

Key Findings
MIM programs have grown rapidly over the last two decades, first in Europe and then more broadly. MIM Compass maintains a database of over 600 MIM programs around the world, 92 percent of which are taught in English. According to GMAC, the majority of MIM programs in the US have experienced a decline in international as well as overall applications while MIM programs in Europe have experienced growth in both these areas.

Internationally accredited MIM programs tend to attract more international students. According to an MIM Compass 2014 survey of MIM programs, they also tend to: help students find low interest loans; have students with higher GMAT scores; charge higher tuition; have larger class sizes; and have more students who find work in consulting.

MIM programs tend to be shorter in North America and the UK compared to continental Europe. Benchmarked programs in North America and the UK tend to be roughly 12 months long. In comparison, those in Europe are closer to two years.

MIMs in Canada offer internships or study abroad options that are integrated into the program. All four benchmarked dual-accredited MIM programs in Canada offer either an internship or study abroad option. They also require team-based, consulting capstone projects.

Benchmarked MIM programs do not offer specializations outside of business fields but commonly offer dual degrees. Four of ten benchmarked institutions offer business specializations. Most benchmarked institutions also offer some upper-division electives from pre-approved lists of business courses. Four of ten offer dual degrees, most commonly with partner institutions that offer study abroad destinations for MIM students.

Domestic tuition for Canadian MIMs tends to be lower than average, but international tuition at these same institutions tends to be higher than key competitors. The four Canadian MIM programs benchmarked in this report have lower domestic tuition than four of the six other benchmarked programs (including University of Mannheim, which offers free domestic tuition as a public German institution). However, international tuition at some Canadian MIMs is more than that of highly ranked UK MIMs at Imperial College and City, University of London.

Fast Facts

- Proportion of all English-speaking MIMs located in Europe: 71%
- Dual-accredited institutions by both EQUIS and AACSB: 137
Research Questions and Methodology

Market Analysis: Master's in Management

Methodology

To assist Simon Fraser University (SFU) as it seeks to design a new Master's in Management (MIM) program, Hanover conducted a literature review and benchmarking analysis to determine key trends in North America and Europe. The analysis aims to provide insight into interrelated research questions about dual accreditation and program structure.

The following analysis is based on a review of information drawn from institutional websites as well as publicly available data sources including AACSB, EQUIS, GMAC, MIM Compass, the Financial Times, and others. Hanover selected the 10 competitor and aspirant institutions included in this analysis based on their location in the US, Canada, and Europe, their accreditation by both EQUIS and AACSB, and the overall reputation of their MIM program.

Research Questions

- What market trends exist relative to the MIM degree, especially in Canada, the US, and Europe?
- How do other double accredited schools of business structure the MIM program, particularly with respect to: program length, price, admissions requirements and typical student characteristics, common courses, specializations, and delivery format?
- How common are interdisciplinary partnerships in MIM programs, and how are these offered?

Benchmarked Institution Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Business School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MIM</th>
<th>AACSB Accredited</th>
<th>EQUIS Accredited</th>
<th>Financial Times MIM Ranking (2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Sauder School of Business</td>
<td>Vancouver, BC, Canada</td>
<td>Master of Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>Peter B. Gustavson School of Business</td>
<td>Victoria, BC, Canada</td>
<td>Master of Global Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's University</td>
<td>Smith School of Business</td>
<td>Kingston, ON, Canada</td>
<td>Master of International Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hult International Business School</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Cambridge, MA, US</td>
<td>Master's in International Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, University of London</td>
<td>Cass Business School</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College</td>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>Adam Smith Business School</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mannheim</td>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>Mannheim, Germany</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHU</td>
<td>Otto Beisheim School of Management</td>
<td>Vallendar, Germany</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSEC</td>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Financial Times, AACSB, and EQUIS.
LITERATURE REVIEW
Overview of MIM Programs

MIM degree programs have rapidly spread from Europe to the rest of the world over the last two decades. MIM degree programs originally were offered in Europe in the wake of the Bologna Process, through which European countries agreed to offer shorter higher education degree programs. This degree type has since spread around the world, and MIM Compass currently maintains a database with more than 600 MIM programs. The bottom right chart in this slide includes the global distribution of full-time, English MIMs based on their 2014 survey of this database. According to this survey, 92 percent of all MIMs are taught in English.

Numerous ranking systems have been developed for MIM programs. The chart below indicates the top five countries with the most top 100 MIM programs, as ranked by the Financial Times. At least three additional ranking systems have been developed by:

- Times Higher Education
- MIM Compass
- The Economist

Global Distribution of Top Ranked MIMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Financial Times MIM Rankings 2018

Definition of MIM Program

MIM Compass defines an MIM program as having three specific attributes, listed below. Beyond this basic definition, significant variations often exist in each country.

1. Postgraduate academic program
2. At least 50 percent of the curriculum is general management courses
3. Open to recent graduates

Source: MIM Compass

Global Distribution of Full-Time, English MIMs

- Europe: 71%
- North America: 14%
- Asia/Pacific: 14%
- Latin America: 1%

Source: Global MIM Survey 2014
MIM Program Trends

Market Analysis: Master’s in Management

MIM Program Trends

Enrolment in MIM programs varies significantly and tends to be larger for those with more international accreditations. Based on a sample of the top 100 ranked MIM programs by Financial Times, enrolment size in 2017-18 ranged from a low of 28 at Shanghai Jiao Tong University to a high of 1,274 at EM Lyon Business School. The average enrolment across all 100 programs was 308 students. According to the MIM Compass 2014 survey, those MIM programs with more international accreditations tend to:

- Help students find low interest loans.
- Have students with higher GMAT scores.
- Charge higher tuition.
- Have larger class sizes.
- Attract more international students.
- Have more students who find work in consulting.

The length of MIM programs is generally shorter in North America and longer in Europe. Based on a sample of the top 100 ranked MIM programs by Financial Times, program length in 2017-18 varied from a low of eight months at University of British Columbia to a high of 36 months at EM Strasbourg Business School. The average length across all 100 programs was 20 months. Three Canadian institutions are included in this top 100 list, and their information is included in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrolment 2017-18</th>
<th>Length (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrolment in Top 100 MIM Programs

Program Length of Top 100 MIM Programs

Note: data from 2017-18.
MIM Program Application Trends

Globally, slightly more than half of MIM programs have reported recent declines in MIM application volume. According to a 2018 GMAC survey of 66 MIM programs around the world, 52 percent reported a decrease in application volume compared to the previous year, 39 percent reported increased volumes, and nine percent reported stable volumes. In the US, MIM programs increasingly reported declining application volumes between 2015-18 while European MIM programs increasingly reported growth in applications during this same period (see charts below). Overall, application volumes for MIM programs has experience positive growth since 2008.

Most MIM programs in the US report recent declines in international applicants while MIM programs in Europe report increases. In 2018, 49 percent of all applications to US MIMs were international students, compared to 75 percent of applicants to European MIMs. While trends for international applications in Canada are not available in this survey, the report does state that 53 percent of all postgraduate business program applications in Canada are from international applications, compared to 36 percent in Canada. This trend suggests that recent declines in US application volumes may not apply to Canada.

Relative Change in Application Volume (US)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Change in Application Volume (Europe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Stable</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Applications 2018 (US)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Applications 2018 (Europe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GMAC Application Trends Survey 2018
BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS
Class Profile Analysis

MIM class profiles tend to be relatively young and highly international. Only a few of the benchmarked programs disclose student class profiles. The average age for MIM students at Queen's University is 24, and 75% of the students are from outside of North America (the largest source of students is China: 41%). At University of British Columbia's MIM program, the average age is 23, and 51% of the students are international. At City, University of London, the average age of incoming students is also 23.

MIM Programs do not compete with MBA Programs because they target different segments and offer different outcomes. These programs do not require work experience and target younger students directly from undergraduate programs in business and non-business fields. MIM Programs support students' attainment of early-career management roles; MBA Programs help students transition to senior-level management roles.

Tuition Analysis

Canadian MIMs tend to be significantly cheaper for domestic students compared to MIMs in other countries, though international tuition for Canadian MIMs can be higher than key competitors. The four Canadian MIM programs benchmarked in this report have lower domestic tuition than four of the six other benchmarked programs (including University of Mannheim, which offers free domestic tuition as a public German institution). However, the international tuition for some of these Canadian programs is higher than competitor programs abroad. For example, the international tuition for both the MIM at Imperial College and at City, University of London is lower than two of the four benchmarked Canadian programs (see chart to right).

Note: Currency is listed in Canadian Dollars using exchange rates from April 2019. *Hult is not included in this chart as the tuition is different for each international campus. See benchmarking table for Hult tuition (Slide 13). *WHU provides the tuition for two different credit tracks (See Slide 14).
MIM Program Requirements

Canadian MIMs are typically 12 months long and divided into three distinct periods of time, culminating in an applied project and experiential learning component. The first two periods are generally dedicated to mandatory coursework that may include a small number of electives. UBC’s MIM program divides each of these periods into shorter modules that each last for just over a month. Programs typically have a course that extend throughout at least the first two periods focused on professional development. Queen’s University’s Master’s in International Business has a Team International Consulting Project that extends throughout the entire program and is presented by the students at the end.

However, most benchmarked MIMs in Canada have a team consulting project that lasts for one semester or less, which is still presented at the end of the program. Most of the programs also end with a third period that includes either an internship or study abroad experience. However, UVic’s new MIM (opening in May 2020) will offer the internship during the second period, and students will complete additional coursework during the third period. Multiple study abroad options often allow students to customize their curriculum through whichever courses are available at a given location.

MIM specializations are only available within business topics and not other university faculties. Four of the ten benchmarked programs offer specializations within various business fields. For example, Imperial College offers four specializations in: Finance; Strategy; Innovation; and Marketing. However, none of the specializations offered by benchmarked institutions appear to be in collaboration with any faculties or disciplines outside of business. Additionally, benchmarked institutions frequently offer the option to take electives, but these electives are only from pre-approved lists focused exclusively on business.

Double degree options are commonly offered with partner institutions. Four of the ten benchmarked programs offer the opportunity for students to complete a double degree, typically with a partner institution that offers a study abroad destination for students in the program. Hult offers dual degrees with other business master’s programs offered by Hult. Additionally, UBC offers an integrated bachelor’s/master’s option for their MIM.

Average Months of MIM Programs by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Averages are calculated using the minimum time possible in which a degree can be completed.
## Overview of MIM Programs at Competitor Institutions in Canada

Benchmarked programs are institutions located in Canada, offering a MIM program. Additionally, all programs are offered from institutions that are dual accredited by AACSB and EQUIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Start Dates</th>
<th>Average Cohort Size</th>
<th>Total Tuition (CAD)</th>
<th>Delivery Format</th>
<th>Entry Requirements</th>
<th>Specializations</th>
<th>Notable Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University of British Columbia Sauder School of Business | Vancouver, BC, Canada | Master of Management | 9 months | August | 91 |  | Optional online preparation; On-campus courses | Maximum two years work experience; Bachelor's Equivalent | None | • #1 MIM in North America  
• Community Business Project and Capstone  
• Optional Study Abroad  
• Integrated BA/MIM also available  
• MIM/MIM in GBS Dual Degree |
| University of Victoria Peter B. Gustavson School of Business | Victoria, BC, Canada | Master of Global Business | 12 or 16 months | September or January | 29 |  | On-campus | Work experience preferred but not required; Bachelor's Equivalent with core business coursework | Four paths available | • Extremely diverse 2016 cohort |
| Queen's University Smith School of Business | Kingston, ON, Canada | Master of International Business | 12 months | September | 98 |  | On-campus | Pre-experience; Bachelor's Equivalent with core business coursework | None | • Flexible coursework  
• Team-based project  
• International exchange (one semester)  
• Double Degree available |

Sources: Institutional Websites (see embedded hyperlinks); The Financial Times: Masters in Management Rankings  
Note: Currency calculations done through X-Rates.com using exchange rates from April 2019.
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### Overview of MIM Programs at Competitor Institutions in Canada

Benchmarked programs are institutions located in Canada, offering a MIM program. Additionally, all programs are offered from institutions that are dual accredited by AACSB and EQUIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Start Dates</th>
<th>Average Cohort Size</th>
<th>Total Tuition (CAD)</th>
<th>Delivery Format</th>
<th>Entry Requirements</th>
<th>Specializations</th>
<th>Notable Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Boston: $61,945  
- San Francisco: $64,638  
- Dubai: $60,873 | On-campus | Maximum three years work experience; Bachelor's Equivalent | - Marketing  
- Finance  
- Entrepreneurship  
- Business analytics  
- Disruptive Technology | #13 MIM Ranking, according to the Economist, 2017  
#53 MIM Ranking, according to the Financial Times, 2018  
4 dual degrees available with second Masters in International Marketing, Finance, Business Analytics, or Disruptive Innovation (18 months) |
| City, University of London Cass Business School | London, UK | MS in Management | 12 months | September | 173 | - Domestic: $40,084  
- International: $40,084 | On-campus | Maximum three years work experience; Bachelor's Equivalent | None | #33 Globally (FT MIM Ranking) |
| Imperial College Business School | London, UK | MS in Management | 12 months | September | 107 | - EU: $42,537  
- International: $42,537 | Hybrid | Pre-experience, Bachelor's Equivalent with quantitative coursework | - Finance  
- Strategy  
- Innovation  
- Marketing  
- Flexible coursework  
- Optional Study Abroad and Immersion Experience | |
| University of Glasgow Adam Smith Business School | London, UK | MS in Management | 12 months | September | 326 | - EU: $56,910  
- International: $37,081 | On-campus | Work experience preferred but not required; Bachelor's Equivalent | None | 11th in the world for Masters in Management (THE/WSJ Business School report, December, 2018) |

Sources: Institutional Websites (see embedded hyperlinks); The Financial Times: Masters in Management Rankings

Note: Currency calculations done through X-Rates.com using exchange rates from April 2019.
## Overview of MIM Programs at Competitor Institutions in Canada

Benchmarked programs are institutions located in Canada, offering a MIM program. Additionally, all programs are offered from institutions that are dual accredited by AACSB and EQUIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Start Dates</th>
<th>Average Cohort Size</th>
<th>Total Tuition (CAD)</th>
<th>Delivery Format</th>
<th>Entry Requirements</th>
<th>Specializations</th>
<th>Notable Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Mannheim Business School</td>
<td>Mannheim, Germany</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>32 months</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>Domestic: free</td>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td>Pre-experience; Bachelor's Equivalent</td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Taxation; Finance Information Systems; Management; Marketing; Operations Management</td>
<td>Mixed German and English track or 100% English track; Double degree options available with multiple institutional partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHU Otto Beisheim School of Management</td>
<td>Vallendar, Germany</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>21 months</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90 credit track: $36,675</td>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td>Maximum two years work experience; Bachelor's Equivalent</td>
<td>Accounting; Economics; Innovation; Marketing &amp; Sales; Strategy &amp; Leadership; Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>#2 MIM Program Ranking in Germany and #16 Globally, according to Financial Times; Double Degree Options through partner institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSEC Business School</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>Master's in Management</td>
<td>21 months</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>EU: $50,954</td>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td>Pre-experience; Bachelor's Equivalent</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Taught in English or in French; Flexible coursework and personalization; Exchanges available; Double degree options around the world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Institutional Websites (see embedded hyperlinks); The Financial Times: Masters in Management Rankings
Note: Currency calculations done through X-Rates.com using exchange rates from April 2019.
Double and Dual Degrees

Formats
- Undergraduate/Graduate
- Graduate-Level Only
- Intra-University Partnerships
- External Partnerships

Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of admissions processes</td>
<td>Facilitation of admissions processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential cost savings</td>
<td>Potential cost savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to leverage faculty's strengths</td>
<td>Accelerated degree completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of partnerships</td>
<td>Time savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitiveness in professional market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exchange Programs

Although many of the benchmarked institutions offer optional study abroad or global experiences, formal exchange programs are less common due to the financial and logistical considerations. While students who participate in study abroad continue to pay the host institution, students who participate in exchange programs pay tuition and fees to the attending institution. Therefore, in an exchange program, it is important to have a reciprocal number of students. To facilitate this exchange, it is common for institutions to require dual-degree completion at the partner institution.

Source: NAFSA

Selected Programs

**UBC Sauder School of Business: M2M UBC-Yale Dual Degree**
- UBC Master of Management and Master of Management Studies in Global Business and Society (GBS) degree from the Yale School of Management
- Two-year program (one year at each school)
- Joint admissions

**Queens University, Smith School of Business: Double Degree Options**
- Second master's degree from any of ten partner universities
- Two-year program
- One of first schools in North America to offer double degrees
- Different admissions requirements than single degree (i.e.: Dual degree requires Bachelor's Degree in Business)
- Thesis required

**Hult Master's in International Business: Dual Degree Options**
- Four options for second master's degree: International Marketing, Finance, Business Analytics, Disruptive Innovation
- 18-month accelerated program
- Campuses in Boston and San Francisco (dependent on degree choice)
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Abbreviated Faculty CVs
Curriculum Vitae

Andrew C. Gemino,
Associate Dean, Graduate Programs
Professor, Management Information Systems
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
E-mail: gemino@sfu.ca

Educational Background

1999 Ph.D. Management Information Systems, University of British Columbia, Canada
1993 M.B.A. Management Science/Management Information Systems, Simon Fraser University
1989 M.A. Economics, Simon Fraser University
1986 B.A. Economics, Simon Fraser University

Employment History

Sept. 2017 – current
Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Segal Graduate School, Beedie School of Business, SFU, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Sept. 2011 - current
Professor, Management Information Systems, Beedie School of Business, SFU, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

March 2006 – Aug. 2011
Associate Professor, Management Information Systems, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

July 1999 – March 2006
Assistant Professor, Management Information Systems, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Refereed Journal Articles

(https://scholar.google.ca/citations?user=lyEYrQwAAAAJ&hl=en&oi=ao)


Updated: December 1, 2019
Curriculum Vitae


Textbooks

Teaching Awards
- SFU Teaching Excellence Award, 2011, Simon Fraser University.
- TD/Canada Trust Teaching Award (1993; 2001), Beedie School of Business, SFU.
- MBA Teaching Excellence Award (1997) from Faculty of Commerce at UBC.
- PhD Outstanding Teaching Award (1996) from Faculty of Commerce at UBC.
- Teaching honor roll (awarded 15 times from 1999-2019) indicates top 10% in Beedie School.

Updated: December 1, 2019
Resume of
Andrew S.G. Harries
aharries@sfu.ca
Location: Vancouver BC Canada.

Summary
Andrew Harries is the Tom Foord Professor of Practice in Entrepreneurship and Innovation at Simon Fraser University's Beedie School of Business. At SFU Beedie Andrew blends the latest in theory and practice in his entrepreneurship and innovation, product management and resourcing new venture programs. In his advisory practice Andrew works closely with companies on business strategy, leadership and governance and the creation of viable, high growth business models.

Andrew chairs the board of directors at Bsquare Corporation (NASDAQ: BSQR), which delivers enterprise Internet of Things software solutions and chaired the board at Contractually through its acquisition by Coupa Software in December 2015. He also serves on the advisory boards of the Beedie School of Business and Science World British Columbia, where he chaired the organization through the successful completion of a $38m renovation and expansion and a major capital campaign.

Andrew was a co-founder of Sierra Wireless Inc. (SW.TO, SWIR) where he served in a variety of executive roles. During his 11 years at Sierra Wireless the company grew from Inception through IPO to over $200m in annual revenues. Subsequently Andrew co-founded Zeugma Systems Inc. where he served for six years as the President and CEO from its initial funding to the revenue stage. Tellabs acquired substantially all of Zeugma Systems in November 2010. Prior to co-founding Sierra Wireless Andrew was a senior product line manager at Motorola Inc. He holds three US patents and an MBA from Simon Fraser University.

Executive History

May 2016 to present
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
Tom Foord Professor of Practice in Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Dec 2010 to present
BUSINESS ADVISOR & CORPORATE DIRECTOR
Serving clients in the Internet of things, connected health and enterprise software sectors.

Oct 2004 to Nov 2010
ZEUGMA SYSTEMS INC.
President & CEO
Zeugma delivered service and subscriber management systems for next generation broadband networks. Tellabs Inc. acquired substantially all of Zeugma in Nov 2010.

May 1993 to Sept 2004
SIERRA WIRELESS, INC. (SW.TO, SWIR)
Senior Vice President, Sales, Marketing, Operations
One of two founders of Sierra Wireless, Andrew architected its product and market strategies and was personally responsible for over $100m in sales and joint development agreements. The company grew from startup to over US$200m in revenue during Andrew's tenure and listed on two senior public exchanges.

July 1989 to Jan. 1992
MOTOROLA INC.
Wireless Data Division
Business analyst, Senior Product Line Manager
Board and Advisory History

Nov 2012 to Present
BSQUARE CORPORATION
Bellevue, WA, USA
Bsquare’s software and professional services solutions enable their enterprise customers to monitor device data, automate processes, predict events and produce better business outcomes that help make digital transformation a reality.
Chair, Board of Directors and member of Audit and Compensation Committees.

Jan 2013 to Dec 2015
CONTRACTUALLY (Acquired by COUPA SOFTWARE INC.)
Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Enterprise SaaS provider delivering the fastest, easiest way to negotiate, sign and manage contracts. Led the company’s seed financing and advised the founder CEO on strategy and financing through the company’s acquisition by Coupa in December 2015.
Lead Investor and Chair, Board of Directors

April 2014 to Present
MOJO INC.
Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Mojo is building the leading open applications platform for the connected car. Applications for business make fleets more productive and for consumers make driving informative and fun. As Executive Chair and Acting CEO, led Mojo through a Series A financing, the development of a strategic plan and recruitment of a new CEO.
Currently an Advisor, formerly Executive Chair and Acting CEO April 2014-Oct 2015.

2011 to 2014
NORSAT INTERNATIONAL INC.
Richmond, B.C., Canada
Satellite and microwave communications systems for use in harsh environments. As chair of compensation committee completely revamped executive comp structure.
Member, Board of Directors & Chair, Compensation Committee

2004 to Present
SCIENCE WORLD BRITISH COLUMBIA
Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
World class Interactive Science and Technology Museum.
Advisory Council and formerly Chair of the Board of Directors 2010-2013.

2004 to Present
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Member and Past Chair, SFU Beedie Dean’s Advisory Board

Education

1987-1989
Master of Business Administration, Simon Fraser University
MBA Research Project: INFORM: A Forecasting Model for Technology Innovations

1999
AEA/Stanford Executive Institute
Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA
Executive leadership program, Stanford Graduate School of Business.

1983-1987
Graduate Member of the Marketing Institute of Ireland
College of Commerce, Dublin, Ireland.

Other
• Married with three children
• Active sports: golf, tennis
• 1999 Deloitte Fast 50: Winner (Sierra Wireless)
• 2000 EY Canada Pacific Entrepreneur of the Year
Academic CV

Dr. Blaize Horner Reich

RBC Professor of Technology and Innovation
Beedie School of Business, SFU

Educational Background

Ph.D. (1993) Business Administration, University of British Columbia, Canada
"Investigating the Linkage between Business and Information Technology Objectives: A Multiple Case Study in the Insurance Industry”.

M.Sc. Business Administration, University of British Columbia, Canada
"The Use of Information Technology for Competitive Advantage in Canada”

B.A. Economics, University of British Columbia, Canada

Employment History

2009-present RBC Professor of Technology and Innovation, Beedie School of Business, SFU
2014-2015 Dean, Beedie School of Business, SFU
2017-present Visiting Professor, Swinburne University, Australia
2003-2008 Visiting Associate, Templeton College, Oxford University
2000-2003 Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Beedie School of Business, SFU
1991-present SFU, Progressively more senior positions; currently Professor, Beedie School of Business
1978-1991 Founder and Principal; Strategic Data Planning Inc.
1970-1977 BC Hydro. Progressively more senior positions ending as corporate Data Administration

Publications- since 2014
Citations at: http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=zsFkJS0AAAAJ&hl=en

Books and book chapters

Publications in Refereed Journals


Academic and Governance Leadership

Journal Editorial Board

- Editorial Board, International Journal of Managing Projects in Business
- Senior Editor, Journal of Information Technology
- Senior Editor, Journal of Strategic Information Systems
- Senior Editor, Information Systems Management
- Department Editor, Project Management Journal (2012-2015)

Supervisor and Examiner

- Head of Accreditation Team – Alberta School of Business, Business Technology Management Program (2018)
- Head of Accreditation Team— Laurier University Business Technology Management Program (2016)
- Senior supervisor of over 65 MBA projects.
- External examiner, 4 PhD dissertations.
Fereshteh Mahmoudian, Assistant Professor, PhD, CPA, CGA

Accounting Area, Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC Canada
V5A 1S6

Phone: 778-782-4068
Fax: 778-782-4920
Cell phone: 778-987-7875
Email: Mahmoudi@sfu.ca

EDUCATION

- PhD, Accounting, Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada, 2016
- Master of Economics - Specialized in Finance, Institute for Advance Education & Research on Management, Tehran, Iran, 2003
- Bachelor of Science in Applied Mathematics, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran, 2000

ACCOUNTING DESIGNATIONS & CERTIFICATIONS

- Chartered Professional Accountant /Certified General Accountant (BC, Canada), 2014
- Certified Sage ACCPAC Financial and Operational System Consultant (North America), 2007

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- Assistant Professor, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2017-Present
- Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2015-2017
- Lab Instructor- Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, 2009-2013
- Instructor, Mount Royal University, Calgary, Alberta, 2008-2011

BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

- Certified Sage Accpac Financial and Operational System Consultant, Calgary Alberta, 2007-2009
- Supervisor of Training Department, ENbank, Tehran, Iran, 2002-2003
- Banking System Consultant Karafraim Bank Tehran, Iran, 2004-2005

RESEARCH

Publications


o Academic grants/Awards 13 (over $200,000)

**ACADEMIC CONFERENCE PRESENTAIONS**

Have presented 24 academic papers at recognized accounting conferences from 2011-2019. Some of the papers have won best paper awards

- Canadian Academic Accounting Association (n=8)
- American Accounting Association (n=8)
- European Accounting Association (n=4)
- Other (n=4)

**SERVICE**

**SFU Faculty Committees at Beedie School of Business**

- Member of the Assurance of Learning Committee – Undergraduate
- Member of the Teaching and Learning Committee- Undergraduate
- Member of the Communications Initiative Action Committee
- Member of the Broad Based Undergraduate Admissions Committee

**Membership in the Academic Community**

- Canadian Academic Accounting Association
- American Accounting Association
- European Accounting Association

**Academic Reviews and Discussant**

- American Accounting Association Conference
- Canadian Academic Accounting Association Conference
- European Accounting Association
- Journal of Business Ethics
- Accounting, Auditing, and Accountability Journal
Jamal Nazari, PhD, CPA, CMA, CGA

Associate Professor of Accounting and Academic Director of KPMG Graduate Programs
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6
Email: jnazari@sfu.ca
Phone #: 778-782-4604

EDUCATION

PhD, Accounting, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada, 2010
Dissertation Title: “An investigation of the relationship between components of intellectual capital and firm’s financial performance”
MA, Accounting, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran, 2001
BA, Accounting, University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran, 1998

PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS

CPA, Chartered Professional Accountant, Canada, 2014
CMA, Certified Management Accountant, Alberta, Canada, 2011
CGA, Certified General Accountant, Alberta, Canada, 2011

WORK HISTORY

Academic Experience

- Academic Director, KPMG Graduate, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, 2018- Present
- Associate Professor of Accounting, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, 2017- Present
- Assistant Professor of Accounting, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, 2013- 2017
- Associate Professor of Accounting, Mount Royal University, Calgary, 2010-2013
- Assistant Professor of Accounting, Mount Royal University, Calgary, 2007-2010
- Part time Professor of Graduate Programs, Sharif University, Iran, 2007-2009
- Sessional Instructor, University of Calgary, Alberta, 2006-2012

Business Experience

- CPA Facilitator, CPA Canada and CPA Western School of Business, 2013-2016
- CMA Instructor, CMA Alberta, Calgary, 2012-2013
- Chief Financial Officer, Respect General Trading Co., Dubai, UAE, 1999-2003
- Chief Financial and Administrative Officer, Bahman Investment Co, Iran, 2002
- Senior Finance Expert, Bahman Group, Mazda subsidiary in Tehran, 1999-2002
- Auditor, National Audit Organization, Tehran, Iran, 1998-1999
TEACHING

University Teaching Experience
Variety of courses from introductory to advanced financial and managerial accounting courses at the undergraduate, graduate and PhD levels at the University of Calgary, Mount Royal University, Sharif University, and Simon Fraser University

Professional Teaching Experience
Facilitator and instructor for a number of modules and programs for CPA Canada, CPA Western School of Business, and CMA programs.

Recognition

Have continuously received one of the highest evaluations in the faculty and have been on teaching honor rolls (top 10%) continuously

RESEARCH SUMMARY

Citation Impact as of December 2019

Google Scholar Profile:
https://scholar.google.ca/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Jamal+Nazari&btnG=

- Citations: 987; h-index: 15; i10-index: 16

Overall Research Output as of December 2019

- Peer Reviewed Book Chapter Publications: 4
- Peer Reviewed Journal Article Publications: 18
- Applied Journals and Magazines and Online Publications: 5
- Peer Reviewed Conference Proceedings/Presentations: 52
- Internal and Practitioner Presentations and Workshops: 16
- Internal Grants: 8 (Σ= $ 98,300)
- External Grants: 6 (Σ= $ 146,400)

Recognition

Publications appear in a variety of top and quality business and accounting journals. Several of the papers have received best paper awards at recognized accounting and business conferences.

SERVICE

- Several university and school level committees in Calgary and Vancouver
- Peer reviewed numerous accounting and business journal papers as well as conferences
- Supervised a number of graduate and undergraduate students
- Served on several professional organization committees including CPA Canada committees and national governmental grant agencies
- Active membership in Canadian Academic Accounting Association, American Accounting Association, and European Accounting Association.
Curriculum Vitae
Jan R. Simon

University Lecturer, Finance, Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Visiting Professor, IESE Business School, Barcelona, Spain

Education

1996 MBA IESE Business School, Spain.
1991 LLM Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium.
1988 LLB Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium.

Employment History

Sep 2013 – Present Senior Lecturer, Finance, Beedie School of Business, SFU.
Sep 2015 – Present Visiting Professor, Finance, IESE Business School and Associate Director International Search Fund Center
Sep 2011 – Aug 2013 Visiting Assistant Professor, Finance, Beedie School of Business, SFU.
Jan 2010 – Sep 2015 Assistant Professor, Finance, IESE Business School.
May 2003 – Dec 2019 Senior Lecturer, Finance, IESE Business School.
Oct 1988 – Jan 1990 Special Forces, 1 BN Para-Commando and NATO Rapid Intervention Force
Service

Academic Chairs

May 2014 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, MBA Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU.

May 2014 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, AMBA Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU.

Sep 2016 – Aug 2017 Academic Uber Chair America’s MBA (SFU-FIA-ITAM-Vanderbilt)

Feb 2014 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, MSc Finance Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU.

Feb 2014 – Aug 2017 Co-Academic Chair, Diploma Financial Engineering, Beedie School of Business-School of Actuarial Studies, SFU.

May 2013 – Aug 2014 Interim Academic Chair Master of Technology Program

Sep 2012 – Aug 2017 Academic Chair, EMBA Program, Beedie School of Business, SFU


Committees

Sep 2018 – Aug 2019 Graduate Programs Review Task Force

Sep 2017 – Aug 2018 Executive Education Committee

Sep 2012 – Aug 2017 Planning and Priority Committee

Sep 2014 – Aug 2017 Graduate Programs Committee

Sep 2012 – Aug 2017 Assurance of Learning Committee

Sep 2015 – Aug 2016 Teaching & Learning Committee

Sep 2014 – Aug 2015 Executive Education Committee
Curriculum Vitae
Kamal Masri

Educational Background

2010 Ph.D. Graduate School of Business (Management Information Systems), Simon Fraser University, Canada
Thesis Title: Conceptual Model Design for Better Understanding.

1994 M.B.A. Graduate School of Business (Management Science), Simon Fraser University, Canada
Project Title: Improving Extrusion Efficiency at Alcan Aluminum Ltd Vancouver Works.

1990 B.A.Sc. Faculty of Applied Science (Metals and Materials Engineering), University of British Columbia, Canada

Professional Experience

Academic Director, Undergraduate Programs, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2019-present)

Academic Director, MBA programs, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2017-2018)

Senior Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2018-Present)

Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2011-2018)

Faculty, School of Business, Kwantlen Polytechnic University (2008-2011)

Selected Research

Refereed Journal Articles


Book Chapters


Conferences and Presentations


Received best paper award.


Academic Awards and Service

- “TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching” award at the Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2009, 2015. Awarded based on excellence and distinction in teaching and related activities.
- Six-time recipient of the Teaching Honor roll (2004 – 2005 and 2007 - 2010). Awarded to the top 10% of the faculty in the Beedie School of Business at Simon Fraser University.
- Recipient of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Doctoral Fellowship award in 2006. $40,000.
- Four-time recipient of SFU Graduate Fellowship award (2004 to 2007). $6,000 each.
- Reviewer, Management Information Systems Quarterly (MISQ 2011)
Kate C. Dilworth  BScN R.N. MBA  ICD.D
Vancouver Canada

dilworth@sfu.ca

011 604 306 1787

Career Profile
34 years health care clinical and consulting experience, teaching, learning and development design, focused on new program development, health service design, inter agency/system coordination, public and professional education, consultation and facilitation related to leadership development, governance and sustainability, transformative change, innovative models of care and professional practice. Specialist in custom designed learning and facilitation to address complex challenges and influence transformative change for interdisciplinary post-secondary and international learners, board directors, senior leaders, practice professionals, multi-stakeholder initiatives. Clinical background in mental health and addictions and health consulting on system design, quality and delivery.

EDUCATION
Institute of Corporate Directors- Rotman, Directors Education Program
Rotman School of Business, University of Toronto, Canada 2015

Master of Business Administration - Strategic Management
Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia – Vancouver, British Columbia 2001

Bachelor of Science, Nursing
University of British Columbia – Vancouver, British Columbia 1985

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS and DESIGNATIONS
BC College of Nursing Professionals (Registered Nurse R.N. 596935)
ICD.D - Institute of Corporate Directors, Canada
Nurses and Nurse Practitioners of BC
Canadian Nurses Association, Canada

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Adjunct Professor and Director Learning Design and Health Programs 2001 – Present
Executive Education, Beedie Simon Fraser University, Canada

- Design and facilitation of professional learning and development in areas of Governance Leadership, Sustainability, Change Leadership, Innovation and Value Creation, working with Boards of Directors, Senior Leadership Teams and practice leaders. (First nations, Physicians and Health Professionals, Resource Sector, Government and Civil Society)
- Health practice lead for development/design of customized interprofessional leadership development education for health professionals, physician, executives). Providence Healthcare, Canadian Cancer Society, BC Children’s Hospital, Health Care Leaders Association, UBC Faculty of Medicine, Ministry of Health, Medical School Pediatric Chairs of Canada, General Practice Services Committee, Alberta Primary Care, Resident Doctors of BC
- Teaching and Facilitation of healthcare clients (physician leads, academics, senior executives)
- Faculty/Instructor Health Programming: “Service Excellence”- Process design, redesign and operations management-impact on professional roles and practice, patient experience, quality and patient safety, team based care, Primary Care Networks. Leadership and Engagement- Certified DSC Assessment & Facilitation, Leading Teams, Change, Multi stakeholder Engagement. Governance, Strategy Innovation & Value Creation
- Program Design, Academic Direction and co-facilitation of program (10th year) supporting leadership and governance development for BC Primary Care Initiative (270 family medicine physician graduates to date)
- Co-Design and Facilitation- Industry Council for Aboriginal Business “Leadership Exchange”- A first in Canada, leadership intensive for pairings of First Nations Chiefs and Corporate CEO’s with a vision to build understanding and common ground for the purposes of economic and community development.
- Academic supervisor- EMBA Aboriginal Business and Leadership capstone projects.
- Mentor/Coach- SFU Entrepreneurship and Venture Connection interdisciplinary team
- BUS238- Introduction to Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Canadian International Resource Development Institute
Academic Director, Program Design Lead and Faculty 2016 – 2019 #LeadershipAQP, Arequipa Peru

- Design and delivery of an eight-day leadership program in Arequipa Peru for leaders, emerging leaders and professionals from community, NGO, government, civil society and private sector working to create sustainable legacies within and beyond the resource sector.

Kate Dilworth  dilworth@sfu.ca

December 2019
Colab Peru- SFU/University Catolica San Pablo Change Lab- Arequipa Peru- Facilitator of stakeholder and student sessions focused on change and Innovation and coach for student entrepreneurship project teams.


Canadian International Resource Development Institute & Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research - Project Director, Designer and Faculty- 2014 - 2016

"Health Impact Assessment Learning and Development Program" South Gobi, Mongolia
- Co design and delivery of a twelve-day program for Mongolian government Inter-ministerial and World Health Organization officials
- Learning focus- Health Impact Assessment, resource governance, public health, and change leadership.

Dilworth and Associates Health Consulting- Select Engagements 2002 & Ongoing

British Columbia Cancer - Strategic Direction, Facilitation and Planning 2018- Provincial Primary Care Program - Family Practice Oncology Network to enhance the systems of care between specialist cancer care & urban & rural primary care system. Design & facilitation session "Building Bridges Strengthening Care"- BC Cancer, University and Primary Care System

Mental Health Commission of Canada- "At Home Chez Soi" Research Demonstration Project on Mental Illness and Homelessness
- Designed and facilitated strategy to engage Persons with Lived Experience (PWLE) to provide input to the research & Principle investigators- a 4-year randomized control research demonstration project examining "Housing First" strategy with support. Vancouver site research application- authored "An Invitation to Share in the Learning" Engaging PWLE with Homelessness and Mental Illness"
- Consultative and practice support to Assertive Community Treatment Team- Service & Housing Leads, Research Team in development of roles/strategies to engage PWLE in peer support, research assistant, patient navigation and community education roles.

Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue Simon Fraser University- Dialogue Forum Associate- 2004 to 2012
- Dialogue Forum- examining the role of dialogue in advancing public health policy
- Undergraduate Seminar in Dialogue- "Health Care" Design & Delivery- Impact on Vulnerable Populations
- Action Canada Federal Leadership Program- "Sustainability in Health Care"
- Fraser Health Authority Hip Fracture Collaborative (Care Redesign- elder hip fracture patients) Dialogue as a systems approach to contribute to quality patient care & development of strong working relationships across care continuum.
- Co- facilitator Co-author of analysis paper.

Additional Health Clients and Consulting Engagements
- Provincial Health Services- HIV AIDS Care, Leadership Development
- Sunnyhill Centre for Children- Professional Practice and Care Delivery
- Vancouver Coastal Health- Riverview Hospital Redesign and $125 M new service design
- Fraser Health- Home and Community Care Strategy
- UBC Faculty of Medicine Department of Ophthalmology and Vancouver Hospital Eye Care Centre
- Health Canada and UBC Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences- Teleophthalmology
- Force Society for Kid's Mental Health - Peer Models of Care

Governance, Advisory Volunteer and Special Projects

AEDES Asociacion Especializada Para El Desarrollo Sostenible, Arequipa Peru- Board Member, General Assembly- 2018 and ongoing
Institute of Families for Child and Youth Mental Health- Inaugural Advisory Committee 2010 to 2015
Minerva Foundation "Helping Women Work Program"- Steering Committee Member and Mentor (2004-2010)
St James Community Service Society and Foundation- Director (Finance, HR Committees) (2004 -2007)
UBC Commerce Faculty Equity Committee (2000- 2002)
Positive Women's Network- Director (1994-1995)

Volunteer
BC Innovation Council- New Ventures Competition - Jury Member- (2002 to Present)
UBC Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences Research Week - Presenter "Health Career Paths for Graduate Students"
Minerva Foundation- Women Leading the Way Program- Tutor and Coach
Student Biotechnology Network - Event Presenter and Mentor (2005- Ongoing)
College of Registered Nurses, BC- Practice Standards Volunteer Reviewer/Reader (1999 - 2010)

AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST
Professional Development Customized Learning Development Design Portfolio Committee Involvement References

Kate Dilworth dilworth@sfu.ca December 2019
KATHLEEN M. BURKE
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, B.C.
Canada V5A 1S6
Ph: (778) 782-5605
Email: kburke@sfu.ca

EDUCATION

1992 - 1999
Doctor of Philosophy, Criminology
Simon Fraser University, B.C.

Dissertation: "Take it like a man:
The silencing of men's experiences
of sexual abuse during childhood."

1990 - 1992
Master of Arts, Criminal Justice
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

1982 - 1986
Bachelor of Arts (Cum Laude), Sociology
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

ACADEMIC/ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

Sept. 2019 – Present
University Lecturer
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University

Core Course Coordinator - BUS303

BUS303-3
"Business Society and Ethics"

Sept. 2012 – Aug. 2019
Senior Lecturer
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University

Course Coordinator - BUS303

BUS303-3
"Business Society and Ethics"
BUS 511-2
"Business Ethics"
Co-taught with Tom Brown
GDBA program

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT/LEADERSHIP

2015 – present
Lead, Curriculum Developer, Instructor
Envision Financial Community Leaders Igniting Change
- 12-week leadership development program to promote community engagement and support in the Fraser Valley.
- Joint partnership of Envision Financial, SFU Surrey, Surrey Poverty Reduction Coalition
- 6 cohorts (73 participants) have completed to-date
- 7th cohort scheduled for January 2020

GRANTS

2018
Principal Applicant – SFU Teaching and Learning Development grant
Course Design Project
“The darkness around us is deep”: Using narrative to model reflection and promote engagement in business ethics education.

2015
Co-Applicant with Stephen Dooley, Executive Director SFU Surrey
SFU Community Engagement Initiative Program grant
- Funding for pilot launch of the Community Leaders Igniting Change 12-week community leadership program.

PUBLICATIONS

2019

2019

2019

2019

2017
LILY LIN

Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, BC Canada V5A 1S6

Tel: 778-782-9729
Email: lily_lin@sfu.ca

ACADEMIC POSITION

2017 - present  Assistant Professor, Marketing
Simon Fraser University

2013 - 2016  Assistant Professor, Marketing
California State University, Los Angeles

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Business Administration (Marketing), May 2013
Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

M.Sc., Psychology (Social Psychology), May 2008
Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada

B.A. (1st class), Psychology (Major), Commerce (Minor), May 2004
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

PUBLICATIONS (PEER REVIEWED)


**TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

Assistant Professor, Marketing Area, Simon Fraser University
- Introduction to Marketing, Summer 2017 (1 Section); Summer 2018 (2 Sections); Summer 2019 (2 Sections)
- New Product Development & Design, Fall 2017 (1 Section); Fall 2018 (2 Sections); Fall 2019 (2 Sections)

Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing, California State University, Los Angeles
- Principles of Marketing - Honours Program, Fall 2016 (1 Section)
- Principles of Marketing, Fall 2013 (1 Section); Winter 2014 (1 Section); Spring 2014 (1 Section); Fall 2014 (2 Sections); Winter 2015 (2 Sections); Spring 2015 (1 Section); Fall 2015 (1 Section); Winter 2016 (1 Section); Spring 2016 (1 Section); Fall 2016 (1 Section)
- Marketing Management in the Global Environment (MBA Core), Spring 2015 (1 Section)
- International Business, Spring 2014 (1 Section); Spring 2015 (1 Section)

Instructor, Marketing Division, University of British Columbia
- Buyer Behavior, 2010 (1 Section)

**TEACHING DEVELOPMENT & TRAINING**

- Attendance at Teaching & Learning Luncheon (SFU), March 2017, April 2018, April 2019
- Attendance at Case Teaching Workshop (SFU), May 2018
- Attendance and Participation at California State University (CSU) Course Development & Redesign Workshops (CSULA), June 2015-January 2016
- Attendance at CSU Teaching Conference (CSULA), March 2015
Dr. Michael R. Johnson  
Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae

Employment History at Academic Institutions

September 2010 – Present  Senior Lecturer, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University

September 2014 – 2017  Academic Director, Management of Technology (MOT) MBA Program, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University

September 1998 – 2010  Faculty, School of Business, Operations Management, BCIT

Other Employment History

June 2003 – 2004  Insight Engineering, Principal Consultant  
Vancouver, BC.

Toronto, Ontario.

September 1998 – 2001  Research Engineer, Vehicle Recycling Partnership (VRP),  
Highland Park, Michigan

June 1997 – 1998  Principal, Yellow Creek Consulting,  
Toronto, Ontario

February 1996 to Aug/96  Production Supervisor, Pirelli Cables Inc.  
Surrey, BC

November 1994 to Aug/95  Industrial Engineer, Seanix Technology  
Richmond, B.C.

Educational Background

Dept. of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering

M.A.Sc. (1994) University of Windsor, Windsor, Canada.  
Dept. of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering

Dept. of Industrial Engineering (Management Science Option).

Teaching History

Courses Taught at SFU:  
BUEC 232: Data and Decisions I (Business Statistics)  
BUS 336: Data and Decisions II (Introduction to Management Science)  
BUS 474: Supply Chain Management  
BUS 553: Business Analytics  
BUS 758: Business Operations Design  
BUS 831: Analyzing and Visualizing Data
Courses Taught at BCIT:
Business Statistics (OPMT 1130, 1208 and 1211)
Quantitative Methods for Business (OPMT 3301 and 3308)
Management Science (BUSA 3500, BUSA 3515, OPMT 2197)
Math Models for Business (OPMT 5751 and OPMT 4408)
Business Mathematics (OPMT 1110 and 1510)
Introduction to Operations Management (OPMT 1100)
Topics in Operations Management – Environmental Management (OPMT 4442)
Information Technology (OPMT 3344) / E-Commerce (OPMT 4344)
Project Management (OPMT 1170)
Problem Solving and Process Improvement (OPMT 2201)
Synchronous Systems (OPMT 4465)
Total Quality Management (OPMT 1182)
Industrial Engineering (OPMT 1184)
Reliability Principles (OPMT 4446)
Advisor - Applied Industry Project (OPMT 4449)
Advisor – Process Improvement Project (OPMT 3341)

Selected Works


Notable Awards

TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching Award - Beedie School of Business, 2011.
Beedie School of Business – Teaching Honour Roll (9 years)
BCIT’s Excellence in Teaching Award – The School of Business, British Columbia Institute of Technology (1999).
Miremad Soleymanian

Contact Information
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Dr
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6
Phone Number: +1(778) 990 5241

E-Mail: miremad.soleymanian@sfu.ca

Employment
Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada
Beedie School of Business
- Assistant Professor of Marketing

July 2019– present

Education
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
Business Administration (Marketing)
- Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D)

University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA
Statistics
- Master of Science

Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
Industrial Engineering
- Master of Science

2009–2012

Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran
Industrial Engineering
- Bachelor of Science

2005–2009

Research Interests
- Insurtech Industry
- Machine Learning
- Dynamic Structural Modeling
- Bayesian Statistics
- Privacy issues

Honors and Achievements
- AMA-Sheth Doctoral Consortium Fellow, University of Leeds, 2018
- Quantitative Marketing and Structural Econometric Workshop Fellow, Northwestern University, 2015
- Research and Graduate Program Fellowship (also known as Grinter Award), Department of Statistics, University of Florida, 2012-2014

Publications in Refereed Journals


Working Papers


• Saeed Karimifard, Miremads Soleymanian, Mehrdad Gholami, “Comparison of Machine Learning Methods for Morphological Heart Arrhythmia.”

Non-Refereed Publications


Conference Presentations

• Empirical and Theoretical (ET) Symposium, Guelph, ON
  “Usage-Based Auto Insurance: Savings vs. Privacy Considerations.” (Poster) 2018

• Marketing Science Conference, Los Angeles, CA
  “Sensor Data, Privacy, and Behavioral Tracking: Does Usage-Based Auto Insurance Benefit Drivers?” 2017

• Quantitative Marketing and Economics (QME) Conference, Evanston, IL
  “Sensor Data, Privacy, and Behavioral Tracking: Does Usage-Based Auto Insurance Benefit Drivers?” 2016

• Empirical and Theoretical (ET) Symposium, Lake Louise, Alberta

Academic Experiences

University of British Columbia
• “Marketing Research COMM 365” (Undergrad), (Spring 2017)

University of Florida
• “Engineering Statistics STA 3032” (Undergrad), (Spring 2014)
MISSION

Education can be entertaining.

My mission is to provide high quality instruction to students by utilizing humor, popular media, real world examples, and my own personal experiences to enhance engagement and retention of complex topics.

CONTACT

📞 +1 604 265 5542
✉️ scott_maceachern@sfu.ca

SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS Office</th>
<th>SimpleTax</th>
<th>Quickbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VBA</td>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>Freshbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>Netsuite</td>
<td>Taxprep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseware</td>
<td>Xero</td>
<td>Power BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindbridge</td>
<td>Tableau</td>
<td>Relativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English: 100%
French: 50%
Portuguese (BR): 40%

EDUCATION

CPA, CA DESIGNATION
2008 - 2011
CA School of Business

BACHELOR OF COMMERCE WITH DISTINCTION
2003 - 2007
University of Victoria

EXPERIENCE

VISITING LECTURER
Simon Fraser University
2018 - Present

PARTNER
LedgerLiberty Solutions Inc. - Accounting & Education Firm
2013 - Present
Develops unique courses and apps for CPAs. Formerly serviced the full accounting cycle needs for companies of all sizes, with an emphasis on small public companies.

EDUCATOR
2011 - Present
UBC Sauder Executive Education (ongoing)
Co-teach self-developed course 'Building a Business Case'.

CPA Western School of Business (ongoing)
Session Leader for Capstone 1 & Associate Session Leader for Capstone 2.

Denison Consulting Services Inc.
Trainer for Common Final Examination (CFE) & Uniform Final Evaluation (UFE) programs.

Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants
Marker of the Comprehensive portion of the 2012, 2013, and 2014 UFES. Multiple choice question developer for the CPA training program.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
2015 - 2018
Lite Access Technologies Inc. - Fibre Optic Cable Deployment Multinational
Responsible for initial public filings during the go public process, transition to TSX-V, three rounds of financing, expansion to United Kingdom, business strategy, tax strategies, subsidiary acquisitions, issuance of financial information, and cash management.

CONTROLLER
2011 - 2013
Canadian Nexus Ventures Ltd. - Junior Mining Management Company
Contracted to act as Controller for companies listed on the TSX and TSX-V within the junior mining and investment industries.

SENIOR STAFF ACCOUNTANT - ASSURANCE AND FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING
2006 - 2011
Ernst & Young LLP
Clients included mining companies in the exploration, development, and operational stages, as well as companies in the telecommunications and investment industries. Provided audit, T1 personal tax and T2 corporate tax services.
SHAFIK BHALLOO  
1100-505 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C.  
Email: Sbhalloo@sfu.ca  sbhalloo@kornfeldllp.com

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS

2004  
York University, Osgoode Hall Law School  
Graduated with an LL.M. in eBusiness Law

1996  
Continuing Legal Education  
Attained certification in Advanced Mediation

1986 to 1989  
University of British Columbia, Law School  
Graduated with LL.B. in 1989

1981 to 1985  
Simon Fraser University  
Completed B.A. (Honours) in Criminology

EXPERIENCE

2016 (May) to current  
Associate Professor of Practice, Simon Fraser University  
Teaching, researching and writing in the areas of Commercial law, Employment law and Business Ethics at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the Beedie School of Business. Involved in course designing of law and ethics courses.

Legal Counsel, Kornfeld LLP  

2000 to May 2016  
Partner, Kornfeld LLP  
Practicing in the areas of Human Rights law, Administrative law, Civil litigation, Labour and Employment law, Commercial litigation and Insurance and Real Estate litigation. Acting as an adjudicator on the Employment Standards Tribunal (2006 to date). Adjunct Professor in the Beedie School of Business (2009 to date) and the School of Criminology (2005 to 2008) at SFU

1997 to 1999  
Associate, Kornfeld Mackoff Silber LLP  
Practicing in the areas of Labour and Employment law, Human Rights law, Corporate/Commercial litigation, General Civil litigation, Insurance law and Real Estate litigation. Participating as counsel in Labour and Commercial Mediations and Arbitrations.
1990 to 1996

Associate lawyer with Harris & Co, Freeman and Co and Miller Thompson
Practiced in the areas of Commercial and Civil litigation, Insurance law, Labour law, Employment law, Human Rights law. Appeared before the Supreme Court of British Columbia; British Columbia Court of Appeal, the Labour Relations Board and BC Human Rights Tribunal. Participated in arbitrations and mediations in civil and commercial as well as labour and employment matters.

ADJUDICATOR EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS TRIBUNAL

2006 to present
Tribunal Member on the Employment Standards Tribunal- Authored over 350 appeal decisions in employment disputes

TEACHING AWARDS

2018
Awarded TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching Award in the Beedie School of Business at SFU

2013
Awarded TD Canada Trust Distinguished Teaching Award in the Beedie School of Business at SFU

APPOINTMENTS AND MEMBERSHIPS

2006 to present
Appointed Adjudicator on the Employment Standards Tribunal

2014 to present
West Vancouver Police Board- Co-Chair on the Board and Chair of the Governance and HR Committees

2005 to 2007
Member, the Judicial Advisory Committee, Provincial Court of British Columbia

2003 to 2005
Member of the Vancouver Police Department’s Chief Constable’s Diversity Advisory Committee

1999 to 2002
Mediator – Conciliation and Arbitration Board, Ismaili Council for British Columbia

1998 to 1999
Legal Officer on the Ismaili Council for British Columbia

REFERENCES
Available upon request

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS
Available upon request
SRINI KRISHNAMOORTHY
Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6, Canada
Srinivas_Krishnamoorthy@sfu.ca, 504.228.5261 (C)

EDUCATION
• PhD – Decision, Risk & Operations, 2005
  Columbia Business School, Columbia University, New York
• PGDM (MBA) - Finance, Operations & Information Systems, 1996
  Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow, India
• B.Tech - Mechanical Engineering, 1994
  Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India

ACADEMIC & PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
• Lecturer - Technology & Operations Management
  Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University
  April 2017 – present
• Sessional Lecturer
  Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto
  Jan 2017 – April 2017
• Visiting Assistant Professor - Management Science
  A.B. Freeman School of Business, Tulane University
  July 2014 – Dec 2016
• Assistant Professor - Management Science
  Ivey Business School at Western University
  July 2005 – June 2014
• Research Analyst - Deming Center, Columbia Business School, Columbia University,
  2003-05
• Manager of Investments, Unit Trust of India, Mumbai, 1996-1998

TEACHING & RESEARCH INTERESTS
• Analytics of Winner-Take-All Markets
• Sports & Entertainment Analytics
• Revenue Management & Pricing Analytics

PEER REVIEWED ARTICLES
1. Pricing of Excess Inventory on Groupon
2. Pricing Strategies with Reference Effects in Competitive Industries
3. Writing ORMS/Analytics cases
4. Teaching ORMS/Analytics with cases
5. Competitive Revenue Management with Forward and Spot Markets
6. Dynamic Revenue Management Games with Forward and Spot Markets
PUBLISHED CASES
2. The Cascade on Broadway (Maclean K. and Krishnamoorthy S.), 2013, Ivey Publishing
4. The Fab Four of Tennis (Krishnamoorthy S. and Pinto J.), 2013, Ivey Publishing
5. Pinpoint Consulting (Chetan D. and Krishnamoorthy S.), 2011, Ivey Publishing
8. M2 Universal Communications (Bansal A., Bell P., Krishnamoorthy S. and Vaz P.), 2009, Ivey Publishing

INVITED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS
- AWOL – The Analytics Concepts Missing in our Courses
  1. INFORMS Annual Conference, Seattle, Oct 2019
  2. CORS Annual Meeting, Halifax, June 2018
- Glitz Investments
  3. INFORMS Case and Teaching Materials Competition at Annual Conference, Houston, Oct 2017
- Broadway Blockbuster Strategy - The Role of Stars and Musicals
  1. DSI Annual Meeting, Washington DC, Nov 2017
  2. POMS 2017, Seattle, May 2017

TEACHING AWARDS/HONOURS
1. Winner of 2017 INFORMS case competition for the case: Glitz Investments - Predicting a Blockbuster, Bajaj S., Bandyopadhyay S. and Krishnamoorthy S.
2. Dean’s Teaching Honour Roll, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University (2017-18, 2018-19)
3. Rotman School of Management Teaching Award of Excellence, University of Toronto (2016-17)
5. David G. Burgoyne Award for Outstanding Commitment to Student Development, Ivey Business School, 2006

EXTERNAL SERVICE
1. Chair for Education Session at DSI Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Nov 2019
2. Chair of the Education Cluster for CORS (Canadian Operations Research Society) Annual Meeting, Halifax, June 2018
5. Chair for Education Cluster at CORS Annual Meeting – Niagara Falls, 2012
6. Chair for Pricing and Revenue Management Session at CORS - INFORMS International Conference – Toronto, June 2009
7. Chair for Pricing and Revenue Management Session at INFORMS Annual Conference – Washington DC, October 2008
8. Judge for INFORMS Case Competition – Seattle, November 2007
9. Reviewer for Interfaces, INFORMS Transactions on Education, Naval Research Logistics, International Transactions in Operational Research, Socio-Economic Planning Sciences

PASTIMES
Playing squash, tasting wine, creating comedy, cooking, reading
Tom Culham P. Eng., MA. Sc, Ph. D.

CAREER PROFILE
An education professional with experience researching, teaching and managing in a postsecondary business environment. A former member of Weldwood of Canada Ltd. executive management team with proven effectiveness in implementing strategic organizational change, negotiating complex supply contracts and reducing total supply chain costs.

Research Interests
Currently conducting action research in postsecondary classes to evaluate the effectiveness of ethics pedagogy and evaluating the contribution of contemplative exercises to ethics education.

Education
Ph. D. awarded March 14, 2012; accepted without revisions Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University. Dissertation Title: Ethics Education of Business Leaders.
M.A.Sc. Transportation Engineering UBC Thesis Title: An Analytical Methodology for Short Run Urban Transportation Policy Questions
B.A.Sc. Civil Engineering University of Waterloo, Ontario

University Teaching and Management Experience 2005 - Present
SFU Beedie School of Business, Lecturer in Strategy, 2019 - Present
SFU Beedie School of Business, Visiting Lecturer 2014 to 2019
- 2014 to present BUS 303 Business Society and Society
- 2017 BUS 707 Business Ethics
City University of Seattle in Vancouver, Professor, Program Director School of Management commencing May 2017
- Responsible for management of the School of Management program in Vancouver including faculty hiring and management, & program quality

UBC Sauder School of Business, Sessional Faculty 2008 to 2017
- Teaching in the Operations and Logistics Division, undergraduate 3rd - 4th year and MBA level supply chain management and operations management courses.
- Teaching in the Organizational Behaviour and Human Resources Division, undergraduate 3rd - 4th year courses on ethics, critical thinking, and diversity management

TRU (Thompson Rivers University) School of Business and Economics, Sessional Faculty, 2010-15
- On behalf of Thompson Rivers University delivered undergrad operations management course at Shanghai Institute of Technology June 2011-13.
- On behalf of Thompson Rivers University delivered undergrad operations management course at Tianjin University of Technology June 2010 and 2015
City University of Seattle in Vancouver School of Management, Senior Faculty, 2005-7
- Responsible for management of the School of Management program in Vancouver including faculty hiring and management, & program quality 2005-7

Research Funding Awards
2018-20 Morrison Foundation Award, Admin. by City University of Seattle in Canada
2017-18 Morrison Foundation Award, Admin. by City University of Seattle in Canada
2016 Morrison Foundation Award Admin. by UBC Maurice Young Center for Ethics
2013 –14 Clement Fung Chair of Asia Standard Hong Kong Administered by UBC Maurice Young Center for Applied Ethics
2008, 2009, 2010 Graduate Fellowship, Simon Fraser University

Recognition Awards
2012 Simon Fraser University Dean’s Convocation Medal:
2010 Paul Tai Yip Ng Memorial Award, best graduate student paper:
Refereed Contributions

Journal Articles


Books


Chapter Publications


Victor Song CV
(Short Version)

Employment
Lecturer in Finance, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, since Sept 2015

Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>BUS 418 D1/D2</td>
<td>3.84/4 and 3.79/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>BUS 418 D1/D2</td>
<td>3.89/4 and 3.75/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/D3</td>
<td>3.88/4 and 3.85/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/D3</td>
<td>3.86/4 and 3.73/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/BUS 418 D1</td>
<td>3.9/4 and 3.76/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
<td>BUS 413 D1/E1</td>
<td>3.85/4 and 3.9/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Evaluation Average: 3.85/4

Excellent Teaching Awards:
- Teaching Honor Roll, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2017.
- Teaching Honor Roll, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, 2016.
- Teaching Recognition Letters, Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University, Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Summer 2016, Fall 2017, Spring 2017, Summer 2019.
- Teaching Excellence Award, Department of Economics, University of Calgary, 2012.
- Teaching Excellence Award, Graduate Students’ Association, University of Calgary, 2009.

Research

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles
Peer-Reviewed Policy Papers

Book Chapters

Working Papers
2. “Social Trust and Stock Price Crash Risk: Evidence from China,” with Kun Su. (Submitted)
4. “Puppy-Dog and Fatter Fat-Cat under Price-Matching,” with Kent Fellows

Services
Committees
• Design Committee for Master in Management program, Simon Fraser University, 2019.
• Beedie Finance Field School Director, since 2019.
• Beedie International Programs Committee, Simon Fraser University, 2018.
• Beedie Committee Teaching & Learning Committee, Simon Fraser University, 2016, 2017.
• Beedie Committee Communications Initiative Action Committee, Simon Fraser University, 2016, 2017.
• University Committee Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning, Simon Fraser University, 2016, 2017.

Student Supervision
• Serve as a main supervisor for Master of Science in Finance projects (2 projects)
• Serve as a second reader for Master of Science in Finance projects (30 projects)
Curriculum Vitae
Shauna Jones, MA

Work: 778-782-5568
EMAIL: SHAUNAI@SFU.CA

Profile

Senior lecturer, facilitator, and coach with over twenty years' experience developing and implementing curricula that focus on helping learners develop themselves into self-reliant, resilient and highly employable individuals. Proven track record delivering education related to collaboration, business communications, leadership, faculty development, and career management. Conduct Scholarship of Teaching and Learning research on teaching teamwork in post-secondary education.

Post-Secondary Teaching Experience

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
Burnaby, BC

Senior Lecturer, Faculty Teaching Fellow
Faculty Lecturer
Visiting Lecturer

September 2015 - present
2006-present
2003, 2005, 2006

- Collaboratively develop and teach the curriculum for BUS 202: Foundations in Collaborative Work Environments
  - Instruct and facilitate up to 90 students per section in this experiential course focusing on developing students' self-awareness, awareness of others, and abilities to work in teams
  - Implement Explicit Team Learning to ensure students learn who best to work in teams while working on a team project
  - Supervise two teaching assistants per section
- Instruct students in a 13-week, 3rd-year mandatory, business communication course which focuses primarily on writing
  - Partner with industry professionals to create experiential learning for a semester-long student team assignment
  - Developed a peer-review component to the course in partnership with SFU’s Student Learning Commons to improve students learning and develop skills in providing constructive feedback
  - Supervise one teaching assistant per section each semester
- Design and update course material, assessments and lessons each semester taking a student-centred approach and using backward design
- Mark and grade student papers

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE
Burnaby, BC
Instructor, Certificate Program in University Teaching and Learning
September 2013 - present

- Co-instruct this 13-week program for graduate students from multi disciplines to develop and refine their course design and teaching practice
- Provide feedback on students’ lesson plans and delivery, teaching philosophies and course design
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY, CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE (CON’T)
Facilitator, Rethinking Teaching Spring 2015 & 2016
- Facilitate small groups within this course for faculty designing or redesigning their courses
- Provide feedback and support to participants in this 4-day workshop

Service to the University

SENATE
Senate Appeals Board for Withdraws with Extenuating Circumstances (Alternate) 2018
Senate Appeals Board for Withdraws with Extenuating Circumstances (Member) 2015-2017

BEEDIE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
Member, Master of Management (MIM) Design Team present
- Contribute to the design of the MIM program, including proposal and course design
Member, Undergraduate Program Review Committee present
- Contribute to the review of the Undergraduate Program, including redesigning the program goals in collaboration with other members
Faculty Teaching Fellow & Member, Teaching and Learning Council present
- Support the transition from Committee to Council for teaching and learning at Beedie
Faculty Teaching Fellow & Chair/Co-chair, Teaching and Learning Committee September 2014 - present
- Lead this committee focused on supporting teaching and learning at Beedie
- Work closely with the Associate Deans and Dean to meet the teaching and learning priorities for the school
- Co/design, coordinate, and co/deliver professional development opportunities for faculty and sessionals
Coordinator, Teaching and Learning Group (TLG) December 2011 - present
- Coordinate TLG workshops that include acting as liaison with workshop presenters and ensuring the promotion of the workshops
- Collaborate with Teaching Fellow, Admin staff, and Associate Dean to produce the Teaching Newsletter
- Design, organize and coordinate, in cooperation with the Associate Deans, Educational Consultant and the presenters, Beedie’s annual Teaching and Learning Luncheon

TEACHING AND LEARNING CENTRE
Academic Planning Committee Member, STLHE Annual Conference, June 2015

Relevant Research Project
The Where and How Teams are Used, Taught, and Assessed Across Core Courses in a Business Undergraduate Curriculum. [Work In Progress]. SFU Teaching and Learning Development Grant (Started January 2018 – work in progress) Collaborators: Shauna Jones and Anirban Kar

Education
Master of Arts in Leadership and Training 2002
ROYAL ROADS UNIVERSITY, Victoria, BC
Terri L. Griffith

Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
500 Granville Street
Vancouver BC V6C 1W6
Canada

+1 (650)-861-1961
+1 (236)-333-2311
at TerriGriffith dot com
@terrigriffith
TerriGriffith.com

Education

Carnegie Mellon University
Graduate School of Industrial Administration (now the Tepper School of Business)
PhD Organizational Psychology & Theory (Focus: Technology Management) 1989
MS Organizational Psychology & Theory 1986
University of California, Berkeley
BA Psychology (Focus: Industrial/Organizational) 1983

Professional Employment

Simon Fraser University - Beedie School of Business
Keith Beedie Chair in Innovation and Entrepreneurship 2019-pres
Professor of Innovation and Entrepreneurship 2019-pres

Santa Clara University – Leavey School of Business
Professor of Management & Entrepreneurship 2001-2019
Associate Dean, Leavey School of Business 2015-2018
Chair, Department of Management & Entrepreneurship 2013-2015
Chair, University Coordinating Committee 2013-2014
Entrepreneurship Leadership Team, Leavey School of Business 2010-2017
Chair-Elect, University Coordinating Committee 2012-2013
Chair, University Taskforce on Communication & Collaboration 2011-2012

Hyperloop Transportation Technologies, Inc.
Crowd Advisor and Contributor 2016-Pres

Washington University - John M. Olin School of Business
Associate Professor of Org. Behavior & Technology Management 1998-2000

Visiting Positions & Affiliations

Center for Effective Organizations, USC: Affiliated Faculty 2018-Pres
Constellation Research, Inc.: Affiliate 2014-Pres
University of California, Berkeley, Haas School of Business 2000-2001
**Editorial Positions**

Senior Editor:  

Associate Editor:  
*Group Decision & Negotiation* (1996 to present)  
ICIS (2000, 2010)  
*MIS Quarterly* (2000-2002)

Guest Editor:  

Panel Member:  
*National Science Foundation* (multiple years)

Special Issue Editor:  
*Organization Science: Information Technology and Organizational Form and Function* (2007, with Ray Zammuto, Ann Majchrzak, Deborah Dougherty, and Samer Faraj)  
*Journal of Engineering and Technology Management: Beyond Sociotechnical Systems* (2001, with Deborah Dougherty)

**Selected Publications**


Jason Yiu Chung Ho

Associate Professor
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby BC Canada V5A 1S6

Email: jason_ho_3@sfu.ca
Phone: (778) 782-5836

Education:
Doctor of Philosophy in Marketing, 2005
The University of British Columbia, Canada

Master of Philosophy in Marketing, 2000
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Bachelor of Business Administration (First Class degree with Honors), 1995
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Research Publications


“Segmenting Consumers of Pirated Movies” (with C. Weinberg), *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 28(4), 2011, p.252-260


University and Post-secondary Teaching Experiences:
Simon Fraser University, Canada, 2007 - Present
Courses taught:
- Introduction to Marketing
- Marketing Research
• Customer Analytics
• Web Analytics
• Analytics Project (Business Analytics & Decision Making Certificate capstone course)
• Directed Studies: Bayesian Statistics (Jose D. Mora, doctoral student)


Ryerson University, Canada, 2005 – 2007
Course taught: e-Marketing

The University of British Columbia, Canada, 2003
Course taught: Introduction to Marketing

Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education, Hong Kong, 1998 – 2000
Course taught: Marketing and Professional Practice (Interior Design)

University and Academic Community Services:

Organizer, SFU Business Analytics Hackathon, Beedie School of Business, SFU, 2016-2019

Member, Steering Committee, Data Science Major, SFU, 2017-2020

Area Coordinator, Marketing Area, Beedie School of Business, SFU, 2011-2014


Coach of SFU marketing team in JDC West Business Competition 2009 & 2010

Member, Editorial Board, Journal of Interactive Marketing, 2014-Present

Member, Editorial Board, Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 2012-Present

Industry Experiences:

Carlsberg Brewery Hong Kong Ltd., Marketing Officer, Hong Kong, 1997 - 1998

Miller Brewing International Inc. / Dah Chong Hong Ltd., Marketing Officer, Hong Kong, 1995 - 1996
Susan Christie-Bell
38347 Peaks Place, Squamish, BC, V8B 0V9
Cell: 778-970-0234 / Email: susan_christie-bell@sfu.ca

ACHIEVEMENTS
Teaching Honour Roll, SFU Beedie School of Business
20-year Teaching Appreciation Award, Capilano University

EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education Degree</td>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>Burnaby, BC</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration Studies</td>
<td>Capilano University</td>
<td>Squamish, BC</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Travel Certificate</td>
<td>LaSalle College, Montreal</td>
<td>QC</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Studies</td>
<td>Concordia University</td>
<td>Montreal, QC</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts Diploma</td>
<td>Marianopolis College</td>
<td>Montreal, QC</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
Teaching / Curriculum Development / Program Management

- Member of the development team for the BUS217W course; successfully piloted the course in Fall 2017, and have continued to develop the course since.
- Course lead responsible for the BUS217W and BUS201 courses for 2019-2020 academic year. Responsibilities include mentorship of instructional team and course administration.
- Experience in curriculum design and development of writing assessment tools. Active in learning and impact assessment at course and credential levels.
- Dedicated to continuous development and use of active and experiential learning strategies.
- Member of Capilano University Senate Curriculum Committee for five years, past Chair for School of Tourism Management Curriculum Committee, Convenor/Coordinator over 14 years within the School of Business, School of Communication, and the School of Tourism Management.
- Developed and delivered internationally recognized WorldHost customer service programs for 11 years with Destination BC: *Service Fundamentals, Frontline Management Solutions, Japanese Service Expectations, Service Across Cultures, Customers with Disabilities, Service in Health Care*.
- Trained, evaluated, and certified new instructors throughout Canada for Destination BC.
- Developed and conducted Human Resource Development Canada Employment Assistance Service programs and workshops for nine years - included *Life Skills, Career Exploration, Job Search Strategies, and Project Management*.
- Developed and delivered training seminars for airline and travel industry personnel, three travel information computer systems (Sabre, Apollo, Reservee)
Cross Cultural Communication / English as an Additional Language & International Education

- Conducted intense teacher training and cross-cultural initiation sessions for new instructors in Japan, including customer service expectations, classroom dynamics, principles of adult learning, and public speaking. Provided the Japanese executive management team with a personal evaluation of each trainee instructor's teaching skill, professionalism, and potential to be a valuable employee and effective instructor.
- Conducted cross-cultural communication skills classes for major Japanese corporations in Japan.
- Taught English as an Additional Language classes (private, group, corporate sessions) for beginner to advanced level students in Kobe, Osaka, Kyoto, and Tokyo, Japan.
- Conducted English for International Business classes for major Japanese corporations, including Nissho Iwai, Mitsubishi Bank, Eli Lilly Pharmaceuticals, and Daimaru Department Stores.

Business / Entrepreneurship

- Small business owner in the Sea to Sky corridor for seven years; experience with design and implementation of business and marketing plans.
- Administered Human Resource Development Canada (HRDC) Employment Assistance Service training programs through the Sea to Sky corridor.
- Experience in business management relating to planning, organizing, marketing, human resources, communications, and financial management.
- Extensive experience with written forms of business communication, including proposals, reports, and business letters.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

| Visiting Lecturer | Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC | 2011-Present |
| Faculty | Capilano University, North Vancouver, BC | 2001-Present |
| Partner | TriUnity Learning Centre, Squamish, BC | 1993-2000 |
| Master Trainer (Contract) | Destination BC, Victoria, BC | 1994-2005 |
| ESL Instructor (Contract) | L.I.N.C., Squamish, BC | 1994-1995 |
| Trainer / Instructor | BiLingual Language Institute, Kobe/Tokyo, Japan | 1991-1993 |
| Instructor | Gemini Group of Air Canada, Montreal, QC | 1988-1991 |

SUMMARY OF COURSES TAUGHT, UNIVERSITY

Beedie School of Business, Simon Fraser University

- BUS201 Introduction to Business
- BUS217W Critical Thinking in Business
- BUS360W Business Communication

School of Communication, Faculty of Business and Professional Studies, Capilano University

- CMNS154 Communications in Outdoor Recreation and Tourism
- CMNS164 Advanced Communication and Interactions for Tourism Management International
- CMNS220 Advanced Business Writing and Editing
- CMNS250 Technical Writing
- CMNS305 Advanced International Interactions
- NABU355 North American Law and Effective Business Communication
APPENDIX G

Program Budget
Budget for the Proposed Program (financial and personnel)

Resource Requirements

The MiM requires instructional and administrative resources, all of which are available at or through SFU. With respect to instructional resources, each cohort of approximately 40 students will require instructors for 13 courses (9 core courses and 4 specialization courses). As the capstone for the program is a strategic applied project (and not a graduate thesis), graduate supervision will be provided by the Academic Director of the MiM Program. As discussed previously (see response to Question 26 above), instruction will be provided by continuing faculty at SFU, by new faculty (continuing, visiting, limited term) hired specifically to teach in MiM as the program grows, and by sessional instructors hired to teach specific MiM courses.

With respect to administrative resources, the MiM requires funding for Program Director, Program Coordinator, Recruitment and Admissions, Career Management Services, Co-curricular Experiences and Graduate Program Operations. All costs associated with the resources used by MiM will be borne by the program.

A detailed budget for the MiM has been prepared in consultation with the Beedie School of Business’s Dean’s Office, including Ali Dastmalchian, Dean; Andrew Gemino, Associate Dean, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies; and Melissa McCrae, Executive Director, Graduate Programs. It is being developed in consultation with Jeff Derksen, Dean of Graduate Studies and Wade Parkhouse, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President Academic. As a consequence, we are confident that the detailed budget is robust in its consideration of program costs and tuition revenue and that the MiM will be a revenue-generating program for SFU and the Beedie School of Business.

Proposed tuition and other program fees

Tuition Fees

Tuition will be charged on a per-term basis. There are several reasons for this. First, it will help to stabilize tuition fees for students, who otherwise could see large fluctuations in their tuition fees over the three terms. Second, it will make the estimation of tuition fees easier to administer and predict. The proposed tuition fees in fall 2021 for domestic students are $6,833.33 per term with annual increases of 2% thereafter; and for international students, $11,500 per term with annual increases of 4% thereafter.

The MiM will be a premium fee program. The justification for the premium fee is the specialized nature of the program that integrates academic and professional instruction that necessitates extraordinary time and effort related to program instruction and administration.

Other Program Fees

The integrated career management and co-curricular experiences are critical components of the program that are not included in tuition fees. The proposed program fees directly related to the staff and operational expenses associated with this program are $1,500 per term for domestic and international students with annual increases of 2% thereafter. Students will be advised in advance of registering (through the MiM website) that they will be responsible for covering any costs incurred related to attendance at the residency of their program or for optional experiences (for example, international applied projects, study tours, etc.).
Total Program Fees

The total program fees for students who begin the MiM in fall 2021 will be $25,000 for domestic students and $39,000 for international students.

Projected Program Surplus

Based on these tuition fees, the program is expected to generate a small surplus given the costs of delivering the program. A portion of any surplus realized will be directed to a bursary targeted for MiM students.
APPENDIX H

Program Steering Committee
Details of Program Steering Committee

For the purpose of developing this program, an MiM Design Team was formed who reported progress and solicited guidance from a Governance Committee within the Beedie School of Business.

Design Team:
Andrew Gemino, Associate Dean, Graduate Programs, Beedie School of Business
Andrew Harries, Tom Foord Associate Professor of Practice in Innovation and Entrepreneurship
Lily Lin, Assistant Professor, Marketing
Shauna Jones, Senior Lecturer, Business Communication
Victor Song, Lecturer, Finance
Michael Johnson, Senior Lecturer, Technology and Operations Management
Arthur Redillas, Director, Recruitment and Admissions
Gurwinder Singh, Director, Graduate Career Management Centre and Employer Engagement
Stephanie Reimer, Associate Director, Corporate and Custom Graduate Programs
Jennifer Beale, Director, Executive Education
Casey Yorke, Strategic Planning Analyst, Beedie School of Business

Governance Committee:
Ali Dastmalchian, Dean, Beedie School of Business
Blaize Reich, Professor, Management Information Systems. Former Dean (Sept 2014-Dec 2015)
Mark Wexler, Professor, Management and Organization Studies and Strategy
Carolyne Smart, Professor Emeritas, Beedie School of Business. Former Dean (Sept 2008-Dec 2009)
Jamie Gray-Donald, Senior VP Sustainability, Enterprise Innovation, QuadReal Property Group, SFU
Beedie School of Business Advisory Board member
APPENDIX I

Target Audience Survey Questions
Target Audience Survey

Student Interview Survey Questions:

1. Which faculty are you in? What is your major?
2. Which year are you in, and when do you expect to graduate?
3. Why did you choose your degree of study?
4. How are you feeling about graduating?
5. Do you have career plans or goals? What are they?
6. How are you feeling about your career prospects right now?
7. Do you feel the degree and related work/volunteer experience you will be graduating with will help you achieve your career goals? How so?
8. [follow up question] If not, what specific gaps do you think you have between your current qualifications and what you need to achieve your career goals?
9. [follow up question] Do you think you will need to pursue a graduate degree or complete additional education for the career you would like to have? If so, what type of graduate degree would you need?
10. [follow up question] How are you paying/did you pay for your undergraduate education? Would you use the same source of funding for a graduate degree?
11. What kind of career training have you received so far from your faculty/the university/other sources (e.g., resume writing, interview skills, networking, etc.)?
12. The Beedle School of Business is considering a Master’s in Management program intended for students with less than 2 years full time work experience and an undergraduate degree in a discipline outside of business. The program will provide students with foundational management skills and experiences that will help them help launch careers. The skills learned in the MIM should enable students to elevate into a junior manager role as they develop experience. If this program were available to you, would you consider it? Why or why not?
13. [follow up question] What would you want to get out of a program like this? (e.g., internship, career management, etc.)
14. If specializations were available what would you like to see? (Can prompt with the following examples: Digital Media Marketing and Communication; Negotiation and Sales; Innovation and New Product Design; Data Analytics and Decision-making)
15. Do you have other comments or thoughts you wish to share?
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate
FROM: Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and Provost pro tem, and Chair, SCUP
RE: Full Program Proposal for a Minor in Indigenous Languages (SCUP 20-19)

DATE: April 28, 2020
PAGES: 1 of 1

At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the Full Program Proposal for a Minor in Indigenous Languages in the Department of Linguistics and the First Nations Languages Program within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, effective Spring 2021.

Motion:

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Full Program Proposal for a Minor in Indigenous Languages in the Department of Linguistics and the First Nations Languages Program within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, effective Spring 2021.

c: N. Hedberg
M. Ignace
Action undertaken by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies at its meeting of April 2, 2020, gives rise to the following recommendation:

Motion

That SCUP approve and recommend to Senate the Full Program Proposal for the Minor in Indigenous Languages in the Department of Linguistics and the First Nations Languages Program within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.
Minor in Indigenous Languages

Full Program Proposal

February 12, 2020
Department of Linguistics and First Nations Languages Program
(Version: March 26, 2020)
1 Executive Summary

a) An overview of the institution’s history, mission, and academic goals:

As Canada’s engaged university, Simon Fraser University is defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting-edge research and far-reaching community engagement. SFU was founded in 1965 with a mission to bring an interdisciplinary approach to learning, embrace bold initiatives, and engage with communities near and far. Today SFU is consistently ranked amongst Canada’s top comprehensive universities and is one of the world’s leading teaching and research institutions.

In British Columbia and elsewhere in North America, Indigenous languages are critically endangered. As Indigenous communities set out to (re)-vitalize their languages, there is an urgent need to advanced communication skills in the language as these are connected to cultural knowledge and traditions, combined with skills of linguistic analysis. Elements in the Minor engage students in language revitalization with opportunities for appropriate to labour market needs in Indigenous communities and in public institutions that provide support for Indigenous language revitalization.

Students in SFU’s Indigenous language proficiency programs (Certificate and/or Diploma) and those with associate degree but not having a pathway to advance their academic growth in the discipline desire to complete a bachelor degree at SFU. The Minor in Indigenous Languages serves as a pathway for the students to apply and further their Indigenous language knowledge, fluency and skills. Students who wish to advance onward to become the trainers of future adult learners of respective Indigenous languages through completion of a bachelor’s degree may ladder into a graduate degree such as the Linguistics of a First Nations Language MA.

The Minor affirms a commitment to continue collaborations with First Nations partners and the development of this program advances support of Indigenous students affirming a pledge of the University and the Faculty (SFU and FASS Academic Plans).

b) Credential to be awarded:

Minor in Indigenous Languages (INLMIN)

c) Location of program:

This program will be offered mostly off-campus in various First Nations communities where the majority of students in our INLG courses live and work. However, if an Indigenous language could be taught on-campus in sufficient depth (e.g. the local Coast Salish language Ḫonq̓əmin̓Ax̱), an INL Minor will be
feasible for students—often as members of cohorts—as well: such cohorts, emerging from Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency and Diploma in First Nations Language Proficiency graduates exist in Squamish Nation and Secwepemc Nation, with additional students currently completing CFNLP and beyond in Yukon (Yukon Native Language Centre and Champagne Aishihik First Nation), and in Haida Gwaii. In 2018-19, two beginning FNLC Cree courses were taught at the Burnaby campus; and in 2016-2017 and 2017-18, 2018-19 and currently in 2019-20, four cohorts of the Squamish Language Academy CFNLP Program (Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency) were taught at the Vancouver Campus and at Squamish Nation. SFU INLP has received new requests for intensive offerings of the CFNLP from additional First Nations language communities.

To complete other courses for the BA outside of the Minor, students will supplement courses taught on-site in their communities with or-campus and distance-education courses. Also, many students take courses that can transfer to SFU at BC post-secondary institutions local to their communities.

d) Faculty offering the proposed new program:

Department of Linguistics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Course offerings and advising will be administered by the Indigenous Languages Program.

e) Anticipated program start date:

An 18-month lead time would require that the program start in Spring 2021. However, it would be far preferable if an exception can be made so as to allow the program to begin in Fall 2020 (or even Summer 2020 if possible) in order to facilitate the transition of students who are currently completing the DFNLP (Diploma in First Nations Language Proficiency) into the BA. We expect the first students to graduate with the Minor in Indigenous Languages in Spring 2021.

f) Anticipated completion time:

As Indigenous languages courses are typically offered on a cohort basis, the completion schedule will follow the funding cycles of the relevant First Nations language organizations and the work schedule of the students, many of whom are employed in the public schools. Completion of the INL Minor will normally be expected within two to four academic years. However, the exact number of terms needed will vary, depending on factors such as whether the CFNLP and/or DFNLP will already have been completed, the extent to which continuous full-time enrolment is required for students to obtain adequate band funding, and the extent to which offerings of courses counting towards the INL Minor are interspersed with courses needed for the other Minor or for a general SFU Bachelor Degree requirements.
g) Summary of the proposed program

- **Aims, goals, and objectives:**

  The main objective is to provide a pathway to a bachelor’s degree for students specializing in their heritage Indigenous languages. Currently, the FNLP offers a 27-unit Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency (CFNLP) and a 30-unit Diploma in First Nations Language Proficiency (DFNLP), credentials which have typically been offered on a cohort basis off-campus. The proposed Minor in Indigenous Languages will enable students who are enrolled in the CFNLP and/or DFNLP to complete a BA degree by combining with another existing SFU minor program, for example, the Extended Minor in Linguistics, the Minor in First Nations Studies, or the Minor in Anthropology.

  Potentially, other SFU students with a major (or minor) in many disciplines (Indigenous Studies, Education, Anthropology, Linguistics, Archeology, History) may be interested in combining their Major with a Minor in Indigenous Languages.

- **Contribution to the mandate and strategic plan of the institution:**

  By enabling Indigenous students to obtain a Bachelor of Arts Degree by means of concentrated study of their own ancestral language within their own community, the proposed Minor in Indigenous Languages will make clear central contributions to meeting current strategic goals of the Faculty as well as the University in general.

  For example, the SFU Strategic Research Plan (2016-2020) recognizes the importance of engaging with Indigenous communities for the purpose of preserving ancestral languages:

  - Community-based research is also critical as we engage with Indigenous communities. In working with these communities, SFU researchers seek ways to address a wide range of social, economic, and historical issues, including the preservation of ancestral languages, strengthening health and educational systems, promoting Indigenous business opportunities, and facilitating efforts to drive change and social welfare. (SFU Strategic Research Plan)

  In addition, both the SFU and FASS Five-Year Academic Plans (2018-2023) pledge to seek ways of advancing reconciliation through the development of new programs that will enhance the experience of Indigenous students. The SFU plan also pledges to expand access to learning opportunities that are integrated into communities:

  - Make timely progress on the SFU Aboriginal Reconciliation Council’s Calls for Action (Commitments, SFU Academic Plan)
  - Enhance programming and services that address support for Indigenous students and their unique and varied needs (1.7, SFU Academic Plan)
Expand access to community-integrated learning (CIL) opportunities (3.2, SFU Plan)

Advancing reconciliation means improving the success rates of Indigenous students and increasing research opportunities for Indigenous scholars. It also means mobilizing Indigenous ways of knowing, and FASS must go further in our commitment and find new models of academic governance, develop new programs, and allocate the resources to do so. (FASS Academic Plan)

- **Linkages between program outcomes and curriculum design:**

No work experience or practicum term will be required for the INL Minor.

Most students are eligible to work as research assistants on research projects through the work student program.

- **Delivery methods:**

The program will mostly be delivered face to face in classrooms. However, some components of some courses may be delivered on-line or through telecommunication.

- **Program strengths:**

The program is designed with maximum flexibility so that individual students and community-based cohorts can collaboratively decide what courses best fit their educational goals.

There are two aspects of language expertise that our students focus on: (i) gaining fluency and literacy in the language, and (ii) gaining knowledge about the structure of the language as well as its socio-cultural setting.

In addition to developing language competency and proficiency (oral, analysis, structure) as well as language and linguistics skill sets, the Minor Program provides opportunities for students to carry out their course work in their speech communities as well as connect with Elders, mentors, and academic experts with detailed knowledge of their heritage language.

- **Level of support and recognition:**

SFU has hosted and also attended meetings with the University of Victoria as well as other BC post-secondary institutions regarding the development of cooperative pathways towards a BC FNL fluency BA. The proposed INL Minor was mentioned as a next step in the long-term goal of developing a Major in Indigenous Languages.

Students who have taken language courses at other British Columbia post-secondary institutions will be able to transfer them into the SFU INL Minor.
• Related programs:

There are currently no Major or Minor programs in BC that allow students to complete coursework focused on a since Indigenous language.

The University of British Columbia has a Major and Minor in First Nations and Endangered Languages. The Major requires only three language courses, and the Minor requires only two. They have offered up to four courses of seven different BC languages.

The University of Victoria offers a laddered Certificate in Indigenous Language Proficiency, Diploma in Indigenous Language Revitalization, and Bachelor of Education in Indigenous Language Revitalization. There are only four Indigenous language courses in total (i.e. for the whole BEd), although each can be repeated for credit.

By contrast, SFU students who complete a BA with the INL Minor will typically complete at least eight language courses. And most of our students, since they will enter into the minor program by first completing the Certificate and Diploma programs in First Nations Language Proficiency, will complete at least 16 language courses. Hence, the programs at SFU are well-suited for First Nations students whose goal is to gain fluency in their ancestral language.

h) Contact information:

Dr. Marianne Ignace, Professor, Linguistics and First Nations Studies; and Director, First Nations Languages Program (250.574.3869, ignace@sfu.ca)

Dr. Peter Jacobs, Assistant Professor, Linguistics; Associate Director, First Nations Languages program (pwjacbos@sfu.ca)

Dr. Nancy Hedberg, Professor, Linguistics and Cognitive Science; and Chair, Linguistics Department (778.782.5659, hedberg@sfu.ca).

2 Credential Recognition and Nomenclature

2.1 Post-secondary recognition

(See “Level of support and recognition” section of this FPP.)

2.2 Industry/employer recognition

A recent cohort of students who completed the Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency generally may serve as an example of potential industry/employer recognition for the Minor program.
The support letters we received First Nations/Indigenous partner organizations for our proficiency programs speak to the labour market demand of First Nations Language Program graduates as well.

First Nations communities continued to experience the loss of Elders/language knowledge keepers. As local schools are preparing to ramp up the amount of language and culture integration and indigenization of curriculum, many of our elders who have worked to pass on the language are aging out and retiring.

Opportunities to train a younger generation of language keepers can ensure that the schools and communities have the language specialists they require to continue their programs.

Past participants are employed within local schools as language teachers and cultural teacher’s assistants as a direct result of our language program. The progress that has been accomplished by our participants, through this program, has been noted within First Nations community partners. Students find employment as language teachers, graduate student research assistants, language nest programmers, language specialist in cultural programming; material developers for community language programming; and positions within their communities.

3 Curriculum/Program Content

3.1 Program structure

Completion of 30 units with courses from INLG and LING disciplines with 15 units of lower division courses and 15 units of upper division courses.

At the lower-division, students will be required to complete or transfer in equivalent credit for a set of beginning INLG language courses. Specifically, the following two entry-level courses:

INLG 133 - Introduction to Indigenous Language I (3)
INLG 134 - Introduction to Indigenous Language II (3)

In addition, they will be required to take three additional lower-division INLG or specified LING courses.

At the upper-division level, students will be required to complete five courses. These can be INLG courses, or LING courses whose content focuses on an Indigenous language. This degree of flexibility will enable each cohort program to be custom designed to fit the needs of the specific community.

Program duration will vary. Where the Program is offered full time, the minimum time required for program completion is two academic terms. (See FPP section 1e.)

Courses will be graded on the basis of assessments of oral, written and multimedia assignments, presentations, and projects, as well as assessments of oral and written
language skills, as per usual practice in SFU language courses. All courses are graded and there are no capstone courses.

See Appendix 8.1 for Program Requirements.

3.2 Core courses

INLG 133 - Introduction to Indigenous Language I (3)

Introduces the structure of an Indigenous language, including phonetics, vocabulary, word formation, and grammatical constructions. Based on a designated language and usually chosen from the Northwest coast area. Students may retake this course for credit with focus on a different Indigenous language. Students who have credit for INLG 231 may not take this course for further credit.

INLG 134 - Introduction to Indigenous Language II (3)*

A continuation of the introductory course in an Indigenous language, including phonetics, vocabulary, word formation, and grammatical constructions. Based on a designated language and will usually be chosen from the Northwest Coast area. Students may take this course for credit with focus on a different Indigenous language. Prerequisite: INLG 133. Students who have completed LING 232 or INLG 232 may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated language.

3.3 Existing and new courses

See Appendix 8.8 for list of courses.

3.4 Curriculum and program goals

Please refer to the Aims and Goals section.

3.5 Work experience/field/practicum placement

No work experience or practicum term will be required for the INL Minor.

4 Program Resources

4.1 Target audience and enrolment plan

When a steady state is achieved, the average intake is expected to be around 15 students per year. However, the size will vary with the particular cohort. For example, we expect that the first cohort, which will consist of nine of the Hul’q’umi’num’ students who are finishing the DFNLP in December 2019, will be somewhat smaller than the second likely cohort, which may await completion of a second offering of the DFNLP in the Squamish Nation that has not yet been scheduled.
4.2 Resources
At present, INLP and Linguistics are seeking approval of a new tenure-track appointment to the INLP, and this will augment our current team. This would greatly enhance ability to offer courses on campus.

Note that our CFNLP and DFNLP offerings have typically required the hiring of sessional, limited term or visiting instructors for 2-6 courses per program. Many of these instructors are First Nations language experts. Such hiring is also likely to be needed for at least some of the offerings of the INL Minor. Much of the cost of instruction is borne through external funding—federal funding (e.g. Post-secondary Partnerships Program), provincial funding (Aboriginal Community Based Training Partnerships Program) as well as contracts from our First Nations community partners.

The main resource requirements will be to fund course instructors and to fund proficient speakers of the languages, e.g. Elders.

The program will not impact or reduce other programs or resources within the unit as the courses are already included in the teaching load and administration portfolio of the core faculty members.

5 Program Review and Academic/Administrative Oversight
This program will be assessed as part of the external reviews of the Department of Linguistics, which take place every seven years.

6 Program Consultation
SFU has hosted and also attended meetings with the University of Victoria as well as other BC post-secondary institutions regarding the development of cooperative pathways towards a BC FNL fluency BA. The proposed INL Minor was mentioned as a next step in the long-term goal of developing a Major in Indigenous Languages. Consultations with SFU Department of Linguistics as well as with students and sponsors.

7 Evidence of Student Interest and Labour Market Demand
Each year, over a dozen students contact the INLP Advisor or the cohort directors about progressing forward into a bachelor’s degree program. This number is increasing dramatically as the number of INLG courses being offered increases.

In the 2018-19 academic year, 37 students graduated with the CFNLP. In total, over 120 students have graduated with the CFNLP.

In the 2018-19 academic year, the inaugural year of the DFNLP, 35 students started in a total of three cohorts, with the first students scheduled to complete in Fall 2019.
There is a high market demand for the graduates of this program. The importance of Indigenous languages is now well-established. The mission to reclaim, revitalize, strengthen and maintain them is currently receiving much attention world-wide (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) and within Canada (https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/campaigns/celebrate-indigenous-languages/legislation.html). This has resulted in a surge in funding for documenting, researching and teaching First Nations languages, creating many jobs for language specialists with First Nations language programs, school districts, universities, and government agencies. The aging of the population of language speakers that have been key figures in language programs in their communities means that First Nations are turning to the younger generation to take responsibility for the language work. Our programs are designed to help participants gain the necessary skills to do well in these jobs.

Our courses provide training that will enable our students to help provide what Indigenous communities are asking for: language nest and daycare programs based on early immersion models; K-12 programs that offer at least partial immersion and eventually full immersion; adult courses taught by a new generation of Indigenous educators with high proficiency in their languages; language and culture programs for all ages; educational materials development; program planning; documentation with Elders; language analysis and creation of resource materials. The need is great and almost all of the graduates of our certificate program are currently employed or furthering their education.

8 Appendices

8.1 Calendar entry

Indigenous Languages Minor

This program is for students who wish to specialize in a particular heritage Indigenous language.

Advanced placement through course challenge to a maximum of 12 units is possible for fluent speakers. Equivalent credit for a set of beginning INLG language courses for transfer credit may be considered. Credit may be applied to a specific language and is achieved by examination from an instructor in that language with the approval of the department.

Advising for this certificate is provided by the Indigenous Languages Program (INLP). Students should plan their program in consultation with the INLP Advisor (fnlp@sfu.ca).

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

A cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 2.00.
Completion of INLG 133, 134 and one INLG or LING elective course prior to declaring the Minor Program is recommended.

Students who have successfully completed three or more INLG/LING courses should contact the INLP Department Advisor (fnlp@sfu.ca) to review eligibility and program completion timeline.

**PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

**Lower Division Requirements**

Students complete a total of 15 units, including

INLG 133 - Introduction to Indigenous Language I (3)*
INLG 134 - Introduction to Indigenous Language II (3)*

and nine additional units in lower division INLG or LING courses. The following foundation courses are recommended:

INLG 130 - Practical Phonetics for Indigenous Languages (3)
INLG 200 - Introduction to Grammar in an Indigenous Language (3)
LING 220 - Introduction to Linguistics (3)
LING 282W - Writing for Linguistics (3)

* preferably in the same language

**Upper Division Requirements**

Students complete a total of 15 units of upper division courses in INLG and/or LING whose content focuses on an Indigenous Language. (See Academic Calendar list of INLG and LING courses.)*

* Students will be advised to take certain 200-level courses that serve as prerequisites for the 300-level courses. Students are required to meet the prerequisites.

** 8.2 New Courses**

In development is a 400-level Writing course (INLG 439W) on Indigenous Language Revitalization (previously taught as special topic as INLG 335).

** 8.3 Market analysis – student interest and labour market demand**

Students of our Diploma cohorts and community partners expressed interest during advising and information meetings.
8.4 Consultation comments and letters of support
See 8.9.

8.5 Resources
The main resource requirements will be to fund course instructors and to fund proficient speakers of the languages, e.g. Elders.
The program will not impact or reduce other programs or resources within the unit as the courses are already included in the teaching load and administration portfolio of the core faculty members.

8.6 Financial plan (only if additional resources required)
Curriculum for courses with prior offerings for various communities have developed content. Tuition-based offerings will follow the University’s student fees structures. The cost of sessional and visiting appointments to supplement continuing faculty teaching on load can be covered through recovery of funds (tuition) and through support from government grants such as the Post-Secondary Partnership Program, as is the case with the Certificate and Diploma in First Nations Language Proficiency.

8.7 Abbreviated curriculum vitae for faculty
N/A (Program does not require Ministry of Advanced Education final approval.)

8.8 List of INLG and LING courses

Indigenous Languages Courses

INLG 130 - Practical Phonetics for Indigenous Languages (3)
Practical training in the description of sounds used in language. Prerequisite: Students in an Indigenous Studies program should complete INLG 133 before INLG 130. Students with credit for FNILG 130 or LING 130 may not take this course for further credit.

INLG 133 - Introduction to Indigenous Language I (3)
Introduces the structure of Indigenous language, including phonetics, vocabulary, word formation, and grammatical constructions. Based on a designated language and usually chosen from the Northwest coast area. Students may retake this course for credit with focus on a different Indigenous language. Students who have credit for FNILG 231 may not take this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 134 - Introduction to INLG II (3)
A continuation of the introductory course in Indigenous language, including phonetics, vocabulary, word formation, and grammatical constructions. Based on a designated language and will usually be chosen from the Northwest Coast area. Students may take this course for credit with focus on a different Indigenous language. Prerequisite: INLG 133. Students who have completed FNILG 134 (or FNILG 232 or LING 232) may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated language.
INLG 158 - Indigenous Language Immersion I (3)
Intensive language instruction in an Indigenous language at a beginner level. The course will be based on a designated language to be named each time it is taught. Students who have completed LANG 132, 158 or 224 for a designated language may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 200 - Introduction to Grammar in an Indigenous Language (3)
A practical overview of the grammar of an Indigenous language based on linguistic principles for those desiring basic knowledge of language structure, grammatical categories and grammatical analysis. This course is particularly suited for students interested in learning and teaching an Indigenous language.

INLG 233 - Description and Analysis of an Indigenous Language I (3)
An intermediate course in the structure of an Indigenous language, including writing systems, texts, general linguistic properties, and language family. Based on a designated language and usually chosen from the Northwest Coast area. Prerequisite: INLG 134. Students who have completed FNLG 331 for a designated language may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 234 - Description Analysis INLG II (3)
A continuation of the intermediate course in a First Nations an Indigenous language, including writing systems, texts, general linguistic properties, and language family. Based on a designated language and usually chosen from the Northwest Coast area. Students may retake this course with focus on a different FN Indigenous language. Prerequisite: INLG 233. Students with credit for FNLG 332 may not take this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 258 - Indigenous Language Immersion II (3)
Intensive language instruction in an Indigenous language at an intermediate level. The course will be based on a designated language to be named each time it is taught. Please inquire at the Department of Linguistics for information on placement. Students who have completed LANG 248 for a designated language may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 300 - Advanced Grammar of an Indigenous Language (3)
Students will gain increasing familiarity with, and practical competence in the use of complex and advanced grammatical patterns of an Indigenous language in order to facilitate accurate communication in that language, in both oral and written form. Prerequisite: Completion of Certificate in Indigenous Language Proficiency offered in the same language as INLG 300, including INLG 200 or LING 220, or with permission of instructor. Students who have taken FNLG 335 or LING 335 or FNLG 435 or LING 435 with the same topic as INLG 300 may not take this course for further credit.

INLG 333 - Indigenous Language Intermediate Level Proficiency I (3)
Aimed at building conversational and narrative fluency and proficiency in a particular Indigenous language. Taught through a "stay in the language" approach through authentic practice of traditional skills and knowledge, as well as everyday communication in both written and oral form. Students may retake this course with focus on a different Indigenous language. Prerequisite: Completion of Certificate in Indigenous Language Proficiency; or with permission of instructor. Students with credit for FNLG 333 may not take this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 334 - Indigenous Language Intermediate Level Proficiency II (3)
Continuation of Indigenous language proficiency intermediate level I builds further conversational and narrative fluency and proficiency in a designated Indigenous language.
Taught through a "stay in the language" approach involving practice of traditional culture-based and everyday skills in a language. Students may retake this course with focus on a different Indigenous language. Prerequisite: Completion of Certificate in Indigenous Language Proficiency including INLG 333 (or as corequisite); or permission of instructor. Students with credit for FNLG 334 may not take this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 335 - Topics in Indigenous Language I (3)
Content varies as required by Indigenous language communities or learners. Usually focuses on intermediate to advanced level topics on structural aspects of a particular Indigenous language, emphasizing language learning and teaching. Prerequisite: INLG 130, INLG 133, INLG 233 or permission of instructor. Recommended: LING 360.

INLG 358 - Indigenous Language Immersion III (3)
Intensive immersion "on the land" or in a classroom setting led by elder or fluent speaker in an Indigenous language at an intermediate level. Exposes learners to a variety of authentic situations where the language is used and spoken in everyday tasks. May be taken again when offered in another Indigenous language set of courses. Prerequisite: Completion of Certificate in Indigenous Language Proficiency including INLG 258; or permission of instructor.

INLG 433 - Indigenous Language Mentoring I (3)
Intended for advanced learners of a particular Indigenous language. Offers advanced vocabulary and/or grammatical skills through individualized practice with fluent speakers (usually elders) of that language. Enrolment requires prior approval of the Department of Linguistics and the local Indigenous community. Students will be evaluated on the basis of the individualized goals and objects set at the beginning of the course. Prerequisite: INLG 332 (or FNLG 332) or permission of course supervisor. Students who have completed FNLG 433 (or LING 433) for a designated language may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 434 - Indigenous Language Mentoring II (3)
Offers additional advanced vocabulary and/or grammatical skills in the First-Nations Indigenous language through individualized practice with fluent speakers (usually elders) of that language. Prerequisite: INLG 433 (or FNLG 433) or permission of course supervisor. Recommended: LING 431 and 432. Students who have completed FNLG 434 (or LING 434) for a designated language may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated language.

INLG 435 - Topics in Indigenous Language II (3)
Content varies as required by Indigenous language communities or learners. Usually focuses on advanced level topics on structural aspects of a particular Indigenous language, emphasizing language learning and teaching. Students may repeat this course for further credit under a different topic. Prerequisite: LING 220, INLG 332 (or INLG 332) or permission of instructor. Recommended: LING 360, 431 and 432. Students who have completed FNLG 435 for a designated topic may not complete this course for further credit for the same designated topic.

INLG 439W - Indigenous Language Revitalization (3)
Engage in planning, coordinating and implementing Indigenous language revitalization programs in Indigenous communities. Examine best practices, teaching methods, language acquisition, and curriculum design. Hands-on practices for learners and fluent speakers and elders on the path of teaching or learning their language as individuals or as part of community language training initiatives. Prerequisite: 12 units of INLG courses. Students who have completed INLG 335 with Language Revitalization topic may not complete this course for further credit. Writing. Breadth-Humanities.
INLG 458 - Indigenous Language Immersion IV (3)
Continuation of intensive immersion "on the land" led by elder or fluent speaker in a language at a high intermediate to early advanced level. Exposes learners to a variety of authentic situations where the language is used and spoken in everyday tasks. May be taken again when offered in another Indigenous language. Prerequisite: Completion of Certificate in Indigenous Language Proficiency including INLG 358; or permission of instructor.

Linguistics Courses
LING 160 – Language, Culture, and Society (3)
An introduction to language in its social and cultural dimensions. Students who have taken LING 260 prior to Fall 2008 may not take LING 160 for further credit. Breadth-Social Sciences.

LING 220 - Introduction to Linguistics (3)

LING 280 - Interdisciplinary Topics in Linguistics (3)
Introduces students to topics in which fundamental concepts of Linguistics are combined with concepts from other fields in order to answer applied or theoretical questions. As topics examined may vary by term, this course may be repeated once for credit if the topic is different.

LING 282W - Writing for Linguistics (3)
Develops skills in writing in linguistics while providing a closer look at fundamental concepts of the discipline. As topics examined may vary by term, this course may be repeated once for credit if the topic is different. Prerequisite: LING 220. Writing/Quantitative.

LING309W – Sociolinguistics (3)
A systematic approach to the study of linguistic variation in different areal, social, and cultural settings. Prerequisite: LING 282W. Recommended: LING 160 or LING 260. Students with credit for LING 409 may not take this course for further credit. Writing

LING 360 – Introduction to Applies Linguistics (3)
Theoretical and practical aspects of second language learning. Prerequisite: LING 282W.

LING 408 – Field Linguistics (3)
The investigation and description of an unfamiliar language. Prerequisite: LING 221 or 321; and 222 or 322.

LING 431 – Language Structures I (3)
Detailed examination of the structure of a selected language. Prerequisite: LING 282W; or LING 221 and 222.

LING 432 – Language Structures II (3)
Detailed examination of the structure of a selected language. Prerequisite: LING 282W; or LING 221 and 222.

LING 480 – Topics in Linguistics I (3)
Investigation of a selected area of linguistic research. This course may be repeated once for credit if the topic is different. Prerequisite: Requirements will vary according to the topic offered.

LING 482W – Topics in Linguistics III (3)
Investigation of a selected area of linguistic research. The course will be writing-intensive. This course may be repeated once for credit if the subject is different. Prerequisite: Requirements will vary according to the topic offered. Writing.
8.9 Letter of support

From the Hul'q'um'um' Language & Culture Society:
(The proposed program title of Minor First Nations Languages has since been renamed to “Minor in Indigenous Languages”)

Hul'q'um'um' Language & Culture Society
1093 Nagel St., Duncan BC V9L 2E6
hlcsstrategi st@gmail.com
February 11, 2020

The Hul'q'um'um' Language & Culture Society, a registered BC society, is an Indigenous not-for-profit collective. Our dedicated team of Elders and language specialists (who are teachers and students in the language) do a variety of research projects and community involved language activities, under the governance of our board of directors. We represent fifteen First Nations and Friendship Centers in the Hul'q'um'um' territory and serve as the language authority for the Hul'q'um'um' language for the Teacher Certification Branch of the Ministry of Education.

Recognizing the urgent need in our territory for language specialists to teach the language, develop educational materials, and to do research with remaining speakers, HLCS partners with Simon Fraser University on delivering the Hul'q'um'um' Language Academy. The professors from SFU and other universities offer courses on Hul'q'um'um' language, culture, and linguistics that lead to the Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency, the Diploma in First Nations Language Proficiency, the Graduate Certificate in the Linguistics of a First Nations Language, and the MA in the Linguistics of a First Nations Language. Besides partnering in the delivery of courses, our research team is very adept doing research and we are currently partnered on several SSHRC grants held by SFU and University of Victoria Faculty. Among our members are 14 language teachers who recently earned SFU MA degrees. Over 30 students have earned their undergraduate certificates. Eight of our students have earned the Diploma and are now in the BA program with extended minors in Linguistics. The proposed minor in First Nations Languages will give them a second minor so that they can complete their BA degrees. We anticipate that over 40 Hul'q'um'um' speakers will be interested in earning a minor in Indigenous Languages in the next few years.

Our lead Elders at the HLCS Ruby Peter and Delores Louie have together over 100 years of working as language specialists. Ruby received honorary doctorate degrees at both Simon Fraser University and University of Victoria last June. Having linguistically trained first language speakers helps keep the quality of the work high and the language use authentic and culturally appropriate. We thank SFU for teaching most of the courses here to the community-based cohort.
so that our Elders can be available to mentor the students on their path toward fluency. The young researchers at HLCS are very motivated and serious and most want to earn degrees. Having the program here means that they can finish degrees while at the same time helping to make sure the work gets shared to the community.

With the recent focus on indigenization of the curriculum in the schools, SFU graduates are in high demand. Every one of the recent Certificate graduates were offered a job as a cultural teaching assistance or as a researcher on funded projects. For the diploma program we have provided the students the unique opportunity of working part-time on HLCS or SSHRC projects while taking four courses a term. This allows them to support themselves and their families while studying. But it also means that they are fully prepared for the jobs they take on at local schools and universities and as researchers on the language projects of various local tribes.

Our hope for the learners is that they will become fluent. Our dream for our language specialists is that they will complete their educations, right up to the PhD level and earn a good salary. We thank SFU for helping these dreams come true.

Huy tseep q’a’, sii’em’

Christopher Alphonse, Yelqwetse’
HLCS Board of
Directors (of the
Quw’utsun’ Tribe)
To: Prof. Catherine Murray
Associate Dean
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6

Re: Tkemlúps te Secwépemc Language Department Support for the new SFU Minor in First Nations Languages
Dear Catherine,

Please accept this letter as indicating the full support by the Tkemlúps te Secwépemc’s Language Department for the newly developed minor in First Nations Language put forth by SFU’s First Nations Languages Program and Department of Linguistics. As one of seventeen communities of the Secwépemc Nation, we at Tkemlúps te Secwépemc are deeply committed to strengthening and revitalizing our ancestral Secwépemc language among our members, and to work with elders and learners from all of our Secwépemc communities to revitalize our critically endangered language.

We see community language courses and mentor-apprentice programs as vitally important ways to achieve this. To this effect, several of our TteS members have benefitted from the SFU undergraduate Certificate in First Nations Language Proficiency (CFNLP), and currently, several of the employees in the TteS language department are completing their SFU Diploma in First Nations Language Proficiency (DFNLP), with courses taught by Elder Mona Jules and Dr. Marianne Ignace. The diploma courses have significantly helped us build a strong cohort of intermediate to advanced learners of Secwepemctsin. As recent graduates of the SFU MA in the Linguistics of a First Nations Language, Jessica Arnouse and I have been able to teach beginner level Secwépemc language courses in our community, thus attracting a good number of new learners to our language. The new Minor in First Nations language, building on the certificate will enable members of our community and nation to become proficient in our language and make significant contributions to Secwepemctsin revitalization at all age levels – from the cradle to adulthood. We fully appreciate and support how the Minor, in combination with other SFU Minors or Majors, will enable our community members to attain bachelor’s degrees as they strengthen our language. Therefore, we would like to express our full and unqualified support for this new credential.

Sincerely,

Ted Gottfriedson

T. Gottfriedson,
Tkemlúps te Secwépemc Language and Culture Department Manager
At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the program name change from Art, Performance, and Cinema Studies Minor to Art and Performance Studies Minor in the School for the Contemporary Arts within the Faculty of Communication, Art, and Technology.

Motion:

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the program name change from Art, Performance, and Cinema Studies Minor to Art and Performance Studies Minor in the School for the Contemporary Arts within the Faculty of Communication, Art, and Technology.

c: C. Lauzon
Action undertaken by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies at its meeting of March 5, 2020, gives rise to the following recommendation:

Motion

That SCUP approve the program name change from Art, Performance and Cinema Studies Minor to Art and Performance Studies Minor in the School of Contemporary Arts within the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology.

The relevant documentation for review by SCUP is attached.
Program Name Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Faculty and academic unit:</th>
<th>FCAT, School for the Contemporary Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current name of program:</td>
<td>Art, Performance and Cinema Studies minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed program name change:</td>
<td>Art and Performance Studies minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for change:</td>
<td>Currently, the School for the Contemporary Arts has a minor in Art, Performance and Cinema Studies, and a minor in Film and Video Studies. To deal with the duplication of content in these two minors and to create more coherence for our students, we propose that the Art, Performance, and Cinema Studies minor will now focus on art and performance studies, and b) the Film and Video Studies minor will focus on cinema studies. Course offerings have also been streamlined to correspond to the two revised minor options. Also note: Our BA in Art, Performance, and Cinema Studies offers two streams: Art and Performance Studies and Cinema Studies. The proposed name change will furthermore better align the Minor to the Major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective term and year:</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following credential(s) will be affected by this change:</td>
<td>Art, Performance and Cinema Studies Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calendar Change: "to" and "from" sections are not required. All deletions should be crossed out as follows: sample. All additions should be marked by a bold.

Art, and Performance, and Cinema Studies Minor
At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the program name change from Film and Video Studies Minor to Cinema Studies Minor in the School for the Contemporary Arts within the Faculty of Communication, Art, and Technology.

Motion:

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the program name change from Film and Video Studies Minor to Cinema Studies Minor in the School for the Contemporary Arts within the Faculty of Communication, Art, and Technology.

c: C. Lauzon
Action undertaken by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies at its meeting of March 5, 2020, gives rise to the following recommendation:

**Motion**

That SCUP approve the program name change from Film and Video Studies Minor to Cinema Studies Minor in the School of Contemporary Arts within the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology.

The relevant documentation for review by SCUP is attached.
## Program Name Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Faculty and academic unit:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCAT, School for the Contemporary Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Current name of program:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film and Video Studies minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposed program name change:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cinema Studies minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rationale for change:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently, the School for the Contemporary Arts has a minor in Art, Performance and Cinema Studies, and a minor in Film and Video Studies. To deal with the duplication of content in these two minors and to create more coherence for our students, we propose that the Art, Performance, and Cinema Studies minor will now focus on art and performance studies, and b) the Film and Video Studies minor will focus on cinema studies. Course offerings have also been streamlined to correspond to the two revised minor options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also note: Our BA in Art, Performance, and Cinema Studies offers two streams: Art and Performance Studies and Cinema Studies. The proposed name change will furthermore better align the Minor to the Major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Effective term and year:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The following credential(s) will be affected by this change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film and Video Studies Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calendar Change:** “to” and “from” sections are not required. All deletions should be crossed out as follows: sample- All additions should be marked by a bold.

| Film and Video Cinema Studies Minor |

June 2018
At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the revised Senate Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units.

Motion:

That Senate approve the revised Senate Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units.

c: W. Parkhouse
   G. Nicholls
Attached are the revised Senate Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units. The last revision of the guidelines was in June 2013. In addition to minor edits, the following further changes have been made:

**3.2 Unit Self-Study**
An addendum is now required as part of the self-study regarding assessment of Educational Goals which will be submitted to SCUTL for comment and written feedback (Section 3.4).

**New Section 6 External Review Process and Program and School Accreditation**
Allows for the alignment of accreditation processes’ timeline with the external review schedule to reduce the duplication of work.

The revised guidelines will take effect upon approval by Senate.

**Motion:**

That SCUP approve and recommend to Senate the revised Senate Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units.
Senate Guidelines for External Reviews of Academic Units

1. Review Cycle:

All academic units\(^1\) are reviewed on a periodic basis, normally once every seven years. The purpose of such reviews is to enable units to conduct their own assessments of their strengths and weaknesses, to obtain the views of external experts in the field, and to support academic planning.

2. Review Purpose:

The review process is intended to ensure that:

(a) The quality of the unit's programs is high and there are measures in place to ensure the evaluation and revision of programs.

(b) The quality of faculty research is high and faculty collaboration and interaction provides a stimulating academic environment.

(c) Unit members participate in the administration of the unit and take an active role in the dissemination of knowledge.

(d) The unit's environment is conducive to the attainment of the objectives of the unit.

Review committees should make their assessments taking into account the resources currently available to the unit and the University.

3. Review Process:

3.1 Initiation:

The review will be initiated by the Vice-President, Academic, after consultation with the Dean of the Faculty and the unit involved. The Dean of Graduate Studies shall be involved in external reviews in relation to graduate programs and graduate student issues.

\(^{1}\) External reviews are normally conducted for Departments, Schools and non-departmentalized Faculties.
Units will be informed of impending reviews at least one year before the site visit by external reviewers. SCUP and Senate will be informed of the units scheduled for review prior to the start of the academic year in which reviews occur. The dates of the external review committee visit and a detailed schedule for the visit will be arranged by the Vice-President, Academic in consultation with the Dean and the unit.

The Vice-President, Academic will prepare the terms of reference for the review committee in consultation with the Vice-President, Research, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Graduate Studies and the unit.

3.2 Unit Self-Study:

The unit will engage in a period of self-study of one to two semesters, possibly including a retreat, during which its members shall consider all aspects of the activities included in its academic plan and will prepare a report covering the following areas:

a. Institutional role, unit role and activities, goals and aspirations;
b. Quality of scholarship demonstrated through grants, graduate student achievements, knowledge mobilization (including publication, patents, applications and impact on communities), awards, citations, honours, and appointments;
c. Service to the community demonstrated by public service activity, involvement in related community groups, membership on boards or similar bodies;
d. Collegial environment for all members (faculty, staff and students) of the unit;
e. Appropriate orientation and training, support for all employee development;
f. Resources for unit activities: faculty, staff, operating budget, space, equipment and library holdings (including the process for determining collection strategies);
g. Planning for the renewal of the unit's faculty members.

As an addendum, the self-study should include:

h. A statement of Educational Goals for each academic program;
i. An evaluation of the success of the unit in meeting the Educational Goals of its program(s), using methods and evidence selected by the academic unit. The evaluation should include evidence for student demand, access to courses, quality of teaching, educational experiences (including co-op and exchange opportunities), student academic achievement, scholarships and awards, student opinions of courses and programs, degrees and other credentials completed, student experience and satisfaction following graduation;

2 Definition of Program; Minor, Major, Master and Doctorate
Material provided to the external review committee shall also include, at minimum, a standard set of data provided by the Office of the Vice-President, Academic and a standard set of data provided by the Office of the Vice-President Research. The unit may supplement this if it so wishes. The unit's most recent Academic Plan must also be forwarded to the external review committee. The self-study report prepared by the unit shall be made available to all members of the unit (faculty, staff and students) prior to being forwarded to the external review committee.

### 3.3 Student Involvement:

Undergraduate and graduate students shall be encouraged to participate in the preparation of material for the unit self-study and student input will be sought throughout the process. Student contributions will be included or reflected in the self-study. The Chair/Director/Dean should contact the student unions (undergraduate and graduate) and student representatives on unit committees, as well as publicizing the review in classes and within the unit. The students will have meetings with the external review committee.

### 3.4 Review Committee:

The external review committee normally will consist of three persons external to the university who are senior members of the discipline, some of whom have had administrative experience. The unit will be asked to provide the Vice-President, Academic with a list of reviewers who represent a broad cross-section of the discipline and who are considered to be outstanding faculty members and objective reviewers. The Vice-President, Academic shall appoint the members of the external review committee. The external review committee will primarily be composed of faculty members from Canadian universities outside British Columbia and from universities in the USA where necessary. More than one gender will be represented on the committee.

The Vice-President, Academic will also appoint an internal member from the University community who will be a member of the committee and who will provide the review committee with contextual advice about the environment and operations of Simon Fraser University but not be involved in the authoring of the report.

The site visit, which could be two or three days in length, will be coordinated by the Office of the Vice President, Academic. The Vice President, Academic (or designate), Vice-President Research (or designate), Dean and Associate Provost Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (or designate) and the Faculty Dean will meet with the review committee at the start of the visit to discuss guidelines for the review and the preparation of the report. The committee will also meet with the unit's faculty and staff members, graduate and undergraduate students, as well as with others with responsibilities affecting the unit. Members of the external review committee should avoid informal social events with members of the unit during the site visit.
Where the unit under review has strong connections to other units at SFU, the Dean/Chair or Director of that cognate unit may request an interview with the review committee.

A written and signed confidential submission to the review committee may be made by any individual or group of individuals who are unable to meet with the reviewers during the site visit.

Information or allegations regarding specific individuals received by the review committee will be transmitted to the Vice-President, Academic and handled in accordance with established University procedures. If the review committee receives general comments or complaints that the environment in the unit is not conducive to a high quality of teaching, learning, research and working, the committee may comment and make recommendations on this in its report or may take the issue up privately with the Vice-President, Academic.

At the conclusion of its visit and within 6 weeks, the review committee will submit a detailed report, including a full and frank assessment of the unit's mission, its various activities, the quality of the unit and its programs, and the resource allocations to and within the unit as well as any issues identified in the Terms of Reference.

The report of the review committee will be a public document. Any supplementary reports concerning confidential matters will not form part of the public record but will be made available to the appropriate University officers. Any individuals named will be apprised of the information and provided with an opportunity to comment.

The addendum regarding Educational Goals (h, and i) will be submitted to the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) for review, in addition to inclusion in materials submitted to the review committee. Written feedback to the Unit will be provided by SCUTL.

4. Developing an Action Plan:

The External Review Report will be submitted to the Vice President, Academic and circulated to the:

(a) unit involved (including faculty, staff and students)

(b) Vice-President, Research

(c) Dean of the Faculty

(d) Dean of Graduate Studies

The unit will review the External Review Report, as well as the feedback on Educational Goals from SCUTL, and prepare a response in conjunction with the Dean of the Faculty and a representative of the Office of the Vice-President, Academic. This response will take the form of an Action Plan to be implemented according to an agreed time line. The
Action Plan will be endorsed by the Dean of the Faculty. For a non-departmentalized Faculty, the Action Plan will be endorsed by the Vice-President, Academic. The Action Plan and the External Review Report together with the comments of the Dean will be presented to SCUP for review and to Senate for discussion and advice. The Dean shall consider the advice of Senate and amend the Action Plan if necessary. The unit will be responsible for implementing the agreed Action Plan.

5. Follow Up

Reviewed units will prepare a report on progress being made in the implementation of the Action Plan in the fourth year following the review. This report will be presented to SCUTL, SCUP and Senate for information.

6. External Review Process and Program and School Accreditation

When an academic unit is accredited in some way i.e. either as a School or a Program, the Associate Vice President, Academic needs to be advised by the Chair/Director in the year that the External Review is scheduled. That accreditation process will be mapped against the SFU external review process and an assessment made by the Associate Vice President Academic as to whether the accreditation process is adequate to waive the external review in part or in full. Should the accreditation process be deemed insufficient to achieve the full intent of an external review, a focused, supplementary review may be required. The details of such a supplementary process will be determined by the Associate Vice President, Academic at that time.

Accommodation will be made where possible to align the accreditation process time line with the external review schedule to reduce the duplication of work.

It is required that in all instances a unit Action Plan be submitted to Senate for approval. The accreditation submission and the accreditation agency/body report must be attached to the Action Plan. Such an Action Plan (stemming from the accreditation process) needs to be produced by the Chair and the Action Plan and associated documents should be and provided to the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Associate Vice President Research for input. The Dean of the Faculty must endorse the Action Plan. A follow up progress report will be expected in the normal way, in the fourth year of the cycle.

March 2020
At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the suspension of admission and dissolution of the Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate within the Faculties of Applied Sciences, Arts and Social Sciences, Environment, Health Sciences, and Science, effective Fall 2020.

Motion:

That Senate approve the suspension of admission of the Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate within the Faculty of Applied Sciences, Arts and Social Sciences, Environment, Health Sciences, and Science, effective Fall 2020.

Motion:

That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the dissolution of the Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate within the Faculty of Applied Sciences, Arts and Social Sciences, Environment, Health Sciences, and Science, effective Fall 2020.

c: J. Derksen
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)

DATE: March 19, 2020

FROM: Jeff Derksen, Chair of Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)

RE: Suspension of Admission and Termination: Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate

For approval:

At its meeting of March 3, 2020, SGSC approved the suspension of admission and termination for Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate within the Faculties of Applied Sciences, Arts and Social Sciences, Environment, Health Sciences, Science and is recommending it to SCUP for approval, effective Fall 2020:

Motion:
That SCUP approve and recommend to Senate the suspension of admission and termination for Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate.
MEMORANDUM

Attention Dr. Jeff Derksen
Dean, Graduate Studies

Date Feb 4, 2020

From Dr. Parvaneh Saeedi, p.saeedi@sfu.ca
Faculty of Applied Science, Graduate Studies Committee

Re: Termination of Modelling of Complex Social Systems graduate certificate at FAS-CMPT

The Faculty of Applied Sciences seeks approval to suspend admission and terminate Modelling of Complex Social Systems graduate certificate, as the program is no longer operational.

This termination should be effective for Fall 2020. Kindly include them on the next SGSC agenda.

Best Regards,

[Signature]

Parvaneh Saeedi,
Faculty of Applied Science, Graduate Studies Committee
MEMO

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
778 782-4967
sean_zwagerman@sfu.ca
sfu.ca/face

Academic Quadrangle 6164
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, BC
Canada V5A 1S6

ATTENTION
Jeff Derksen, Dean
Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies

FROM
Sean Zwagerman, Chair, Graduate Studies Committee
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

RE
Proposed termination of Modelling of Complex Social Systems Graduate Certificate

DATE
January 22, 2020

PAGE 1

Dear Dr. Derksen,

On behalf of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, I am seeking approval to suspend admission into the Modelling of Complex Social Systems' graduate program and terminate its graduate certificate as the program is no longer operational since there have been no intakes for a number of years and funding is no longer available.

Sincerely,

Sean Zwagerman
Associate Dean, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
MEMO

To: Dr. Jeff Derksen, Dean of Graduate Studies / Chair of SGSC
From: Dr. Dongya Yang, Associate Dean / Chair, Faculty of Environment Graduate Studies Committee
Subject: To suspend and terminate MOCSSY certificate
Date: Jan 20, 2020
CC:

The Faculty of Environment seeks approval to suspend admission and terminate Modelling of Complex Social Systems graduate certificate as the program is no longer operational.

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

[Signature]

Dongya Yang, Ph.D.
Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies
Professor of Bioarchaeology
MEMO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENTION:</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Daria Babeshko  
Coordinator, Graduate Curriculum and Policy  
Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies | 778.782.3188 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Frank Lee  
Director of MSc and PhD Programs  
Faculty of Health Sciences |

| RE: | Modelling of Complex Social Systems graduate certificate |

| DATE: | Jan 23, 2020 |
| TIME: | |

The Faculty of Health Sciences seeks approval to suspend admission and terminate Modelling of Complex Social Systems graduate certificate, as the program is no longer operational.

Regards,

Frank Lee, PhD  
Associate Professor  
Director, FHS MSc & PhD Programs  
Faculty of Health Sciences  
Simon Fraser University  
Blusson Hall 10520  
8888 University Drive  
Burnaby, BC  
Canada, V5A 1S6  
Office: 778.782.8649  
Fax: 778.782.5927  
e-mail: f.lee@sfu.ca

SFU acknowledges the Coast Salish People on whose traditional territories we are privileged to live, work, and play.
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Jeff Derksen, Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
FROM: Michael Silverman, Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies
RE:

DATE: January 24, 2020
PAGES: 1

The Faculty of Science seeks approval to suspend admission and terminate the Modelling of Complex Social Systems graduate certificate as the program is no longer operational.

Michael Silverman, Ph.D.

cc: D. Babeshko
Proposal to Suspend Admission and Terminate a Program

1. All impacted credentials, levels and categories of the degree, and specific discipline or field of study
   Graduate Certificate in Modelling of Complex Social Systems

2. Location of the program
   SFU Burnaby

3. Faculty(ies), Department(s), or School(s) offering the program
   Faculty of Applied Science, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, Faculty of Science, Faculty of Environment

4. Anticipated final dissolution date
   Fall 2020

5. Reasons for termination of the program:
   MoCSSy is no longer operational. Vahid Dabbaghian, the program director, left SFU several years back. MoCSSy was hosted by IRMACS, which is now the Big Data Hub. Once the funding began to run out, it was no longer possible to continue the program.

6. Plan for phasing-out of program, including
   There haven’t been any students enrolled in the program for several years.

7. Name, title, phone number and email address of the institutional contact person in case more information is required (normally, the Dean of the Faculty in which the program is housed)
   Daria Babeshko, Coordinator, Graduate Curriculum and Policy Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, gscurric@sfu.ca, 778-782-3188.
At its April 22, 2020 meeting, SCUP reviewed and approved the suspension of admission to the Latin American Studies Graduate Certificate in the School for International Studies within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, effective Fall 2020.

Motion:

That Senate approve the suspension of admission to the Latin American Studies Graduate Certificate in the School for International Studies within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, effective Fall 2020.

c: G. Otero
   S. Zwagerman
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)
FROM: Jeff Derksen,
Chair of Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)
RE: Suspension of Admission: Latin American Studies Graduate Certificate

DATE: March 19, 2020

For approval:

At its meeting of March 3, 2020, SGSC approved the suspension of admission for Latin American studies Graduate Certificate within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and is recommending it to SCUP for approval, effective Spring 2021:

Motion:
That SCUP approve and recommend to Senate the suspension of admission for Latin American studies Graduate Certificate within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.
MEMO

Office of the Dean

STREET ADDRESS
Academic Quadrangle
Room 6164

MAILING ADDRESS
8888 University Drive
Burnaby BC Canada
V5A 1S6

778-782-4967 (Tel)
scan_zwagerman@sfu.ca
www.sfu.ca/fass

ATTENTION: Jeff Derksen, Dean
Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies

FROM: Sean Zwagerman, Chair
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Graduate Studies Committee

RE: Course Changes under Delegated Authority

DATE: February 5, 2020

Dear Jeff,

The following were approved by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Graduate Studies committee at their meeting on February 4, 2020, and are forwarded to the Senate Graduate Studies Committee for approval. Please include them on the next SGSC agenda.

1. School of Public Policy
   a) Calendar entry change, PLCY’s M.A.
   b) The new course, PLCY 835

2. Department of Economics
   a) Calendar entry change, ECON’s Ph.D.
   b) The new course, ECON 984

3. School for International Studies
   a) The new course, IS 879
   b) The program suspension, LAS Graduate Certificate

4. Department of Psychology
   a) Calendar entry change, Clinical Neuropsychology Track

These curriculum items should be effective for Fall 2020.

Sean Zwagerman
Associate Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
TO          Sean Zwagerman, Chair, FASSGSC
FROM        Gerardo Otero, Coordinator, Latin American Studies
SUBJECT     Program Suspension: Latin American Studies Graduate Certificate
DATE        January 28th, 2020

At its meeting of January 13th, 2020, the School for International Studies approved the
following curricular program changes (Effective term: Spring 2021):

- Suspension of Admission: Latin American Studies Graduate Certificate

Please place this proposal on the agenda of the next meeting of the Faculty of Arts and
Social Sciences Graduate Studies Curriculum Committee.

Regards,

[Signature]

Gerardo Otero
Proposal to suspend admissions to a program

NOTE: Suspension of admissions to a program does not result in the termination of a program. After a program has been suspended for at least two semesters, an academic unit follows the process to terminate the program. Or, if no students are currently enrolled in the program, academic units can consider the fast track option.

The School for International Studies proposes to suspend admissions to the Latin American Studies Graduate Certificate. This option is almost unused, with zero graduates in 2019, and is considered difficult to achieve due to an insufficiency of required courses on offer.

In accord with Senate-approved procedures for suspension of admission and program termination, the details of the proposed suspension are provided below.

1. Latin American Studies (LAS) Graduate Certificate
2. Location: Vancouver Campus
3. Offered by: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Latin American Studies Program (housed in School for International Studies)
5. Reasons for suspension of admissions:
   - Lack of enrollment demand
   - Insufficient resources/inability to provide necessary courses for the program
6. Plan for suspension:
   a) Steps taken to consult with students: There are no students enrolled in the program at the moment.
   b) Steps taken to consult with impacted instructors and staff: Faculty were consulted via email, demonstrating support to suspend admission to the program. No impact on staff.
   c) Steps taken to ensure students in the program have the opportunity to complete the program: Not applicable as there are no students enrolled in the program.

February 2016
d) Confirmation of consultation with other impacted departments and faculties: There are no impacts on other departments or faculties.

7. Institutional contact: Gerardo Otero, Professor, 778-782-4508, otero@sfu.ca.
For information:

Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of April 2, 2020 SCUS approved the following curriculum revisions effective Spring 2021.

a. Faculty of Applied Sciences (SCUS 20-32)

1. School of Engineering Sciences

   (i) Requirement changes for internal transfers from another Simon Fraser University program for the:
      • Major, Engineering Science, Computer Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Major, Engineering Science, Electronics Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Major, Engineering Science, Systems Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Biomedical Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Computer Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Electronics Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Engineering Physics Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Systems Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science

   (ii) Core course requirement changes for the:
      • Major, Engineering Science, Computer Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Major, Engineering Science, Electronics Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Major, Engineering Science, Systems Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Biomedical Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Computer Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Electronics Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Engineering Physics Option Bachelor of Applied Science
      • Honours, Engineering Science, Systems Engineering Option Bachelor of Applied Science
2. School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering

   (i) Requirement changes to the Mechatronic Systems Engineering Major and Honours programs

3. Sustainable Energy Engineering

   (i) Requirement changes to the Sustainable Energy Engineering Major program

b. Faculty of Environment (SCUS 20-33)

1. School of Environmental Science

   (i) Upper division requirement changes to the:
      • Environmental Science Major
         o Environmental Earth Systems Concentration
         o Envirometrics Concentration
         o Water Science Concentration
      • Environmental Science Honours
         o Applied Biology concentration
         o Environmental Earth Systems Concentration
         o Envirometrics Concentration
         o Water Science Concentration

2. Department of Geography

   (i) Upper division requirement changes to the Global Environmental Systems Major and Honours Programs

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682.
For information:

Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of April 2, 2020 SCUS approved the following curriculum revisions effective Spring 2021.

a. Faculty of Environment (SCUS 20-31)

1. The Environmental Science Program

(i) New Course Proposal:
   - EVSC 489-4 Environmental Science Thesis 1
For information:

Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of April 2, 2020 SCUS approved the following curriculum revisions effective Spring 2021.

**a. Faculty of Applied Sciences**

1. School of Computing Science
   
   (i) Prerequisite and equivalent statement change for CMPT 295
   (ii) Prerequisite change for CMPT 371, 379 and 433
   (iii) Deletion of CMPT 150, 250, 261, 301, 401 and XX1
   (iv) Temporarily withdraw CMPT 126, 170, 305, 408 and 461

2. School of Engineering Science

   (i) Deletion of ENSC 304, 374, 472 and 489
   (ii) Prerequisite change for ENSC 220, 225, 320, 324, 380, 386 and 470

3. School of Mechatronics Systems Engineering (MSE)

   (i) Deletion of MSE 400, 401 and 411W
   (ii) Prerequisite change for MSE 222, 223, 250, and 280

4. School of Sustainable Energy Engineering (SEE)

   (i) Prerequisite change for SEE 225, 230, 251 and 351

**b. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences**

1. Courses to be Deleted

   - BUEC 433 Forecasting in Business and Economics (Inactive)
   - CHIN 185 Intensive Mandarin Chinese in the China Field School
   - CRIM 333 Gender, Law and the State
   - CRIM 334 Law and Human Reproduction
CRIM 336 Corporate Crime and Corporate Regulation
CRIM 384 Crime and Literature
CRIM 440 Correctional Administration and Planning
CRIM 450 Techniques of Crime Prevention II
EAS 101 English Language Fundamentals for the Arts and Social Sciences
ECON 353 Economic History of Canada
ECON 388 Introduction to Law and Economics
ECON 404 Methodology of the Social Sciences
FNST 402 The Discourse of Aboriginal Peoples
GERM 104 German for Reading Knowledge I
GSWS 334 Law and Human Reproduction
HUM 152 Ancient Greek II
HUM 321 The Humanities and Critical Thinking
IS 209W Latin America: the National Period
ISPO 431 Europe in Comparative Perspective
LANG 222 Latin III
LANG 272 Latin IV (Inactive)
LAS 498 Capstone Project
POL 211 Politics and Ethics (Inactive)
POL 462 Non-Profit and Alternative Service Delivery
PSYC 335 Sensation (Inactive)
PSYC 462 Topics in Social Psychology II (Inactive)
PSYC 463 Topics in Social Psychology III (Inactive)
PSYC 479 Topics in Psycholegal Psychology III (Inactive)
SA 357W Survey Methods (S) (Inactive)
SA 421 Commodities and Substances: Bodies, Consumption and Ingestion (A)

2. Courses to be Temporarily Withdrawn

COGS 381 Directed Research
COGS 480 Directed Research
DIAL 460 Seminar in Dialogue and Public Issues
ECON 368 Regional Economic Analysis
ENGL 342 Studies in British Literature since 1945
ENGL 349 Studies in American Literature since 1900
ENGL 468W Topics in Drama
FNST 363 Indigenous Poetry, Poetics, Printmaking
FNST 376 Indigenous Weaving Technologies: Community of Beings
FNST 383 Indigenous Technology: Art and Sustainability
GSWS 432 Sex in the Sixties
HIST 321 State and Society in Early Modern Europe
HUM 422 The Humanities and the Critique of Culture
LING 441 Linguistic Universals and Typology
POL 251 Introduction to Canadian Public Administration
POL 456 Governing Instruments
POL 470 African Social and Political Thought
PSYC 430 Advanced Topics in Cognitive Psychology
SA 210 The Return of the Folk Devils (S)
SA 245 Cultures and Images (A)
SA 418 Global Health: Humanitarian Encounters (A)
SPAN 204 Spanish Vocabulary
c. Faculty of Environment

1. Faculty of Environment

(i) Deletion of ENV 197, 198, and 222W

2. Department of Archaeology

(i) Deletion of ARCH 335

3. The School of Environmental Science

(i) Temporarily withdraw EVSC 399 and 499
(ii) Title and prerequisite change for EVSC 490W

4. Department of Geography

(i) Deletion of GEOG 422, 426, 466 and 468
(ii) Temporarily withdraw GEOG 362, 381, 417 and 455
(iii) Title and description change for GEOG 356

d. Faculty of Health Sciences

(i) Temporarily withdraw:

- HSCI 140 - Complementary and Alternative Medicine (3)
- HSCI 215 - Perspectives on Disability and Injury (3)
- HSCI 439 - Pathogenesis of Human and Animal Viral Infectious Diseases (3)
- HSCI 458 - Prevention and Management of Cardiovascular Disease (3)
- HSCI 460 - Population and Public Health Advocacy (3)

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682.
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate

FROM: Elizabeth Elle, AVP Learning & Teaching, for the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning

RE: Implementation of the SETCwg and TAWG reports on teaching assessment

DATE: March 16, 2020

The Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) has approved the following implementation plan, and brings it to Senate for approval.

Motion: That Senate approve the implementation plan for teaching assessment, including four explicit actions, as recommended by the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning.

Two working groups recently released reports on the assessment of teaching: Developing a Teaching Assessment Framework for Simon Fraser University: Final Report of the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Working Group (SETCwg, 2018), and Strategies to Value Effective Teaching (Teaching Assessment WG, 2019). These reports are provided for Senate for information.

The SETCwg report includes an extensive literature review to inform best practices of assessment, explored SFU policies and practices at other institutions related to assessment of teaching, and presented an inventory of teaching assessment methods other than student opinion surveys. SETCwg produced an important teaching assessment framework with five principles: 1) use multiple methods, 2) use multiple sources, 3) assess at multiple points in time, 4) view assessment holistically, and 5) align assessment with an instructor’s career path. The TAWG report re-emphasized this assessment framework, and additionally made recommendations for the adoption of the framework in tenure and promotion criteria. TAWG called for training of TPC members regarding the assessment of teaching, and suggested the university could do better in celebrating teaching effectiveness, not only through awards but through additional non-competitive methods.

The following four actions are approved by SCUTL for implementation.

1. Both reports clearly state best practices for evaluating teaching, which include using multiple assessment methods, over multiple points in time, and adopting a holistic approach to the evidence that considers the instructor’s career path. Departments and Faculties at SFU should adopt these best practices. In addition, TPC Chairs and TPC members should be provided with support and guidance to ensure they appropriately assess teaching as part of a fair and transparent process in biennial and promotion reviews.
**Action:** The collective agreement between SFUFA and SFU states that departmental tenure and promotion criteria should be “reviewed and either reaffirmed or revised no less than every three years. These departmental criteria must be approved by the Dean, copied to the Vice-President, Academic and the Association.” Departments will normally begin to review criteria once the new collective agreement is in place later this year.

One way to encourage adoption of best practices around assessing teaching is to ensure that Department/Faculty criteria are clear on how teaching is assessed, with consideration of the recommended framework from SETCwg (specifically: 1) use multiple methods, 2) use multiple sources, 3) assess at multiple points in time, 4) view assessment holistically, and 5) align assessment with an instructor’s career path). Once the new Collective Agreement is implemented and units are revising their criteria for assessing teaching, units will be asked to send their criteria to SCUTL so the committee can provide formative feedback on the evaluation of teaching. This should ideally occur prior to the criteria being sent to the Dean for approval.

*In addition, Faculty Relations, the AVP L&T, and the Centre for Educational Excellence, should develop workshops and other support systems to ensure TPCs can effectively assess teaching.*

2. Student experience surveys such as the current SETC system at SFU provide a voice for students, and an opportunity for instructors to get formative feedback on their teaching. Some concerns have been raised about SFU’s current system, including survey length, question format, and response rates. In some cases, the results of these surveys are misused, suggesting their strengths and limitations are not well understood.

**Action:** The AVP Learning & Teaching has launched a review of the framework and questions in SETC, and should work with the Learning Experiences Assessment and Planning (LEAP) Division in the Centre for Educational Excellence to both improve the current student experience surveys and to design a process to educate students, faculty, and TPCs on appropriate use of surveys.

3. Reconsider the definition and implementation of the Excellence in Teaching Award, and consider expanding this and other recognition programs to better align with SFU’s commitment to innovation and leadership in teaching.

**Action:** The AVP Learning & Teaching has been tasked by the Provost with reviewing the SFU Excellence in Teaching Award (underway). With input from SCUTL, the AVP L&T will make a recommendation to the Provost regarding strengthening and expanding the way SFU values and celebrates teaching by all instructors, inclusive of employment group, career stage, and educational design (curricular/co-curricular, online/face-to-face, etc.). The recommendations for teaching awards will also include less formal opportunities to better celebrate and share examples of teaching innovations and effectiveness across the university.

4. Instructors should be provided with support (especially early in their careers) for multiple aspects of their teaching, including how to increase the effectiveness of their teaching practice and assistance with the development of resources, such as teaching portfolios, that will be considered by TPCs.

**Action:** The Centre for Educational Excellence will develop diverse resources in support of this initiative (workshops, one-on-one consultations, online modules, communities of practice, etc.).
Developing a Teaching Assessment Framework for Simon Fraser University

Prepared by:
Daniella Sieukaran, Research Assistant
Kiran Bisra, Manager of Assessment and Course Evaluation
Teaching and Learning Centre
Spring 2017
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Working Group (SETCWG) prepared this report to inform the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) on Teaching Assessment (TA) policies and practices that are currently implemented at SFU. Throughout this report, published research on post-secondary instructor teaching assessments is used as context for discussion, analysis, and presentation of the results.

In particular, this report includes the following five sections:

1. A literature review to determine current and best practices for teaching assessment, beyond student course evaluations (i.e., at SFU, usually referred to as “student evaluations of teaching and courses” – SETC). (Chapter 1)

2. Which SFU policies govern the teaching assessment of instructors and courses, and how these are currently implemented at the academic unit level. (Chapter 2)

3. Teaching assessment practices used by either SFU Faculty Teaching Fellows or recent recipients of the Excellence in Teaching Award (Chapter 3)

4. Current teaching assessment practices at Canadian universities (Chapter 4)

5. A Teaching Assessment Methods Inventory (Chapter 5)

From this work, we propose a Teaching Assessment Framework (TA Framework) that outlines a set of guiding principles and we provide a Teaching Assessment Methods Inventory (TA Methods Inventory). An academic unit interested in revamping their teaching assessment policies and procedures could use the TA Framework in conjunction with the TA Methods Inventory to construct a customized Teaching Assessment Model (TA Model).

Teaching Assessment Framework

A single clear, consistent, and effective teaching assessment tool is nearly impossible to define, especially when different academic institutions develop their own measures for their own teaching assessment purposes. Instead, we propose a Teaching Assessment Framework that outlines five principles that govern reliable and valid teaching assessment. This framework provides individual academic units and instructors guidance on how to effectively approach teaching assessments.

Principles:

1) Use multiple methods – several pieces of data and evidence should be collected using various methods.

2) Use multiple sources – to increase validity, Teaching Assessment Methods from various sources should be gathered.

3) Gather Teaching Assessment Methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability.

4) View Teaching Assessment Methods holistically – without focusing on one particular piece of data or evidence.

5) A teaching assessment should align with an instructor’s career path – one single prescribed, weighted evaluation should not be used for all instructors.
1. Multiple Methods

Different types of data and evidence should be gathered, considered, and analyzed when assessing teaching.

Teaching Assessment Methods (TA Methods) are ways and means of collecting pieces of information that can be used in a teaching assessment. There are two types of TA Methods: 1) methods with formal procedures, which result in data, or 2) methods without formal procedures, resulting in evidence. Both TA Data and TA Evidence can inform teaching assessment (Figure 1).

Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data) result from formal procedures of execution (e.g., guidelines on how to generate or collect data). Examples of TA Methods that produce TA Data are peer classroom observations, self-reflection instruments, and student course evaluations.

Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence) result from informal procedures of execution. Compared to TA Data, TA Evidence often showcases quality of teaching indirectly, and can be difficult to assess and compare across individuals. Examples of TA Methods that produce TA Evidence are testimonials, participating in professional development, and teaching awards.

Figure 1: Teaching Assessment Methods.
2. Multiple Sources

The information source is an important consideration in any assessment because, implicitly, where and how the assessment information is gathered will bring up issues of bias, power dynamics, and validity. The results of one TA Method could differ depending on the source.

Five key sources often used in teaching assessment are:

- **Self** assessment information generated by the instructor himself/herself
- **Student** assessment information generated by students in the instructor’s courses
- **Peer/Administrator** assessment information from colleagues, educational consultants, department Chairs, Deans, mentors, external referees, and Tenure and Promotion Committee members
- **Alumni** – assessment information from the instructor’s former students
- **Course Data** – course statistics collected by academic units or the institution

3. Multiple Points in Time

Teaching Assessment Methods should be collected over several points in time to increase the reliability of the teaching assessment. For example, a peer should observe classroom instruction several times before submitting a report.

4. Holistically

Teaching Assessment Methods should be triangulated by using the results of one piece of data or evidence to verify another. Therefore, no one TA Method should bear a significantly greater weight than another.

5. Align with Instructor’s Career Path

There are many approaches by which an instructor may demonstrate quality teaching in a higher education setting. For example, good teaching may be exhibited by providing high quality graduate supervision, redesigning a laboratory course, or using innovative teaching techniques in a classroom. A teaching assessment should be flexible and align with an instructor’s career path and goals, rather than using a prescribed, weighted evaluation.

**Teaching Assessment Model**

Using the TA Framework described above, each academic unit can develop their own Teaching Assessment Model, which would contain three elements.

1. The first element of the TA Model would be to develop a descriptive Teaching Assessment Model Instrument (TA Model Instrument), specifying the number and types of TA Methods, information sources, and information collection time points that would be required by the academic unit (see Figure 2). Also, the instrument should indicate a set of optional TA Methods from which an instructor can choose to gather additional pieces of data or evidence. By providing instructors with this flexibility, they can submit information
highlighting their unique interests and contributions.

In order to aid academic units, a TA Methods Inventory has been compiled (Chapter 5), which outlines 73 types of TA Data and TA Evidence that can be used to assess teaching, organized by information source.

2. Another element of the TA Model is outlining which types of TA Data and TA Evidence are gathered/solicited by the instructor, and which are provided/solicited by the academic unit. For example, two academic units may decide to use a list of teaching activity (e.g. lists of courses: level and breadth) as evidence in their assessment. One academic unit may require the instructor to submit this list, while the other could decide it is the responsibility of the academic unit’s administration to provide this list.

A teaching portfolio or dossier contains TA Data and TA Evidence an instructor has compiled or gathered for her own teaching assessment. Teaching portfolios/dossiers can include TA Data and TA Evidence such as self-reflections, documentation of achievements, and course materials.

3. The TA Model would include the process by which specific TA Methods are implemented (i.e., how information is collected). For example, an academic unit may decide to make peer classroom observations mandatory. With that said, there are various ways that groupings can be formed (Cardiff University, 2009; Siddiqui, Jonas-Dwyer, & Carr, 2007):

   • Self-selected pairs
     o Pro: more incentive to help the other instructor
     o Con: evaluators may be less objective
   • Pairs selected by administration
     o Pro: can effectively avoid conflict of interests and other problematic pairings
     o Con: instructors may feel like they have less control over the process
   • Peer triads/clusters (sometimes in groups of four)
     o Pro: increases learning opportunities
     o Con: may be more challenging to coordinate schedules

The specific implementation of the peer classroom observations would be dependent on the academic unit’s TA Model. Another example would be the specific statistics requested from the student evaluation of teaching and course response reports.

4. The last element of the TA Model would be to include mechanisms that are implemented to reduce bias (e.g., having multiple reviewers for peer classroom observation).
### Academic Unit: History
### Instructor: Sam Guy

#### Part 1: Teaching Assessment Methods (4 Data Types)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self (2)</td>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-evaluation instrument</td>
<td>Fall 2013, 2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (1)</td>
<td>Student course evaluations (at least 5 courses)</td>
<td>Fall 2013, 2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer/Administrator (1)</td>
<td>Method (1)</td>
<td>Peer Classroom Observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part 2: Teaching Assessment Evidence (16 Data Types)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self (6)</td>
<td>Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Contributions (2):</td>
<td>Teaching Materials - HIST 301</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authored Textbook (War &amp; Joy)</td>
<td>Oct. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Growth or Scholarship (3):</td>
<td>Tech innovation - clickers</td>
<td>Fall 2013, 2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop on learning outcomes</td>
<td>Feb. 25, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenter - TLCC</td>
<td>Sept. 25, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (4)</td>
<td>List of supervised dissertations/theses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence supporting calibre of supervised dissertations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (3):</td>
<td>Informal course survey - HIST 200</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail from Student</td>
<td>March 23, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail from Tee Ah</td>
<td>April 2, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer/Administrator (3)</td>
<td>Letter from Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence (2):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from Col League (UBC)</td>
<td>March 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter from TLC Consultant</td>
<td>Fall 2014, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni (1)</td>
<td>Evidence (1):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad student post-doc at Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Data (2)</td>
<td>Evidence (2):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade distribution - HIST 200</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade distribution - HIST 200</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Sample TA Model Instrument.
Chapter 1: Literature Review

An academic literature review is conducted to obtain peer-reviewed documents, whereas a grey literature review is conducted to capture reports that are not peer-reviewed and reports detailing best practices at universities.

During March and April 2016, academic and grey literature searches were conducted using the following search terms:

- “teach* effect*”,
- “teach* evaluat*”, and
- “teach* assessment”.

A total of 93 relevant academic and 65 grey literature results were identified.

Results:

Best practices identified in this literature review are as follows:

- Guidelines for an effective TA Model should include the following steps:
  - Clarify institutional goals regarding teaching and its assessment.
  - Involve instructors in the development of the TA Model.
  - Ensure that the TA Model is flexible.
  - Explicitly define teaching assessment criteria.
  - Provide adequate training for TA Methods for instructors and evaluators.
  - Combine professional development with teaching assessment.
  - Review the TA Model periodically (Cashin, 1996).

- Usage of multiple TA Methods – several pieces of information should be considered (Berk, 2005; Gravestock, 2011; Paulsen, 2002).

- Usage of multiple information sources – to increase validity, TA Methods from various information sources should be gathered (Berk, 2005; Gravestock, 2011; Paulsen, 2002).

- Gather TA Methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability (Berk, 2005; Gravestock, 2011; Paulsen, 2002).

- View TA Methods holistically, but have clear guidelines (e.g., at least three information sources should be evaluated; Arreola, 2006; Berk, 2005; Centra, 1993; Van Valey, 2011).

- An instructor’s career path is unique, and therefore, the specific teaching assessments used for his or her evaluation should complement the instructor’s career path and goals (Van Valey, 2011).

Chapter 2: Current SFU Policies and Practices

SFU Policies and Procedures, as well as departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) documents are analysed. Additionally, TPC Chairs were interviewed between April 2016 and August 2016 to determine current teaching assessment practices.

Results

- There is a lack of alignment between the broader SFU policy on assessing teaching effectiveness (SFU A11.05 2.2), departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee policy documents (TPCPD), and current Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) practices.
SFU A11.05 2.2 states the following three TA Methods be used:
- student course evaluations
- teaching portfolios/dossiers
- classroom observations

TPC Chairs revealed that there are five TA Methods that are used in practice, and each method is mandatory to varying degrees (e.g., a TPC Chair may state that they use teaching portfolios, but it is not a requirement).
- student course evaluations (100%),
- teaching philosophy statements (83%),
- teaching portfolios/dossiers (73%),
- classroom observations – in-person (9%), and
- learning outcomes (3%).

TPC Chairs report that they do not know how to assess the evidence provided for teaching assessment purposes, leading them to rely more heavily on the quantitative results of student course evaluations.

TA Methods used in tenure and promotion decisions are often sourced from:
- students (in the form of course evaluations), and
- self in the form of a teaching portfolio (e.g., teaching philosophy statement, a list of courses taught, curricular or course design contributions)
  - but rarely includes peer, alumni or course data.

Most academic units are using multiple TA Methods and view them holistically for tenure and promotion decisions.

57% of TPC Chairs think that their current departmental teaching assessment procedures are “adequately effective”.

Ideally, TPC Chairs would like to use the following TA Methods for tenure and promotion:
- peer classroom observations,
- classroom observations by a third party (e.g., educational consultants), and
- learning outcomes.

Chapter 3: Teaching Assessment Practices Used by SFU Exemplary Instructors

Exemplary teachers are operationally defined as either current Faculty Teaching Fellows or recipients of the Excellence in Teaching Award in 2014 or 2015. Ten exemplary teachers were interviewed between May 2016 and June 2016 to help inform this review.

Results

- Interviews reveal that 80% of exemplary teachers report using multiple TA Methods. However, only two types of TA Data are self-reported:
  - student course evaluations (10%), and
  - peer classroom observations (10%).
- The two most common pieces of TA Evidence are:
  - self-reflections (70%), and
  - reflection or responsiveness to assessments (50%).
- Self-generated TA Methods are most commonly used, and TA Methods from peers is rarely used.
- Ideally, exemplary teachers would like SFU instructors to use the following TA Methods:
  - peer classroom observations, and
  - peer review of course materials.
Chapter 4: Teaching Assessment Practices at Canadian Universities

Eleven institutional contacts were interviewed at nine Canadian universities between May 2016 and June 2016 to determine current teaching assessment practices. Institutional tenure and promotion policy documents are analysed to determine which policies govern teaching assessment at these respective universities.

Results

Institutional contacts reported the following:

- The following TA Methods are used at Canadian universities:
  - student course evaluations (reported by 100% of institutional contacts),
  - teaching portfolios/dossiers (66%),
  - classroom observations (in-person, 56%),
  - teaching philosophy statements (44%), and
  - review of course materials (11%).
- Use of innovative techniques is the most common piece of TA Evidence, as cited by institutional contacts.
- Self-generated TA Methods are most commonly used, and TA Methods from students and peers is rarely included.
- All institutions are using multiple TA Methods and generally view them holistically for tenure and promotion decisions.
- Ideally, institutional contacts would like to use the following TA Methods for tenure and promotion:
  - peer classroom observations (in-person),
  - self-reflections, and
  - formative assessments (e.g., informal course surveys).

The three most commonly appearing TA Methods in policy documents are:

- student course evaluations (100% of policy documents),
- teaching portfolios/dossiers (89%), and
- teaching philosophy statements (67%).

Chapter 5: Teaching Assessment Methods Inventory

A Teaching Assessment Methods Inventory (TA Methods Inventory) was developed to identify evaluation approaches in post-secondary teaching. It includes TA Methods that can be used for tenure and promotion purposes (i.e., summative assessment), as well as for professional growth and development (i.e., formative assessment).

The TA Methods Inventory contains 73 TA Methods (17 TA Data and 56 TA Evidence), which are categorized by information source. Additionally, some sources of evidence are further categorized:

1) Self
   - pedagogical contribution: contributing to pedagogy, on an individual level, at a departmental level, or an institution level
   - pedagogical growth: committing to and improving one’s pedagogy
   - pedagogical scholarship: conducting and reading research on pedagogy

2) Student
   - outcomes: measurable outcomes of student success
3) **Peer/Administrator**

- **testimony**: formal or informal feedback from peer/administrators; can be solicited or unsolicited
- **other**: other pieces of evidence from peers/administrators that are not testimony

### Chapter 6: Recommendations

A table was created to present the following consolidated list of recommendations as well as associated support for each recommendation.

#### Institution

1. Clarify institutional and departmental goals regarding teaching and its assessment.
2. Revise SFU Policy A11.05 2.2 to adopt the TA Framework principles including:
   - Use **multiple TA Methods**. For example, use student-generated TA Methods beyond course evaluations (e.g., student work).
   - Use **multiple information sources**, emphasizing the importance of peer-generated TA Methods.
   - Request academic units conduct more frequent, formative assessments over **multiple points in time**, that help inform summative assessment (i.e., tenure and promotion decisions). This would assist in tracking improvements over time.
   - TA Methods should be triangulated by using the results of one type of TA Data or TA Evidence to verify another.
   - An instructor’s career path is unique, and therefore, the specific teaching assessments used for his or her evaluation should complement the instructor’s career path and goals.
3. Revise SFU Policy A11.05 2.2 in the following ways:
   - Clarify whether this policy supersedes, supplements, or guides departmental Tenure and Policy Committee Policy Documents (TPCPD).
   - If a specific TA Method is listed, clarify whether it is required, recommended, or optional. The current language suggests that all TA Methods listed are required, when that is not in line with actual practice.
4. Create and distribute an institution-wide template for a TA Model Instrument (Figure 2), that all academic units could use, ensuring that clear and concise information is present.
5. Create and distribute the TA Methods Inventory (Chapter 5) for academic units who are revamping their TA Model.
6. In conjunction with the Teaching and Learning Centre, create institution-wide manuals and/or kits for commonly used TA Methods.
Academic Units

1. Create a TA Model which:
   a. Revises the current TPCPD so it aligns with actual practices
   b. Create a descriptive TA Model Instrument that explicitly states the number and types of TA Methods, information sources, and points in time that are required.
   c. Outlines criteria for teaching assessment, including guidelines, definitions, and specific examples. For example, “use of innovative techniques” is frequently mentioned in the TPCPD and interviews; however, there appears to be no consensus as to what this means in practice. Another example is the words “feedback” or “comments” sometimes do not explain what they are referring to (e.g., letters, e-mails, or surveys).
   d. Specify who is responsible for soliciting/gathering TA Data and TA Evidence, and information collection processes.
   e. Explain which, if any, mechanisms are in place to reduce bias.

2. Revise the current TPCPD in the following ways:
   a. If using another academic unit’s TPCPD as a template, do not simply copy and paste. Review the template to find ways to tailor it to fit the needs of the specific academic unit. Proofread for typos, as well as spelling and grammatical errors.
   b. If TA Methods are weighted, provide greater consideration to student and peer/administrator TA Methods, compared to other information sources.

3. Encourage teaching assessment to focus on TA Evidence, which adds richness to assessment information. Specifically,
   a. Include a greater number of pedagogical growth and pedagogical scholarship pieces of evidence. Currently, emphasis is placed on pedagogical contributions. For example, mandatory documentation of reflection/responsiveness to prior assessments and use of innovative techniques should be included in every TPCPD.
   b. Use TA Methods that directly measure teaching performance (e.g., peer classroom evaluations).

Chapter 7: Limitations and Recommendations for Future Work

A brief discussion of the principles for use of the information contained in this report. This section also includes a discussion of the limitations of the current research, as well as specific recommendations for implementation at the university. Additional assessment resources are also addressed and covered in more detail in Appendices E and F.
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SUMMARY

The purpose of conducting a literature review is to determine current and best practices for teaching assessment, beyond student course evaluations. An academic literature review is conducted to obtain peer-reviewed documents, whereas a grey literature review is conducted to capture reports that are not peer-reviewed.

During March and April 2016, academic and grey literature searches were conducted using the following search terms:

- “teach* effect*”,
- “teach* evaluat*”, and
- “teach* assessment”.

A total of 93 academic results and 65 relevant grey literature results were identified.

From the results, a total of 32 Teaching Assessment Methods (TA Methods) were identified, which contributed to the creation of the TA Methods Inventory (Chapter 5).

Best practices identified in this literature review include:

- Clarify institutional goals regarding teaching and its assessment.
- Involve instructors in the development of the teaching assessment model.
- Ensure that the teaching assessment process is flexible.
- Explicitly define teaching assessment criteria.
- Provide adequate training for TA methods to instructors and evaluators.
- Combine professional development with teaching assessment.
- Review the teaching assessment model periodically.
- Multiple types of TA methods should feed into the assessment.
- Information should be collected from several sources.
- Gather TA Methods over multiple points in time.
- View teaching assessment holistically, and have clear guidelines (i.e., at least three information sources should be evaluated).

SECTION I: METHODOLOGY

Section I.1 Academic Literature

During April 2016, an academic literature search was conducted using an EbscoHost feature that searched several databases at once, including the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and PsycINFO. Separate literature searches were conducted for Web of Science and Dissertations Abstracts.

Search terms used were:

- “teach* effect*”,
- “teach* evaluat*”, and
- “teach* assessment”.

Results were considered relevant if:

- Published in 2000 or later,
- were full-text journal articles,
- written in English,
- focusing on a post-secondary setting, and
- extended beyond student course evaluations.

Reference sections of three key articles were also reviewed to find additional relevant articles:

- Berk, 2005
- Gravestock, 2011
- Paulsen, 2002

Results found through these three key articles were not limited to the aforementioned inclusion criteria (e.g., books were included, articles published prior to 2000 were included).

The relevant academic literature set was analysed to tease out TA Methods that are in use, as well best practices for teaching assessment. These results are presented in Section II: Results.

**Section I.2 Grey Literature**

During March 2016, a grey literature search was conducted using Google and Google Scholar.

Search terms used were:

- “teach* effect*”,
- “teach* evaluat*”, and
- “teach* assessment”.

Results were considered relevant if:

- focused on a post-secondary setting, and
- extended beyond student course evaluations.

Relevant results were recorded in a spreadsheet, TA Methods were noted, and general recommendations for teaching assessment were summarized.

A telephone interview with Gravestock at University of Toronto was conducted in May 2016 to determine whether or not the approaches and recommendations revealed in the academic and grey literature are still considered current best practices for teaching assessment. Gravestock’s dissertation is considered a seminal piece on Canadian TA Methods, and arguably the most comprehensive overview of Canadian TA Methods to-date.
SECTION II: RESULTS

Section II.1 Academic Literature

Table 1 outlines the results from the academic literature search. A total of 93 relevant results were found. Most results were peer-reviewed and from the USA. Also, most results were within the last 5 years, which emphasizes that teaching assessment is a hot-button issue.

Table 1: Academic Literature Search Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to 2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II.2 Grey Literature

From the grey literature search, a total of 65 relevant results (including websites) and 31 relevant documents were found. Table 2 outlines the 31 documents found from the grey literature search. Most results were from the USA and were resource guides. There is some overlap between what was found in the grey and academic literature searches.
SECTION III: CONCLUSION

From the results, a total of 32 TA Methods were identified, which contributed to the creation of the TA Methods Inventory (Chapter 5).

Best practices were identified from the academic and grey literature reviews and incorporated in the principles of this report’s Teaching Assessment Framework:

- Multiple sources and multiple types of TA Methods should be used to assess teaching, over multiple time points (Berk, 2005; Gravestock, 2011; Paulsen, 2002). This point is reiterated by Van Note Chism (1999), “The evaluation literature has continually stressed that for evaluations of teaching to be fair, valid, and reliable, multiple sources of information must be engaged, multiple methods must be used to gather teaching assessment information, and the TA Methods must be gathered over multiple points in time” (p. 7).
- Teaching assessment should come from various sources: the candidates themselves, students, peers/administration, alumni, and course data (Berk, 2005; Gravestock, 2011; Paulsen, 2002).
- When considering the five aforementioned information sources, greater weight should be given to information from students and peers/administrators (Arreola, 2006; Berk, 2005; Centra, 1993).
- Information sources should be corroborated, in order to increase reliability and validity (Arreola, 2006; Berk, 2005; Centra, 1993; Van Valey, 2011). If assessment results are similar among information sources, then confidence can be placed in those results. Alternatively, if assessment results are disparate among information sources, further investigation is required to determine the cause of the disparity.
sources, then further TA Methods and particularly careful interpretation of the results may be needed (Van Valey, 2011).

- Teaching assessment should offer flexibility, recognizing the diversity of instructors’ career patterns (Van Valey, 2011).

- TA Methods should be viewed holistically, but with some weighting, where no one area is given a premium value, at the detriment of others (Berk, 2005; Gravestock, 2011; Paulsen, 2002).

- In order to develop an effective teaching assessment model, Cashin (1996) suggests some important guidelines:
  - Clarify institutional goals regarding teaching and its assessment.
  - Use pilot programs to implement new TA Methods, when appropriate.
  - Involve instructors in the development of the teaching assessment model.
  - Ensure that the teaching assessment model is flexible.
  - Explicitly define teaching assessment criteria.
  - Provide adequate training for new TA Methods to instructors and evaluators.
  - Combine professional development with teaching assessment.
  - Review the teaching assessment model periodically.

A telephone interview with Gravestock confirmed that these approaches and recommendations are still considered current best practices for teaching assessment.
SECTION IV: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This book is a step-by-step guide for implementing different information sources for teaching assessment. It provides case studies, as well as sample rubrics and worksheets.

This article presents 12 distinct methods to assess teaching. Definitions and commentary on each method is offered. It also emphasizes the importance of triangulating multiple information sources.

This report reviews the websites of 30 American post-secondary institutions to determine current teaching assessment practices. It offers recommendations, such as having an institutional-wide definition of effective teaching and offering adequate training to instructors and evaluators.

This article suggests an expanded definition of teaching that aligns with TA Methods that can be used in teaching assessment. It also outlines guidelines for teaching assessment, such as using multiple information sources and allowing adequate time to thoroughly assess teaching.

This seminal article outlines 16 principles of effective teaching assessment, such as clarifying institutional goals and using pilot programs to test new TA Data and TA Evidence.

This book offers guidelines on effectively using self-reported TA Methods, including teaching portfolios/dossiers. Also, it suggests strategies to increase the use of peer TA Methods.

This dissertation contains an analysis of tenure policy documents from 46 Canadian universities. Policy documents are analyzed to determine how well they reflect academic literature.

Directions for Teaching and Learning, 88, 3-9.
This article discusses how to effectively determine teaching assessment criteria and how to differentiate between formative and summative assessment.

This article focuses on three central principles that govern effective teaching assessment: (a) clarifying expectations of and by instructors, (2) identifying the nature and sources of TA Methods, and (c) clarifying the purposes and uses of assessment information.

This article provides administration and instructors with answers to the practical implementation of teaching portfolios/dossiers for assessment. Topics discussed include how to organize portfolios/dossiers and issues of maintaining reliability and integrity of portfolios/dossiers.

This book discusses the uses and implementation of various types of TA Data and TA Evidence. It also addresses how to gain support from instructors and administration, how to triangulate information sources, and how to avoid common pitfalls.

This book discusses the benefits, goals, and procedures involved in implementing the use of peer TA Methods, such as peer classroom observations. It also outlines barriers to peer TA Methods and suggests strategies to overcome them. Additionally, it contains numerous rubrics for peer review of teaching.

This book offers guidelines and rubrics for various types of TA Data and TA Evidence, as well as emphasizing the importance of peer TA Methods. Although originally written for sociology departments, this book offers a perspective that all departments can benefit from.
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SUMMARY

This chapter summarizes SFU policies that govern the teaching assessment of instructors, and how they are currently implemented at the departmental level. SFU Policies and Procedures, as well as departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) documents are analysed. Additionally, TPC Chairs were interviewed between April 2016 and August 2016 to determine current teaching assessment practices. In addition to the interviews, the Teaching Assessment Framework presented in the main report is used to frame this analysis.

Overall, there is a lack of alignment between the broader SFU policy on assessing teaching effectiveness (SFU A11.05 2.2), departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee policy documents (TPCPD), and current TPC practices.

SFU A11.05 2.2 states that three types of Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data) and seven types of Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence) should be triangulated when assessing an instructor.

Compared to A11.05 2.2, the variety of TA Data types and TA Evidence listed in the TPCPD is much greater. However, the three most commonly occurring methods in TPCPD are the three TA Methods listed in A11.05 2.2:

- student course evaluations (95% of TPCPD),
- teaching portfolios/dossiers (86% of TPCPD), and
- classroom observations (51% of TPCPD).

Generally, interviews with TPC Chairs found that they most frequently use student course evaluations and teaching portfolios to assess teaching quality. Teaching portfolios often consist of information supplied by the candidate (e.g., teaching philosophy statement, a list of courses taught, curricular or course design contributions).

TPC Chairs revealed that there are only five TA Methods that are used in practice, and each method is mandatory to a different extent (e.g., a TPC Chair may state that they use teaching portfolios, but it is not a requirement). Below is a list of the methods and the percentage of departments that use the TA Data:

- student course evaluations (100%),
- teaching philosophy statements (83%),
- teaching portfolios/dossiers (73%),
- classroom observations – in-person (9%), and
- learning outcomes (3%).

TPC Chairs also identified 17 pieces of TA Evidence that are considered when assessing teaching effectiveness—much fewer than the number listed in TPCPD.

Other notable interview results include:

- Student- and self-generated information is most commonly used, and information from peers is rarely included.
- Most departments are using multiple information types and viewing them holistically for tenure and promotion decisions.
- TPC Chairs report that they do not know how to assess the TA Evidence provided, leading them to rely more heavily on the quantitative results of student course evaluations.
• 57% of TPC Chairs think that their current departmental teaching assessments are “adequately effective”.
• Ideally, TPC Chairs would like to use the following TA Methods for tenure and promotion:
  o peer classroom observations,
  o classroom observations by a third party (e.g., educational consultants), and
  o learning outcomes.
• 57% of TPC Chairs believe their current teaching assessment processes create and/or foster a positive learning environment for students, and 53% believe it encourages opportunities for professional growth among instructors.

SECTION I: METHODOLOGY

Three investigations are conducted to examine what SFU policies govern the assessment of instructors, and how these are currently implemented at the department level:

1. A document analysis of the SFU Policies and Procedures documents both at the institution and departmental levels.
2. Interviews with TPC Chairs.
3. A comparison between the policy documents and their current implementation.

Section I.1 Policy Document Analysis

Two types of policy document analyses are presented in this report. First, the Teaching Assessment Methods (TA Methods) stated in the policies are identified, and then the extent to which each TA Method is mandatory is noted. This second coding is guided by a discussion with Dr. Pam Gravestock, a seminal Canadian researcher in teaching assessment. Each TA Method was coded as either “required”, “recommended”, or “optional”, replicating coding used in Gravestock’s dissertation (Gravestock, 2011; Table 3). An additional descriptor was added – “conflict” – when two or more descriptors applied.

Table 3: Coding for Policy Document Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Words in Policy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>are, ask, expect, must, request, shall, should, will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>advise, encourage, recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>at applicant's discretion, can, could, if so inclined, may, might, on one's own initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>used two or more descriptors to describe one TA Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TA Methods are further categorized as either TA Data (products from formal procedures or execution) or TA Evidence (products from informal procedures of execution).

Section I.1.1 Which TA Methods are included in the SFU Policies and Procedures?

SFU Policy Number A11.05 titled “Criteria for Appointment, Contract Renewal, Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Review” was identified as pertinent to this policy review. More specifically, the following section was isolated and analysed:
Section 2.2 Teaching Effectiveness

Success as a teacher is of fundamental importance for evaluating the performance of a faculty member. Matters which should be taken into consideration in evaluating teaching include mastery of the subject, generation of enthusiasm in students, maintenance of appropriate academic standards, dedicated involvement within one’s field(s), openness to innovation, graduate supervision, and development of academic programs. Consideration shall be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction. Teaching effectiveness should be measured or assessed through a combination of methods, including student questionnaires, the observations of faculty colleagues, teaching portfolios, and the calibre of supervised dissertations and theses. At a minimum, faculty members must follow the general procedures developed by their departments to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Services to students over and above formal teaching should also be taken into consideration, particularly where the service is of a time-consuming nature.

This section (SFU A11.05 2.2) was parsed for a list of TA Methods. Then, the items were compared to the TA Methods Inventory (Chapter 5) created from the literature review (Chapter 1). If the item was not already in the inventory, it was added. The result of this analysis is a short inventory of TA Methods.

Section I.1.2 Which TA Methods are listed in the departmental TPCPD?

First, 52 departments or units were identified at SFU. Following exclusion criteria outlined in Table 4, 14 departments were removed. As a result, 38 departments were solicited for TPCPD.

Table 4: Reasons for Exclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Exclusion</th>
<th>Number of Departments</th>
<th>Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program no longer running and/or irrelevant (e.g., workshops)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>African Middle Eastern Studies, Canadian Studies, Dialogue, Explorations, Japan, Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPC because their instructors are evaluated by other departments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asia-Canada (evaluated by Humanities), Cognitive Science (evaluated by Psychology), Environmental Science (evaluated by Geography), Labour Studies (evaluated by Anthropology/Sociology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPC because department only has Sessional Instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development and Sustainability, Sustainable Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TPC and individual contact cited because they are a program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Latin American Studies, Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-seven (37) departments provided their TPCPD and two analyses were conducted on these TPCPD:

1. Identification of which TA Methods appear in the TPCPD
2. Investigation of the alignment between TA Methods identified in TPCPD and the ones that appear in the SFU Policies and Procedures. For each TA Method identified in the SFU A11.05 2.2, it was noted whether it:
   - is absent from the TPCPD
   - included in the TPCPD, with the same exact wording
   - included in the TPCPD, but with distinct wording

A few of the TPCPD differentiated the assessments by whether the candidate is applying for a teaching-track or research-track. In these cases, TA Methods for both tracks were coded.

In order to maintain interrater reliability, the TPCPD were independently coded by two coders (i.e., the authors of this report). Any coding discrepancies were discussed and resolved.

Section I.2 Interviews

TPC Chairs of the 38 previously identified departments were invited for interviews to discuss their current tenure and promotion practices, specifically related to teaching assessment. Thirty (30) TPC Chairs agreed to participate, whereas 8 chose not to participate. One TPC Chair asked that their Undergraduate Chair be interviewed instead, and one Dean was interviewed instead of their TPC Chair. Each interview was approximately 30 minutes long and participants were given the option of being anonymous.

To assist in developing interview questions, an Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) search was conducted using the search terms: "tenure" and "interview". The titles of the first 250 entries were scanned and relevant articles were searched for themes related to teaching assessment practice in higher education. The questions focused on which TA Methods are used for assessment purposes (i.e., tenure and promotion), how mandatory these TA Methods are, and any changes the TPC Chair would like to adopt. The complete list of interview questions can be found in Appendix A7.

It should be noted that some departments are using TA Methods for other purposes, such as professional growth and development; however, these were the focus of the interviews. The TA Methods are categorized into four sources of information: self-generated, student, peer/administrator, and alumni.

Based on the results from early interviews, interview questions about pedagogical innovation and reputation-building surrounding teaching were added to later interviews.

Section II: RESULTS

Section II.1 Policy Document Analysis

Section II.1.1 Which TA Methods are listed in the SFU Policies and Procedures?

The results of this analysis include a short inventory of the TA Methods that university policy expects that all TPC use in their decision-making for tenure and promotion (Table 5). Three types of TA Data are included in SFU A11.05 2.2, and the information source for each type
of TA Data derives from a different source (i.e., self, student, and peer/administrator). However, there are seven types of TA Evidence included, and all but one come from a single source—the candidates themselves. Lastly, the phrasing in SFU A11.05 2.2 implies that all 10 TA Methods are mandatory (i.e., required).

**Table 5: Linkage between SFU A11.05 2.2 and the TA Methods Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Methods Inventory</th>
<th>Phrases from SFU A11.05 2.2</th>
<th>Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TA Data</strong></td>
<td>• Teaching portfolios</td>
<td>Self Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student questionnaires</td>
<td>Student Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observations of faculty colleagues</td>
<td>Peer/Admin Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TA Evidence - Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td>• Development of academic programs</td>
<td>Self Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate supervision</td>
<td>Self Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability and willingness of a faculty member to teach</td>
<td>Self Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Services to students over and above formal teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses: level and breadth)</td>
<td>Self Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervision of experiential learning courses OR participation in student-led programs or events (depending on what the service is)</td>
<td>Self Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TA Evidence - Pedagogical Growth</strong></td>
<td>• Openness to innovation</td>
<td>Self Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TA Evidence - Student Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>• Calibre of supervised dissertations and theses</td>
<td>Student Source</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section II.1.2 Which TA Methods are listed in the departmental TPCPD?**

A complete list of the TA Methods that appear in the TPCPD is located in Appendix A1-A6, along with the extent to which each TA Method is mandatory.

The relationship between the broader SFU policy on assessing teaching effectiveness (A11.05 2.2) and the departmental TPCPD is unclear. SFU Policy Number A11.05 5.1 states, “These departmental criteria must be approved by the Dean, copied to the Vice President, Academic and must be consistent with the general university requirements for tenure and promotion contained in this policy.” Although there is consensus that the TPCPD should govern practice, the specific nature of the relationship between the broader SFU policy and the departmental TPCPD is unclear; does it supersede, supplement, or guide the departmental TPCPD?

Some TPCPD:

- Only list SFU A11.05 2.2
- Include SFU A11.05 2.2 in its entirety, but then add their own procedures which may or may not conflict with information provided in SFU A11.05 2.2
- Include parts of SFU A11.05 2.2, but then add their own procedures which may or may not conflict with information provided in SFU A11.05 2.2
- Make no mention of SFU A11.05 2.2
The top three TA Data types occurring in the TPCPD are the same three that are stated in the SFU A11.05 2.2 (Table 6). When student course evaluations and teaching portfolios/dossiers appear in TPCPD, they are often described as being required for candidates to submit during the tenure and promotion assessment process. However, classroom observations (in-person) appear in only 51% of TPCPD and are only required in approximately half of those documents.

Table 6: Frequency of TA Methods in the TPCPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student course evaluations*</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)*</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA evaluations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency in grading with similar courses</td>
<td>Course Data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TA Methods included in SFU A11.05 2.2

The types of TA Evidence which are listed in the TPCPD and for which the candidates themselves are the source are shown in Table 7. TA Evidence in the form of pedagogical contributions is the most common and varied, whereas pedagogical scholarship is rarely mentioned. Curriculum/course design and development as well as graduate supervision or committee service appears in almost every TPCPD.
Table 7: Frequency of TA Evidence (Self Source) in the TPCPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence (Self Source)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development*</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service*</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses: level and breadth)*</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses*</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials (online or software)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA supervision</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in student-led programs or events*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating latest research into teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques*</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping current in subject area</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration with professional body</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Scholarship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at education conferences</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TA Methods included in SFU A11.05 2.2

Table 8 lists the types of TA Evidence that appear in TPCPD, for which the candidates themselves are not the source. The most common TA Method is the number and/or calibre of supervised dissertations and theses. This TA Method only appears in 43% of the TPCPD, even though it is listed in the SFU A11.05 2.2 as a mandatory piece of evidence.
### Table 8: Frequency of TA Evidence (Non-Self Sources) in the TPCPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence (Non-Self Source)</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and/or calibre of supervised dissertations/theses*</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student distinctions</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success of former graduate students</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TA Methods included in SFU A11.05 2.2

### Section II.2 Interviews

For a summary of responses to the interview questions refer to Appendix A8.

#### Section II.2.1 Which TA Methods are currently implemented at the department level?

A complete list of the departmental usage of TA Methods that are cited by TPC Chairs is located in Appendix 9 and Appendix 10, along with the extent to which each TA Method is mandatory.

TPC Chairs mentioned using five sources of TA Data (Table 9), of which student course evaluations are cited by all. The TA Method of classroom observations (in-person) was brought up in three of the interviews, but it is only considered mandatory in one of the departments.

### Table 9: Frequency of TA Data Cited During Interviews with TPC Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Counts are based on specific mention by the TPC Chair. It is possible that the TPC Chair forgot or is unaware of all TA Methods used in their department.
3. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, a TPC Chair may have thought a teaching dossier includes consideration of teaching awards.

The types of TA Evidence which, according to TPC Chairs, are used in departments are summarized in Table 10. Generally, the source of evidence is most often the candidates themselves, and most pieces of TA Evidence are only cited by a handful of TPC Chairs.

Table 10: Frequency of TA Evidence Cited During Interviews with TPC Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses)</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success of former grad students</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Counts are based on specific mention by the TPC Chair. It is possible that the TPC Chair forgot or is unaware of all TA Methods used in their department.
3. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, a TPC Chair may have thought a teaching dossier includes consideration of teaching awards.

Of the 30 departments interviewed, 29 (97%) report using multiple information sources and 27 (90%) stated that they review the TA Methods in a holistic manner. One TPC Chair noted, “all [TA Methods] are in conversation with each other.” As such, there is often no structure or guidelines when presented with various, sometimes conflicting, information. Many TPC Chairs noted that they often rely heavily on student course evaluations and view other TA Methods as supplementary to student course evaluations. Student course evaluations are often relied upon because they offer numeric metrics that are easy to compare (i.e., quantitative information) and the implementation process is simple. However, it is important to note that there are other student-generated TA Methods (as well as other information sources), which can offer more rich information.

Two departments are an exception and do provide guidelines. Political Science weighs
student course evaluations at approximately 90% and teaching dossiers at 10%. While, First Nations Studies weights their student course evaluations at approximately 40%, teaching portfolios at 40%, and professional development at 20%.

Many TPC Chairs noted that there is a perception among many instructors that research is more important than teaching when making tenure and promotion decisions. Dr. Vance Williams, the Chemistry Undergraduate Chair said that, “the 40-40-20 rule is a little mythological.” It is often noted that teaching is viewed like a pass/fail system, where an instructor only “fails” if there are many, blatant red flags.

Section II.2.2 Do TPC Chairs believe their current TA Methods are effective?

Just over half of TPC Chairs believe that their current TA Methods are adequately effective (Table 11). Those who believe they are adequately effective often note it is because they use a diversity of TA Methods and teaching is assessed in a holistic manner.

Table 11: Interview Question for TPC Chairs: “Do you believe your department’s current criteria for assessing teaching is adequately effective at determining an instructor’s suitability for tenure and promotion?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, adequately effective</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately effective, but need improvements</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately effective</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who believe their current TA Methods are not adequately effective often mention that research is the primary focus in their tenure and promotion decisions. For example, Dr. Peter Hall, TPC Chair for Urban Studies mentioned that assessment for tenure and promotion is usually “organized around the life cycle of research”, giving sufficient time to complete a large research project or write a book.

A second reason provided for why the current TA Methods may not be effective is that current TA Methods “cannot differentiate between adequate and excellent teaching” (Dr. Tom Loughin, TPC Chair for Statistics and Actuarial Science). There is an appetite for more robust TA Methods, possibly with reliability and validity measures.

Section II.2.3 Which TA Methods do TPC Chairs want to include?

TPC Chairs were asked, “In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods you would like to include for tenure and promotion?” The top three answers included:

- Classroom observations (in-person) by a colleague or administrator
- Classroom observations (in-person) by an educational consultant
- Learning outcomes

Section II.2.4 Do TPC Chairs believe TA Methods can have positive outcomes?
57% of TPC Chairs believe their current TA Methods create and/or foster a positive learning environment for students (Table 11), and 53% believe they encourage opportunities for professional growth among instructors (Table 13).

**Table 12: Interview Question for TPC Chairs: “Do you believe that your department’s current TA Methods have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment for students?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe a connection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13: Interview Question for TPC Chairs: “Do you believe that your department’s current TA Methods encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure/neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Martin Hahn, the TPC Chair of Philosophy, mentioned that as there has been an increased institution-wide promotion of student course evaluations, students now know that the university administration is taking course evaluations seriously. He believes that this “may improve student attitudes” toward teaching assessment, and in turn influence the learning environment. Student comments are often noted to be particularly helpful in creating a positive learning environment. TPC Chairs that believe there is no connection between their current TA Data and the learning environment state that students may feel forced, disconnected, or uninformed about the teaching assessment process. Additionally, they may feel like their voices are not truly being heard.

For those who believe that the current TA Methods do not encourage professional growth, they often note that professional growth is self-directed and self-initiated. Many TPC Chairs mentioned the need for more positive reinforcement (e.g., external incentives, rewards, recognition) for professional growth in teaching. Some TPC Chairs suggested that a mentor or mentorship committee for each instructor would inspire professional growth, mirroring supervision models in research training, such as having a Senior Supervisor and an examining committee.

**Section II.3 Comparison of TA Methods between TPCPD and TPC Chair Interviews**

Table 14 summarizes the frequency of TA Data that are included in the TPCPD and mentioned during the interviews with the TPC Chairs. Compared to TPCPD, TPC Chairs mentioned classroom observations (in-person) at a much lower rate and teaching
philosophy statements at a much higher rate. Only approximately half the TA Data types appearing in the TPCPD are cited in the interviews. Additionally, one type of TA Data that is mentioned in interviews but is not present in TPCPD is learning outcomes.

Table 14: Frequency Comparisons of TA Data between TPCPD and Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>TPCPD</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student course evaluations*</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)*</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA evaluations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency in grading with similar courses</td>
<td>Course Data</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TA Methods included in SFU A11.05 2.2

Of the 36 pieces of TA Evidence included in TPCPD, fewer than half are mentioned by TPC Chairs (Table 15). As well, one type of TA Evidence mentioned in interviews that is not present in TPCPD is anecdotal reports from students. Generally, if a type of TA Evidence is mentioned by TPC Chairs, it is at a less frequent rate, compared to TPCPD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>TPCPD</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses: level/breadth)*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials (online or software)</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA supervision</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook contributions</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in student-led programs or events*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating latest research into teaching</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques*</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping current in subject area</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration with professional body</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Scholarship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at education conferences</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Self Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number/calibre of supervised dissertations and theses*</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student distinctions</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success of former graduate students</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referee testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal course surveys</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni testimony</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TA Methods included in SFU A11.05 2.2
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SUMMARY

This chapter summarizes teaching assessment approaches used by SFU “exemplary” teachers. The goal is to determine current best practices for Teaching Assessment Methods (TA Methods), as used by SFU instructors who excel at pedagogy.

“Exemplary teachers” are operationally defined as either current Faculty Teaching Fellows or recipients of the Excellence in Teaching Award in 2014 or 2015. Ten exemplary teachers were interviewed between May 2016 and June 2016, and the TA Methods Inventory presented in Chapter 5 is used for these analyses.

Interviews reveal that 80% of exemplary teachers report using multiple TA Methods. However, only two TA Data types are self-reported:

- student course evaluations (10%), and
- peer classroom observations (10%).

Nine pieces of TA Evidence are used, of which the majority of evidence is self-generated. The two most common TA Evidence are:

- self-reflections (70%), and
- reflection or responsiveness to assessments (50%).

All self-generated TA Evidence is focused on pedagogical growth (i.e., formative assessment) and not tenure and promotion (i.e., summative assessment). Similarly, exemplary teachers often note that they believe the primary purpose of teaching assessment is for continual professional development. It is a common viewpoint among exemplary teachers that research is valued more for tenure and promotion decisions, compared to teaching.

Other notable interview results include:

- Self-generated TA Methods are most commonly used, and TA Methods from peers are rarely used.
- Ideally, exemplary teachers would like SFU instructors to use the following TA Methods:
  - peer classroom observations, and
  - peer review of course materials.
- 50% of exemplary teachers believe their current TA Methods create and/or foster a positive learning environment for students, and only 10% believe it encourages opportunities for professional growth among instructors.
- 50% of exemplary teachers believe that innovation is an important component of teaching; however, all exemplary teachers (100%) report taking risks in the classroom.

SECTION I: METHODOLOGY

Twelve (12) exemplary teachers were identified at SFU. “Exemplary teachers” are operationally defined as either current Faculty Teaching Fellows or recipients of the Excellence in Teaching Award in 2014 or 2015. One instructor was excluded as they retired.

As a result, 11 exemplary teachers were invited for interviews to discuss their teaching
assessment practices. One instructor did not respond to an invitation to participate in this study, leaving a participant pool of 10. This sample of exemplary teachers is not considered exhaustive, but a representative sample (e.g., from different departments). Interviews were either conducted in-person, over the telephone, or via e-mail. Each interview was approximately 30 minutes long and participants were given the option of being anonymous.

To assist in developing interview questions, an Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) search was conducted using the search term: “teaching excellence”. The titles of the first 50 entries were scanned; later results were mainly irrelevant. Relevant articles were skimmed for themes related to teaching assessment practice in higher education. The questions focused on which TA Methods are used for assessment purposes, definitions of excellent teaching, and any changes exemplary teachers would like to adopt. The complete list of interview questions can be found in Appendix B1.

The TA Methods are categorized into four relevant information sources: self-generated, student, peer/administrator, and alumni.

**SECTION II: RESULTS**

For a summary of responses to the interview questions refer to Appendix B2.

**Section II.1 Which TA Methods are currently used by exemplary teachers?**

A complete list of the TA Methods that are used by exemplary teachers is located in Appendix B3.

Eight of the exemplary teachers report using multiple TA Methods. However, exemplary teachers mention using only two types of TA Data – student interviews and peer classroom observations (Table 16), often neglecting to report the TA Data mentioned by their respective departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair (Chapter 2). However, exemplary teachers often note that professional growth is a key goal for teaching assessment (i.e., formative assessment). When considering tenure and promotion decisions, one anonymous exemplary teacher mentioned, “teaching is just not focused on, not praised, [nor] talked about.” Anne Macdonald, Faculty Teaching Fellow for the Beedie School of Business, echoes a similar opinion: “Research ability is the cake and being a good teacher is only the icing on the cake.”

Exemplary teachers report using 9 pieces of TA Evidence. The majority of evidence is self-generated, all of which is focused on pedagogical growth.
Table 16: Frequency of TA Methods Cited During Interviews with Exemplary Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Methods</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflections</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal course surveys</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking notes after class</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to lecture recordings</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions)</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>/10</td>
<td>/100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Counts are based on specific mention by the exemplary teacher. It is possible that the exemplary teacher forgot to mention a TA Methods.
2. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, an exemplary teacher may have thought taking notes after class involves self-reflections.

Section II.2 Which TA Methods do exemplary teachers want to include?

Exemplary teachers were asked, “In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods you would like SFU instructors to use?” The top two answers are:

- Peer classroom observations
- Peer review of course materials

Section II.3 Do exemplary teachers believe TA Methods can have positive outcomes?

50% of exemplary teachers believe their current TA Methods create and/or foster a positive learning environment for students (Table 17); only 10% believe it encourages opportunities for professional growth among instructors (Table 18).

Table 17: Interview Question for Exemplary Teachers: “Do you believe that TA Methods can have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment for students?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm evaluations could help</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Counts are based on specific mention by the exemplary teacher. It is possible that the exemplary teacher forgot to mention a TA Methods.
2. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, an exemplary teacher may have thought taking notes after class involves self-reflections.
Table 18: Interview Question for Exemplary Teachers: “Do you believe that TA Methods can encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure/neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Joanna Ashworth, Faculty Teaching Fellow for the Faculty of Environment, mentioned “anything that demonstrates an openness and willingness to respond to feedback helps create a positive learning environment.” For those who believe there was no connection, they note that the interaction between the instructor and student is of the upmost importance, regardless of assessment practices.

When considering whether TA Methods can encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors, several exemplary teachers note that professional growth is self-initiated and that pedagogical conversations with colleagues, not teaching assessment, are the most important mechanism for professional development. Dr. Kevin Oldknow, Teaching Fellow in Applied Sciences, suggested that if professional development became more explicitly recognized in tenure and promotion decisions, then it would be more encouraged.

Section II.4 Pedagogical innovation and risk taking in the classroom

Exemplary teachers define pedagogical innovation in the following ways:

Table 19: Exemplary Teachers’ Definitions of Pedagogical Innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trying new methods for knowledge transfer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unique assignments or testing methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some exemplary teachers suggested more than one definition.

Half (50%) of exemplary teachers believe that innovation is an important component of teaching. As one anonymous exemplary teacher said: “The world and [our] audience is changing...Traditional methods do not work anymore. [We] must keep being innovative in engaging students.” Conversely, Anne Macdonald, Faculty Teaching Fellow in the Beedie School of Business, said that “innovation for innovation’s sake can be a distraction.”

A follow-up question was asked regarding whether exemplary teachers take risks in the classroom and all (100%) exemplary teachers responded affirmatively. Examples of risks taken are:

- Classroom flipping
• Having small-group discussions in large lectures
• Using backchannels during lectures for students to respond to open-ended questions
• Changing seating arrangements in smaller classes
• Appropriate and relevant self-disclosure
• Departing from lesson plans

Dr. Kevin Oldknow, Faculty Teaching Fellow for Applied Sciences notes that, “when students see [the instructor] trying new things and making an effort, it can play a role in inspiring students, and for that reason alone, it’s essential.”

SPOTLIGHT

Dr. Gary Wang, recipient of the Excellence in Teaching Award in 2014 and Professor in the School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering, took a risk in the classroom by using role-taking and game-playing to simulate the dynamics between customers and manufacturing companies. He used a game to teach quality control and total quality management to students who had limited industrial experience. Based on an informal course survey, the game approach was effective in teaching abstract course concepts and giving students simulated real-world experience.
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SUMMARY

This chapter summarizes which policies govern the teaching assessment of instructors, and how they are currently implemented, at other Canadian universities. Institutional tenure and promotion policy documents are analysed to determine which policies govern teaching assessment. Additionally, 11 institutional contacts were interviewed at 9 Canadian universities between May 2016 and June 2016 to determine current teaching assessment practices. The Teaching Assessment Methods Inventory (TA Methods Inventory) presented in Chapter 5 is used for these analyses. This report focuses on institution-wide policies, although it is acknowledged that departments have diverse policies.

The three most commonly appearing types of TA Data in policy documents are:

- student course evaluations (100% of policy documents),
- teaching portfolios/dossiers (89%), and
- teaching philosophy statements (67%).

Half of the types of TA Data are peer data. Use of innovative techniques is the most common piece of TA Evidence that appeared in policy documents, and evidence in the form of pedagogical contributions is the most varied. Institutional contacts identified 8 types of TA Evidence that are considered when assessing teaching effectiveness – significantly fewer than the number listed in policy documents. However, the vast majority of forms of TA Evidence are mentioned by only one institution.

Compared to SFU’s policies, other Canadian universities’ policies report using double the amount of TA Data types, with an emphasis on peer data. Of the 36 pieces of TA Evidence included in policy documents at other Canadian universities, only 6 are mentioned in the SFU policy documents, of which the majority are pedagogical contributions.

Institutional contacts revealed that there are only five types of TA Data that are used in practice, and each type of TA Data is mandatory to a different extent (e.g., an institutional contact may state that they use teaching portfolios, but it is not a requirement). Below is a list of the types of TA Data and the percentage of institutions that use these types of TA Data:

- student course evaluations (100%),
- teaching portfolios/dossiers (66%),
- classroom observations (in-person, 56%),
- teaching philosophy statements (44%), and
- review of course materials (11%).

Use of innovative techniques is the most common piece of TA Evidence, as cited by institutional contacts. Other notable interview results include:

- self-generated TA Methods are most commonly used, and peer- and student-generated TA Methods are rarely employed.
- all institutions are using multiple TA Methods, and generally view them holistically for tenure and promotion decisions.
- 45% of institutional contacts think that their current departmental TA Methods are “adequately effective”.
- ideally, institutional contacts would like to use the following TA Methods for tenure and promotion:
  - peer classroom observations (in-person),
  - self-reflections,
formative assessments (e.g., informal course surveys).

- only 36% of institutional contacts believe their current TA Methods create and/or foster a positive learning environment for students, while 55% believe they encourage opportunities for professional growth among instructors.

Overall, most of the types of TA Data are mentioned at identical rates in both the policy documents and interviews. However, compared to policy documents, fewer forms of TA Evidence are mentioned in interviews and at less frequent rates.

**SECTION I: METHODOLOGY**

Four investigations are conducted to examine the institutional policies which govern the assessment of instructors at other Canadian universities:

1. A document analysis of institutional tenure and promotion policy documents
2. A comparison between the institutional tenure and promotion policy documents at SFU and other Canadian universities
3. Interviews with key institutional contacts
4. A comparison between the policy documents and their current implementation at other Canadian universities

**Section I.1 Policy Document Analysis**

Two types of policy document analyses are presented in this report. First, the TA Methods stated in the policies are identified, and then the extent to which each TA Method is mandatory is noted. This second coding is guided by a discussion with Dr. Pam Gravestock, a seminal Canadian researcher in teaching assessment. Each TA Method is coded as either “required”, “recommended”, or “optional”, replicating coding used in Gravestock’s dissertation (Gravestock, 2011; Table 20). An additional descriptor was added – “conflict” – when two or more descriptors applied.

**Table 20: Coding for Policy Document Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Words in Policy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>are, ask, expect, must, request, shall, should, will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>advise, encourage, recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>at applicant's discretion, can, could, if so inclined, may, might, on one's own initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>used two or more descriptors to describe one TA Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine which TA Methods are included in the institutional tenure and promotion policy documents at other Canadian universities, 11 universities were identified from a contact list from previous Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses (SETC) projects. Two institutions (University of Guelph and University of Waterloo) did not respond to an invitation to participate in this study. As a result, the sample included 9 Canadian universities, that were solicited for tenure and promotion policy documents:

- University of Alberta
- University of British Columbia
- University of Calgary
- Carleton University
- McGill University
- Queens University
University of Toronto
University of Victoria
York University

This sample is not considered exhaustive, but a representative sample.

Two analyses were primarily conducted on the policy documents from the 9 universities:

1. Identification of which TA Methods appear in the policy documents
2. A comparative investigation of the institutional policies at SFU and other universities

A few of the policy documents differentiated the assessments by whether the candidate is applying for a teaching-track or research-track. In these cases, TA Methods for both tracks were coded.

Section I.2 Interviews

Key institutional contacts from the 9 previously identified universities were invited for interviews to discuss their institution’s current tenure and promotion practices, specifically related to teaching assessment. One individual was initially contacted from each institution. An overview of the various institutional contacts and their roles is provided in Table 21. Two institutional contacts (from University of Calgary and York University) suggested speaking to an additional individual; thus, these universities had two institutional contacts each. This led to a total of 11 institutional contacts at 9 Canadian universities. Factual information about TA Methods were recorded once for each university, even if mentioned by two institutional contacts at one university. Alternatively, answers to opinion-based questions were recorded for all 11 institutional contacts. Each interview was approximately 30 minutes long and participants were given the option of being anonymous.

Table 21: Roles of Institutional Contacts at Canadian Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Title</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Presidents (Academic)/Provosts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors, Teaching and Learning Centres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Policy Analyst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Tenure and Promotion Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assist in developing interview questions, an Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC) search was conducted using the search terms: “tenure” and “interview”. The titles of the first 250 entries were scanned and relevant articles were searched for themes related to teaching assessment practice in higher education. The questions focused on which TA Methods are used for assessment purposes (i.e., tenure and promotion), whether these TA Methods are mandatory or not, and any changes the institutional contact would like to adopt. The complete list of interview questions can be found in Appendix C1.

It should be noted that some universities are using TA Methods for other purposes, such as professional growth, however these were not the focus of the interviews. The TA Methods are categorized into five information sources: self-generated, student, peer/administrator, alumni, and course data.
SECTION II: RESULTS

Section II.1 Policy Document Analysis

A complete list of the TA Methods that appear in the policy documents at other Canadian universities is located in Appendix C3-C5, along with the extent to which each TA Method is mandatory.

As shown in Table 22, the top three types of TA Data most frequently occurring in the policy documents are:

- student course evaluations,
- teaching portfolios/dossiers, and
- teaching philosophy statements.

All policy documents mentioned student course evaluations and half of the types of TA Data are peer data.

Table 22: Frequency of TA Data in the Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (video analysis)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>/9 /100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of TA Evidence, for which the candidate themselves is the source, listed in policy documents are shown in Table 23. Use of innovative techniques is the most common piece of evidence. Evidence in the form of pedagogical contributions is the most varied, whereas pedagogical scholarship is rarely mentioned.
Table 23: Frequency of TA Evidence (Self Source) in the Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence (Self Source)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development</td>
<td>6 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>6 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service</td>
<td>5 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses</td>
<td>5 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity</td>
<td>4 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td>3 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring colleagues</td>
<td>3 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials (online or software)</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA supervision</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td>7 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>5 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping current in subject area</td>
<td>4 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth</td>
<td>2 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Scholarship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
<td>4 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at educational conferences</td>
<td>4 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>3 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
<td>2 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in pedagogical associations</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>9 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 lists the types of TA Evidence that appear in policy documents, for which the candidates themselves are not the source. The most common types of TA Evidence – student testimony and teaching awards/nominations – appears in only two-thirds of the policy documents. Half of the TA Evidence noted only appeared in one policy document.
## Table 24: Frequency of TA Evidence (Non-Self Sources) in the Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence (Non-Self Source)</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>6 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>5 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>3 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number/calibre of supervised dissertations/theses</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>2 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni testimony</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student distinctions</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal course surveys</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referee testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success of former graduate students</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course enrollment data</td>
<td>Course Data</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** /9 /100%

## Section II.2 Policy Document Comparison between SFU and Other Canadian Universities

Table 25 summarizes which types of TA Data are included in SFU Policy A11.05 2.2 (see Chapter 2) and how frequently they appear at other Canadian universities. Compared to SFU, other Canadian universities reported using *twice as many* types of TA Data with an emphasis on peer data.

### Table 25: Frequency Comparisons of TA Data between Policy Documents at SFU and Other Canadian Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>SFU Policy A11.05 2.2</th>
<th>Other Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (video analysis)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 36 pieces of TA Evidence included in policy documents at other Canadian universities, *only 6* are mentioned in the SFU policy documents, the majority of which are pedagogical contributions (Table 26). However, one type of TA Evidence is mentioned in the SFU policy that is not present in the other Canadian universities’ policy documents – participation in student-led programs or events.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>SFU Policy A11.05 2.2</th>
<th>Other Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in student-led programs or events</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials (online or software)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping current in subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Scholarship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at educational conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in pedagogical associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Self Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number/calibre of supervised dissertations/theses</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni testimony</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student distinctions</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal course surveys</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referee testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success of former graduate students</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course enrollment data</td>
<td>Course Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II.3 Interviews

For a summary of responses to the interview questions refer to Appendix C2.

Section II.3.1 Which TA Methods are currently implemented at other Canadian universities?

A complete list of the institutional usage of TA Methods that are cited by institutional contacts are located in Appendix C6 and Appendix C7, along with the extent to which each TA Method is mandatory.

Institutional contacts mentioned using five types of TA Data (Table 27), of which student course evaluations are cited by all. Classroom observations (in-person) and teaching philosophy statements were brought up in five and four interviews, respectively, even though they are only considered mandatory at two of the institutions. Review of course materials is only mentioned by one institutional contact and it is only recommended.

Table 27: Frequency of TA Data Cited During Interviews with Institutional Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Counts are based on specific mention by the institutional contact. It is possible that the institutional contact forgot or is unaware of all TA Data used at their institution, particularly on a departmental level.
3. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, an institutional contact may have thought a teaching dossier includes a teaching philosophy statement.

Types of TA Evidence which are used in other Canadian universities, according to institutional contacts, are summarized in Table 28. Use of innovative techniques is the most common piece of evidence. Generally, the source of evidence is most often the candidates themselves, and most types of TA Evidence are only cited by one institution.

Table 28: Frequency of Types of TA Evidence Cited During Interviews with Institutional Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
2. Counts are based on specific mention by the institutional contact. It is possible that the institutional contact forgot or is unaware of all TA Evidence used at their institution, particularly on a departmental level.
forgot or is unaware of all TA Evidence used at their institution, particularly on a departmental level.

3. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. For example, an institutional contact may have thought use of innovative techniques includes technology.

All participants report using multiple information sources and 8 of the 9 state that they review the TA Methods in a holistic manner. McGill University’s institutional contact was unsure whether departments take a holistic approach, but mentioned that there is no formal weighting at the institutional level.

Section II.3.2 Do institutional contacts believe their current TA Methods are effective?

Just under half of institutional contacts believe that their current TA Methods are adequately effective (Table 29).

Table 29: Interview Question for Institutional Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe your institution’s current criteria for assessing teaching is adequately effective at determining an instructor’s suitability for tenure and promotion?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, adequately effective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately effective, but need improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some departments are and others are not</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately effective</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five of the 11 institutional contacts (45%) mentioned that they believe their current criteria are adequately effective because they use multiple information sources. The anonymous institutional contact from University of Toronto mentioned that over time, they “have not raised the bar necessarily”, but they have made their tenure and promotion process and expectations more transparent and explicit. Additionally, they have given evaluators better tools and mechanisms for support (e.g., workshops). On the other hand, Mary Anne Waldron, Associate Vice-President (Faculty Relations and Academic Administration) of University of Victoria mentioned that TA Methods could use some improvement, because universities are “more at home with assessing scholarship [i.e., research] than teaching.”

Section II.3.3 Which TA Methods do institutional contacts want to include?

Institutional contacts were asked, “In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods you would like to include for tenure and promotion?” The top three answers included:

- classroom observations (in-person),
- self-reflections, and
- formative assessments (e.g., informal course surveys).
Section II.3.4 Do institutional contacts believe TA Methods can have positive outcomes?

Only 36% of institutional contacts believe their current TA Methods create and/or foster a positive learning environment for students (Table 30), and 55% believe they encourage opportunities for professional growth among instructors (Table 31).

Table 30: Interview Question for Institutional Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe that your institution’s current TA Methods have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment for students?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm evaluations would help</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe a connection</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Interview Question for Institutional Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe that your institution’s current TA Methods encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to TA Methods developing a positive learning environment, one of the anonymous institutional contacts for the University of Calgary mentioned that “students have commented that they are aware that the institution values research over teaching. We need to demonstrate the value of teaching and learning and put it into practice. We need to practice what we preach.” The anonymous institutional contact for University of British Columbia mentioned that his anecdotal evidence shows that midterm evaluations (i.e., informal course surveys) lead to better class climates and better year-end student course evaluations. He believes that midterm evaluations “reduce the distance between students and instructors...[and] show that someone cares to collect, attend, and respond to feedback”. This differs from typical student course evaluations where feedback is at the end of the semester and students do not see how the instructor uses the feedback.

When considering if TA Methods can encourage professional growth, several institutional contacts noted that TA Methods can facilitate professional growth, as long as self-reflection occurs. One of the anonymous institutional contacts from University of Calgary mentioned that instructors need to “take an intentional look at what they do in the classroom and identify goals for improvement... What gets measured [TA Methods] is what gets done [professional growth].” Conversely, the anonymous institutional contact from University of Alberta believes that “sharing ideas with colleagues” leads to professional growth, instead of
teaching assessment. One of the anonymous institutional contacts from University of Calgary suggested that ideally, each instructor would have a mentor (someone in their department or the Teaching and Learning Centre) to review and interpret students course evaluations (and other TA Methods) with them, in order to encourage professional growth.

**Section II.4 Comparison of TA Methods between Institutional Contact Interviews and Policy Documents**

Table 32 summarizes the frequency of types of TA Data that are included in the policy documents and mentioned during the interviews with other Canadian universities. Most of the TA Data mentioned/appeared at *identical* rates in both the policy documents and the interviews. Compared to policy documents, institutional contacts mentioned teaching portfolios/dossiers and teaching philosophy statements at a *much lower* rate. Additionally, one type of TA Data appears in one policy document, but is not mentioned in interviews—classroom observations (video analysis).

**Table 32: Frequency Comparisons of TA Data between Policy Documents and Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>Policy Documents</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (video analysis)</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 36 types of TA Evidence included in policy documents, fewer than a quarter are mentioned by institutional contacts (Table 33). Generally, if a type of TA Evidence is mentioned by institutional contacts, it is at a *significantly less frequent* rate, compared to policy documents. An exception is use of innovative techniques, which is cited at a *higher* rate by institutional contacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Info. Source</th>
<th>Policy Documents</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials (online or software)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping current in subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self - Pedagogical Scholarship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at educational conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in pedagogical associations</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Self Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number/ calibre of supervised dissertations/theses</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni testimony</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student distinctions</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA testimony</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal course surveys</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referee testimony</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional success of former graduate students</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course enrollment data</td>
<td>Course Data</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**SUMMARY**

This chapter presents a Teaching Assessment Methods Inventory (TA Methods Inventory), which can be used to evaluate post-secondary teaching. It includes TA Methods that can be used for tenure and promotion purposes (i.e., summative assessment), as well as professional growth and development (i.e., formative assessment).

The TA Methods Inventory contains 73 TA Methods, categorized using two dimensions:

- **Type of teaching assessment information**
  - 17 methods resulting in Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data)
  - 56 methods resulting in Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence)

- **Information source**
  - self,
  - student,
  - peer/administrator,
  - alumni,
  - course data.

**SECTION I: METHODOLOGY**

The construction of the TA Methods Inventory was an iterative process, for which each of the following investigations contributed toward the final Teaching Assessment Framework:

- Reviewing SFU tenure and promotion policy documents and conducting interviews with SFU Tenure and Promotion Committee Chairs (Chapter 1),
- Academic and grey literature reviews on teaching assessment (Chapter 2),
- Conducting interviews with SFU Faculty Teaching Fellows and teaching award winners (Chapter 3), and
- Reviewing tenure and promotion policy documents and conducting interviews with administrators at other Canadian universities (Chapter 4).

Once all of the relevant data were collected, a TA Methods Inventory was built to organize the data.

**SECTION II: TA METHODS INVENTORY**

The TA Methods Inventory is a collection of 73 identified ways of assessing teaching, which have varying degrees of usage, reliability and validity. Table 34 is an overview of the 17 identified types of TA Data, which are categorized into the five information sources: self, student, peer/administrator, alumni, and course data. Appendix D1 provides definitions and examples of each type of TA Data.

This report’s literature review (Chapter 1) and interviews with key institutional contacts at Canadian universities (Chapter 3) reveal that teaching portfolios/dossiers and course portfolios/dossiers are considered a TA Method. However, in our TA Methods Inventory, teaching and course portfolios/dossiers are viewed as simply containers for TA Data and TA Evidence (i.e., teaching/course portfolios are solely a collection of TA Data and TA Evidence, and nothing more).
Table 34: Teaching Assessment Methods (TA Methods) by information source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Peer/Administrator&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Course Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Alumni surveys</td>
<td>Consistency in grading with similar courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instruments</td>
<td>TA evaluations</td>
<td>Classroom observations (video analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Review of teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Instructional Diagnoses (SGID)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Assessment Techniques (CAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes (e.g., pre- and post-tests)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement survey data (e.g., modified NSSE)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Peer/Administrator includes: Colleagues, educational consultants, department Chairs, Deans, mentors, external referees, and Tenure and Promotion Committee members.

<sup>2</sup> National Survey of Student Engagement

Table 35 is an overview of the 56 identified pieces of TA Evidence, which are categorized into the 5 aforementioned information sources. Appendix D1 and Appendix D2 provides definitions and examples of each piece of TA Evidence.

Additionally, some information sources are further broken down:

4) **Self**
   - **pedagogical contribution**: contributing to pedagogy, on an individual level, at a departmental level, or an institution level
   - **pedagogical growth**: committing to and improving one’s pedagogy
   - **pedagogical scholarship**: conducting and reading research on pedagogy

5) **Student**
   - **outcomes**: measurable outcomes of student success
   - **feedback**: formal or informal feedback from students; can be solicited or unsolicited
6) **Peer/Administrator**
   - **testimony**: formal or informal feedback from peer/administrators; can be solicited or unsolicited
   - **other**: other pieces of evidence from peers/administrators that are not testimony

**Table 35: Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence)***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Scholarship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development</td>
<td>Professional development (e.g., workshops, conferences)</td>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service</td>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses: level and breadth)</td>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>Presentations at education conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials (online or software)</td>
<td>Keeping current in subject area</td>
<td>Membership in pedagogical associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36: Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Contributions</th>
<th>Pedagogical Growth</th>
<th>Pedagogical Scholarship</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses[^1]</td>
<td>Registration with professional body</td>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook contributions</td>
<td>Taking notes after class</td>
<td>Listening to lecture recordings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating latest research into teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td>Self-reflections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in student-led programs/events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring colleagues (formal or informal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an evaluator for any peer review of teaching procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 37: Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Peer/Administrator</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Course Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testimony¹</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Professional success of former graduate students</td>
<td>Grade distributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators³</td>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>Alumni testimony (letter, feedback, e-mail)</td>
<td>Course enrollment data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational consultants</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Employers of alumni (letter, feedback, e-mail)</td>
<td>Course files/portfolios, used for external accreditation review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions)</td>
<td>Record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of the effect of courses on alumni career choices</td>
<td>Course-level student retention/drop-out rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Experiential learning courses may include: Field work, laboratory work, clinical work, Honours theses, directed readings, Capstone projects, etc.
2. Testimony can be in the form of a letter or an e-mail.
3. Administrator includes Dean, department Chair, or mentor.

### SECTION III: ISSUES TO CONSIDER

Instructors have varied career paths, and therefore using the same set of TA Methods for each instructor may be challenging. For example, one instructor may supervise many graduate students and, so, include alumni testimonials and letters from alumni employers in her teaching portfolio. Another instructor may have devoted efforts to making pedagogical contributions through curriculum re-design and writing textbooks.

It is important to note that most TA Methods do not focus on the learning experience within the classroom, but instead on one’s dedication to pedagogy as a whole. Only a small handful of TA Methods directly assess teaching performance (e.g., student course evaluations, peer classroom observation). A related concern is those who do assess within the classroom may not have the expertise to evaluate teaching (e.g., students).

Generally, TA Methods require time and resources that may not be available. For example, in order to conduct student focus groups or interviews, an educational consultant/expert may need to be assigned to ensure quality analysis. Implementing a method for a particular department may require research, including a review of academic literature and pedagogical websites to decide upon the best implementation strategy.
Even though TA Evidence provides richness and depth to teaching assessments, there are disadvantages to consider. The main disadvantage is that there is often no formalized way to judge them. Some pieces of TA Evidence are focused on products and not the actual learning experience. For instance, one piece of TA Evidence often used in teaching assessments is teaching activity, which usually entails lists of the courses an instructor has taught; but, this piece of evidence does not consider the quality of teaching. Other pieces of TA Evidence are difficult to compare across instructors because they are highly context-dependent.

It is also important to be aware that testimony—whether it is from students, peers/administrators, or alumni—only comes from those who are willing to provide testimony, which means that samples may be biased.

Each TA Method has specific advantages and disadvantages, with the quality of a TA Method depending on how the teaching assessment information is collected and analyzed. The advantages of each piece of TA Evidence varies significantly, as evidence does not have formal procedures or methods of analyses. However, Appendix D3 outlines advantages for each type of TA Data. For each piece of data, the more checkmarks, the better. When deciding upon a type of TA Data to collect, finding another one that has “complementary” checkmarks is preferable, in order to reap the maximum benefits and avoid disadvantages
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for the University</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>TPC Chair Interviews and policy documents</th>
<th>Exemplary SFU Instructor Interviews</th>
<th>Practices at Canadian Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarify institutional and departmental goals regarding teaching and its assessment.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Revise SFU Policy A11.05 2.2 to adopt the Teaching Assessment Framework principles including: a. Use multiple Teaching Assessment Methods. b. Use multiple information sources, emphasizing the importance of peer-generated TA Methods. c. Request academic units conduct more frequent, formative assessments over multiple points in time, that help inform summative assessment (i.e., tenure and promotion decisions). This would assist in tracking improvements over time. d. The results of one piece of Teaching Assessment Data or Teaching Assessment Evidence should be used corroborate another (e.g. classroom observations may be used to verify SETC data). e. An instructor’s career path is unique, and therefore, the specific teaching assessments used for their evaluation should complement the instructor’s career path and goals.</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Revise SFU Policy A11.05 2.2 in the following ways: a. Clarify whether this policy supersedes, supplements, or guides departmental Tenure and Policy Committee Policy Documents. b. If a specific Teaching Assessment Method is listed, clarify whether it is required, recommended, or optional. The current language suggests that all Teaching Assessment Methods listed are required, when that is not in line with actual practice.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Create and distribute a template for a Teaching Assessment Model Instrument, that all academic units could use, ensuring that clear and concise information is present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Create and distribute the Teaching Assessment Methods Inventory (Appendix E) for academic units who are revamping their Teaching Assessment Model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Together with the Teaching and Learning Centre, create institution-wide manuals and/or kits for commonly used Teaching Assessment Methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adhere to appropriate ethical standards identified in this report, including ethical use of assessment data in evaluation and decision-making regarding individual faculty, and work to address the limitations present in any university-wide assessment system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for Academic Units</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>TPC Chair Interviews and policy documents</td>
<td>Exemplary SFU Instructor Interviews</td>
<td>Practices at Canadian Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Create a Teaching Assessment Model which:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Revises the current TPCPD so it aligns with actual practices</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a descriptive Teaching Assessment Model Instrument that explicitly states the number and types of Teaching Assessment Methods, information sources, and points in time that are required.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Outlines criteria for teaching assessment, including guidelines, definitions, and specific examples. For example, &quot;use of innovative techniques&quot; is frequently mentioned in the TPCPD and interviews; however, there appears to be no consensus as to what this means in practice. Another example is the words &quot;feedback&quot; or &quot;comments&quot; sometimes do not explain what they are referring to (e.g., letters, e-mails, or surveys).</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Specify who is responsible for soliciting/gathering Teaching Assessment Data and Teaching Assessment Evidence, and information collection processes.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Explain which, if any, mechanisms are in place to reduce bias.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Revise the current TPCPD in the following ways:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If using another academic unit’s TPCPD as a template, do not simply copy and paste. Review the template to find ways to tailor it to fit the needs of the specific academic unit. Proofread for typos, as well as spelling and grammatical errors.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If Teaching Assessment Methods are weighted, provide greater consideration to student and peer/administrator Teaching Assessment Methods, compared to other information sources. Special attention should be paid to ensure data is not being filtered by the candidate.</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Encourage teaching assessment to focus on Teaching Assessment Evidence, which adds richness to assessment information. Specifically,
   a. Include a greater number of pedagogical growth and pedagogical scholarship pieces of evidence. Currently, emphasis is placed on pedagogical contributions. For example, mandatory documentation of reflection/responsiveness to prior assessments and use of innovative techniques should be included in every TPCPD.
   b. Use Teaching Assessment Methods that directly measures teaching performance (e.g., peer classroom evaluations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Academic Units</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>TPC Chair Interviews and policy documents</th>
<th>Exemplary SFU Instructor Interviews</th>
<th>Practices at Canadian Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourage teaching assessment to focus on Teaching Assessment Evidence, which adds richness to assessment information. Specifically,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Include a greater number of pedagogical growth and pedagogical scholarship pieces of evidence. Currently, emphasis is placed on pedagogical contributions. For example, mandatory documentation of reflection/responsiveness to prior assessments and use of innovative techniques should be included in every TPCPD.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use Teaching Assessment Methods that directly measures teaching performance (e.g., peer classroom evaluations).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUMMARY

This chapter presents a brief discussion of the principles for use of the information contained in this report. Limitations of the current research are provided, as well as specific recommendations for implementation at the university level. Additional assessment resources are addressed and are covered in more detail in Appendices E and F.

SECTION I: PRINCIPLES FOR USE

Appropriate and ethical use of assessment data is the professional responsibility of the user—in the case of instructional assessments as envisioned in this report, that would include the faculty member (for formative assessment); or for summative assessment their Chair, Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee, Dean, Vice President Academic, President, and Board of Governors. Each stakeholder is responsible for the ethical use of assessment data in the course of evaluation and decision-making regarding individual faculty. Reciprocal accountability for ethical use of assessment data should be assured in policy and practice.

SECTION II: LIMITATIONS

This report looked at the literature and practices (at SFU and other Canadian institutions) regarding the assessment of teaching at the post-secondary level. While we make recommendations based on the evidence in the literature review and for areas where greater clarity in SFU policy or practice is clearly needed, it is important to note that we make no quality judgement regarding the delineated practices and values of different units at SFU or practices and values of other universities. Based on the data we’ve collected, we cannot claim that practices or values at other institutions are any better or worse than those at SFU. While the report recommends a framework for teaching assessment, the mechanisms used to assess teaching within that framework may vary considerably across contexts.

The research and recommendations in this report focus primarily on classroom instruction. Other aspects of teaching covered in the SFU Collective Agreement (Article 28.5) were not covered by this work, including:

1. Mastery of the subject
2. Generation of enthusiasm in students
3. Maintenance of academic standards
4. Involvement within one's field(s)
5. Innovation
6. Graduate supervision
7. Development of academic programs
8. Breadth of teaching

As a result, while the teaching framework suggested here can potentially be used to better understand faculty teaching in the context of assigned courses, it can only be used to inform
one piece of the broader assessment of faculty teaching as defined under the collective agreement.

Current teaching assessment policy at SFU is primarily summative and has been developed under the SFU / SFUFA collective agreement. There are no university-wide policy frameworks in place regarding the formative assessment of teaching. Further, there is a broad mixture of assessment and evaluation mechanisms in policy and practice at SFU, which are used in both formative and summative ways. This mixture of assessment types and uses creates a complex environment that makes it difficult to accurately understand the nature of teaching and learning at SFU.

In addition to these general limitations, there are a number of specific limitations to this work.

**Specific Limitations**

1. Explicit standards of teaching quality are not considered or defined in this report (no definition of quality teaching or instructional practice is currently suggested or available at SFU)
2. The ethical implications regarding data collection, storage, and use are not considered within this report, especially the right to confidentiality and privacy of evaluatees is not considered
3. Standards and issues related to the use of the data collected under the proposed framework is not considered in this report (formative; summative; or comparative)
4. The costs of implementation are not considered (costs in time, training, developing data gathering and maintenance systems, etc.)

**SECTION III: RECOMMENDATIONS**

SFU, in consultation with SFUFA and the Faculty Senate, should clarify how teaching assessments developed at the institution are to be used, and when they should be formative, summative, or used for comparative purposes. It is important to note that formative assessment systems hold the potential to vastly strengthen teaching at SFU, but such systems generally should not be used for summative evaluations. The stakes involved for summative assessments can fundamentally alter how evaluatees respond to and engage with teaching assessments, reducing the validity and reliability of the judgements that can be made based on the data gathered. To fully understand and strengthen teaching, the University should explore the role of formative assessment at SFU in addition to the attempts already made to improve summative assessment.

**Specific Recommendations**

1. At a minimum, the University should design its assessments to meet The Personnel Evaluation Standards set by the Joint Committee for Standards in Educational Evaluation (JCSEE) and adopted by the Canadian Evaluation Society and the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (see appendices).
2. The purpose of the assessment system should be clearly defined (formative; summative; comparative). This means there may need to be multiple systems designed for the departments and faculties performing assessment.

3. The specific uses of the data collected through the assessment system should be clearly established (for example, users should know when it is appropriate (or not appropriate) to use specified data to make individual judgements, program or group evaluations, or establish comparative rankings).

4. Ethical principles for data collection and use must be established and maintained, including the protection of confidentiality and privacy.

5. Any changes in practice at SFU should be carefully designed around desired outcomes and evaluated for effectiveness and impact on teaching practice, with ongoing revision as appropriate.

SECTION IV: ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

We strongly recommend that any assessment system used at SFU to make high-stakes summative decisions regarding teaching effectiveness should adhere to professional standards for assessment and evaluation, including the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE), as appropriate. Two relevant standards publications are:

The Personnel Evaluation Standards, 2nd Ed.

The evaluation of teaching for employment decisions should adhere, as appropriate, to the professional guidelines for personnel evaluation established by the JCSEE. See Appendix E

The Program Evaluation Standards, 3rd Ed.

Effective teaching is not done in isolation. Evaluation of teaching and educational programs should further adhere, as appropriate, to the principles outlined in the Program Evaluation Standards published by JCSEE. See Appendix F

---

1 The JCSEE standards are supported by the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA), the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES), and the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE)
Appendix A:
Current SFU Policies and Practices
## Legend for Appendix A1-A6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Words/descriptions that appear in policy documents</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>are, ask, expect, must, request, shall, should, will</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>advise, encourage, recommend</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>at applicant's discretion, can, could, if so inclined, may, might, at one's own initiative</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Used two or more descriptors to describe one TA Method</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>No mention of the TA Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "xx" denotes that a TA Method was referred to using the exact wording as SFU A11.05 2.2
## Appendix A1: TA Data in TPC Policy Documents

### TA Data in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Peer/Administrator</th>
<th>Course Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>TA evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Teaching Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Art and Technology</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Teaching Prof</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend on page**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Peer/Administrator</th>
<th>Course Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
<td>TA evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Environmental Management</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Physiology &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A2: TA Evidence of Pedagogical Contributions in TPC Policy Documents

### TA Evidence in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Pedagogical Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum/ course design and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2</td>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechatronic Systems Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the pedagogical contributions of teaching assistants (TAs) in various faculties and departments at SFU, as referenced in SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2. The contributions are categorized into self and pedagogical contributions, with specific details regarding curriculum/course design and development, graduate supervision or committee service, teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses), teaching materials, teaching materials (online or software), supervision of experiential learning courses, and TA supervision.
## TA Evidence in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Curriculum/course design and development</th>
<th>Graduate supervision or committee service</th>
<th>Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses)</th>
<th>Teaching materials</th>
<th>Teaching materials (online or software)</th>
<th>Supervision of experiential learning courses</th>
<th>TA supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Art and</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Environmental Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Physiology &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Teaching Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A2 (continued): TA Evidence of Pedagogical Contributions in TPC Policy Documents

### TA Evidence in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbook contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporating latest research into teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in student-led programs or events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2</th>
<th>Computing Science</th>
<th>Engineering Science</th>
<th>Mechatronic Systems Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication, Art and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Environmental Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Physiology &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Textbook contributions</th>
<th>Incorporating latest research into teaching</th>
<th>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</th>
<th>Availability to students outside classroom</th>
<th>Guest lecturing</th>
<th>Participation in student-led programs or events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- TA Evidence in TPC Policy Documents
## Appendix A3: TA Evidence of Pedagogical Growth in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>TA Evidence in TPC Policy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechatronic Systems Engineering</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Full Professor</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Teaching Professor</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Professional development" /> <img src="image2" alt="Use of innovative techniques" /> <img src="image3" alt="Use of innovative techniques with technology" /> <img src="image4" alt="Reflection or responsiveness to assessments" /> <img src="image5" alt="Keeping current in subject area" /> <img src="image6" alt="Registration with professional body" /> <img src="image7" alt="Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication,</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Technology</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Physiology &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Full Professor</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A4: TA Evidence of Pedagogical Scholarship in TPC Policy Documents

### TA Evidence in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Pedagogical Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechatronic Systems Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Pedagogical Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication,</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Environmental Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Physiology &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix A5: TA Evidence sourced by students in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number and/or calibre of supervised dissertations and theses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU policy A 11.05 Section 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechatronic Systems Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Art and</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Environmental Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Physiology &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A6: TA Evidence sourced by peer/administrators and alumni in TPC Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Peer/Administrator</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Teaching awards and nominations</th>
<th>Reputation</th>
<th>Professional success of graduate students</th>
<th>Alumni testimony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechatronic Systems Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Peer/Administrator</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>External referee</td>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Professional success of graduate students</td>
<td>Alumni testimony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication, Art and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive Arts and Tech - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Environmental Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Physiology &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math - Teaching Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molecular Biology &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A7: Interview Questions for TPC Chairs.

1. Would you like to be identified with your responses or prefer to be anonymous?

2. Please list and describe the TA Methods that are currently used in your department to assess an instructor’s suitability for tenure or promotion? We are not interested in research criteria.

3. When assessing teaching, does your department consider teaching innovation, such as the use of technology, in the classroom?

4. Going through the list of all the TA Methods you previously listed, please state whether each one is required, recommended, or optional, within your department?

5. Going through this same list again, what are the percentages/weights given to each one in your department? Or is it a more holistic approach?

6. Who decides what the teaching assessment criteria are for your department? Is it you, another departmental figure (e.g., department head), or are you just using the university’s standard practices?

7. Does your department do anything unique when assessing instructors with joint appointments?

8a. Are instructors provided with your tenure and promotion policy upon being hired?

8b. Is your tenure and promotion policy easily accessible by instructors?

9. Do you believe that your department’s current TA Methods are adequately effective at determining an instructor’s suitability for tenure or promotion? Please explain why or why not.

10. Are there any current TA Methods that you would like to remove or modify? Why or why not?

11. In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods you would like to include for tenure and promotion? Why or why not?

12. Do you believe that your department’s current TA Methods have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment for students or is it totally independent? Please explain.

13. Do you believe that your department’s current TA Methods encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors? Please explain.

14. Does your department have any formal or informal mentoring opportunities to assist instructors on the path to tenure and promotion? If yes, please describe.

15. Lastly, I want to talk about how instructors’ teaching reputations are formed. Amongst students, they might find out who are easy or hard professors or who has a nice or difficult personality by sharing their experiences on Rate My Professors, browsing on social media like Facebook, and talking in-person to their classmates. But, I wanted your opinion on how
an instructor gets a teaching reputation, whether good or bad, among their colleagues in their department?
### Appendix A8: TPC Chair Interview Responses.

1) Would you like to be identified with your responses or prefer to be anonymous?  
- Identified: 23 (77%)  
- Anonymous: 7 (23%)  
  **Total:** 30 (100%)

2) List and describe the TA Methods that are currently used in your department to assess an instructor's suitability for tenure or promotion.  
(Refer to Appendix C3.)

3) When assessing teaching, does your department consider teaching innovation, such as the use of technology, in the classroom?  
- Yes: 15 (50%)  
- No: 6 (20%)  
- N/A (not asked during interview): 9 (30%)  
  **Total:** 30 (100%)

4) Going through the list of all the TA Methods you previously listed, state whether each one is required, recommended, or option, within your department?  
(Refer to Appendix C3.)

5) Going through this same list again, what are the percentages/weights given to each TA Methods in your department? Or is it a more holistic approach?  
- Holistic: 27 (90%)  
- Specific weighting: 2 (7%)  
- Only one TA Method used: 1 (3%)  
  **Total:** 30 (100%)

6) Who decides what the teaching assessment criteria are for your department?  
- Written by TPC and faculty voted to accept the policy: 22 (73%)  
- Written by TPC Chair and faculty voted to accept the policy: 1 (3%)  
- Use the university policy: 2 (7%)  
- Do not know: 5 (17%)  
  **Total:** 30 (100%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7) Does your department do anything unique when assessing instructors with joint appointments?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the same TA Methods</td>
<td>21  70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the university policy</td>
<td>1  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>3  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with other department that instructor is affiliated with</td>
<td>5  17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30  100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8a) Are instructors provided with your tenure and promotion policy upon being hired?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24  80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available when job applicants are Interviewed (i.e., prior to hiring)</td>
<td>1  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, only given it at the time of tenure/promotion</td>
<td>2  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, implicitly aware of the tenure and promotion policy</td>
<td>2  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>1  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30  100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8b) Is your TPC policy easily accessible by instructors?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, available upon request</td>
<td>20  67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, available on faculty intranet</td>
<td>7  23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, given verbal instructions</td>
<td>1  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>2  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30  100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9) Do you believe that your department's current TA Methods are adequately effective at determining an instructor's suitability for tenure or promotion?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, adequately effective</td>
<td>17  57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately effective, but need improvements</td>
<td>7  23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately effective</td>
<td>6  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30  100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) Are there any current TA Methods that you would like to remove or modify?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations - reduce bias and/or increase validity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations - consider more carefully influencing factors (e.g., class size, level)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations - implement a mechanism to prevent online response rates from dropping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations - want no limit to department/instructor questions that can be added</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations - articulate importance of process to students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching dossiers - instructors to provide more detail and comment on use of technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements - departments provide more guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make teaching dossiers and student e-mail testimonials required</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalize process of obtaining feedback from undergraduate student caucus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods that you would like to include for tenure and promotion?*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person) by a third party and/or educational consultants (e.g., TLC)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessments (i.e., informal course surveys)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focus groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track students after course completion to see their improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (video analysis)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referee testimony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni surveys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course files/portfolio, used for external accreditation review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some TPC Chairs suggested more than one TA Method.
12) Do you believe that your department’s current TA Methods have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe a connection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) Do you believe that your department’s current TA Methods encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure/neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14) Does your department have mentoring to assist instructors on the path to tenure and promotion?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring Model</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal mentoring</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal mentoring, where instructors feel free to seek advice/help from anyone when needed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal mentoring, with pairings, but informal scheduling</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mentoring of any kind</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15) How does an instructor get a teaching reputation, whether good or bad, among their colleagues?* | Frequency
---|---
Sitting on biannual review committees and TPC | 8
From undergraduate students in hallways, the department office, and in common classes | 8
Interactions with colleagues in hallways | 5
Small department, so everyone knows each other well | 4
Interactions with colleagues in departmental meetings or committees | 4
Sharing teaching resources and course materials; informal mentoring | 3
Grade distributions | 3
Departmental announcements of who won teaching awards and grants | 3
 Constantly gathering information; being attentive and aware of what colleagues are doing | 2
From teaching assistants/graduate students | 2
Instructor’s own children may be students at SFU | 1
Hearing colleague’s interactions with students during office hours | 1
Student applications for conferences and awards | 1
Reading each other’s syllabi for various reasons | 1
Team-teaching | 1
Hearing that an instructor is "stuck" with a certain course for various reasons | 1
Hearing that students are waiting until a particular instructor is or is not teaching a course | 1
Promoting or advertising each other’s courses to students | 1
Departmental social events | 1
Instructors venting about student course evaluations | 1

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some TPC Chairs suggested more than one idea.
### Legend for Appendix A9-A10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Light blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TA Data in TPC Chair Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Peer/Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix A10: TA Evidence in TPC Chair Interviews

#### TA Evidence in TPC Chair Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Pedagogical Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum/course design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate supervision or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>committee service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., lists of courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Anonymous1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B10 (continued): TA Evidence in TPC Chair Interviews.

#### TA Evidence in TPC Chair Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Pedagogical Growth</th>
<th>Pedagogical Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Pedagogical Growth</td>
<td>Pedagogical Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Anonymous1</td>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Anonymous1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A10 continued: TA Evidence in TPC Chair Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Computing Science</td>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions)</td>
<td>Professional success of former graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Nations Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Contemporary Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Peer/Administrator</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>Student testimony</td>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions)</td>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Actuarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Anonymous1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:
TEACHING ASSESSMENT PRACTICES USED BY SFU EXEMPLARY INSTRUCTORS
Appendix B1: Interview Questions for Exemplary Teachers.

1. Would you like to be identified with your responses or prefer to be anonymous?

2. How do you personally define “excellent” teaching in the post-secondary setting?

3. How do you know “excellent” teaching when you see it? (i.e., in another colleague)

4a. How do you define teaching innovation?

4b. Do you believe teaching innovation is an essential component of teaching excellence?

4c. Do you take risks in the classroom?

5. How do you personally assess your teaching, in order to improve your teaching?

6. In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods you would like SFU instructors to use?

7. Do you believe that TA Methods can have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment for students or is it totally independent? Please explain.

8. Do you believe that TA Methods can encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors? Please explain.

9. Lastly, I want to talk about how instructors’ teaching reputations are formed. Amongst students, they might find out who are easy or hard professors or who has a nice or difficult personality by sharing their experiences on Rate My Professors, browsing on social media like Facebook, and talking in-person to their classmates. But, I wanted your opinion on how an instructor gets a teaching reputation, whether good or bad, among their colleagues in their department?
Appendix B2: Exemplary Teacher Interview Responses.

1) Would you like to be identified with your responses or prefer to be anonymous?  

| Identified | Frequency | 5  | 50%  |
| Anonymous | Frequency | 5  | 50%  |
| **TOTAL** | Total     | 10 | 100% |

2) How do you personally define "excellent" teaching in the post-secondary setting?*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Quality</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying fundamental concepts to new problems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instilling passion about the course material</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and inspiring students - &quot;finding something in the students that they would not find, with your intervention and encouragement&quot; (quote by an anonymous exemplary teacher)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing ideas to percolate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal learning for the students and the teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching critical thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being accessible to students (e.g., regular office hours, e-mail)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing students' individuality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigour and discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested and curious about students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying new things</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable with the idea that he/she does not have all the answers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enjoy themselves in class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are successful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refining teaching to improve the student experience, with the consideration of student feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between student assessment and learning outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some exemplary teachers suggested more than one definition.
3) How do you know "excellent" teaching when you see it? (i.e., in another colleague)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student engagement - body language, excitement and energy levels</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student participation in class</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observation - seeing their teaching from the students' point of view</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong communication skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are engaged in deep dialogue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not avoiding difficult questions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing controversial and real-world concepts into the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students take more courses with the same instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students declare major after taking class with an instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor shows interested and enthusiasm for course material</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students regularly attend instructor's office hours (i.e., not just before exams)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor is engaged and curious toward students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not following a script</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has control of the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between instructor and students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are having fun while learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear objectives for lesson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking in with students to find out if they understand course concepts before moving on</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive to different learning styles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some exemplary teachers suggested more than one idea.

4a) How do you define teaching innovation?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trying new methods for knowledge transfer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving unique assignments or testing methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some exemplary teachers suggested more than one definition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4b) Do you believe teaching innovation is an essential component of teaching excellence?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4c) Do you take risks in the classroom?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) How do you personally assess your teaching, in order to improve your teaching?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Refer to Appendix D3.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods that you would like SFU instructors to use?*</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer classroom observations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of course materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni surveys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More formative assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some exemplary teachers suggested more than one TA Method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7) Do you believe that TA Methods can have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm evaluations could help</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Do you believe that TA Methods can encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe/unsure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) How does an instructor get a teaching reputation, whether good or bad, among their colleagues?*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Reputation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking to students</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During meetings and being on committees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting on tenure and promotion committees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade distributions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with the colleague</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Water cooler talk&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At departmental social events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate My Professors website</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to colleagues give research lectures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements of teaching award winners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some exemplary teachers suggested more than one idea.
### Appendix B3: Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data) and Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence) in Exemplary Teacher Interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Peer/Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashworth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gajdamaschko</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldknow</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Houten</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>TA Method used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:
TEACHING ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AT CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES
Appendix C1: Interview Questions for Institutional Contacts at Other Canadian Universities.

1. Would you like to be identified with your responses or prefer to be anonymous?

2. Please list and describe the TA Methods that are currently used at your institution to assess an instructor's suitability for tenure or promotion? We are not interested in research criteria.

3. When assessing teaching, does your institution consider teaching innovation, such as the use of technology, in the classroom?

4. Going through the list of all the TA Methods you previously listed, please state whether each one is required, recommended, or optional, at your institution?

5. Going through this same list again, what are the percentages/weights given to each TA Method at your institution? Or is it a more holistic approach?

6. Who decides what the teaching assessment criteria are for your institution?

7. Does your institution do anything unique when assessing instructors with joint appointments?

8a. Are instructors provided with your tenure and promotion policy upon being hired?

8b. Is your tenure and promotion policy easily accessible by instructors?

9. Do you believe that your institution’s current criteria for assessing teaching are adequately effective at determining an instructor’s suitability for tenure or promotion? Please explain why or why not.

10. Are there any current TA Methods that you would like to remove or modify? Why or why not?

11. In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods you would like to include for tenure and promotion? Why or why not?

12. Do you believe that your institution’s current TA Methods have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment for students or is it totally independent? Please explain.

13. Do you believe that your institution’s current TA Methods encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors? Please explain.

14. Does your institution have any formal or informal mentoring opportunities to assist instructors on the path to tenure and promotion? If yes, please describe.

15. Lastly, I want to talk about how instructors’ teaching reputations are formed. Amongst students, they might find out who are easy or hard professors or who has a nice or difficult personality by sharing their experiences on Rate My Professors, browsing on social media like Facebook, and talking in-person to their classmates. But, I wanted your opinion on how an instructor gets a teaching reputation, whether good or bad, among their colleagues?
Appendix C2: Institutional Contacts (From Other Canadian Universities) Interview Responses.

1) Would you like to be identified with your responses or prefer to be anonymous?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) List and describe the TA Methods that are currently used at your institution to assess an instructor's suitability for tenure or promotion.

(Refer to Appendix E4.)

3) When assessing teaching, does your institution consider teaching innovation, such as the use of technology, in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Going through the list of all the TA Methods you previously listed, state whether each one is required, recommended, or option, at your institution?

(Refer to Appendix E4.)

5) Going through this same list again, what are the percentages/weights given to each TAME at your institution? Or is it a more holistic approach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holistic</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Who decides what the teaching assessment criteria are for your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Defined by collective agreement and approved by Senate</th>
<th>Defined by collective agreement and voted on by faculty association</th>
<th>Provost and approved by Senate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) Does your institution do anything unique when assessing faculty members with joint appointments?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the same TA Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with other department that the instructor is affiliated with</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the collective agreement guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8a) Are instructors provided with your tenure and promotion policy upon being hired?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8b) Is your tenure and promotion policy easily accessible by instructors?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, available on university website</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) Do you believe that your institution's current TA Methods are adequately effective at determining an instructor's suitability for tenure or promotion?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, adequately effective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately effective, but need improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some departments are and others are not</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequately effective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Are there any current TA Methods that you would like to remove or modify?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations - add more relevant questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all guidelines more explicit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11) In an ideal world (i.e., unlimited time and resources), are there any other TA Methods that you would like to include for tenure and promotion?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations (in-person)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflections</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessments (e.g., informal course surveys)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate interviews conducted by peers/admin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referee testimony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider how instructors incorporate equity and diversity in the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete sets of student comments from student course evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of course materials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some institutional contacts suggested more than one Method.

12) Do you believe that your institution's current TA Methods have an impact on creating or fostering a positive learning environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm evaluations would help</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe a connection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No connection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                         | 11        | 100%       |

13) Do you believe that your institution’s current TA Methods encourage opportunities for professional growth for instructors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                         | 11        | 100%       |

14) Does your institution have mentoring to assist instructors on the path to tenure and promotion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal mentoring, with pairings, but informal scheduling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on an institutional level, but in departments - some are formal and others are informal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                                                      | 9         | 100%       |
15) How does an instructor get a teaching reputation, whether good or bad, among their colleagues?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcements of teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations with/mentoring students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with the instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being on annual review, biennial review, and tenure and promotion committees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing about instructors involved in departmental teaching initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing about instructors involved in pedagogical research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists of course evaluation data shared within the department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Water cooler talk&quot; with other colleagues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing syllabi when &quot;inheriting&quot; a course or sharing course sections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages and a total were not calculated, because some institutional contacts suggested more than one idea.
## Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Words/descriptions that appear in policy documents</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>are, ask, expect, must, request, shall, should, will</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>advise, encourage, recommend</td>
<td>Light Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>at applicant's discretion, can, could, if so inclined, may, might, at one's own initiative</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Used two or more descriptors to describe one TA Method</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>No mention of the TA Method</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "xx" denotes that a TA Method was referred to using the exact wording as SFU A11.05 2.2
## Appendix C3: Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data) in Canadian University Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Peer/Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C4: Teaching Assessment Evidence (Self Source) in Canadian University Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Curriculum/course design and development</th>
<th>Graduate supervision or committee service</th>
<th>Teaching activity</th>
<th>Teaching materials</th>
<th>Teaching materials (online or software)</th>
<th>Supervision of experiential learning courses</th>
<th>TA supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C4 (continued): Teaching Assessment Evidence (Self Source) in Canadian University Policy Documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>TA Evidence in Canadian University Policy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Contributions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C4 (continued): Teaching Assessment Evidence (Self Source in Canadian University Policy Documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>TA Evidence in Canadian University Policy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
<td>Presentations at educational conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in pedagogical associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Teaching grants</th>
<th>Pedagogical research</th>
<th>Published articles in education journals</th>
<th>Presentations at educational conferences</th>
<th>Membership in pedagogical associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C4 (continued): Teaching Assessment Evidence (Self Source) in Canadian University Policy Documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>TA Evidence in Canadian University Policy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keeping current in subject area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of a pedagogical plan for growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ** Alberta  
  - UBC - Full Prof  
  - UBC - Teaching Prof  
- ** Calgary  
  - Full Prof  
  - Teaching Prof  
- ** Carleton  
- ** McGill  
- ** Queens  
- ** Toronto  
- ** Victoria  
- ** York - Full Prof  
- ** York - Teaching Prof  

- Green: Evidence present  
- Red: Evidence not present  
- Blue: Evidence not applicable  

- The table above shows the presence of evidence for self-assessment and pedagogical growth across various universities and positions.
### Appendix C5: Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data) in Canadian University Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number and/or calibre of supervised dissertations and theses</td>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Full Prof</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Teaching Prof</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Full Prof</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Teaching Prof</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Full Prof</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Teaching Prof</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C5 (continued): Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data) in Canadian University Policy Documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Peer/Admin</th>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>Course Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York - Teaching Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Testimony**
  - Colleagues
  - Administrators
  - External referees
- **Other**
  - Teaching awards and nominations
  - Reputation
- **Alumni**
  - Professional success of former graduate students
  - Alumni testimony
- **Course Data**
  - Course enrollment data
Appendix C6: Teaching Assessment Data (TA Data) Used at Canadian Universities (Interview Data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Peer/Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Teaching portfolios/dossiers</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>Student course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C7: Teaching Assessment Evidence (TA Evidence) Used at Canadian Universities (Interview Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Pedagogical Contributions</th>
<th>Pedagogical Growth</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Peer/Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching activity</td>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D:  
TEACHING ASSESSMENT METHODS INVENTORY
## Appendix D1: Glossary of TA Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Data</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>A reflective pedagogical rationale, intended to outline:</td>
<td>• Beliefs about teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An instructor’s beliefs about teaching and learning</td>
<td>• Teaching aims and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• His/her teaching style</td>
<td>• Teaching accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contextualization of his/her teaching methods, and</td>
<td>• Directions for future improvement/advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highlighting alignment of goals and teaching practice</td>
<td>• Strategies to achieve future teaching objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How to incorporate equity/diversity in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How adapt teaching to different types of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expectations about student-instructor relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Viewpoint on evaluation and its impact on students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Approaches to Teaching Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• College Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation instruments</td>
<td>Reliable and valid instruments that assess an instructor’s teaching approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Course Evaluations</th>
<th>TA Evaluations</th>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Small Group Instructional Diagnoses (SGID)</th>
<th>Classroom Assessment Techniques (CAT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End-of-course, summative evaluations about the instructor's teaching effectiveness and course content</td>
<td>TAs that an instructor supervises evaluate instructor's teaching effectiveness and course content</td>
<td>Facilitated group discussions with a subset of the instructor's students</td>
<td>Interviewing students at the end of the semester to gain qualitative data on their experiences with the instructor and the course</td>
<td>Informally obtain student feedback in small groups</td>
<td>Brief, in-class writing activities, asking students to reflect and quickly gauge comprehension after a class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value of course material</td>
<td>• Value of course material</td>
<td>• Value of course material</td>
<td>• Value of course material</td>
<td>• Value of course material</td>
<td>• One-Minute Paper (&quot;What was the most important thing you learned during today’s class?&quot; and “What important question remains unanswered in your mind?&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructor enthusiasm</td>
<td>• Instructor enthusiasm</td>
<td>• Instructor enthusiasm</td>
<td>• Instructor enthusiasm</td>
<td>• Instructor enthusiasm</td>
<td>• The Muddiest Point (&quot;What was the muddiest – most unclear – point for you in today’s class?&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organization</td>
<td>• Organization</td>
<td>• Organization</td>
<td>• Organization</td>
<td>• Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rapport with students</td>
<td>• Rapport with students</td>
<td>• Rapport with students</td>
<td>• Rapport with students</td>
<td>• Rapport with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum breadth</td>
<td>• Curriculum breadth</td>
<td>• Curriculum breadth</td>
<td>• Curriculum breadth</td>
<td>• Curriculum breadth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exams/grading</td>
<td>• Exams/grading</td>
<td>• Exams/grading</td>
<td>• Exams/grading</td>
<td>• Exams/grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assignments/readings</td>
<td>• Assignments/readings</td>
<td>• Assignments/readings</td>
<td>• Assignments/readings</td>
<td>• Assignments/readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workload/course difficulty</td>
<td>• Workload/course difficulty</td>
<td>• Workload/course difficulty</td>
<td>• Workload/course difficulty</td>
<td>• Workload/course difficulty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Course design</td>
<td>• Course design</td>
<td>• Course design</td>
<td>• Course design</td>
<td>• Course design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning environment</td>
<td>• Learning environment</td>
<td>• Learning environment</td>
<td>• Learning environment</td>
<td>• Learning environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TA Data</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Examples/Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Learning outcomes
- Measuring students on predetermined learning outcomes at the beginning and end of the course
- Should be connected to course objectives

### Engagement survey data
- Surveys asking students to rate how actively involved and engaged they feel in the classroom

### Classroom observations (in-person)
- A peer/administrator sits in on a lecture or tutorial, with the goal of offering feedback
- Content knowledge
- Student engagement
- Interaction with students
- Class organization
- Communication skills
- Active learning

### Classroom observations (video analysis)
- Evaluator views a video of an instructor's teaching
- May occur if the evaluator's availability or location does not allow him/her to attend the class at the scheduled time or location
- Content knowledge
- Student engagement
- Interaction with students
- Class organization
- Communication skills
- Active learning

### Review of course materials
- A peer/administrator review one's course materials
- Syllabi
- Lecture notes/slides
- Assignments
- Exams
- Content knowledge
- Organization

### Review of teaching portfolios/dossiers
- A peer/administrator review one's teaching portfolio/dossier
- Structure and organization
- Adequate self-reflection
- Showcases breadth and depth of teaching experience
- Includes concrete examples for teaching methods

### Interviews
- A peer/administrator interviews an instructor about their teaching philosophy and approach
- Could occur at the time of tenure and promotion (i.e., interview may be conducted by a member(s) of the Tenure and Promotion Committee)
- Beliefs about teaching and learning
- Teaching aims and objectives
- Directions for future improvement/advancement
- Strategies to achieve future teaching objectives
| Alumni surveys | Quantitative surveys that document alumni’s experiences with the instructor and the course | Long-term value of course material
Usefulness of course material in current career
Impact of instructor on career trajectory
Instructor rapport with students |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended time frame is 2-5 years post-grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consistency in grading with similar courses
Comparing grading data (assignments, exams, and/or final grades) with courses in a similar subject area and/or level to determine whether or not grading is within a similar range

#### TA Data
| Consistency in grading with similar courses | Comparing grading data (assignments, exams, and/or final grades) with courses in a similar subject area and/or level to determine whether or not grading is within a similar range | Patterns and anomalies
Lowest grade
Highest grade |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Mean
Median
Mode |
## Appendix D2: Glossary of TA Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course design and development</td>
<td>Initiatives taken to develop/improve curriculum</td>
<td>• Developing a new course&lt;br&gt;• Creating a new theoretical framework for an existing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service</td>
<td>Supervising graduate (Masters or Doctoral) students or sitting on examining committees</td>
<td>• Being a senior/co supervisor&lt;br&gt;• Being a secondary supervisor&lt;br&gt;• Being an external examiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity (e.g., lists of courses - level and breadth)</td>
<td>• Overview of courses an instructor has taught&lt;br&gt;• Considering a range/breadth and various levels of instruction</td>
<td>• A list of courses taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>Materials used for one's courses</td>
<td>• Syllabi&lt;br&gt;• Lecture notes/slides&lt;br&gt;• Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials (online or software)</td>
<td>Materials used for one's courses, that incorporates technology</td>
<td>• Course website&lt;br&gt;• Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning courses</td>
<td>Mentoring and supervising students in experiential learning courses</td>
<td>• Field work&lt;br&gt;• Laboratory work&lt;br&gt;• Clinical work&lt;br&gt;• Honours theses&lt;br&gt;• Directed readings&lt;br&gt;• Capstone projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA supervision</td>
<td>Mentoring and supervising teaching assistants</td>
<td>• Level and quality of training&lt;br&gt;• Supervision and mentorship given to TAs&lt;br&gt;• Level of support given to his/her TAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook contributions</td>
<td>Writing textbook sections in one's research area</td>
<td>• A Physics professor contributing to a Physics textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating latest research into teaching</td>
<td>Bringing current research issues and developments into the classroom or incorporating these issues/developments into assignments/exams</td>
<td>• Organizing an in-class student debate on a current hot-button issue in one's research area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-transfer of pedagogy to colleagues</td>
<td>Sharing knowledge about teaching and learning with one’s peers</td>
<td>• Running a teaching circle in one's department, where participants discuss pedagogical issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to students outside classroom</td>
<td>Being available and accessible to students outside of classroom hours</td>
<td>• Consistently holding office hours&lt;br&gt;• Effective e-mail communication with students&lt;br&gt;• Being open to setting up student appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Evidence</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Examples/Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturing</td>
<td>• Lecturing in classes other than one's own</td>
<td>• Lecturing in a colleague's class, another academic institution, or in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guest lectures are in the area of one's expertise (i.e., research area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in student-led programs or events</td>
<td>Being involved in student initiatives</td>
<td>• Being on a speaker panel for a student event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring colleagues</td>
<td>Formally or informally mentoring colleagues regarding pedagogical practices</td>
<td>• Being a mentor for a department mentorship program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Informally meeting with a colleague to discuss and offer advice regarding pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an evaluator for any peer review of teaching procedure</td>
<td>Assessing colleagues' teaching</td>
<td>• Being an evaluator for a classroom observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviewing and offering feedback on a colleague's course materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Self - Pedagogical Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Attending or leading professional development opportunities at one's academic institution, other institutions, or conferences</td>
<td>• Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td>Introducing a novel technique into the classroom</td>
<td>• Finding different ways to incorporate active learning into the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finding different methods to encourage small-group discussion in large lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques with technology</td>
<td>Introducing a novel technique into the classroom, with the aid of technology</td>
<td>• Using an innovative platform (e.g., Tophat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Using an existing platform in an innovative way (e.g., using backchannels in lectures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating courseware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection or responsiveness to assessments</td>
<td>Using feedback from student course evaluations (and other forms of assessment) to improve one's teaching</td>
<td>• Finding a common theme for an area of improvement in student course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a strategy to address the weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining a record of changes made due to self-reflection on assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Self - Pedagogical Growth (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Keeping current in subject area | Staying abreast of current issues and developments in one’s research area | • Subscribing to journals in one’s research area  
• Attending conferences in one’s research area  
• Completing continuing education (CE) credits for one’s professional license |
| Registration with professional body | Some departments may require/recommend registration with professional bodies | The Department of Psychology requires clinical faculty to be registered with the College of Psychologists of British Columbia |
| Developing a pedagogical plan for growth (e.g., goals) | Incorporating feedback from all available TAD into a personal framework for improving one's teaching abilities | • Setting annual goals |
| Taking notes after class | Could be recorded in teaching logs/journals | • Delivery of course material  
• Responsiveness of students to a new classroom activity  
• Level of student engagement and interest |
| Listening to lecture recordings | Audio-recording one's lectures and reviewing them afterwards | • Delivery of material  
• Communication skills  
• Clarity  
• Organization |
| Self-reflections | Involves observing and then reflecting/analyzing one’s teaching practices and beliefs | • Analyzing lesson plans to determine if they meet course objectives  
• Informally gauging student engagement in the classroom |

## Self - Pedagogical Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching grants</td>
<td>Obtaining funds to investigate an innovative teaching and/or learning practice</td>
<td>• SFU Teaching and Learning Development Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research</td>
<td>Conducting original pedagogical research to better understand teaching and how best to enhance student learning</td>
<td>• Conducting research on teaching methods or student assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Self - Pedagogical Scholarship (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Published articles in education journals</td>
<td>Publishing original pedagogical research in education journals</td>
<td>• Canadian Journal of Higher Education&lt;br&gt;• Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning&lt;br&gt;• International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at education conferences</td>
<td>Presenting original pedagogical research at conferences, seminars, workshops, and professional meetings</td>
<td>• Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Annual Conference&lt;br&gt;• Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in pedagogical associations</td>
<td>Being a member of regional, provincial, national, or international associations or societies focused on the improvement of teaching and learning</td>
<td>• Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education&lt;br&gt;• Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student - Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and/or calibre of supervised dissertations and theses</td>
<td>A quantitative record of supervised graduate work (i.e., number) or a qualitative document of supervised graduate work (i.e., calibre)</td>
<td>• Frequencies&lt;br&gt;• Written comments from students' external examiners or examining committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of student work</td>
<td>• Showcases outstanding student performance&lt;br&gt;• Can be paper or video evidence</td>
<td>• Assignments&lt;br&gt;• Essays/reports&lt;br&gt;• Creative work&lt;br&gt;• Student portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student distinctions</td>
<td>Considering success achieved by current students, typically in a mentoring relationship with instructor (e.g., Honours students, directed studies students)</td>
<td>• Competitions&lt;br&gt;• Awards&lt;br&gt;• Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance reports from employers of students (e.g., co-op)</td>
<td>Used when students participate in work-study or co-op programs, and student performance may be directly related to the knowledge and training received from their instructor</td>
<td>• Knowledge of subject area&lt;br&gt;• Critical thinking skills&lt;br&gt;• Problem solving skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classroom attendance records
- A record of students attending class; typically on a weekly basis
- Easier to track in smaller classes (e.g., seminars, tutorials)
- Typically tracked by instructor or TA

### Student testimony (letter, e-mail)
- Describes the instructor's teaching ability and the classroom experience
- Can be informal (e-mail) or formal (letter)
- Can be solicited or unsolicited

### TA testimony (letter, e-mail)
- Describes the instructor's teaching ability, the classroom experience, and supervision skills
- Can be informal (e-mail) or formal (letter)
- Can be solicited or unsolicited

### Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions, undergraduate student caucus)
- Informal student feedback about an instructor's teaching effectiveness or course content

### Informal course surveys
- Written and administered by instructor
- Intended to informally obtain formative assessment feedback

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom attendance records</td>
<td>A record of students attending class; typically on a weekly basis&lt;br&gt;• Easier to track in smaller classes (e.g., seminars, tutorials)&lt;br&gt;• Typically tracked by instructor or TA</td>
<td>Frequencies&lt;br&gt;• Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testimony (letter, e-mail)</td>
<td>Describes the instructor's teaching ability and the classroom experience&lt;br&gt;• Can be informal (e-mail) or formal (letter)&lt;br&gt;• Can be solicited or unsolicited</td>
<td>Value of curriculum&lt;br&gt;• Instructor enthusiasm&lt;br&gt;• Organization&lt;br&gt;• Rapport with students&lt;br&gt;• Breadth of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA testimony (letter, e-mail)</td>
<td>Describes the instructor's teaching ability, the classroom experience, and supervision skills&lt;br&gt;• Can be informal (e-mail) or formal (letter)&lt;br&gt;• Can be solicited or unsolicited</td>
<td>Value of curriculum&lt;br&gt;• Instructor enthusiasm&lt;br&gt;• Organization&lt;br&gt;• Rapport with students&lt;br&gt;• Breadth of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions, undergraduate student caucus)</td>
<td>Informal student feedback about an instructor's teaching effectiveness or course content</td>
<td>Value of curriculum&lt;br&gt;• Instructor enthusiasm&lt;br&gt;• Organization&lt;br&gt;• Rapport with students&lt;br&gt;• Breadth of curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal course surveys</td>
<td>Written and administered by instructor&lt;br&gt;• Intended to informally obtain formative assessment feedback</td>
<td>Value of curriculum&lt;br&gt;• Instructor enthusiasm&lt;br&gt;• Organization&lt;br&gt;• Rapport with students&lt;br&gt;• Breadth of curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Peer - Testimony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>• Describes instructor's teaching ability and teaching experience</td>
<td>• Teaching awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>• Can be informal (e-mail) or formal (letter)</td>
<td>• Teaching accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching reputation among colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referees</td>
<td>• Can be solicited or unsolicited</td>
<td>• Teaching contributions outside of the classroom (e.g., evidence of innovative course/curriculum design, documentation of professional development activities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Peer - Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA Evidence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples/Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards and nominations</td>
<td>• Formal distinctions to recognize exceptional instructors</td>
<td>• SFU Excellence in Teaching Award (institution-level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At faculty or institutional level</td>
<td>• Cormack Teaching Award (SFU Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May also be external awards</td>
<td>• 3M National Teaching Fellowship (Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>• A mock teaching session amongst a small group of colleagues</td>
<td>• Verbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each instructor has 10 minutes: 6 minutes for a short teaching lesson/activity and then 4 minutes to receive feedback from colleagues</td>
<td>• Presentation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides a concise overview of teaching skills, strengths, and weaknesses</td>
<td>• Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Audience rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Common opinion about instructor's teaching abilities, within/outside the academic institution</td>
<td>• Use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Display of passion/enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Audience engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Media requests or interviews discussing a successful teaching innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Invitations to contribute to education journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Evidence</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Examples/Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Professional success of former graduate students | Considering success achieved by former graduate students in their education or careers | • Admission to prestigious programs  
 • Job interviews/offers |
| Alumni testimony (letter, feedback, e-mail) | • Describes the instructor's teaching ability and classroom experience  
 • Can be informal (e-mail) or formal (letter)  
 • Can be solicited or unsolicited | • Long-term value of course material  
 • Usefulness of course material in current career  
 • Impact of instructor on career trajectory |
| Employers of alumni (letter, feedback, e-mail) | Used to determine if an instructor's specific course goals are being exemplified in their alumni' workplaces | • Knowledge of subject area  
 • Critical thinking skills  
 • Problem solving skills |
| Anecdotal knowledge (e.g., informal discussions) | Informal alumni feedback about an instructor's teaching effectiveness or course content | • Long-term value of course material  
 • Usefulness of course material in current career  
 • Impact of instructor on career trajectory |
| Evidence of the effect of courses on alumni career choices | • Documented evidence of an instructor’s course influencing alumni’s career choices  
 • Can be either quantitative or qualitative data | • Numerically tracking over time how many students state that instructor's course influenced their career choices (quantitative)  
 • Solicited or unsolicited written comments from alumni explaining how the instructor influenced this career choices (qualitative) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Course Data</strong></th>
<th><strong>TA Evidence</strong></th>
<th><strong>Definition</strong></th>
<th><strong>Examples/Components</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade distributions</td>
<td>Examining the grade distribution for an instructor's course to determine quantitative, objective measures of student success</td>
<td>Patterns and anomalies</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Should not be used in departments where instructors must adhere to a predetermined grade distribution (i.e., grading on a curve)</td>
<td>Lowest grade</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest grade</td>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course enrollment data</td>
<td>Examining course enrollment data to determine demand for an instructor's courses</td>
<td>Demand for an instructor's elective courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record of students who choose another course with the same instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course files/portfolios used for external accreditation review</td>
<td>Some departments apply for external accreditation, which requires course files/portfolios</td>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These files document the planning, process, and outcomes of one specific course</td>
<td>Lecture notes</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of students who select and succeed in advanced courses</td>
<td>Analyzing course enrollment data to determine which students select advanced courses in the instructor's academic field and then keeping a record of grades or other measures of success in the advanced courses</td>
<td>Looking at grade distributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking at student distinctions (competitions, awards, scholarships)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written comments from those who teach courses for which the instructor's course is a prerequisite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course-level student retention/drop-out rates</td>
<td>A record of students who either dropped out of a particular course or those who stayed enrolled for the entire duration of the course</td>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D3: Advantages of TA Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Teaching philosophy statements</th>
<th>Self-evaluation instruments</th>
<th>Student course evaluations</th>
<th>TA evaluations</th>
<th>Focus groups</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative data - easy comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative data - richer data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic/macro view of teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiates between different calibres of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility on what areas of teaching to focus on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to track changes over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less prone to bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators have good recall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators are experienced at assessing teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher response rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators require minimal training</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional resources/supports are not needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially cost-effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes use of already existing data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for administrators to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not intrusive for instructor</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators feel participation is truly voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators feel truly anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators benefit and learn too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional growth for instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
<td><strong>48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
<td><strong>48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

Not applicable

*Percentages calculated based on applicable factors (e.g., self-evaluation instruments only had 18 applicable factors).
### Appendix D3 (continued): Advantages of TA Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group Instructional Diagnoses</td>
<td>Classroom Assessment Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative data - easy comparisons</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative data - richer data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic/macro view of teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiates between different calibres of teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility on what areas of teaching to focus on</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to track changes over time</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less prone to bias</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators have good recall</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators are experienced at assessing teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher response rate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited feedback</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate feedback</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evalutors require minimal training</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional resources/supports are not needed</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially cost-effective</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes use of already existing data</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for instructor</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for evaluators</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for administrators to implement</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not intrusive for instructor</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators feel participation is truly voluntary</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators feel truly anonymous</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators benefit and learn too</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional growth for instructor</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages collaboration</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (%)*</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

Not applicable

*Percentages calculated based on applicable factors (e.g., learning outcomes only had 24 applicable factors).
Appendix D3 (continued): Advantages of TA Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Peer/Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(video)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Easy comparisons</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Richer data</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic/macro view of teaching</td>
<td>Holistically understands teaching</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiates between different calibres of teaching</td>
<td>Differentiates between teaching styles</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility on what areas of teaching to focus on</td>
<td>Flexibility in teaching</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to track changes over time</td>
<td>Easier to track changes over time</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less prone to bias</td>
<td>Bias is minimized in feedback</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators have good recall</td>
<td>Evaluators have good memory</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators are experienced at assessing teaching</td>
<td>Evaluators are experienced in teaching assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher response rate</td>
<td>Higher response rate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited feedback</td>
<td>Unsolicited feedback</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate feedback</td>
<td>Immediate feedback</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators require minimal training</td>
<td>Minimal training required</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional resources/supports are not needed</td>
<td>Additional resources not needed</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially cost-effective</td>
<td>Cost-effective</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes use of already existing data</td>
<td>Makes use of existing data</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for instructor</td>
<td>Not labour-intensive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for evaluators</td>
<td>Not labour-intensive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not labour-intensive for administrators to implement</td>
<td>Not labour-intensive for administrators</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not intrusive for instructor</td>
<td>Not intrusive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators feel participation is truly voluntary</td>
<td>Evaluators feel truly voluntary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators feel truly anonymous</td>
<td>Evaluators feel truly anonymous</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators benefit and learn too</td>
<td>Evaluators benefit and learn</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional growth for instructor</td>
<td>Encourages professional growth</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages collaboration</td>
<td>Encourages collaboration</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

| Not applicable |

*Percentages calculated based on applicable factors (e.g., consistency in grading only had 18 applicable factors).
Appendix D3 (continued): Advantages of TA Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Alumni surveys</th>
<th>Course Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative data - easy comparisons</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative data - richer data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Data</td>
<td>Holistic/macro view of teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiates between different calibres of teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility on what areas of teaching to focus on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to track changes over time</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Data</td>
<td>Less prone to bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluators have good recall</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluators are experienced at assessing teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher response rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsolicited feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Evaluators require minimal training</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional resources/supports are not needed</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financially cost-effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes use of already existing data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not labour-intensive for instructor</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not labour-intensive for evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not labour-intensive for administrators to implement</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Risk</td>
<td>Not intrusive for instructor</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluators feel participation is truly voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluators feel truly anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-products</td>
<td>Evaluators benefit and learn too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages professional growth for instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
<td><strong>67%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

*Not applicable*

*Percentages calculated based on applicable factors (e.g., consistency in grading only had 18 applicable factors).*
Appendix D4: Example of a Self-Evaluation Instrument (Self TAM) – The Teaching Perspectives Inventory.

Sample item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEFS - What do you believe about instructing or teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be an effective teacher, one must be an effective practitioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should be virtuoso performers of their subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should focus on developing qualitative changes in thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENTIONS - What do you try to accomplish in your instruction or teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My intent is to demonstrate how to perform or work in real situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect people to master a lot of information related to the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to make apparent what people take for granted about society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS - What do you do when instructing or teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I cover the required content accurately and in the allotted time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I link the subject matter with real settings of practice or application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask a lot of questions while teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Beliefs - SD, D, N, A, SA = strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree, respectively.
Intentions and Actions - N, R, S, U, A = never, rarely, sometimes, usually, and always, respectively.

Reference: Collins, J. B., & Pratt, D. D. (2011). The Teaching Perspectives Inventory at 10 years and 100,000 respondents: 10.177/0741713610392763
Appendix D5: Example of an Alumni Survey (Alumni TAM).

Sample Item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did the [insert name of program] help you develop the following [related to professional and ethical behaviour]?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My ability to work together in a respectful and collaborative manner with team members to complete tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to demonstrate ethical reasoning, moral maturity and a moral sense of mind in decision-making, including academic integrity and social responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to demonstrate leadership, including giving direction and guidance to others, as well as strategic visioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to demonstrate personal organization, accountability and time management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did the [insert name of program] help you develop the following [related to critical and creative thinking]?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My ability to gather and analyze evidence, ask in-depth questions, and make informed conclusions and judgements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to identify and solve problems, including evaluating alternatives and articulating reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to think creatively, initiate change and take intellectual risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to integrate existing knowledge across disciplinary boundaries, and to evaluate the limits of my own knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D6: Example of an Informal Course Survey (Student-Feedback TAE).

Sample items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Overall</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you like the course so far (from 1 to 5 with 5 being the most positive)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that you have learned something from this course (5 being the most positive)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate the difficulty level of this course (5 being the most difficult):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. The Instructor (Please rate the following items from 1 to 5 with 5 being the most positive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office hour/tutorial:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection with individual students:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Is the pace of the course:  
   _____ too slow?  
   _____ too fast?  
   _____ about right?

4. Is the number of assignments:  
   _____ too few?  
   _____ too many?  
   _____ about right?

5. Why do you think yourself/others skip lectures:  
   _____ The lecture is boring.  
   _____ I rarely/never skip lectures.  
   _____ Too busy with other duties.  
   _____ Because it is in the late afternoon.  
   _____ Because the assignment is not due yet.  
   _____ Other.

Survey created by Dr. Gary Wang, SFU Professor in the School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering.
Appendix D7: Example of a Focus Group (Student TA Data).

Student Context

1. What are your time commitments outside of university? What activities compete with university study?


2. What had you heard about the course or teacher before the first class/lecture? What did you think the course would be about when you chose it?

Student Impressions of the Course Design

3. How did you feel about the course readings? How were readings relevant (or not) to the course aims?

4. How did the assessment tasks help you achieve the course’s outcomes?

PROMPTS: What were your favourite activities/assessments in the course? Why?

5. What is your sense of the balance between the range of areas covered and how thoroughly they are covered in this course or subject?

PROMPTS: Are there any ideas you would have liked to discuss more intensely? How much time did you feel you had to look further into key areas and ideas?

6. What, for you, have been the key ideas/areas in this course or subject? How well do you feel you understand these?

PROMPTS: Brainstorm some key ideas and write them on a white board – Did you expect these themes/ideas at the outset of the course?

Student Impressions of Learning Environment

7. What was your general impression of the ‘feel’ of classes (i.e. were students keen or lethargic, was the teacher excited/passionate or unenthusiastic)? What might have contributed to this atmosphere?

8. How did you feel about class discussions and/or activities? How were they relevant to course aims and/or assessment tasks?

9. What is your sense of any compromises or ‘short cuts’ you may have taken in this course or subject? Why did you feel you needed to take these short cuts?
10. Did you ever feel the need to go beyond the course materials or to investigate a topic more thoroughly? What made you want to go further into a topic?

**Overall Student Impressions**

11. How useful do you think this course or subject will be in your future career?

PROMPTS: What career would you like to pursue? What are the key skills in that career?

12. What advice would you give to a friend who was about to undertake this course?

Appendix D8: Example of a Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID, Student TA Data).

Course Title:
Course Instructor:
Date:

What do you like most about this course so far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you like least about this course so far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What suggestions do you have for your instructor to improve your learning experiences in this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What might you do to improve your learning experiences and those of other students in this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D9: Example of Classroom Assessment Techniques (CAT, Student TA Data).

The Muddiest Point

This technique will help you determine which key points were missed by the students.

In today’s session, what was least clear to you?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

When and how to apply it:
- Apply this technique after a lecture or after the class session.
- Hand out the cards to the students and give them about 3 minutes to respond anonymously.
- Don’t use this method after every class or it will become monotonous and the information won’t be as useful.

One-Minute Paper

This is a useful technique because it is anonymous and encourages the quieter students to ask questions.

1. What was the most useful or the most meaningful thing you learned this session?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

2. What question(s) do you have as we end this session?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

When and how to apply it:
- The one-minute paper (or as many minutes as you like) can be used after a class or at the beginning of a class to review the previous session.
- Student answers to question 1 indicate whether you met your goal for the session.
- Student answers to question 2 indicate which parts of the lesson you may need to review.

Appendix E:
SUMMARY OF THE PERSONAL EVALUATION STANDARDS

1 Retrieved from http://www.jcsee.org/personnel-evaluation-standards
Propriety Standards
The Propriety Standards are intended to ensure that a personnel evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of the evaluatee and those involved in the evaluation.

- **P1 Service Orientation** Personnel evaluations should promote sound education, fulfillment of institutional missions, and effective performance of job responsibilities, so that the educational needs of students, community, and society are met.
- **P2 Appropriate Policies and Procedures** Guidelines for personnel evaluations should be recorded and provided to the evaluatee in policy statements, negotiated agreements, and/or personnel evaluation manuals, so that evaluations are consistent, equitable, and fair.
- **P3 Access to Evaluation Information** Access to evaluation information should be limited to persons with established legitimate permission to review and use the information, so that confidentiality is maintained and privacy protected.
- **P4 Interactions with Evaluatees** The evaluator should respect human dignity and act in a professional, considerate, and courteous manner, so that the evaluatee’s self-esteem, motivation, professional reputations, performance, and attitude toward personnel evaluation are enhanced or, at least, not needlessly damaged.
- **P5 Balanced Evaluation** Personnel evaluations should provide information that identifies both strengths and weaknesses, so that strengths can be built upon and weaknesses addressed.
- **P6 Conflict of Interest** Existing and potential conflicts of interest should be identified and dealt with openly and honestly, so that they do not compromise the evaluation process and results.
- **P7 Legal Viability** Personnel evaluations should meet the requirements of all federal, state, and local laws, as well as case law, contracts, collective bargaining agreements, affirmative action policies, and local board policies and regulations or institutional statutes or bylaws, so that evaluators can successfully conduct fair, efficient, and responsible personnel evaluations.

Utility Standards
The Utility Standards are intended to guide evaluations so that they will be informative, timely, and influential.

- **U1 Constructive Orientation** Personnel evaluations should be constructive, so that they not only help institutions develop human resources but encourage and assist those evaluated to provide excellent services in accordance with the institution’s mission statements and goals.
- **U2 Defined Uses** Both the users and intended uses of a personnel evaluation should be identified at the beginning of the evaluation so that the evaluation can address appropriate questions and issues.
• **U3 Evaluator Qualifications** The evaluation system should be developed, implemented, and managed by persons with the necessary qualifications, skills, training, and authority, so that evaluation reports are properly conducted, respected and used.

• **U4 Explicit Criteria** Evaluators should identify and justify the criteria used to interpret and judge evaluatee performance, so that the basis for interpretation and judgment provide a clear and defensible rationale for results.

• **U5 Functional Reporting** Reports should be clear, timely, accurate, and germane, so that they are of practical value to the evaluatee and other appropriate audiences.

• **U6 Professional Development** Personnel evaluations should inform users and evaluatees of areas in need of professional development, so that all educational personnel can better address the institution's missions and goals, fulfill their roles and responsibilities, and meet the needs of students.

**Feasibility Standards**

The Feasibility Standards are intended to guide personnel evaluation systems so that they are as easy to implement as possible, efficient in their use of time and resources, adequately funded, and viable from a political standpoint.

• **F1 Practical Procedures** Personnel evaluation procedures should be practical, so that they produce the needed information in efficient, non-disruptive ways.

• **F2 Political Viability** Personnel evaluations should be planned and conducted with the anticipation of questions from evaluatees and others with a legitimate right to know, so that their questions can be addressed and their cooperation obtained.

• **F3 Fiscal Viability** Adequate time and resources should be provided for personnel evaluation activities, so that evaluation can be effectively implemented, the results fully communicated, and appropriate follow-up activities identified.

**Accuracy Standards**

The accuracy standards determine whether an evaluation has produced sound information. Personnel evaluations must be technically adequate and as complete as possible to allow sound judgments and decisions to be made. The evaluation methodology should be appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and the evaluatees being evaluated and the context in which they work.

• **A1 Validity Orientation** The selection, development, and implementation of personnel evaluations should ensure that the interpretations made about the performance of the evaluatee are valid and not open to misinterpretation.

• **A2 Defined Expectations** The qualifications, role, and performance expectations of the evaluatee should be clearly defined, so that the evaluator can determine the evaluation data and information needed to ensure validity.
• **A3 Analysis of Context** Contextual variables that influence performance should be identified, described, and recorded, so that they can be considered when interpreting an evaluatee’s performance.

• **A4 Documented Purposes and Procedures** The evaluation purposes and procedures, both planned and actual, should be documented, so that they can be clearly explained and justified.

• **A5 Defensible Information** The information collected for personnel evaluations should be defensible, so that the information can be reliably and validly interpreted.

• **A6 Reliable Information** Personnel evaluation procedures should be chosen or developed and implemented to assure reliability, so that the information obtained will provide consistent indications of the evaluatee’s performance.

• **A7 Systematic Data Control** The information collected, processed, and reported about evaluatees should be systematically reviewed, corrected as appropriate, and kept secure, so that accurate judgments about the evaluatee’s performance can be made and appropriate levels of confidentiality maintained.

• **A8 Bias Identification and Management** Personnel evaluations should be free of bias, so that interpretations of the evaluatee’s qualifications or performance are valid.

• **A9 Analysis of Information** The information collected for personnel evaluations should be systematically and accurately analyzed, so that the purposes of the evaluation are effectively achieved.

• **A10 Justified Conclusions** The evaluative conclusions about the evaluatee’s performance should be explicitly justified, so that evaluatees and others with a legitimate right to know can have confidence in them.

• **A11 Metaevaluation** Personnel evaluation systems should be examined periodically using these and other appropriate standards, so that mistakes are prevented or detected and promptly corrected, and sound personnel evaluation practices are developed and maintained over time.
Appendix F:
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Utility Standards

The utility standards are intended to increase the extent to which program stakeholders find evaluation processes and products valuable in meeting their needs.

- **U1 Evaluator Credibility** Evaluations should be conducted by qualified people who establish and maintain credibility in the evaluation context.
- **U2 Attention to Stakeholders** Evaluations should devote attention to the full range of individuals and groups invested in the program and affected by its evaluation.
- **U3 Negotiated Purposes** Evaluation purposes should be identified and continually negotiated based on the needs of stakeholders.
- **U4 Explicit Values** Evaluations should clarify and specify the individual and cultural values underpinning purposes, processes, and judgments.
- **U5 Relevant Information** Evaluation information should serve the identified and emergent needs of stakeholders.
- **U6 Meaningful Processes and Products** Evaluations should construct activities, descriptions, and judgments in ways that encourage participants to rediscover, reinterpret, or revise their understandings and behaviors.
- **U7 Timely and Appropriate Communicating and Reporting** Evaluations should attend to the continuing information needs of their multiple audiences.
- **U8 Concern for Consequences and Influence** Evaluations should promote responsible and adaptive use while guarding against unintended negative consequences and misuse.

Feasibility Standards

The feasibility standards are intended to increase evaluation effectiveness and efficiency.

- **F1 Project Management** Evaluations should use effective project management strategies.
- **F2 Practical Procedures** Evaluation procedures should be practical and responsive to the way the program operates.
- **F3 Contextual Viability** Evaluations should recognize, monitor, and balance the cultural and political interests and needs of individuals and groups.
- **F4 Resource Use** Evaluations should use resources effectively and efficiently.

Propriety Standards

The propriety standards support what is proper, fair, legal, right and just in evaluations.

- **P1 Responsive and Inclusive Orientation** Evaluations should be responsive to stakeholders and their communities.
- **P2 Formal Agreements** Evaluation agreements should be negotiated to make obligations explicit and take into account the needs, expectations, and cultural contexts of clients and other stakeholders.
- **P3 Human Rights and Respect** Evaluations should be designed and conducted to protect human and legal rights and maintain the dignity of participants and other stakeholders.
• **P4 Clarity and Fairness** Evaluations should be understandable and fair in addressing stakeholder needs and purposes.

• **P5 Transparency and Disclosure** Evaluations should provide complete descriptions of findings, limitations, and conclusions to all stakeholders, unless doing so would violate legal and propriety obligations.

• **P6 Conflicts of Interests** Evaluations should openly and honestly identify and address real or perceived conflicts of interests that may compromise the evaluation.

• **P7 Fiscal Responsibility** Evaluations should account for all expended resources and comply with sound fiscal procedures and processes.

**Accuracy Standards**

The accuracy standards are intended to increase the dependability and truthfulness of evaluation representations, propositions, and findings, especially those that support interpretations and judgments about quality.

• **A1 Justified Conclusions and Decisions** Evaluation conclusions and decisions should be explicitly justified in the cultures and contexts where they have consequences.

• **A2 Valid Information** Evaluation information should serve the intended purposes and support valid interpretations.

• **A3 Reliable Information** Evaluation procedures should yield sufficiently dependable and consistent information for the intended uses.

• **A4 Explicit Program and Context Descriptions** Evaluations should document programs and their contexts with appropriate detail and scope for the evaluation purposes.

• **A5 Information Management** Evaluations should employ systematic information collection, review, verification, and storage methods.

• **A6 Sound Designs and Analyses** Evaluations should employ technically adequate designs and analyses that are appropriate for the evaluation purposes.

• **A7 Explicit Evaluation Reasoning** Evaluation reasoning leading from information and analyses to findings, interpretations, conclusions, and judgments should be clearly and completely documented.

• **A8 Communication and Reporting** Evaluation communications should have adequate scope and guard against misconceptions, biases, distortions, and errors.

**Evaluation Accountability Standards**

The evaluation accountability standards encourage adequate documentation of evaluations and a metaevaluative perspective focused on improvement and accountability for evaluation processes and products.

• **E1 Evaluation Documentation** Evaluations should fully document their negotiated purposes and implemented designs, procedures, data, and outcomes.
• **E2 Internal Metaevaluation** Evaluators should use these and other applicable standards to examine the accountability of the evaluation design, procedures employed, information collected, and outcomes.

• **E3 External Metaevaluation** Program evaluation sponsors, clients, evaluators, and other stakeholders should encourage the conduct of external metaevaluations using these and other applicable standards.
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APPENDIX G

Terms of Reference: Working Group on Policies and Priorities for Evaluation of Instructors and Courses

The Teaching and Course Evaluation Project (TCEP) issued a report, a set of appendices, and a set of best practices, all of which have been endorsed by Senate. The Report includes the following statements:

*It is also recommended that a parallel process begin immediately to define key institution-wide policies and teaching and learning priorities for institution-wide questions* (p. 3)

*Conduct process from VPA Office to set clear evaluation goals, including clear general definitions of what constitutes effective teaching, and develop institution-wide evaluation questions that reflect these goals; it is recommended to ensure both education and evaluation expertise are involved in this process* (p.15)

Working group tasks

Phase 1.

1. Compile a list of attributes that characterize effective teaching in the different disciplines across the university. This list should be distributed to TPC chairs for consultation.

2. Develop a set of goals for evaluation of instructors and courses that can be used across the institution. These goals should reflect questions and issues for which student evaluations can provide germane information, and should be distributed to TPC chairs for consultation.

3. Develop a set of eight questions that reflect the university’s definition of “effective teaching” and the goals of evaluation; these questions will be used on all instructor/course evaluations.

The group should report on these activities to SCUTL no later than September 2014.

Phase 2.

1. Determine what SFU policies (including collective agreements) govern the evaluation of instructors and courses, and how these are currently implemented at the department/school/faculty level.

2. Evaluate current policies and practices against the document “Best Practices on Interpretation and Use of Evaluation Data”, submitted by SCUTL as part of the TCEP package to Senate in January 2014. Identify areas where SFU practices and policies require revision or additions.

3. Items 1 and 2 can be considered later (beginning in November 2014) with a report to SCUTL in May or July 2015:

Proposed working group composition (to be determined by SCUTL) and support people
Three faculty members (suggest at least one nominated by SFUFA, at least one from Education with appropriate expertise in evaluation, and at least one SCUTL member as chair)

One additional faculty member with experience in using teaching evaluations in assessment of performance (e.g. TPC chair, department chair)

One sessional instructor (nominated by TSSU)

One undergraduate student (SCUTL member?)

One graduate student (SCUTL member?)

One IRP representative

Project manager (from Teaching and Learning Centre)

Researcher (if required) – selected by project manager and funded by VPA.

**Consultation**

Because the teaching and course evaluation instrument will be used widely across the university, it is essential that consultation take place on any issues that are not already covered by the TCEP report and associated documents that went to Senate in January 2014. When consultations are required they should include instructors, academic administrators, employee groups, Academic Relations, Human Resources, and students. However, given the timeframe for this submission, it is recommended that at least the chairs of TPCs are consulted.

**Governance and reporting**

Working group will report to SCUTL. SCUTL will consult with VPA before submitting report to Senate for approval. Submission to Senate no later than October 2014.
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I. Executive Summary

The Teaching Assessment Working Group (TAWG) was established in August 2017 to encourage an active conversation amongst faculty at SFU about how we assess and value teaching and to recommend ways to review teaching practice that are consistent, flexible and robust, and that are useful and useable to faculty, chairs, tenure and promotion committees (TPCs) and deans. In this report, TAWG proposes several recommendations in five main categories:

1. Use of student evaluations of teaching (SET)
2. Use of teaching assessment methods beyond SET
3. Improving the recognition of teaching
4. Training and support for faculty members and TPCs
5. Recommendations for changes to policy and administration

Evaluating teaching effectiveness is a key goal of both the biennial review and tenure/promotion processes. While it is generally accepted that an effective teacher promotes and enables learning, it is difficult to measure teaching effectiveness because it is difficult to measure learning. While Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) are the most commonly used form of assessment, SET in itself is not a measure of student learning. It is better to think of SET as a tool for understanding the student experience. We recommend that faculty use SET as a tool to inform pedagogy, to find out what students believe is working in their classes and what isn’t, to discover how a new format or method was received. We recommend that TPCs and Deans not use SET for the biennial review process, as there is too much potential for bias. TPCs may use SET results in evaluating tenure/promotion applications as one form of evidence demonstrating how students experience the applicant’s teaching, particularly changes in that experience over time. We also see a potential role for Chairs and Directors to use SET as one part of a broader set of indicators to identify outliers, to inform teaching assignments and as part of a collective assessment of a program to help identify changes to improve student learning and experience.

The use of teaching assessment methods beyond SET has recently been studied by a group reporting to the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning. One major finding of the group’s final report (SETCWG, 2017) is that TPCs rely heavily upon student evaluations and are not comfortable with other assessment methods. TAWG supports the recommendations of this report, which include the development of a more robust assessment of teaching based on five principles: that assessments of teaching should use multiple methods and multiple sources gathered over multiple points in time, all of which should be viewed holistically (without focusing on a single method or source) and used in alignment with individual instructors’ career paths. The report includes a comprehensive discussion of methods that are consistent with these principles. In our report, we propose guidelines for faculty and TPCs for use of these methods. TAWG recommends that each Academic Unit define a teaching assessment framework based on Faculty Member Guidelines (Appendix E) and the TPC Guidelines (Appendix F) for use within the Unit and that TPC members be encouraged to participate in training on how to assess teaching. These tools have been drafted in terms of three sources of data: self-reflection, students, and peers.

To increase the recognition of teaching, we recommend that we expand and enhance teaching awards at SFU, as well as improve the recognition and celebration of teaching award winners. We also
recommend that the University explore non-competitive criteria-based mechanisms to recognize teaching effectiveness and highlight the importance of teaching within the University’s mandate.

Faculty members will require guidance in preparing documentation for teaching assessment. As part of its mandate, TAWG has worked to develop a series of workshops to introduce faculty members to different methods of assessing teaching. The workshops start with an overview of teaching assessment methods and practices, and continue with workshops focusing on use of student feedback, peer feedback, and self-assessment and reflection. We recommend that workshops on assessing and valuing teaching be provided for TPC members by the Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching (AVPLT), working in concert with Faculty Relations, SFUFA and the Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE) (formerly Teaching and Learning Centre).

To ensure that teaching is valued, it should be assessed comprehensively, without focus on a single source or method, evaluated as an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation and reflection, and it should be recognized, both through salary review and promotion, and through public recognition. We recommend that Academic Units review their tenure/promotion criteria related to teaching for clarity and consistency and that they define a teaching assessment framework for their unit to use to evaluate teaching. We recommend that Academic Units be encouraged to assign step awards based on both teaching and research and to make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award. Deans should make sure that departmental criteria for teaching assessment are multi-faceted and comprehensive and that biennial review (BR) and tenure/promotion (TP) cases provide sufficient evidence for effective teaching. The Vice-President Academic should encourage TPCs to attach more significance to teaching at BR and TP and should explore shifting from a summative to a formative system of assessment to encourage positive change.

The report concludes with some suggestions for ways to review implementation of these recommendations and their impact.

The full list of recommendations is provided in Appendix A. We hope that these recommendations will be useful and useable and will help build a culture where teaching is valued.
II. Introduction

The Teaching Assessment Working Group was established by Vice President, Academic and Provost Peter Keller in August 2017 to encourage an active conversation amongst faculty at SFU about how we assess and value teaching and to recommend ways to review teaching practice that are consistent, flexible and robust, and that are useful and useable to faculty, chairs, tenure and promotion committees (TPCs) and deans. The TAWG Terms of Reference are attached as Appendix B. The group included representation from all faculties, from the SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA), the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL), and Faculty Relations, and included both teaching and research faculty who were at various levels of their careers.

We met with Dean’s Advisory Councils in all eight faculties as well as several additional groups to identify concerns and to invite feedback. We also reviewed several recent SFU reports related to these issues:

- Task Force on Teaching and Learning: Final Report (TFTL, 2010),
- Teaching and Course Evaluation Project: Final Report (TCEP, 2013), and
- Developing a Teaching Assessment Framework for Simon Fraser University: Final Report of the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Working Group (SETCWG, 2018),

as well as a recent thesis examining the role of teaching evaluation in tenure and promotion policies in Canada (Gravestock, 2011). Following the release of a draft of this report, TAWG hosted a session at the Teaching and Learning Centre’s (TLC’s) 17th Symposium on Teaching and Learning to gather feedback and further recommendations from the community.

Building a culture where teaching is valued is central to SFU’s Mission Statement,

“To be the leading engaged university defined by its dynamic integration of innovative education, cutting-edge research, and far-reaching community engagement,”

as an innovative education requires that faculty members be engaged in their teaching, and that they have access to the support and encouragement they need to be able to create and implement innovations.

However, various concerns about the climate for teaching and the availability of teaching support have been raised in our consultations:

- Faculty are reluctant to try new things because they feel this may negatively impact their teaching assessments and hence their evaluations during biennial reviews and promotion;
- We heard from many faculty members that they do not feel their teaching is valued, but concerns were particularly strong amongst teaching faculty who felt that their contributions were ignored in the biennial review process;
- Teaching excellence is not broadly recognized, rewarded, celebrated or communicated;
- TPCs are not comfortable using methods of teaching assessment other than formal surveys of student evaluations of teaching;
- There is a lack of alignment between departmental tenure and promotion (TP) criteria and TP review practice; and
- After at least ten years of discussion and reports, some progress has been made (e.g. creation of the Teaching and Learning Centre (TLC), introduction of university-wide student evaluation...
Based on these concerns, we developed goals in three main areas, for (1) faculty members, (2) academic units, and (3) the University, that we believe will improve the way we value and assess teaching; these goals can be found in Appendix C. The goals were distributed to the community in early 2018 for consideration by academic units and faculties as they drafted their 2019-2024 Academic Plans (TAWG, 2018a). Since then, TAWG has used these goals to develop a set of strategies and recommendations to value teaching practice and to facilitate consistency, flexibility and robustness of reviews of teaching practice of use to all stakeholders.

Our recommendations to address the above goals fall into five main categories:

1. Use of student evaluations of teaching (SET)
2. Use of teaching assessment methods beyond SET
3. Improving the recognition of teaching
4. Training and support for faculty members and TPCs
5. Recommendations for changes to policy and administration

The recommendations in each category, with some background and discussion and a list of the goals addressed, are presented in this report. A summary is provided in Appendix A. We hope that these recommendations will be useful and useable and will help build a culture where teaching is valued.
III. Background

Assessment and Evaluation

A key precept of any assessment system is that it be designed with a specific outcome in mind—that is, what is it that the assessment is supposed to examine and how will the data be used? In the current context, assessment of teaching, results might be used by the instructor to adjust the course structure, content, or pedagogical approach to formatively improve student outcomes. This would be the typical practice within a formative assessment system. In planning their teaching, instructors would look at assessment data as providing information for their use within their practice and the primary purpose would be to get data, typically in a timely and ongoing manner, that allows them to fully understand the outcomes of their planning, instruction, and student learning activities and adjust their teaching as needed. Formative assessment is typically a core component of any continuous improvement system.

Assessment data might also be used in a summative manner for evaluation—that is to evaluate the outcomes of a system at a set point in time. Summative evaluations are typically designed to determine the value of a program, course, or experience and frequently have higher stakes associated with them as a result. Again, in the current context, assessment data could be used to determine the “value” (e.g. evaluation) of a faculty member’s teaching at key points in time (the end of a course, during biennial review, for renewal, for tenure or for promotion). When data is used to evaluate something in a summative manner, the goal is descriptive and the results are not as readily available for formative use. For example, the results of our biennial assessments summarize two years of teaching data and are provided in the middle of the semester following submission of the review documents, meaning any changes an instructor might make would be in response to data 2½ to three years old by the time changes could be implemented. Summative assessments are frequently used for periodic review of specific performance outcomes.

While contract renewal, tenure and promotion are focused on individual achievement, biennial assessment in the current context of limited salary steps introduces competitive stimuli. In effect, the biennial assessment system shifts the focus from a descriptive criterion assessment (what is the effectiveness of each individual’s teaching and does it meet defined effectiveness criteria) to a normalized system (how can we differentiate between participants to allocate limited rewards, irrespective of an independent measure of quality).

These three features—formative, summative, and competitive evaluation—are core parts of many evaluation systems, including our own. In considering how best to assess teaching, it is critical that the influence of the entire evaluation system be considered, and not just the particular definitions of effective teaching or specific measures that may be available.

Recent SFU Reports

Three recent SFU reports provide background related to issues of teaching assessment, as well as recommendations that are relevant to faculty members, tenure and promotion committees (TPCs), and the University: the Task Force on Teaching and Learning (TFTL) report “TFTL: Recommendations Report” (TFTL, 2010), the Teaching and Course Evaluation Project (TCEP) report “Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses” (TCEP, 2013), and the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Courses Working Group (SETCWG) report “Developing a Teaching Assessment Framework for SFU” (SETCWG, 2017). Each of
these reports includes a comprehensive survey of the literature and consideration of the situation at SFU. A few highlights will be presented here; please see these reports for further details.

The goal of the TFTL was to develop recommendations to enhance teaching and learning support at SFU. The group studied the teaching and learning environment at SFU and recommended establishment of a coordinated teaching and learning support system. Of particular interest to academic units, they recommended development of a coherent system to evaluate teaching and learning effectiveness that includes multiple inputs as well as ability to recognize teaching workload, and encouraged more ways to recognize and value teaching, including awards, special recognitions and incentives.

The TCEP was asked to develop recommendations for a new system of student evaluation of teaching and courses, with an emphasis on improving the teaching and learning environment, ensuring efficient methods of data collection, storage and protection of privacy, and adoption of guidelines for best practices in the use of evaluation data. The report was based on earlier work by the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) and the TFTL. The report presents many recommendations related to the ethical and appropriate use of SET data, but also emphasizes that SET should not be the sole source of data for decision making around teaching performance, suggesting that peer evaluation and/or teaching dossiers provide supplemental information.

The SETCWG was tasked with determining which SFU policies govern the evaluation of instructors and courses, and identifying areas where SFU practices and policies require revision or additions. The report reviews both the relevant academic literature and SFU policies, and summarizes interviews with SFU TPC Chairs, teaching fellows, and teaching award recipients. The report contains a number of recommendations, but also highlights limitations and recommendations for future work. It contains a proposed framework for teaching assessment and an inventory of 73 methods of teaching assessment. The framework is based on five principles:

1. Use multiple methods – several pieces of data and evidence should be collected using various methods,
2. Use multiple sources – to increase validity, teaching assessment methods from various sources should be gathered,
3. Gather teaching assessment methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability,
4. View teaching assessment methods holistically – without focusing on one particular piece of data or evidence, and
5. A teaching assessment should align with an instructor’s career path – one single prescribed, weighted evaluation should not be used for all instructors.

Current Situation at SFU

Teaching assessment methods used at SFU

The SFUFA/SFU Collective agreement (SFUFA/SFU 2014) clearly states that “teaching is of fundamental importance” and that matters that should be taken into account when evaluating teaching include mastery of the subjects being taught, generation of enthusiasm in students, maintenance of appropriate academic standards, dedicated involvement within one’s field(s), openness to innovation, graduate

---

1 Teaching effectiveness, and other terms used to describe teaching and teaching assessment, are defined in Appendix D.
supervision, and development of academic programs. In addition, it states that consideration should be given to the ability and willingness of a faculty member to teach a range of subject matter and at various levels of instruction, and to the provision of services to students over and above formal teaching, particularly where the service is of a time-consuming nature. It states that teaching effectiveness should be evaluated through a combination of methods, including student questionnaires, observations of faculty colleagues, teaching portfolios, and the calibre of supervised dissertations and theses.

The SETCWG report summarizes the current state (as of 2016) of teaching assessment methods at SFU. The SETCWG studied what was written in departmental tenure and promotion criteria, and surveyed chairs to find out what actually happened in the TP review process. Table 1 summarizes the results and compares methods that were included in TP criteria to those actually used in the review process. This table includes methods included in TP criteria by > 50% of the departments (for further detail see SETCWG report, Tables 32 and 33):

Table 1: Summary of use of teaching assessment methods in TP criteria and TP review practice (SETCWG report, Tables 32 and 33). Use of some methods is required, while use of others is either recommended or optional.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>TP Criteria</th>
<th>TP Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of use in departmental TP criteria</td>
<td>Frequency of use in TP review - required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assessment Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching dossiers</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy statements</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assessment Evidence – Pedagogical Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/courses design and development</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate supervision or committee service</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching activity (list of courses, level and breadth)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of experiential learning coursers</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assessment Evidence – Pedagogical Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of innovative techniques</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are obvious discrepancies between policy (TP criteria) and practice (frequency of use), with most forms of assessment being used less than stipulated. The exception is the observation that student evaluations of teaching (SET) are used universally.

Views of SFU faculty members on teaching assessment
In the fall of 2018, the TAWG surveyed all faculty members at SFU to find out how they reflect on their teaching, what evidence they feel would be useful in evaluating their teaching, and how they feel their teaching is valued. 340 faculty members responded to the survey, or 30% of faculty at SFU.

A report on the survey has been prepared (TAWG, 2019). Most of the questions were multiple choice questions, but some had open-ended answers. The results of the multiple choice questions are represented as tables and/or graphs. The open-ended answers were analyzed by Ms. Vanja Zdjelar, MA candidate in Criminology. Her work is summarized in the TAWG report, but her complete report, which describes the methodology in detail and compares the response of tenure vs teaching track and of tenured vs untenured faculty, is also available (Zdjelar, 2019).

From the survey, it is clear than many faculty are reflective, thoughtful teachers who care deeply about their teaching. Participants report that student feedback, both informal (e.g. conversations with students outside of class, surveys they conduct during class, and alumni feedback) and formal (teaching evaluations including SFU’s online system SETC), is very important. It helps them determine whether their course went well, whether or not they should make changes, and informs the changes that they make. In general, participants feel that their TPCs rely too heavily on formal teaching evaluations including SETC, and would like to see TPCs use a broader range of assessment methods. Overall, participants are not very satisfied with the way their teaching is assessed; on a scale of 1 (not satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), they ranked their satisfaction at 2.64. They are most satisfied with how their teaching is valued by their students (3.81), followed by their academic unit (2.97). They are least satisfied by how their teaching is valued by SFU (2.67). About 30% of respondents to Question 16 (Overall, how satisfied are you with how your teaching is valued) responded that they felt that their teaching was not valued. However, many others wrote that they personally value their teaching and achieve great satisfaction from this aspect of their work.
IV. Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching

Summary

Evaluating teaching effectiveness is a key goal of both the biennial review and tenure/promotion processes. While it is generally accepted that an effective teacher promotes and enables learning, it is difficult to measure teaching effectiveness because it is difficult to measure learning. While student evaluations of teaching (SET) are the most commonly used form of assessment, SET in itself is not a measure of student learning. It is better to think of SET as a tool for understanding the student experience. The use of SET allows students to have a voice in their education. SET can also be very useful for identifying outliers – either teachers who are struggling or teachers who are exceptional.

Kaplan Decision (2018)

Contention between the Ryerson Faculty Association and Ryerson University about the use of SET for the purpose of evaluation of a faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher was sent to an arbitration hearing presided over by William Kaplan, a Canadian lawyer, mediator and arbitrator. His decision (Kaplan, 2018) provides a useful summary of the benefits and difficulties with use of SET:

- SETs have value because they capture the student experience
- SETs are easy to administer
- Numerous factors – including personal characteristics, response rates, and course characteristics – skew the results
- Averages establish nothing relevant or useful about teaching effectiveness, and should not be compared across course formats, levels, topics, or disciplines
- If SETs must be presented, they should be presented as a frequency distribution with response rates and as a source of information about the student experience, and not as a measure of teaching effectiveness
- Deans, Chairs and TPCs should be educated in the inherent and systematic biases in SETs
- The best way to assess teaching is through use of a teaching dossier and in-class peer assessment

In his deliberations, Mr. Kaplan heard expert testimony from Professors Phillip Stark and Richard Freishtat (Stark and Freishtat, 2014). Professor Stark (UC Berkeley) visited SFU in April, 2018 to give a public presentation and to discuss use of SET with TAWG and other interested parties (Stark, 2018). In his lecture, Professor Stark gave a very comprehensive overview of bias issues related to use of SET and made several suggestions as to how SET should be used. Links to Mr. Kaplan’s decision, Prof. Stark’s presentation and paper, and other references can be found in the Bibliography – please see these references for further details.

Recommendations

All users of SET data should understand the risks involved in using data that research has shown may systematically disadvantage some faculty members and groups of faculty for reasons that are unrelated to their teaching. SET data should be used with caution, and never as the only indicator regarding faculty teaching.
Use of SET by Role

By Faculty Members

Faculty should:
- Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching
- Utilize the four questions that are available to them in SETC to find out what is working, and what isn’t, in their classes, how a new format of assignments or new material was received, etc., with the idea of using the responses as a basis for reflection of their teaching
- Use the opportunity to add contextual information as a way to reflect on their teaching
- Use mid-semester (informal) surveys for formative questions and end of semester survey for summative questions
- Consult with experts such as their faculty’s Educational Consultant on how to word questions – in particular on how to ask questions that focus on the student experience

By TPCs

Because of the different purposes of biennial reviews (competitive) and tenure/promotion decisions (summative), we are recommending using SET in different ways in the two processes:
- TPCs should not use SET results for biennial review, because there are questions of validity and too much potential for bias.
- TPCs may use SET results in evaluating tenure/promotion applications as one form of evidence demonstrating how students experience the applicant’s teaching, particularly changes in that experience over time.

By Chairs and Directors

- Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching
- Use SET results as one indicator among multiple indicators to inform teaching assignments
- Use SET results to flag outliers for further investigation — faculty who receive consistently exceptional responses may be considered for awards; faculty who receive consistently negative responses may be provided with support to improve their teaching practice
- Use SET results as one part of a broader program of collective assessment of a program to help identify changes to improve student learning and experience

SETC Design

- Preamble:
  o Use the preamble on the SETC questionnaire to educate students on the importance of SET, how it is used, and how to make useful comments
- Contextual component:
  o Make the purpose of the instructor-related context section clearer. This could be used as an opportunity for the faculty member to reflect on their teaching — what they tried, what worked, what didn’t. This section is currently presented as a way to influence how the results are evaluated, which is not the same thing.
- Questions:
  o Students are asked to respond to a SET survey for each class they are taking at a time when they are already busy and stressed.
- Reduce the number of questions. The current version consists of 23 questions – 10 would be more reasonable, e.g. 3 institution questions, 3 department questions and 4 instructor questions.
- Make sure that questions provide answers to things the institution/department/instructor are really interested in and can only find out in this way (e.g. make sure that the information is not provided by the annual student satisfaction survey)
- To reduce survey fatigue consider shifting to sampling strategy for gathering responses rather than a census approach.
- Revise any judgment-based questions on SETC questionnaires (Stark and Freishtat, 2014). Questions should be rewritten to focus on the student’s experience e.g.
  - I could understand the instructor’s explanations (instead of The course instructor explained concepts clearly)
  - I understood what was expected of me (instead of The course instructor explained grading criteria clearly)
- Questions should focus on issues that affect learning and the learning experience e.g.
  - I feel this course is too much work
  - I cannot read the instructor’s handwriting
  - I feel I learned a lot in this class

- Presentation of Responses
  - Reorganize the presentation to condense the information
  - Do not present averages, present frequency distributions with response rates
  - Do not rank or compare across faculty, course formats, levels, topics or disciplines
  - Provide instructors with more raw data so that they can explore, for example, cross-tabulations on pairs of questions in order to better understand the student experience in their class, while ensuring confidentiality of students is maintained

Goals addressed
- The capacity to understand and evaluate teaching is present in all steps of the process
- TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching
V. Use of Teaching Assessment Methods Beyond SET

Article 28.5 of the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement (SFUFA/SFU, 2014) states that “Teaching effectiveness should be measured or assessed through a combination of methods, including student questionnaires, the observations of faculty colleagues, teaching portfolios, and the calibre of supervised dissertations and theses.”

The final report of the SETCWG summarizes assessment policies and practices currently implemented at SFU and recommends potential improvements (SETCWG, 2017). It includes a discussion of best practices identified in a literature review, relevant SFU policies used in tenure and promotion processes, results of interviews with chairs of SFU Tenure and Promotion Committees and with select SFU award-winning instructors, a summary of teaching assessment practices and policies used at other Canadian institutions, and a teaching assessment framework that outlines guiding principles and provides an inventory of assessment methods for use by academic units in developing their teaching assessment policies and practices.

One major finding of the report was that, despite SFU policies such as Article 28.5 of the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement and unit TP criteria that recommend using multiple methods of assessment, interviews with TPC Chairs in 2016 indicated that TPCs rely heavily upon student evaluations (100%). Only 9% of TPC Chairs reported utilizing classroom observations despite this method being mentioned in 51% of the TP criteria. While teaching philosophy statements and/or portfolios were frequently submitted (83% and 73% respectively), TPC Chairs noted that there was uncertainty about how they should be assessed, leading once again to a greater reliance on student evaluations.

Decreasing the reliance of TPCs on student evaluations is also recommended by a recent arbitration decision involving teaching assessment at Ryerson University (Kaplan, 2018). Arbitrator William Kaplan declared that where “assessing teaching effectiveness is concerned – especially in the context of tenure and promotion – [student evaluations of teaching] are imperfect at best and downright biased and unreliable at worst”.

In recommending the development of a more robust assessment of teaching, the SETCWG outlined five principles: assessments of teaching should use multiple methods and multiple sources that are gathered over multiple points in time, all of which should be viewed holistically (without focusing on a single method or source) and used in alignment with individual instructors’ career paths.

Based on these principles, the report includes a Teaching Assessment Inventory, which identifies 73 methods of assessment that are generated from different sources: the instructor, students, peers and administrators, alumni, and from course data (SETCWG 2017, Tables 34-37, pp. 63-66).

In order to help assist faculty members in presenting and TPCs in identifying and assessing multiple methods and sources, the Teaching Assessment Working Group has reorganized the SETCWG’s 73 methods into two tables that focus on methods and sources, one to provide guidance for faculty members (Appendix E), and one to provide guidance for TPCs (Appendix F). These documents are meant to be used as a starting point as academic units work to define the teaching assessment framework that will be used for biennial review and tenure and promotion decisions in their unit.

In addition, feedback from faculty members at the 2019 Symposium on Teaching and Learning suggests a simpler approach. Many teaching assessment methods can be described as being either student, peer, or self-assessments. Faculty member feedback suggested that Academic Units use student focus groups...
(in addition to formal SET surveys for student feedback), that they include peer observation for formative assessment, and that a self-reflection piece of 2-3 pages might follow one of the following formats:

(a) 3 most significant achievements
(b) What did you do? What did you learn? What will you do next year?
(c) What did you try? What worked? How did things improve?

SFU and the CEE may wish to further investigate these and other approaches to understanding teaching at SFU.

Guidance for faculty members

TAWG has summarized the 73 methods described in the SETCWG Report (SETCWG, 2017, Tables 34-37, pp. 63-66) in a single table (Appendix E) to help guide faculty members as they work to demonstrate their effectiveness as a teacher for biennial review or tenure/promotion processes. The table summarizes the 73 methods into four main sections: documentation, reflection on current goals and past practice, student outcomes and observations, and reflection on future goals. The format is designed to encourage reflection and follows the guiding principles of a teaching dossier. Departments may also use Appendix E to generate discussion about the aspects of teaching they can assess and value, and the ways in which they might operationalize those values through evaluation. All of the documentation listed is provided/assembled by the faculty member, unless otherwise noted. Please note that this table presents an inclusive list; what a faculty member actually includes will depend on department requirements.

Guidance for tenure and promotion committees

In order to best assist TPCs in identifying multiple methods and sources, the Teaching Assessment Working Group has reorganized the SETCWG’s 73 methods (SETCWG, 2017, Tables 34-37, pp. 63-66) into a single table that focuses on methods and sources (Appendix F). The table focuses on three groups of assessment methods: documentation of teaching and related activities, reflections on teaching, and outcomes and observations. While Appendix E is designed to help faculty members make their case, we hope that the approach outlined in Appendix F will help academic units in their evaluation of their colleagues teaching. Please note that the list of assessment methods is an inclusive list; what a TPC uses will depend on department requirements.

Assessing teaching is difficult and how TPCs assess their colleagues’ teaching – either for promotion or biennial review – will have an impact on faculty careers. The Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching should work with Faculty Relations, SFUFA, and the Teaching & Learning Centre to provide advice and workshops for TPCs on how to assess teaching beyond student evaluations. Ultimately, adjudication of teaching effectiveness should be based on a preponderance of evidence across all of the data sources presented.

General comment on teaching assessment

Teaching assessment at SFU contains all three of the components described in Section III; formative, summative and competitive evaluation. In particular, biennial assessment in the current context of limited salary steps introduces competitive stimuli. In such a competitive, incentivized system
substantial research shows that participants tend to change their behaviours to increase the likelihood that they will be able to obtain the rewards (or avoid the sanctions). In effect, the higher the stakes within the system, the more likely it becomes that the system will be corrupted as participants attempt to manipulate the data to ensure their place in the distribution and obtain the rewards. When rewards are allocated competitively, this pits members of the system against each other and further breaks down both the system and the community.

To mitigate the negative effects of competitive, high-stakes evaluation systems, research suggests that data be gleaned from a wide variety of sources and across multiple time points (to limit the ability of participants to manipulate outcomes), or that separate systems for evaluation be used. For example, creating a formative system where data is provided exclusively to improve teaching eliminates the incentives that tend to encourage manipulation. Reducing competition within the system also reduces the incentives for manipulation, as does creation of a categorical (noncompetitive) evaluation system.

While the bulk of our work focuses on the methods for gathering and using data, attention to the larger incentive system is also important and we recommend that SFU and SFUFA should work collaboratively on further examining SFU’s current incentive system in light of the unintended impacts the system may have on accurately determining faculty performance.

Goals addressed

- Faculty members feel they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
- TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching
- Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
- The capacity to understand teaching and evaluate it well is present in all steps in the process
- A general framework for methods of teaching assessment has been adopted, which can be used to inform the work of academic units
VI. Improving the Recognition of Teaching

As part of the completion of our mandate, we would like to recommend a number of strategies to celebrate teaching excellence.

The primary mechanism for teaching recognition at SFU is through teaching awards. This document focusses on this mechanism, but also includes some ideas for non-competitive, criteria-based recognition.

Recommendations

1. Expand and enhance teaching awards at SFU

   The University recognizes teaching excellence through the University Excellence in Teaching Awards, awarded annually to up to three faculty members. In addition, some Faculties offer awards to their faculty members. Making sure that there is a diversity and hierarchy of awards available will make it easier to nominate excellent teachers for national and international awards. We recommend that:

   - The variety of teaching awards at the University level be increased;
     - awards could be made in different areas such as excellence in TA development, instructional technology innovation, course development, experiential learning, risk taking, etc. in order to highlight different aspects of teaching excellence,
     - awards could target different stages of an academic career (early, mid, late), and
     - awards could target different instructor groups (faculty members, sessional instructors, TAs, TMs).

   For example, the University of Calgary offers awards celebrating teaching excellence in 13 different categories, including diverse learning contexts, individual and team awards, curriculum design and educational leadership.

   - The award guidelines be reviewed and revised as the criteria are vague and not in line with current standards, in particular, we should ensure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. For example, applications for University of Calgary teaching awards require a teaching dossier that includes information from the nominee, from peers, and from students.

   - Faculties that do not currently have a teaching award be encouraged to develop one. This will both recognize teaching at the Faculty level and makes sure that the Faculty’s excellent teachers are known and can be nominated for University awards.

2. Expand and enhance recognition and celebration of teaching award winners

   - For example, the visibility of teaching award winners could be increased through dinners and/or receptions, such as the FASS Cormack Teaching Award Reception and Symposium, or by posting photos and bios in prominent places.

   - Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc.

   - Award winners could be encouraged to open their classrooms, or could be seconded to provide professional development for their colleagues.

   - Chairs should be encouraged to celebrate teaching, for example by awarding extra merit steps to award winners.
3. Expand and enhance support for nominees and nominators

The process of identifying teaching excellence begins at the level of the academic unit. TPCs should be encouraged to identify faculty-level nominations during biennial review or tenure/promotion processes. Subsequently, winners of faculty-level awards should be nominated for university awards, and university award winners should be nominated for national awards. At each level, award winners should be counselled on what they should do to prepare for the next level of award. Each academic unit should be encouraged to nominate a member for faculty-level awards, and each Faculty should ensure that a member of the faculty is nominated for university-level awards.

A central support model should be developed for nominations for national and international awards. This could include appointment of an awards facilitator to make sure that candidates are identified and encouraged. A nomination for a national award would then include collaboration between nominator, nominee, nominee’s academic unit, CEE, and the office of the AVPLT.

4. Awards are one way to recognize excellent teaching. Other teaching recognition mechanisms are available at SFU and should be continued and enhanced:

- Appointment of Faculty Teaching Fellows
- Awarding steps in biennial review associated with teaching effectiveness
- Recognition of teaching achievements in biennial review and tenure/promotion letters
- Recognition of teaching innovations in CEE newsletters
- Recognition of teaching innovation on the main SFU website and in SFU News

5. Finally, TAWG recognizes that there are many faculty engaged in highly effective teaching at SFU and that not all quality teaching can be adequately recognized through competitive awards. As a result, we recommend that the University explore non-competitive criteria-based mechanisms to value and recognize the importance of teaching to the University’s mandate. These could include

- Encouraging TPCs to attach more importance to teaching at all stages of a faculty member’s career: hiring, biennial review, tenure and promotion
- Encouraging TPCs to recognize teaching outside the formal classroom – for example supervision of graduate students, field courses, and special topics courses
- Encourage certification of professional development experiences
- Explore development of a multi-tiered teaching fellowship program.

Goals addressed

- Faculty feel that they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
- Outstanding teaching is celebrated
- Academic units identify and promote their best teachers for faculty, university, national and international teaching awards
VII. Training and Support for Faculty Members and TPCs

Faculty members and TPCs should feel comfortable with a range of teaching assessment methods. Faculty members will require guidance in preparing documentation for teaching assessment. TPC members should become comfortable using the evidence from multiple, new teaching assessment methods. As a result, significant training and support will be required.

Daria Ahrensmeier and Sarah Turner from CEE, working in collaboration with TAWG, have developed a series of workshops that will introduce faculty members to different methods of teaching assessment. The workshops start with an overview of teaching assessment methods and practices, and continue with workshops focusing on use of student feedback, peer feedback, and self-assessment and reflection. For details, see Appendix G.

These workshops should be part of a series of workshops for early, mid and late career faculty that provide professional development and support to faculty teaching at different stages of their careers. The workshops will help faculty members prepare material for more accurate assessment of their teaching and will help them be reflective and responsive teachers. TPCs should recognize participation in these types of professional development as an indicator of faculty commitment to effective teaching in the teaching review process.

Workshops for TPC members should be provided by the Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching, working in concert with the Faculty Relations, SFUFA and the CEE. These workshops should include information on how to use different teaching assessment methods, how to evaluate teaching-related data, and on the inherent and systematic biases of SET. Some training could be made available online. These workshops should help TPCs work more efficiently and effectively.

Both faculty members and TPC members will need time to engage in training, to prepare for, and to perform a more comprehensive teaching assessment. Institutional support is required to minimize the impact on workload. We have included a few suggestions on how to minimize the impact on workload in the next section, Section VIII.

Goals addressed

- Faculty members are reflective and responsive teachers
- Faculty members adapt their teaching to changing environments
- Faculty members are comfortable taking risks and are rewarded for experimenting with their teaching practices
- TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching
- Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
- The capacity to understand teaching and evaluate it well is present in all steps in the process
VIII. Recommendations for Changes to Policy and Administration

Summary

To ensure that teaching is valued, it should be assessed comprehensively, without focus on a single source or method, evaluated as an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation and reflection, and it should be rewarded, both through salary and promotion and through public recognition.

Faculty want to hear a consistent message from chairs and other administrators that teaching is valued – teaching needs to impact hiring and promotion, faculty should have access to training that supports their needs and interests, faculty should be encouraged to try new things, and faculty who are having difficulty should have access to support.

While summative assessment is appropriate at the stages of tenure and promotion, where a decision is being made on whether a candidate has been performing at the level expected, this is not necessary for biennial review where the emphasis is on comparing the progress of different department members. SFU should consider increasing the opportunities for formative assessment, where feedback is designed to promote growth and improvement of performance.

Changes that Academic Units Can Make

Based on recent SFU reports and discussions with various stakeholders, TAWG would like to recommend a number of changes that academic units can make in how they assess and value teaching. These changes will demonstrate that teaching is valued, will provide more support to faculty in their teaching, and will ensure that their efforts are assessed in a fair, unbiased manner. Each department can choose practices that are best suited for their discipline.

Practices that demonstrate that teaching is valued:

- Ask candidates to give a teaching presentation as part of the hiring process
- Ensure that the hiring practice for teaching faculty is as rigorous and thoughtful as the practice of hiring research faculty in order to identify candidates of the highest calibre
- Implement a formal mentorship program to support new faculty as they start teaching (Teaching Fellows and/or CEE Educational Consultants to help)
  - Encourage formative assessment before tenure and promotion, i.e. year 3 for Assistant Professor or Lecturer, as this is a particularly important time in a faculty member’s professional development
  - Provide formative assessment on promotion to Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer – what can they work on as they prepare for promotion to Professor or University Lecturer? (This will probably have to occur after the promotion decision)
- Encourage award-winning teachers to open their classrooms to new instructors
- Ensure that representation of teaching faculty on TPCs reflects the ratio of teaching to research faculty in the Academic Unit (this may require changes to the Collective Agreement)
- Use the biennial review process to
  - identify faculty members to recommend for teaching awards, or other recognition
  - recognize teaching innovations
  - recognize educational leadership projects
Assign step awards based on both teaching and research; make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award

Suggestions of methods from academic units at SFU that have been effective in promoting a culture where teaching is valued in their unit

Set aside time at every department or school meeting to discuss teaching issues, e.g. through issues raised by the curriculum committees, or through sharing by faculty members of new ideas they have tried or come across

Encourage formation of a Teaching Circle, a small group of faculty members who meet on a regular basis to discuss teaching and learning concerns, in your department

**Practices that improve assessment of teaching:**

Academic units should review their unit’s tenure/promotion criteria related to teaching. Academic units assess teaching as part of the tenure and promotion process, and as part of the biennial review process. To inform both faculty members and the TPC, it is important that the department criteria related to teaching be clear and applied consistently.

All departmental TP criteria are now published on the Faculty Relations webpage ([www.sfu.ca/faculty-relations](http://www.sfu.ca/faculty-relations)). Some define criteria related to teaching more clearly than others – we have included what we believe to be a couple of good examples of clear criteria in Appendix H.

During our consultations, faculty members raised concerns about several issues related to existing criteria. When reviewing departmental TP criteria, please ensure that the following issues are clarified:

- Departmental TP criteria are *in addition* to the University criteria; this may not be obvious to new faculty members, for example.
- Is graduate supervision – including senior supervisor, member of supervisory committees, and internal/external reviewer – considered part of research or teaching and how is it evaluated?
- How will professional development activities, including professional development that leads to certification, be recorded and recognized?
- How will the supervision of student projects or group work, interdisciplinary teaching, and community-engaged teaching be recorded and recognized?
- How will risk-taking and experimentation with teaching practice be rewarded and recognized?
- What criteria will be used to differentiate between satisfactory, successful, excellent, and outstanding teaching? These are words used to describe expectations for different ranks in the Collective Agreement, but they are not currently defined there – for examples, please see the definitions that TAWG has been using, summarized in Appendix D.

Each unit should define the teaching assessment framework that will be used to evaluate teaching – including details of the tools and processes to be used, and an example of each. See recommendations for use of SET and methods of assessment beyond SET in Sections IV and V, respectively, for details. Each unit should define a version of the guidelines for faculty members (Appendix E) and guidelines for TPCs (Appendix F) for use in the unit. Using these tools will ensure that best practices in teaching assessment are being followed, as described in the SETCWG report:

- Use multiple methods – a diversity of data and evidence should be collected using various methods (observations, interviews, surveys, etc.).
• Use multiple sources – to increase validity, teaching assessment methods from various sources should be gathered (students, colleagues, self, etc.).
• Gather teaching assessment methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability.
• View teaching assessment methods holistically – without focusing on one particular piece of data or evidence.
• Align the teaching assessment with an instructor’s career path – one single prescribed, weighted evaluation should not be used for all instructors.

Many units do not differentiate the evidence used in biennial assessment and at tenure and promotion. We recommend that academic units specify the evidence used in the biennial assessment in the unit’s TP criteria and that this should focus on evidence of teaching effectiveness specific to the short-term process of biennial assessment. This could include measures of both classroom teaching and external efforts to strengthen teaching, including participation in professional development.

Finally, TPC members will need to be encouraged to participate in training on how to assess teaching (see Section VII Training and Support).

Suggestions for ways to manage workload

• Focus on doing the most thorough reviews at year 3 at the time of contract renewal and/or in the year before promotion
• Consider doing salary reviews every three years after promotion to Full Professor or University Lecturer, or perhaps throughout one’s entire career (would need to be part of the Collective Agreement)
• Provide training to TPC members on how to evaluate teaching-related data to help them work more efficiently
• Provide rubrics for evaluation
• Provide exemplars of high-quality teaching and portfolios

Actions for Deans

We recommend that Deans review departmental criteria for teaching carefully to ensure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive. They should encourage cross-disciplinary review and sharing of TP criteria and ensure that Academic Units realize that TP criteria are now available online. During the review process, they should encourage TPC Chairs to ensure that contributions to teaching impact the step award. They should send biennial review (BR) and tenure/promotion (TP) cases back if there is not sufficient evidence for effective teaching.

We recommend that Deans ensure that their Faculty has teaching awards, that the award guidelines are clear, and that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. They should encourage all of their Academic Units to submit teaching award nominations and celebrate their award winners. See TAWG’s recommendations on teaching recognition (Section VI) for further information.

Teaching Fellows were introduced following the TFTL Report (TFTL 2010). They are meant to provide support for continued improvement in teaching within the faculty as well as bring attention to issues related to teaching. They provide the opportunity for cross-faculty exchange of teaching innovations and
issues. Deans should make sure that they have a full complement of Teaching Fellows and that their roles are clear.

Actions for the VPA / AVPLT

We recommend that senior leadership take the following actions to demonstrate support for a culture where teaching is valued:

• Review recommendations from previous reports to make sure that progress has been made. For example, the TFTL Report (TFTL, 2010) recommended that SFU develop and implement a phased institutional plan to raise awareness of the broad range of SFU teaching and learning successes, services and support for teaching and learning and to ensure that they are recognized, used, and celebrated at all three campuses in an appropriate manner and that we establish and communicate a vision statement and principles to provide direction and common purpose around teaching and learning at SFU. It would be great to see a mission statement where teaching plays a more prominent role!

• Enable the development of additional methods of assessing teaching. For example, faculty are interested in the opportunities afforded by peer evaluation. Other institutions have developed peer evaluation systems, but to implement such a program at SFU will require leadership and commitment.

• Explore shifting from a summative to a formative system that encourages positive change. In a competitive incentivized system substantial research shows that participants tend to change their behaviour to increase the likelihood that they will be able to obtain the rewards (or avoid the sanctions). In effect, the higher the stakes within the system, the more likely it becomes that the system will be corrupted as participants attempt to manipulate the data to ensure their place in the distribution and to obtain the rewards. When rewards are allocated competitively, this pits members of the system against each other and further breaks down both the system and the community. SFU and SFUFA should work collaboratively on further examining SFU’s current incentive system in light of the unintended impacts the system may have on accurately determining faculty performance.

• Review the award guidelines for the University Awards to make sure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. Consider increasing the variety of awards available. Celebrate award winners. See TAWG’s recommendations on teaching recognition (Section VI) for further information.

• Initiate a review of departmental criteria for tenure and promotion that includes a focus on teaching criteria and teaching assessment. Review the revised criteria carefully to make sure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive.

• Ask the Deans to have TPCs attach more importance to teaching at the time of biennial reviews and promotion and ask them to turn back biennial review and promotion cases that do not indicate that teaching has been assessed comprehensively.

• Extend the orientation period for new faculty in order to give new faculty time to prepare for teaching, and encourage the establishment of a year-long series of workshops addressing instructional issues facing new faculty.
Institutional Support

The CV system is in the process of being redesigned. The new version should collect more teaching-related information to support faculty in reflection on their teaching and to help them prepare teaching material for BR and TP. The new CV system could provide a template for a teaching dossier. It should also make it easier to incorporate existing data to avoid manual data entry. We recommend that a design committee be established that includes both teaching and research faculty. For examples of information that should be included, please see Appendices E and F.

Examples of best practice should be collected and made available to the SFU community in one location. Appendix H includes some examples that TAWG has collected. For example, the CEE could be tasked with maintaining and updating resources related to teaching assessment on a regular basis, making them available to the SFU community through the CEE website. The following should be included:

- Best examples of departmental TP Criteria related to teaching assessment
- Examples of instructions sent to faculty preparing documentation for biennial review
- Information on how to conduct an informal student survey, with an example
- Information on how to conduct a student focus group, with an example
- Information on how to conduct peer assessment
- Information on how to prepare a teaching philosophy statement
- An example of a short teaching dossier that could be used to present material for teaching assessment for biennial review

Other recommendations:

- Encourage a scholarly approach to teaching
- Support development of a peer assessment program
- Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc.
- Provide opportunities to present teaching innovations at yearly sharing events
- Provide institutional support for faculty who wish to apply for external funding for teaching-related research
- Provide funding to attend conferences related to teaching

Resources

Using SET as a proxy measure for teaching effectiveness is fast and easy, but the opportunities for bias are high. A culture where teaching is valued, where faculty members are reflective and responsive teachers, where they adapt their teaching to changing environments, and where they are comfortable taking risks asks more of faculty members. TPC members and Chairs will require training in types of teaching assessment methods and in how to evaluate teaching submissions. Resources for professional development for faculty members and training for TPC members are required to support a community of teaching.

- Resources are required for: Collection of additional teaching assessment data, e.g. peer or expert observation, video analysis, surveys of alumni, student input beyond SETC such as focus groups or exit surveys
- Faculty members require support and professional development
• TPCs require support, e.g. training in evaluating teaching submissions and peer assessment and on the inherent and systematic biases of SET
• Develop ways to manage TPC workload – we have heard that there is not enough time to do a good job. Could TPC members be relieved from other service obligations? Could the workload of Chairs/Directors be reduced? We have made a couple of suggestions in the section “Changes that Academic Units Can Make”
• The CEE requires resources to provide
  o Workshops for faculty – general; CEE should offer a coordinated series of workshops aimed at early-, mid- and late-career faculty members
  o Resources to develop a peer assessment program
  o Support for teaching assessment activities
  o Support for teaching awards and teaching award submissions
  o Resources to develop a teaching development certificate
  o Educational consultants with disciplinary knowledge
  o Support for SETC – the SETC managing group is under-staffed and under-supported
  o Development of support for faculty and academic units creating SET questions that avoid bias; with support of the EDI office
  o Consider seconding faculty to work and learn in the CEE and then return to Faculties with added capacity
• Institute for Studies in Teaching and Learning in the Disciplines (ISTLD)
  o Continue to support faculty-led inquiry

Changes to the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement

As part of its work, TAWG has made a number of recommendations for consideration in the next round of negotiations of the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement. These include adding a new section describing steps for academic units to use to develop criteria for evaluation of teaching that are in addition to the university criteria, including recognition of the scholarship of teaching and learning as a form of scholarship, and working towards harmonization of criteria for teaching and research faculty in order to reduce differences and distinctions. For further detail, please see the TAWG submission (TAWG, 2018b).

Reporting and Review

Developing a culture where teaching is valued and rewarded falls within the mandate of the AVPLT. We suggest the AVPLT consider enlisting the support of Senate, through the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning, and the Centre for Educational Excellence, and other local structures already in place to support teaching and learning, for example the Beedie Teaching and Learning Group.

A general review of the impacts of the project should be initiated within five years – ideally to inform the next Academic Planning cycle. We recommend that repeats of the two surveys – the survey of TPCs conducted by the SETCWG and the survey of faculty members conducted by TAWG – be used as measures of change of culture. Given the discontent with the way merit steps are assigned during biennial reviews expressed by teaching faculty, we recommend that a comparison be made of the merit
steps awarded to teaching and research faculty across the university and any differences justified or corrected. Progress on the recommendations made in recent reports related to teaching assessment (TAWG, SETCWG, TCEP, TFTL) should also be reviewed.

Finally, these recommendations will need to be revised as the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement evolves.

Goals addressed

- Faculty members are aware of teaching expectations for their rank and position
- Faculty members are reflective and responsive teachers, they adapt their teaching to changing environments, and they are comfortable taking risks and are rewarded for experimenting with their teaching practices
- Faculty members feel they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
- Expectations for different ranks for teaching and research faculty are clear
- Teaching is valued at hiring and promotion
- Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
- TP criteria reflect best practice and current teaching research, and are used to inform tenure and promotion decisions
- TP criteria, practice and assessment are aligned
- SFU has articulated a vision statement and principles to provide direction and common purpose around teaching and learning
- There is a clear definition of expectations for both teaching effectiveness and teaching excellence, and the standards expected for different ranks for teaching and research faculty
- A general framework for methods of teaching assessment has been adopted, which can be used to inform the work of academic units
- There is a program of professional development and support that is clearly aligned with this evaluation framework
- The University has established a support system to provide formative feedback and instructional development to all interested faculty
- There is a program of support and/or training for all those involved in the review process
- The expectations, evaluation framework, and support mechanisms are regularly reviewed
- Institutional policies regarding teaching and learning are regularly examined and revised
- Appropriate resources, including the CEE, are tasked with supporting the advancement of teaching and learning throughout the university
IX. Conclusions

The Teaching Assessment Working Group met for a period of twenty months from September 2017 to April 2019. During that time, members reviewed recent SFU reports related to assessment of teaching, invited several experts to present to the community, met with various groups within the community, and discussed ways to build a culture where teaching is valued.

Teaching is a multifaceted activity and we must consider a comprehensive approach to understanding and valuing teaching. This includes using multiple methods to assess teaching. We support the SETCWG recommendations that, to assess teaching, multiple methods, multiple sources, and multiple points in time should be applied. We recommend that academic units focus on formative assessment of teaching for new assistant professors and lecturers during the early part of the faculty member’s career. We recommend that academic units perform a comprehensive, summative assessment at the time of promotion to associate professor or senior lecturer and at the time of promotion to full professor or university lecturer. These processes will require additional expertise and work on the part of faculty and TPCs and should be supported by training – through workshops and on-line material – for faculty and TPC members.

To ensure that teaching is valued, faculty members need to hear a consistent message from chairs and other administrators that this is indeed the case – teaching needs to impact hiring and promotion and faculty should have access to training that supports their needs and interests. Addressing these issues requires the attention of faculty members, their Chairs and Directors, and their Deans. Finally, excellent teaching should be rewarded through salary increases, at promotion, and through public recognition.
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### XI. Appendices

#### Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations

**Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Statement on the Use of SET data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All users of SET data should understand the risks involved in using data that research has shown may systematically disadvantage some faculty members and groups of faculty for reasons that are unrelated to their teaching. SET data should be used with caution, and never as the only indicator regarding faculty teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of SET by Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utilize the four questions that are available in SETC to find out what is working, and what isn’t, in their classes, how a new format of assignments or new material was received, etc., with the idea of using the responses as a basis for their reflection of their teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use the opportunity to add contextual information as a way to reflect on their teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use mid-semester (informal) surveys for formative questions and end of semester survey for summative questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consult with experts such as their faculty’s Educational Consultant on how to word questions – in particular on how to ask questions that focus on the student experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of SET by TPCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of the different purposes of biennial reviews (competitive) and tenure/promotion decisions (summative), we are recommending using SET in different ways in the two processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TPCs should not use SET results for biennial review, because there are questions of validity and too much potential for bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TPCs may use SET results in evaluating tenure/promotion applications as one form of evidence demonstrating how students experience the applicant’s teaching, particularly changes in that experience over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of SET by Chairs and Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Use this as a tool to inform pedagogy rather than assess teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use SET results as one indicator among multiple indicators to inform teaching assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use SET results to flag outliers for further investigation – faculty who receive consistently exceptional responses may be considered for awards; faculty who receive consistently negative response may be provided with support to improve their teaching practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use SET results as one part of a broader program of collective assessment of a program to help identify changes to improve student learning and experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETC Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preamble:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use the preamble on the SETC questionnaire to educate students on the importance of SET, how it is used, and how to make useful comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual component:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Make the purpose of the instructor-related context section clearer. This could be used as an opportunity for the faculty member to reflect on their teaching – what they tried, what
worked, what didn’t. This section is currently presented as a way to influence how the results are evaluated, which is not the same thing.

**Questions:**
- Students are asked to respond to a SET survey for each class they are taking at a time when they are already busy and stressed.
  - Reduce the number of questions. The current version consists of 23 questions – 10 would be more reasonable, e.g. 3 institution questions, 3 department questions and 4 instructor questions.
  - Make sure that questions provide answers to things the institution/department/instructor are really interested in and can only find out in this way (e.g. make sure that the information is not provided by the annual student satisfaction survey)
- Revise any judgment-based questions on SETC questionnaires. Questions should be rewritten to focus on the student’s experience e.g.
  - I could understand the instructor’s explanations (instead of The course instructor explained concepts clearly)
  - I understood what was expected of me (instead of The course instructor explained grading criteria clearly)
- Questions should focus on issues that affect learning and the learning experience e.g.
  - I feel this course is too much work
  - I cannot read the instructor’s handwriting
  - I feel I had taken the right pre-requisites to prepare for this course

**Presentation of SETC Responses**
- Reorganize presentation to condense the information
- Do not present averages, present frequency distributions with response rates
- Do not rank or compare across faculty, course formats, levels, topics or disciplines
- Provide instructors with more raw data so that they can explore, for example, cross-tabulations on pairs of questions in order to better understand the student experience in their class, while ensuring confidentiality of students is maintained

**Use of Teaching Assessment Methods Beyond SET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow the five principles outlined in the SETCWG Report (SETCWG, 2018)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Use multiple methods – several pieces of data and evidence should be collected using various methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use multiple sources – to increase validity, Teaching Assessment Methods from various sources should be gathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gather Teaching Assessment Methods over multiple points in time - this will increase reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. View Teaching Assessment Methods holistically – without focusing on one particular piece of data or evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A teaching assessment should align with an instructor’s career path – one single prescribed, weighted evaluation should not be used for all instructors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Units**
Work to develop guidelines for faculty members and for TPC members on which assessment methods should be used for biennial review and tenure and promotion decisions. Tables in Appendices E and F are included for guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFU and SFUFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively on further examining SFU’s current incentive system in light of the unintended impacts the system may have on accurately determining faculty performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improving the Recognition of Teaching**

### Expand and Enhance Teaching Awards at SFU

- **Increase the variety of teaching awards at the University level**
  - awards could be made in different areas such as excellence in TA development, instructional technology innovation, course development, experiential learning, risk taking, etc. in order to highlight different aspects of teaching excellence,
  - awards could target different stages of an academic career (early, mid, late), and
  - awards could target different instructor groups (faculty members, sessional instructors, TAs, TMs). For example, the University of Calgary offers awards celebrating teaching excellence in 13 different categories, including diverse learning contexts, individual and team awards, curriculum design and educational leadership.

- Review and revise the award guidelines as the criteria are vague and not in line with current standards, in particular, we should ensure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. For example, applications for University of Calgary teaching awards require a teaching dossier that includes information from the nominee, from peers, and from students.

- Encourage faculties that do not currently have a teaching award to develop one. This will both recognize teaching at the Faculty level and make sure that the Faculty’s excellent teachers are known and can be nominated for University awards.

### Expand and Enhance Recognition and Celebration of Teaching Award Winners

- For example, the visibility of teaching award winners could be increased through dinners and/or receptions, or by posting photos and bios in prominent places, such as the FASS Cormack Teaching Award Reception and Symposium.

- Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc.

- Award winners could be encouraged to open their classrooms, or could be seconded to provide professional development for their colleagues.

- Chairs should be encouraged to celebrate teaching, for example by awarding extra merit steps to award winners

### Expand and Enhance Support for Nominees and Nominators

TPCs should be encouraged to identify faculty-level nominations during biennial review or tenure/promotion process, winners of faculty-level awards should be nominated for university awards, and university award winners should be nominated for national awards.

- At each level, award winners should be counselled on what they should do to prepare for the next level of award.
Each academic unit should be encouraged to nominate a member for faculty-level awards, and each faculty should ensure that a member of the faculty is nominated for university-level awards.

A central support model should be developed for nominations for national and international awards.

### Continue and enhance other teaching recognition mechanisms at SFU

- Appointment of Faculty Teaching Fellows
- Awarding steps in biennial review associated with teaching effectiveness
- Recognition of teaching achievements in biennial review and tenure/promotion letters
- Recognition of teaching innovations in CEE newsletters
- Recognition of teaching innovation on the main SFU website and in SFU News

### Explore non-competitive criteria-based mechanisms to value and recognize the importance of teaching to the University’s mandate

These could include

- Encouraging TPCs to attach more importance to teaching at all stages of a faculty member’s career: hiring, biennial review, tenure and promotion
- Encouraging TPCs to recognize teaching outside the formal classroom – for example supervision of graduate students, field courses, and special topics courses
- Encouraging certification of professional development experiences
- Explore development of a multi-tiered teaching fellowship program

### Training and Support for Faculty and TPCs

- The CEE should offer workshops for faculty members on teaching assessment methods. We have proposed a series of four workshops (Appendix G): an overview of teaching assessment methods and practices, use of student feedback, use of peer feedback, and use of self-assessment and reflection.
- These should be part of a series of workshops for early, mid and late career faculty that provide professional development and support to faculty teaching at different stages of their careers
- Workshops for TPC members should be provided by the Associate Vice President, Learning and Teaching, working in concert with the Faculty Relations, SFUFA and the CEE. These workshops should include information on how to use different teaching assessment methods and on the inherent and systematic biases of SET.

### Recommendations for Changes to Policy and Administration

#### Changes that Academic Units Can Make

### Practices that demonstrate that teaching is valued:

- Ask candidates to give a teaching presentation as part of the hiring process
- Ensure that the hiring practice for teaching faculty is as rigorous and thoughtful as the practice of hiring research faculty in order to identify candidates of the highest calibre
- Implement a formal mentorship program to support new faculty as they start teaching (Teaching Fellows and/or CEE Educational Consultants to help)
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- Encourage formative assessment before tenure and promotion, i.e. year 3 for Assistant Professor or Lecturer, as this is a particularly important time in a faculty member’s professional development
- Provide formative assessment on promotion to Associate Professor or Senior Lecturer – what can they work on as they prepare for promotion to Professor or University Lecturer? (This will probably have to occur after the promotion decision)

- Encourage award-winning teachers to open their classrooms to new instructors
- Ensure that representation of teaching faculty on TPCs reflects the ratio of teaching to research faculty in the Academic Unit (this may require changes to the Collective Agreement)
- Use the biennial review process to
  - identify faculty members to recommend for teaching awards, or other recognition
  - recognize teaching innovations
  - recognize educational leadership projects
- Assign step awards based on both teaching and research; make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award
- Set aside time at every department or school meeting to discuss teaching issues, e.g. through issues raised by the curriculum committees, or through sharing by faculty members of new ideas they have tried or come across
- Encourage formation of a Teaching Circle in your department (e.g. Biology)

Practices that improve assessment of teaching:
- Academic units should review their unit’s tenure/promotion criteria related to teaching.
- Clarify that all departmental criteria are in addition to the university criteria
- Clarify how your academic unit views graduate supervision – including senior supervisor, member of supervisory committees, and internal/external reviewer
- Recognize and value professional development, including professional development that leads to certification, and recognize supervision of student projects or group work, interdisciplinary teaching, and community-engaged teaching
- Recognize and reward risk taking and experimentation with teaching practices
- Clarify what your academic unit means by satisfactory, successful, excellent, and outstanding teaching
- Include information about the evidence used in the biennial review process in the unit’s TP criteria and focus on evidence of teaching effectiveness specific to the short-term process of biennial assessment
- Define the teaching assessment framework that will be used to evaluate teaching – including details of the tools and processes to be used, and an example of each (See Appendix E and F)
- Encourage TPC members to participate in training on how to assess teaching (see Section VII Training and Support)

Suggestions of ways to manage workload
- Focus on doing the most thorough reviews at year 3 at the time of contract renewal and/or in the year before promotion
- Consider doing salary reviews every three years after promotion to Full Professor or University Lecturer, or perhaps throughout one’s entire career (would need to be part of the Collective Agreement)
- Provide training to TPC members on how to evaluate teaching-related data to help them work more efficiently
- Provide rubrics for evaluation
- Provide exemplars of high-quality teaching and portfolios

**Actions for Deans**

- Review departmental criteria for teaching carefully to ensure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive. During the review process, encourage TPC Chairs to make sure that contributions to teaching impact the step award. Send biennial review (BR) and tenure/promotion (TP) cases back if there is not sufficient evidence for effective teaching.
- Encourage cross-disciplinary review and sharing of departmental TP criteria and make sure that Academic Units realize that departmental TP criteria are now available online.
- Ensure that your Faculty has teaching awards, that the award guidelines are clear, and that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. Be sure to encourage all of your Academic Units to submit teaching award nominations. Celebrate award winners.
- Make sure that you have a full complement of Teaching Fellows and that their roles are clear.

**Actions for the VPA/AVPLT**

- Review recommendations from previous reports (TFTL, 2010; TCEP, 2013; SETCWG, 2018) to make sure that progress has been made
- Enable the development of additional methods of assessing teaching, for example peer evaluation
- Explore shifting from a summative to a formative system that encourages positive change
- Review the award guidelines for the University Awards to make sure that the criteria take a comprehensive and holistic approach to teaching assessment. Consider increasing the variety of awards available. Celebrate award winners.
- Initiate a review of departmental criteria for tenure and promotion that is designed to focus on teaching criteria and teaching assessment. Review the revised criteria carefully to make sure that teaching assessment is multi-faceted and comprehensive.
- Ask the Deans to encourage TPCs to attach more importance to teaching at the time of biennial reviews and promotion and ask them to turn back biennial review and promotion cases that do not indicate that teaching has been assessed comprehensively.
- Extend the orientation period for new faculty and encourage the establishment of a year-long series of workshops addressing issues facing new faculty.

**Institutional Support**

- Make sure that the new CV System can collect more teaching-related information to support faculty in their reflection on their teaching and help them prepare teaching material for BR and TP
- Collect and make available examples of best practice
- Encourage a scholarly approach to teaching
- Support development of a peer assessment program
- Highlight teaching successes and innovation in University and Faculty newsletters, web pages, etc.
- Provide opportunities to present teaching innovations at yearly sharing events
- Provide institutional support for faculty who wish to apply for external funding for teaching-related research
- Provide funding to attend conferences related to teaching

Resources

- Resources are required for: Collection of additional teaching assessment data, e.g. peer or expert observation, video analysis, surveys of alumni, student input beyond SETC such as focus groups or exit surveys
- Faculty members require support and professional development – this requires support of the CEE and the ISTLD
- TPCs require support, e.g. training in evaluating teaching submissions and peer assessment
- Develop ways to manage TPC workload – we have heard that there is not enough time to do a good job. Could TPC members be relieved from other service obligations? Could the workload of Chairs/Directors be reduced? We have made a couple of suggestions in the section “Changes that Academic Units Can Make”
- Provide the resources the CEE needs to present workshops, teaching assessment activities (including peer assessment and SET), educational consultants with disciplinary knowledge
- Continue support for faculty-led inquiry

Reporting and Review

- We recommend that the AVPLT enlist the support of Senate, through the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning, the Centre for Educational Excellence, and other local structures already in place to support teaching and learning,
- Compare how merit steps are awarded to teaching and research faculty to make sure that there are no discrepancies
- Initiate a review of the impacts of the project within five years. Repeat the two surveys – the survey of TPCs conducted by the SETCWG and the survey of faculty members conducted by TAWG – to measure change of culture
- Revise these recommendations as the SFUFA/SFU Collective Agreement evolves
Appendix B: TAWG Terms of Reference

Teaching Assessment Working Group
Strategies to Value Effective Teaching

Terms of Reference

Preamble

Some 54 Tenure and Promotion Committees (TPC’s) exist across SFU each charged with reviewing faculty performance and providing recommendations. Each TPC develops review criteria consistent with their Faculty and disciplinary needs.

Faculty members are evaluated and promoted based on their performance in three areas as set out in the SFU-Faculty Collective Agreement, Section 28.5. These areas are Research, Teaching, and Service. Although the distribution of these areas is not mentioned in the collective agreement it is generally considered to be 40% Research, 40% Teaching and 20% Service for research faculty and 80% Teaching, 20% Service for teaching faculty (these percentages may vary depending on expectations).

In general, the metrics used to evaluate the research component are well known, consistent, and relatively straightforward to apply. The evaluation of teaching practice and related metrics are not as well known across disciplines and, in practice, may not be as consistent or as straightforward to apply. It is the belief of this working group that TPC’s are committed to valuing teaching by fairly evaluating all components of a faculty members’ teaching practice but may lack a consistent set of evaluation tools to choose from. It will beneficial to all to review best practices locally, at other institutions, and as identified in the literature and to share these with the SFU academic community.

Purpose of Working Group

The charge of this working group is to provide a set of strategies to value teaching practice and recommendations to facilitate consistency, flexibility, and robustness of reviews of teaching practice that are useful and usable by Faculty, Chairs, Tenure and Promotion Committees (TPCs), and Deans.

Scope

The working group should identify current practice and issues of concern by considering the following:

1. Review of current Departmental TP Criteria to determine the types and ways in which teaching practice are being evaluated,
2. Review of current University Criteria,
3. The experiences of TPC Chairs and Deans,
4. The experiences of a sample of faculty members who have been reviewed,
5. The experiences of other groups e.g. SFUFA, SCUTL, Faculty Relations.

The working group should explore alternatives to current practice by considering, for example, the following:
1. Best practices at SFU including the types and range of strategies being used,
2. Best practices at other institutions in Canada including the types and range of strategies being used,
3. Recent literature relevant to faculty teaching reviews.

The working group will work to advance awareness of alternatives by considering, for example, the following:
1. Workshops for faculty with experts,
2. Promotion of discussions at department meetings,
3. Development of a website of resources

The working group will write a report summarizing their findings and develop a set of recommendations for different stakeholders regarding:

1. Strategies to celebrate teaching excellence,
2. A broad and flexible set of teaching competencies,
3. Methods for formative and summative evaluation of teaching,
4. Support for faculty including submission templates,
5. Clarification of Departmental and general University criteria,
6. Strategies to increase efficacy, fairness and efficiency,
7. Strategies to promote sustainability of the initiative.

**Committee Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Frisken (Chair)</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Johnson (Director)</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Gajdamaschko</td>
<td>Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panayiotis Pappas</td>
<td>Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) 2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Day</td>
<td>SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Spear</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Cukierman</td>
<td>Faculty of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Abramson</td>
<td>Beedie School of Business (2017-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Ahadi</td>
<td>Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Laitsch</td>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Perkins</td>
<td>Faculty of Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Report of the Teaching Assessment Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diego Silva</td>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Thorpe-Dorward</td>
<td>Faculty Relations (Ex-Officio) (2017-2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Goals for improving how we assess and value teaching

TAWG developed goals in three main areas, for faculty members, academic units, and the University, that we believe will improve the way we value and assess teaching. These goals were distributed to the community in early 2018 for consideration as academic units and faculties drafted their 2019-2024 Academic Plans. TAWG also used these goals to develop the strategies and recommendations to build a culture at SFU where teaching is valued that are outlined in this report. The goals addressed by recommendations in each of the five categories are summarized at the end of the appropriate section.

The goals are that:

1. Faculty members are reflective practitioners within a community of teaching
   - They are aware of teaching expectations for their rank and position
   - They are reflective and responsive teachers
   - They adapt their teaching to changing environments
   - They are comfortable taking risks and are rewarded for experimenting with their teaching practices
   - They feel they are part of a culture where teaching is valued
   - Outstanding teaching is celebrated

2. Academic units value and reward teaching as one of the primary academic responsibilities
   - Expectations for different ranks for teaching and research faculty are clear
   - Teaching is valued at hiring and promotion
   - TPCs have the tools and knowledge to value effective teaching
   - Multiple teaching assessment methods are integrated into the work of TPCs
   - Departmental TP criteria reflect best practice and current teaching research, and are used to inform tenure and promotion decisions; criteria, practice and assessment are aligned
   - Academic units identify and promote their best teachers for faculty, university, national, and international teaching awards

3. The University provides support to faculty members and academic units for the design, development, delivery, and evaluation of effective teaching
   - SFU has articulated a vision statement and principles to provide direction and common purpose around teaching and learning
   - The capacity to understand teaching and evaluate it well is present in all steps in the process
   - There is a clear definition of expectations for both teaching effectiveness and teaching excellence, and the standards expected for different ranks for teaching and research faculty
   - A general framework for methods of teaching assessment has been adopted, which can be used to inform the work of academic units
   - There is a program of professional development and support that is clearly aligned with this evaluation framework
   - The University has established a support system to provide formative feedback and instructional development to all interested faculty
   - There is a program of support and/or training for all those involved in the review process
   - The expectations, evaluation framework, and support mechanisms are regularly reviewed
   - Institutional policies regarding teaching and learning are regularly examined and revised
   - Appropriate resources, including the TLC, are tasked with supporting the advancement of teaching and learning throughout the university
Appendix D: Definitions

There are a number of terms used to describe teaching and assessment. In this report, we used the definitions below; departments may use these as a starting point as they work to define terms that are relevant to their discipline and context.

**Formative Assessment** – ongoing feedback that is designed and used to promote growth or improvement in the person’s performance

**Summative Assessment** – an evaluation designed to present conclusions about the merit or worth of a person’s performance

**Effective Teaching**

Section 28.5 of the 2014-2019 SFU/SFUFA Collective Agreement states:

“Success as a teacher is of fundamental importance for evaluating the performance of a faculty member. Matters which should be taken into consideration in evaluating teaching include **mastery of the subject, generation of enthusiasm in students, maintenance of appropriate academic standards, dedicated involvement within one's field(s), openness to innovation, graduate supervision, and development of academic programs.**”

This is consistent with accepted definitions of effective teaching in the field. For example, Gravestock (2011, p 54) states

“In general, it is agreed that an effective teacher should be:

- Organized and prepared for class;
- Knowledgeable about and demonstrate a strong interest in the subject matter;
- Able to motivate students;
- Fair and reasonable in their evaluation of student work;
- Able to assist with and encourage student learning;
- Able to encourage discussion;
- Dynamic and energetic in the classroom and possess effective presentation skills; and,
- Interested in their students learning.”

For more information, Gravestock references a more complete definition published by Queen’s University in 1995, which is reproduced in Gravestock’s thesis (Gravestock, 2011, Appendix G, p 347).

**Scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL)** – “The systematic study of teaching and/or learning and the public sharing and review of such work through presentations, performance, or publications.”

McKinney, p39. From [https://www.stlhe.ca/sotl/what-is-sotl/](https://www.stlhe.ca/sotl/what-is-sotl/)


---

Active research – research in teaching and learning in one’s own classroom

Scholarly teaching – teaching informed by research /scholarship of teaching and learning (UBC Collective Agreement)

Excellent teaching and outstanding teaching – These two terms are used to describe teaching expectations for promotion at SFU but are not defined in the SFUFA/SFU Collective agreement. They are generally used to describe teaching that exceeds expectations for effective teaching. Excellent teaching is sometimes described as being a combination of effective and scholarly teaching. In general, each academic unit will need to define these terms in the context of disciplinary norms in order to make it clear what is expected for promotion to senior academic positions within the academic unit. The Criteria for Promotion recently approved by the Faculty of Education in December 2018 (Faculty of Education, 2018) provide a comprehensive example.

Innovative teaching – introducing or applying practices that are new to them or to their classroom

Educational leadership

Educational leadership is the process of influencing colleagues, students, and SFU administration to improve student learning. It includes leadership in the exploration of instructional strategies and student learning; mentorship of colleagues; and the creation, development, and/or implementation of policies, initiatives, and programs within the University to enhance student learning and teaching practice.

Two other terms are used to define teaching – quality teaching and successful teaching – but we believe that these are captured in the terms above and have avoided using them.
Appendix E: Guidance for use of teaching assessment methods by faculty members

This table was created by Daria Ahrensmeier to help faculty members systematically collect information and document the scope, effectiveness and progression of their teaching. It is meant for personal reflection and professional development, but can also be used for biennial review and/or tenure/promotion processes. Departments may also use the table to generate discussion about the aspects of teaching they can assess and value, and the ways in which they might operationalize the assessment. The table reorganizes the 73 teaching assessment methods described in the SETCWG Report (SETCWG, 2017, Chapter 5) from a user’s point of view. The format encourages reflection and follows the guiding principles and structure of a teaching dossier. All of the documentation listed is provided/assembled by the faculty member, unless otherwise noted. Please note that this list shows a wide variety of options; what a faculty member actually includes will depend on their own interests or department requirements. Faculty and departments should refer to the details in the SETCWG report when considering these items, and are encouraged to request help and further information from the CEE (Centre for Educational Excellence). Departments should also consider Appendix F: Guidelines for use of teaching assessment methods by academic units as a scaffold for evaluation of teaching for biennial review, tenure and promotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented</th>
<th>How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included</th>
<th>Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation of Teaching and Related Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught</td>
<td>Number, type, level of courses; student population; specific responsibilities; description of student activities; teaching strategies and innovation</td>
<td>Breadth and depth of experience; use of evidence-based, research-informed practices; adaptability to audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course materials</td>
<td>Syllabus, course plan; sample lecture, sample assignment, midterm, final; grading rubrics</td>
<td>Alignment of Educational Goals, assessment, and teaching practice; use of evidence-based, research-informed practices; meaningful/authentic assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course (re)design; curriculum (re)design</td>
<td>New vs old course materials (see details above); new vs old program including curriculum map, Program Level Educational Goals</td>
<td>Consideration of Student needs and/or feedback; alignment of Educational Goals, assessment, and teaching practice; use of evidence-based, research-informed practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA training and/or supervision</th>
<th>Graduate student supervision</th>
<th>Active participation in teaching circles or communities of practice</th>
<th>Educational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included

| TA training materials | Number of students; student careers, student awards | Presentations, reports | Mentoring other instructors; creation of course materials for broader use; writing/editing textbook; creating community of practice; editor for a SOTL/DBER journal |

#### Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching

| Awareness of student needs, demands and issues the TAs may face | Awareness of graduate student needs and methods to support their success | Interest in new developments, literature, and continuous improvement including sharing experiences | Impact beyond one’s own classroom, on the larger teaching community |

### Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) and/or Discipline Based Education Research (DBER)

| Grants, projects, reports, presentations, publications |

#### Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching

| Impact on the larger teaching community through scholarly work. |

### Professional development activities related to teaching

| Documentation of participation in workshops etc; artifacts created; certificates; journals or books read |

#### Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching

| Interest in continuous improvement, learning about new developments and research; adherence to professional standards in a field |

### Teaching-related administrative work

| Committee work, program development participation |

#### Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching

| Support of teaching community; interest in program improvement to address changing needs |
### Final Report of the Teaching Assessment Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented</th>
<th>How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included</th>
<th>Why – Examples for what the documentation can illustrate about the instructor’s teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection on Current and Past Practices</strong></td>
<td>Reflections on Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching Philosophy Statement; Teaching Dossier; Reflection on own teaching in relation to SoTL or DBER literature, Teaching Perspectives Inventory etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Educational Leadership Dossier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other teaching-related Publications</strong></td>
<td>Blogs, videos, opinion pieces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes and Observations</strong></td>
<td>Course data</td>
<td>Grade distributions; attendance, retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational goals</td>
<td>Mapping of educational goals to course work and related grades or other assessment</td>
<td>Degree of achievement of educational goals through the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student outcomes</td>
<td>Student work samples; concept inventory (pre-/post-test) results</td>
<td>Illustration of student learning via examples or validated, reliable tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td>SETC; student focus groups, interviews (provided by CEE); instructor-developed surveys; in-class feedback; alumni feedback; testimonials</td>
<td>Student perception of the course, their learning, and the instructor’s teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA feedback</td>
<td>TA focus groups, interviews, exit survey (all provided by CEE)</td>
<td>TAs’ perception of the course, the instructor’s...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What – The kind of information that may be collected and documented</td>
<td>How – Examples for Details, specific materials and data that may be included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer feedback</td>
<td>Classroom observation with or without standardized protocol (provided by peers; training by CEE available)</td>
<td>Student engagement and interaction; use of suitable, effective methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert feedback</td>
<td>Classroom observation with or without standardized protocol (provided by CEE or, e.g., university lecturers)</td>
<td>Student engagement and interaction; use of suitable, effective, evidence-based, research-informed methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching awards</td>
<td>Awards, nominations</td>
<td>Demonstration of particular dedication to teaching, innovation etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on Future Goals</td>
<td>Reflections on future development as an instructor</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy statement; Teaching dossier; reflection on development options based on feedback and observations, inspired by literature or interactions with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for future teaching (innovation), course development, SoTL, DBER, etc</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy statement; Teaching dossier; ideas inspired by feedback and observations, community, student/department needs and/or literature</td>
<td>Seeking opportunities for professional growth as instructor to further teaching in the department and address the (changing) student needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Guidance for use of teaching assessment methods by academic units

This table organizes the SETCWG’s 73 methods for assessment of teaching (SETCWG, 2017, Tables 34 and 35, pp. 63-66) into a single table organized by methods and sources. The table focuses on three groups of assessment methods: documentation of teaching and related activities, reflections on teaching, and outcomes and observations. While Appendix E is designed to help faculty members record and document their teaching, we hope that this approach will help academic units in choosing their sources for evaluation of their colleagues’ teaching. A $ indicates methods that would need to be financially supported. Faculty and departments should refer to the full SETCWG report in considering any of these items and contact the Centre for Educational Excellence (CEE) for support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Current &amp; Former Students</th>
<th>Peer/Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation of Teaching &amp; Related</td>
<td>Courses taught</td>
<td>Student work</td>
<td>Review of course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Activities</td>
<td>Course (re)design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of SoTL/DBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate student supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T.A. training/supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching &amp; Learning (SoTL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and/or Discipline Based Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research (DBER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on Teaching: 1) Current &amp;</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy (why do you do what you do in the classroom?)</td>
<td>Faculty-developed surveys</td>
<td>Pre- &amp; post-observation meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Practices 2) Future Goals</td>
<td>Narrative reflection on teaching activities &amp; practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes &amp; Observations</td>
<td>Video analysis $</td>
<td>Number/calibre of students supervised</td>
<td>Peer observation $ \ $ Expert (CEE, University Lecturers) observation $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Recommendations for workshops for faculty members

This Appendix describes four workshops designed to introduce faculty members to different methods of teaching assessment. The workshops were designed by Daria Ahrensmeier and Sarah Turner from TLC in collaboration with TAWG and were piloted at the Symposium for Teaching and Learning on May 15 and 16, 2019, at SFU’s downtown campus.

Design overview and considerations

- Workshops should illustrate that instructors’ professional development and the reflection on and presentation of their development and achievements are complementary processes.
- Correspondingly, the workshops should provide guidance on how to implement the various teaching assessment methods, how to analyze the resulting data, and how to present the results, including reflection. They should also illustrate pros and cons of each method and their limitations.
- The workshops should offer face-to-face options as well as online materials for self-study/review, including exemplars for instructors at various ranks/career stages and from various disciplines.
- The sessions should be short (typically no more than 2 hours), with each session focused on one topic.
- For the workshops to be efficient, departments should be strongly encouraged to discuss their view of effective teaching so that instructors can use that view as a guideline.
- It is important that these sessions are both supported from the bottom up, i.e. including faculty voices in the creation and development of each module, and top down. It is recommended that there be clear support of these initiatives by the VPA, AVPTL and directors and chairs.

Draft Timeline (2019/2020)

- Design sessions, supplementary material, outreach strategy: Jan – April
- Book space, promote sessions, plan evaluation: February and March
- Pilot newly developed sessions at the Teaching and Learning Centre’s Symposium: May
- Revise and refine, using feedback from participants and consultations with stakeholders: June - August
- Begin offerings and create supplementary/online materials: September – April

Module 1: Teaching Assessment – An Overview

While there are multiple options for teaching assessment beyond student course evaluations, not many of them are currently being used at SFU. The goal of this workshop is to provide an overview of these options, how they can be implemented, their pros and cons, and the type, breadth and depth of information they can provide, including their limitations. We will also address how instructors can use the results for continuous improvement of their teaching, where they can find support for implementation and analysis, and what a TPC will likely be looking for in their assessment.

Faculty members should expect an initial increase in workload when implementing these methods, but the workshops will illustrate the benefits that make up for it: a combination of multiple methods (e.g. surveys, observations, reflection) and data sources (students, peers, self) at several points in time is not
only suggested in SFU policies, it is also widely seen as a more nuanced, fair and realistic approach that allows for interpretation within the context of an individual instructor’s career path.

Module 2, with Kiran Bisra: Student Feedback on Teaching
Collecting meaningful, relevant and timely student feedback on teaching can lead to improvements and further development of an instructor’s teaching practice. Methods of collecting this feedback are varied, and include student course evaluations (including SETC instructor-selected questions), mid-term instructor-designed surveys (distributed early enough to make adjustments), and student focus groups (conducted by an educational consultant, TA’s or Peers), or class observations by trained undergraduate students.

Participants will learn how to identify key aspects of the learning experience they would like feedback about, how to use survey question design principles to craft questions about those aspects, distill and analyze survey results, and how to use this data to improve their students’ learning experience.

Module 3: Peer Feedback – Approaches to Design
Teaching assessment by peers provides a complementary angle to student assessment and can contribute to a more holistic picture of an instructor’s practice. While formative peer assessment has recently become more popular at SFU and elsewhere, many questions regarding the process still remain. This session examines the goals and scope of peer observation as well as models, options and guidelines for performing and for receiving peer feedback.

Participants will evaluate the benefits and limitations of these models and discuss how to document and extract information, as well as how to present findings. Faculty members who have implemented peer assessment processes will share their own experiences highlighting the various ways they have made the workload both sustainable and manageable. Special attention will be paid to the various ways these experiences have informed instructors’ practice and creative models for sharing and showcasing the learning from peer feedback.

Module 4: Teaching Philosophy Statements and Dossiers
The commonly used format for documenting an instructor’s teaching effectiveness, progress, and self-reflection is the teaching dossier, which includes the teaching philosophy statement.

In this workshop, participants will get started on preparing their own dossier and philosophy by reviewing the typical structure and content of teaching dossiers, and comparing several examples from a variety of disciplines and career stages. They will start to create their Philosophy of Teaching statement, discuss approaches for documenting teaching activities and effectiveness as well as reflections, and engage in peer review of the results. They will also learn what to look for when assessing another instructor’s teaching dossier, and where to find support.

Follow-Up session: Drop-in session for participants to receive feedback on their teaching dossier drafts
Appendix H: Examples / templates

1. TP Criteria related to teaching assessment
   a. Department of History
   b. Faculty of Education
2. Informal course survey of students, not led by instructor
   a. Student focus group – SETCWG Appendix D7
   b. Small group instructional diagnosis – SETCWG Appendix D8
3. Informal course survey of students, led by instructor
   a. Student Feedback TAE – SETCWG Appendix D6
   b. Muddiest point – SETCWG Appendix D9
   c. One minute paper – SETCWG Appendix D9
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate
FROM: Jeff Derksen,
Chair of Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)
RE: New Course Proposal

DATE: April 30, 2020

For information:
Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of April 7, 2020, SGSC approved the following new course, effective Spring 2021:

Faculty of Science
Department of Physics
1) New course: PHYS 816 Quantum Information

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682
MEMORANDUM

ATTENTION: Senate

DATE: April 30, 2020

FROM: Jeff Derksen,
Chair of Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)

RE: Course Changes

For information:
Acting under delegated authority at its meeting of April 7, 2020, SGSC approved the following curriculum items, effective Spring 2021:

Faculty Communication, Art and Technology
Department of Publishing
  1) Course change (deletion): PUB 897 Internship Project Report

Faculty of Health Sciences
  2) Course change (title, description): HSCI 803

Senators wishing to consult a more detailed report of curriculum revisions may do so on the Senate Docushare repository at https://docushare.sfu.ca/dsweb/View/Collection-12682
To: Senate

From: Kris Nordgren, Secretary
Senate Nominating Committee

Date: May 1, 2020

Subject: Senate Committee Elections

This is a summary of the nominations received and outstanding vacancies for Senate committees.

All nominations must be received by the Senate Office from the Nominating Committee in time to be included in the documentation sent out for the next Senate meeting. Senators will be informed that further nominations may be made by individual members of Senate. Any such nominations must reach the Committee Secretary the Friday before the meeting of Senate, and no further nominations will be accepted after this time. The Committee Secretary will provide members of Senate at the Senate meeting with such further nominations as may have been received. Oral nominations during the meeting of Senate will not then be allowed.

If only one nomination is received for a position, the position will be elected by acclamation. If more than one nomination is received for a position, online voting will be held during the week following the Senate meeting on Tuesday, May 19, 2020. An email will be sent to all Senators with information about the candidates and a link to the online voting system. Voting will be permitted for 48 hours and election results will be released within three days of the end of voting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>TERM (from June 1, 2019)</th>
<th>NOMINATIONS RECEIVED (after April Senate Elections)</th>
<th>CANDIDATES ELECTED (from April Senate meeting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DQAC</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAR</td>
<td>Student Senator (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIA</td>
<td>Faculty Member (Communication, Art and Technology)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Member (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCODA</td>
<td>Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUH</td>
<td>Student (at-large)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Budd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUP</td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Student Senator (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student Senator</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student Senator (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGAAC</td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGSC</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC/LPAC Dual Positions</td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Applied Sciences)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Arts and Social Sciences)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Communication, Art and Technology)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senator (Science)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCSAB/SGAAC</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student (Alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUAAC</td>
<td>Undergraduate student (alternate)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SCIA Faculty members: In the event that the Faculty Member is unable to attend, the Faculty Dean is authorized to appoint an alternate replacement.

**Abbreviations:**

- CC: Calendar Committee
- DQAC: Diverse Qualifications Adjudication Committee
- ESC: Electoral Standing Committee
- LPAC: Library Penalties Appeal Committee
- REB: Research Ethics Board
- SAB: Senate Appeals Board
- SCAR: Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- SCCS: Senate Committee on Continuing Studies
- SCEMP: Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning
- SCIA: Senate Committee on International Activities
- SCODA: Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals
- SCUH: Senate Committee on University Honours
- SCUP: Senate Committee on University Priorities
- SCUS: Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
- SCUTL: Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning
- SGAAC: Senate Graduate Awards Adjudication Committee
- SGSC: Senate Graduate Studies Committee
- SLC: Senate Library Committee
- SNC: Senate Nominating Committee
- SPCSAB: Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards & Bursaries
- SUAAC: Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee
To: Senate

From: Rummana Khan Hemani
Registrar and Executive Director, Student Enrollment

Date: April 28, 2020

Subject: Election Report to Senate (For Information)

The University Act and Rules of Senate require that the Registrar report the results of elections to Senate and the Board of Governors for information.

**Student Election to Senate**

A call for nominations was sent to all undergraduate and graduate students on January 22, 2020 for seventeen student positions on Senate for term of office from June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021.

Twenty-five nominations were received: five graduate students and twenty undergraduate students.

The election rules state that there shall be at least one student elected from each faculty and at least three undergraduate and three graduate students among the total number of students elected. Online voting resulted in the election of the following candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>Undergraduate/Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Daniel</td>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Preet Singh</td>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett Gildersleve</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Lam</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabe Liosis</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy Nguyen</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Lord Ferguson</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhi Parmar</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanishvir Singh</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samad Raza</td>
<td>Communication, Art and Technology</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Election to Board of Governors

A call for nominations was sent to all undergraduate and graduate students on January 22, 2020 for two student positions on the Board of Governors: one undergraduate student, elected by and from the undergraduate student body, and one graduate student, elected by and from the graduate student body, for term of office from June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021.

Four undergraduate student nominations were received and online voting resulted in the election of Corbett Gildersleve to the undergraduate student position on the Board of Governors.

Two graduate student nominations were received and online voting resulted in the election of Alexandra Gunn to the graduate student position on the Board of Governors.

Student Election to Senate Graduate Studies Committee

A call for nominations was sent to all graduate students on January 22, 2020 for four graduate student positions (2 regular, 2 alternate) on the Senate Graduate Studies Committee for term of office from June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021.

The nominations were received and the following candidates were elected by acclamation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Lam</td>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Nordgren</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the SGSC terms of reference, post-election vacancies will be filled by election by Senate.
**Faculty Election to Senate**

A call for nominations was sent to all faculty members on March 9, 2020 for faculty positions on Senate. The following candidates were elected by and from faculty members jointly by acclamation for term of office from June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2023:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Brennand</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Coleman</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Leznoff</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following candidates were elected by and from the respective faculties by acclamation for term of office from June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2023:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Chapman</td>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corina Andreoiu</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A call for nominations will be issued during the Summer 2020 term to fill the remaining vacancies by and from the faculties jointly: one position from Communication, Art and Technology, one position from Education, and one position from Health Sciences.

A call for nominations will be issued during the Summer 2020 term to fill the remaining vacancies elected by and from the respective faculties: one position from Arts and Social Sciences, one position from Business, one position from Education, and one position from Health Sciences.

For a summary of all the nominations received and the positions filled on Senate committees and Faculty College resulting from the faculty call on March 9, 2020, please go to:

http://www.sfu.ca/students/elections/faculty.html

**Convocation Election to Senate**

A call for nominations for four convocation member positions on Senate was posted on March 6, 2020. Seven nominations were received and the following candidates were elected/re-elected through an online vote for term of office from June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2023:

- Matt Martell
- Rob McTavish
- Colin Percival
- Stephen Spector