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Process Overview

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

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

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

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

(1) Health

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

(2) College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning

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

(3) Language Training

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

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

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

The Task Force released its Discussion Document (a previous version of this report) on December 17, 2007. Since that time we have held four Open Forums and received a variety of written and verbal responses. In total, more than 125 members of the University community joined us in person, or on-line, in the Open Forum consultation process. We have also received a response from the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association that was based on a member’s survey, although we have not been advised of the number of individuals the feedback contained in the report may represent. In addition to public consultation processes, the Task Force also held discussions on the report with the Senate Committee on University Priorities, as well as the Academic Chairs/Directors meeting group, and the Deans and Vice Presidents.
Generally, the Task Force is of the view that the major brushstrokes of its recommendations were supported and well received by the University community. Notwithstanding a generally positive reception, there were several areas of the report that attracted considerable discussion and important issues and concerns were raised. We summarize the major areas as follows:

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

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

Major Structural Recommendations of the Task Force

Overview

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

- the elimination of the existing Faculty of Applied Sciences
• the creation of three new Faculties:
  o Faculty of Communication, Art and Design (name to be determined) consisting of the Schools of Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts & Technology and the Master of Publishing Program
  o Faculty of Engineering and Computing, comprised of the Schools of Engineering Science and Computing Science
  o Faculty of Environment and Sustainability (name to be determined)\(^1\) initially comprised of the School of Resource and Environmental Management, the Department of Geography, the Environmental Science Program restructured into a new Department of Environmental Sciences, the Centre for Sustainable Community Development, and the Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies.

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

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

• the future development of an Institute for Advanced Scholarship

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

New Faculties

Faculty of Engineering and Computing

\(^1\) The new Faculty will have to be identified through a collaborative naming process. The term “Sustainability” is important to the Centre for Sustainable Development and to the Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies. Resource and Environmental Management would like a name that is communicative of the interdisciplinary vision of the Faculty and the plans for integrating environmental research and teaching across the arts, humanities, and social, applied, and natural sciences. The Department of Geography clearly prefers the straightforward name Faculty of Environment. During the activities of Working Group 3 and the Task Force, we considered various names for the new Faculty. To some the term, “Faculty of Environment” conveys a historic conceptualization of study in the environment that existed during the 1970s. To others, the term sustainability potentially communicates a passing trend and a framework of activism that is not seen as suitable for a permanent structural entity within the University. The Task Force view is that the term must be chosen so as to communicate effectively to the external community that the initiative in the environment at Simon Fraser University is built upon a vision of integration across the disciplines, that deals with problem-centered topics, and which speaks to a broadly conceived scope of activity. For reference throughout the remainder of the report we will simply call the new Faculty the “Environment Faculty” so as to demonstrate no position on the name by the Task Force.
The original submissions of the Schools of Engineering Science and Computing Science called for the creation of a new Faculty comprised of their two units. In its examination of issues, Working Group 1 created a list of six potential structural configurations that might effectively house these units. (WG 1 report, p. 9) Four critical issues needed to be answered: (1) To what extent does the vision for the future of the University wish to strategically highlight Computing and Engineering?; (2) Should Simon Fraser University integrate a more comprehensive notion of computational sciences through the inclusion of departments such as Mathematics and Statistics & Actuarial Science?; (3) What is the likelihood of success and distinctiveness of a Faculty comprised of the Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science within a national context?; and, (4) What is distinct about their arguments within the internal SFU context? We have the overriding fifth question that we must assess for all proposals: that being, how would a new Faculty of Engineering and Computing help Simon Fraser University exemplify the four qualities that we wish to define ourselves by in 2025?

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

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

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

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

Given the technological and computational focus of both of the Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science, the Task Force considered the option of placing Computing Science and Engineering Science in closer proximity to the Department of Mathematics. This could be accomplished either by moving the Schools of Engineering Science and Computing Science to the Faculty of Science or by the realignment of Mathematics to a new Faculty structure comprised of the three units. The most comprehensive set of multidisciplinary collaborations both in research and teaching for the School of Computing Science actually exists with the Department of Mathematics. We note that this strong collaborative environment is effectively managed across Faculty boundaries and thus, we do not see Faculty boundary divisions as an obstacle that requires redress by us. Importantly, the Department of Mathematics has equally, if not stronger, interconnections with the Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science and thus any re-conceptualization of the location of Mathematics would by necessity require the realignment of Statistics and Actuarial Science as well. Notably, both departments are thriving within the Faculty of Science and are contributing significantly to the overall profile and strength of that Faculty and to the goals of Simon Fraser University for the year 2025 with regard to the nature of the faculty complement, undergraduate and graduate student experience, and outreach and engagement with our communities. As a consequence, we do not believe any structural proposal that would potentially jeopardize this success, is warranted or justified. We would also note that the preeminent example of the combination of Computing and Mathematics occurred at the University of Waterloo some forty years ago. It has led, by all accounts, to exceptional success for the institution. It is not clear, however, that the opportunities that presented themselves forty years ago, are necessarily still in place today, and therefore a move in the direction of bringing these disciplines together in a structural way may have had its moment in history.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendation 1: That a Faculty of Engineering and Computing be established.
Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Communication, and Design (name to be determined)

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

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

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

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

The School of Communication attracts one of the largest departmental undergraduate student complements in the University and it has established a prominent national
reputation for excellence. Further its undergraduate student enrolment has increased by over 25% in the last five years alone. Notwithstanding this success, there will be several recruitment challenges for the School of Communication in the future. Undergraduate communications programs are dramatically expanding within the British Columbia University College system at institutions such as Malaspina, Kwantlen, and Capilano. While there are currently restrictions on these programs enabling them to offer only two years of study in communications, it is anticipated that there will be a move toward full baccalaureate offerings within the BC College System in the not-too-distant future. Further, increased competition is in evidence from the emergence of new initiatives in communications programming and research at universities such as Ryerson, York and the University of Calgary. As the Working Group 4 noted, “The University that will rise to lead the nation will be one that is (a) clearly distinctive from competitors, (b) provides students with an exceptional learning experience, and (c) builds interdisciplinary understanding upon core disciplinary strength. It is a critical moment and opportunity for the future of Simon Fraser University’s School of Communication.” (WG 4 Report, p. 18)

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

Created in 2003, the School of Interactive Arts and Technology has become one of the leaders in Canada in a field where art, technology, and design converge. Since 2003, a number of institutions have emerged on the stage to share the prominence of this integrated trilogy. While we believe that Simon Fraser University’s School remains a leader, we also feel it critical that its development be nurtured, and its maturity facilitated, so as to assure its leadership position for the future. This requires, in our view, the positioning of the School within an environment that is defined by its shared philosophical orientation to the value of art, design and technology; to the commitment to interdisciplinarity and pedagogical innovation; to the recognized contributions of art and art making, natural and applied science, and theoretical and epistemological research. While the School has endeavored to create an environment of internal balance among its elements, it is equally critical to the School to have external balance in its neighboring community of units. The addition of the School of the Contemporary Arts into the new Faculty will provide important connectivity to art and design elements within SIAT. There is, however, a perceived gap by the technology area to have lost some of its external balance by the removal of the Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science. It will be critical to develop “expressways” (to quote the Director of SIAT) between the two Faculties, and the proposed new collaborative programming in the IT/ICT area (see Volume IV) should be expeditiously developed and based at the Surrey campus.
The Master of Publishing Program has earned a national reputation as a leader in the publishing industry in Canada. Its unique approach to professional programming, its quality, and its head-start in the field, have contributed to significant success. Should the Publishing activities of the University be consolidated under a single umbrella hosted by the Publishing Program – including the Master of Publishing Program, the Undergraduate Minor in Publishing, and the Writing and Publishing Program in Continuing Studies - we believe this would lead to a more expansive and potentially greater presence for Publishing Studies at Simon Fraser University in the future. We explore program amalgamation in Volume IV of this report.

Opportunities for inter-unit collaboration by the Schools of Communication, Contemporary Arts, Interactive Arts and Technology and the Publishing Program, would be prevalent within a new Faculty. Examples of potential programs include Screen Studies; Technology and Society; Citizenship and Democracy in a Globalizing World; Global Media and Communication; Information Technology; Publishing and Technology\(^2\); and Sport, Commerce, Culture and Community, to name just a few.

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

Importantly we note that there is almost total unanimity\(^3\) within all four of the units that a new Faculty comprised of their units would provide an excellent academic environment for their success as researchers and educators.

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

---

**Environment Faculty**

The environment has emerged as a dominant global issue that permeates our society at all levels. Environmental concerns will increasingly influence the way people live on the planet and shape global aspirations for improving human wellbeing and health. The University is uniquely positioned to contribute to the global environmental challenge. This is because of its key role in education and research as well as its inherent quality of universality which puts the university in the unique position of housing expertise in the

---

\(^2\) This labeling by the Working Group is intended as a representation of potential collaborations that would explore the evolving technology in the publishing industry. It is not a term originating from the Master of Publishing Program.

\(^3\) Voting results on motions to participate in a new Faculty resulted in only three (3) faculty members from all Schools not supporting a motion for inclusion and two (2) faculty members abstaining from the vote.
many areas of sciences and humanities relevant to addressing environmental problems. Furthermore, universities recognize that to remain relevant and receive broad support from all aspects of society, it is important to respond to the need for engagement in the area of the environment.

The National Research Council of the United States in 2001 published a report entitled the “Grand Challenges in Environmental Sciences”. This report sought to identify a limited number of “major scientific tasks that are compelling for both intellectual and practical reasons, [and] that offer potential for major breakthroughs on the basis of recent developments in science and technology”. (Grand Challenges, p.2) The eight grand challenges identified were: biogeochemical cycles, biological diversity and ecosystem functioning, climate variability, hydrologic forecasting, infectious disease and the environment, institutions and resource use, land-use dynamics, and reinventing the use of materials. In the report, the National Research Council described the complexity of solving environmental problems:

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

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

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

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

More locally, there have been two recent significant activities by government with regard to environment and sustainability initiatives. In November 2007, Mr. Godfrey, the Liberal Environmental Caucus Chair, introduced into the House of Commons a National Sustainable Development Act (C-474). Notably this Act was developed within Simon Fraser University’s School of Resource and Environmental Management. Secondly, the British Columbia Provincial Government recently declared that the focus of the 2008 provincial budget will be one designed around priority environmental initiatives. The governments funding priorities are being developed on the basis of significant citizenry input (including household surveys, public consultations, and open discussion tables) and this confirms the view of the Task Force that Simon Fraser University has a critical role to play not only in addressing and researching global environmental issues but also in providing local citizens and students with comprehensive environmental understanding and education.

In response to the global environmental crisis and the actions of governments, organizations, and professional councils, North America universities are restructuring, refocusing, and re-visioning, their focus on environmental research and teaching. The range of responses is instructive. In the United States, there has been an increasing occurrence of pan-university, multidisciplinary environmental initiatives led by the large institutions such as Harvard, Stanford, and Columbia. These are often of an initiative-style model built upon dispersed disciplinary Departments, Faculties, and even Colleges, which form the coordinating nexus of a number of Institutes, Centres and programs. Typically they are topic-centered and multidisciplinary in approach and have the benefit of extraordinary levels of funding. In contrast, the Canadian University system until recently has been predominantly characterized by Faculties of Environment, Departments of Environmental Science or Departments of Environmental Studies with a clear divide between the social and natural sciences. Within the past five years, there have been three initiatives that have caught the attention of the Working Group and the Task Force. These are the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth and Resources at the University of Manitoba, the Centre for Environment at the University of Toronto, and the new Interdisciplinary School of Environment and Sustainability at the University of Saskatchewan. Each, in their own way, seeks to support a more interdisciplinary and expansive conceptualization of environment spanning the social sciences and natural

---

4 See Science article for an overview of the focus and work of these initiatives.
sciences. The move of universities towards interdisciplinary collaboration has not gone unnoticed. In a recent article, “A Threat So Big: Academics Try Collaboration”, in the New York Times (December 25, 2007), Jeff Toppin cited just a few of the major institutions such as Duke University, Arizona State University, University of California, Berkley, Rochester Institutes of Technology, Yale, and others, which all have recently developed multidisciplinary initiatives around environmental topics. Interestingly, almost all have included the word “Sustainability” in their initiative’s title. Also interesting is the significant external funding these initiatives have attracted and the way in which many of these initiatives involve collaboration with non-academic community and corporate partners.

Dr. Munro has pointed out in his report, that student undergraduate enrolment in environmental courses at Simon Fraser University has been relatively stable, and thus as overall enrolment of the University has grown, this has represented a declining proportion of our educational activity. It is unlikely that there is a lack of student interest in, or demand for, environmental programming. It may be, though, as one student described at an Open Forum, that there is such lack of clarity and direction in environmental programming at Simon Fraser University that they are studying it in spite of the obstacles that exist. Several trends point to a positive student demand scenario in the future. First, the heightened attention to environmental issues in the public is increasing prospective student awareness to the importance of research and education in the solution to the world’s environmental problems. Second, the “graying of the green generation” and the accompanying recognition that activism needs to be accompanied by scientific research is leading to an increasing need for trained environmental managers and researchers. Third, the interrelated nature of environmental problems has led to a call for a new type of research and education, one focused on the integration of disciplinary approaches to discovery and knowledge development. Fourth, movements to increase environmental education within the K-12 system within North American will lead to increased awareness about the areas of potential study and career paths available to students who pursue advanced study in the environment. Finally, a recent poll of high school counselors by Simon Fraser University resulted in 80 of 110 indicating that there would be a very positive response by prospective students to the opportunity to study in an Environment Faculty at Simon Fraser University.

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

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

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

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

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

Given the diverse types of structural elements – Departments, Independent Programs, integrative curriculum programs, and perhaps other types of curriculum initiatives in the future, the structuring of interrelationships is critical. We do not envision a Faculty that will be dominated by departments with only peripheral activity in integrated interdisciplinary programming around problem-centered issues. We envision instead a system of equally important elements – strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary units - contributing to the overall definition and distinctiveness of an Environment Faculty at Simon Fraser University. To ensure that this objective is met, we envision that the Chair/Director of each department and interdisciplinary program would have an equal voice and vote in the activities of the Faculty and would sit as equal members of a Deans Advisory Committee. The Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Committee would initially develop the blueprint for new integrative programming, the faculty complement growth associated with this plan would be directed to the new programs. Long-term decisions on growth, strategic direction, and budgetary allocation would be a matter of determination by the Dean acting in collaboration and with the advice of his/her advisory council.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have heard concerns that without the identification of specific thematic foci, and based on the original founding units identified, it is not clear where some members of the University, particularly natural scientists, might contribute and collaborate in the new Faculty as there is no clearly identifiable academic unit to which they might seek full, joint, or temporary appointment. The Task Force believes strongly that for an initiative in the Environment to be successful it must have strong participation and representation by the natural, applied, and social sciences, as well as public policy, humanities, health, education, and business. In consideration of the feedback received, the Task Force has reconsidered the way in which we had imagined the Environmental Science program to develop. We continue to believe that it should be established as an independent program within the new Faculty. We can see, however, ways in which this program might be developed further into graduate level programming and ways in which other related programs could be developed based on existing expertise of other scientists. As a consequence we believe that we should be less constraining in our conceptualization and rather than establishing a house for the existing undergraduate environmental science program alone, we should instead establish a structure that would enable that program to develop and to attract other scientists in the development of cognate environmental science type programs. In conclusion, therefore, we recommend that a Department of

5 Voting results were 3 in favour, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.
Environmental Science be established within the new Faculty, the founding constituent program of which will be the existing undergraduate environmental science program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

6 Here and elsewhere in this report we will make recommendations that particular processes be considered by Senate. We use the term “Senate” to represent the full process of review and consideration that leads to Senate approval. In no way do we wish to convey any alteration to the standard processes of consideration of approval that exist within the University.
We also recommend that given the asymmetry in unit size, the constitution of the Faculty and the policy concerning the selection of the Dean will need to be constructed to ensure fair representation and meaningful engagement of each unit in the Faculty regardless of the size of academic complement. It is also critical that faculty complement growth associated with the Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Committee blueprint be directed to new interdisciplinary programming.

Health

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

Our understanding has led us to two major observations:

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

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

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

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

Goals:
(1) That the vision for health research and teaching at Simon Fraser University be bold, and that it be deepened and expanded.
(2) That we continue to recognize the benefits of multiple perspectives and orientations to the study of health and that we recognize that contributions will be made within many disciplines and through the integration of the natural, applied and social sciences by means of problem-centered themes. We will find these across all areas of the University.
(3) That despite our diverse areas of activity in health, we retain as our utmost priority coherence and clarity in educational programming and the need for making significant contributions to society and the world through our research and discovery.
(4) That while health research and programming will exist in diverse areas across the University, Simon Fraser University must speak with a strong and single voice to the external community.
Recommendation 5: That the School of Kinesiology be relocated to the Faculty of Science.

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

Recommendation 7: That a “SFU Health Network” be established.

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

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

Faculty of Applied Sciences

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

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

College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning

Working Group 5 noted in their report that:

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

The Working Group further wrote that we need to:
“... establish Simon Fraser University as a place where students obtain an outstanding education, enriched by opportunities to engage and experience their world as preparation for their role in it.”

(page 3, Working Group 5 report)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Experiential Learning Division would have the following responsibilities:
• develop, incubate, nourish and house credit (but not degree granting) programming of an interdisciplinary, cross-Faculty character within College Programs;
• develop a portal to showcase experiential programming and learning opportunities across the University;
• serve as a reference, resource, and support centre for members of the University community seeking to develop new experiential programming; and,
• coordinate experiential credit administration and adjudication processes in the future

The Lifelong Learning Division would have the following responsibilities:

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

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

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

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

Division of Experiential Learning

There is a vast literature on “experiential learning” and “experiential education” and the Task Force does not pretend to have a complete or necessarily sophisticated

---

7 See Volume V – Structural Elements – for a detailed discussion of a College Program.
understanding of these fields. What do we mean by an “experiential” component to the educational experience of Simon Fraser University? For the Task Force, the answer probably lies somewhere between the definitions of “experiential learning” and “experiential education”. J.J. Stethno’s (1986) review of experiential learning models and D.A. Kolb’s (1984) theoretical framework of experiential learning both articulate four defining features of experiential learning: “(1) action that creates and experience, (2) reflection on the action and experience, (3) abstractions drawn from the reflection, and (4) application of the abstraction to a new experience”. Experiential education, in comparison, can be seen to build upon these four features but extends them in two important ways. First, “the transactive component between teacher and learner” is critical in experiential education. Second, experiential education, building upon the work of John Dewey, Kurt Hahn, and Paulo Freire, also seeks to “consider the larger system level issues of education such as the socio-political-economic elements in the learning environment” and encourages both learner and teacher to explore “issues of values, relationship, diversity, inclusion and community”.

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

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

We imagine an “experiential component” in its fullest sense. At the most integrative end of the spectrum we cite the residential component of medical degrees or the PDP program in our own Faculty of Education as exemplary of an experiential educational component. Less intensive, but equally representative of an experiential learning activity is the ad-hoc industrial-faculty member collaborations offered through IRMACS, or the senior undergraduate research assistantships of undergraduate students. These are integrative examples, demonstrating experiential components intimately interconnected to the disciplines. There are other examples of initiatives at Simon Fraser University that qualify for inclusion as an interdisciplinary experiential component to the learning

---

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

experience. The Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue which shares many of the qualities of experiential education in the definition presented earlier combines the features of comprehensive interdisciplinarity and significant experiential activity, with an array of social, political, economic, and community issues and values. Both student and educators are intimately involved in the overall learning experience.

The examples presented so far are less likely to come automatically to mind when one thinks of Simon Fraser University’s activities in “experiential learning”. The most commonly associated types of activities are those that can be broadly classified into our Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) unit. This unit is the area of primary responsibility and coordination for cooperative education, volunteer and internship opportunities, career planning, and more recently service learning. This latter area, commenced in August 2007, is defined by Student Services as a “type of experiential learning in which students connect their academic learning with community issues. Typically, community engagement and structured reflection is incorporated into an academic, for-credit course. Students’ academic, career, and personal development is positively impacted.” The Task Force clearly recognizes that the activities being engaged under the umbrella of work-integrated learning and international experiences (such as learning a foreign language, participating in a field school, international exchange program, or study-abroad experience) clearly fall under our vision for an experiential component to the education of Simon Fraser University students. We do not, however, have any desire for the new College that we ultimately recommend here to seek to assume responsibility for these activities nor to have the activities currently housed within Student Services relocated to the College. The College will serve both as a home to new experiential learning activities and as a conduit of connection between initiatives housed around the University. We encourage and expect that the College and Student Services will develop a strong and positive relationship with extensive interaction, just as the College must develop an integrative network of connections with disciplines across the University.

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

Simon Fraser University has long recognized the value of experiential learning. The considerable diversity of cooperative learning opportunities for students, our international field schools, and participation of students in research projects, are just a few of the ways in which we offer our students unique experiences to complement their discipline based learning. The examples and successes to date, speak to the ability of existing Faculty and administrative structures to successfully innovate and create some forms of experiential learning opportunities for students. The Cooperative Education and International Field School models are illustrative for the ways in which they combine both central infrastructure and support with connectivity to the disciplines they serve.
Over the past five years, the University has introduced the concept of a semester of study in a problem-centered area that changes from year to year. We have introduced cohort-based first year experience programs for undergraduate students. And we have mounted a new multidisciplinary graduate certificate program in Development. Despite their different foci, subject matters, and target audience, all three have two qualities in common: they seek to deepen the experience of students at the University, and they are highly interdisciplinary in design. All have been highly successful; attracting excellent students and all are being well received. But each of these learning forms has encountered considerable administrative difficulty within a structural system that is designed around disciplines.

The Task Force believes that our strengths in this area are hidden. We also believe that we should expand the opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning as part of their degree at Simon Fraser University. While there are members of the Task Force who would propose that this be a mandatory experience for students, defining of the SFU undergraduate program and that opportunities also be afforded at the graduate level, we ultimately reached the view that further exploration of this proposal is required and that we should instead conceive as a first step, the introduction of opportunities for students to obtain credit for experiential learning. This will require a thorough review of the way in which such credits fit within other changes to the undergraduate curriculum (W,Q,B), the potential impact on overall degree credit requirements, and the ways in which these experiences can be evaluated, adjudicated, implemented and coordinated. Such a review must also identify existing opportunities and ensure that they are prominently featured in an overall coherent portal of information for students. While the W-Q-B initiative focused on the undergraduate experience, we believe that there are also great opportunities to be afforded at the graduate level. For example, many students in Masters or Doctoral programs in areas of public policy, international studies, environment, health, etc. might find a semester in dialogue, a language certificate program, or a community project extremely interesting and a value-added component to their degree. Further, we can even imagine that for some students the opportunity may not present itself during their degree for a study abroad semester, international field school or language in location program, but that once they have completed their degree requirements, they might be interested in participating through an alumni program. This strategy would provide valued continued learning opportunities for our alumni as well as strengthen their connection to the University, perhaps leading to Simon Fraser University being the first choice for further post-graduate education or as an option for financial contribution.

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

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

Division of Lifelong Learning

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 9: That a College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning be established.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1: That the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning be the locus and home for the encouragement, coordination, interconnection, and development of interdisciplinary, cross-Faculty experiential learning programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.a: That the Semester in Dialogue and the Centre for Dialogue be consolidated and that they be classified as a College Program within the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.b: That the Vice President, Academic establish a Committee for Experiential Learning (CEL), and that this Committee be established with a mandate to develop a plan for introducing an experiential credit for undergraduate students. We further recommend that the CEL be mandated to submit its plan to Senate by September 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2: That the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning house the existing portfolio of Continuing Studies and Distance Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institute for Advanced Scholarship

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

Our recommendations have been designed as well to serve our vision for developing an expanded range of outstanding programmatic options for graduate students, increasing the diversity and opportunity for interdisciplinary courses of study, and being more actively engaged in the research mission of the University. Prospective graduate students in Computing Science and Engineering Science will see Simon Fraser University similar to other Canadian and US Universities – with their disciplines clustered in a focused and visible configuration of a Faculty. But unlike other institutions, they will have unique educational experiences given the foci of our Engineering and Computing disciplines. For graduate students interested in issues of Environment and Sustainability, an area of increasingly critical need of study and research within the world, our graduate students will find a clear constellation of graduate programming opportunities both within the new Environment Faculty as well as through the communication portal that will exist to ensure that there are clear pathways of study known to students. Further, the specific plan for the development of new integrative graduate programming within the Faculty
will provide our graduate students with exciting new interdisciplinary program opportunities. The structures that are being designed to bridge faculty members from across the University will also provide the strong networks of collaboration and interconnectedness that will provide for importantly diverse thesis and dissertation supervisory committees. Future graduate students from Simon Fraser University will also benefit tremendously from the programming imagined through the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning. New interdisciplinary programming and unique curriculum initiatives such as perhaps a graduate dialogue semester, international experiences, etc., will enrich their discipline based learning. And finally, the Institute for Advanced Scholarship, with a key component dedicated to the participation and membership in the Institute by graduate students, will provide the structural mechanism for more actively engaging graduate students in world leading research.

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

The final quality we sought to design our recommendations to serve was the role we envision for Simon Fraser University with respect to the local and international communities we serve. We had aspired to have Simon Fraser University become a “place where we fulfill our social responsibility to provide learning opportunities to all
members of society through a comprehensive collection of programming … where we [would] actively pursue and contribute to understanding and knowledge development in the large social and environmental problems of the world; and where we [would] provide our students with opportunities to learn with individuals, and participate in initiatives, in communities around the world”. We have recognized our social responsibility to engage in perhaps the world’s most pressing area of issues – environment and sustainability. We have appreciated the role of University’s to foster, nourish, and showcase the arts, art-making and culture within society. We have understood the continuing influence that technology is having in society. And we have chosen to coalesce our strengths in each of these areas so as to provide “neighborhoods” within Simon Fraser University dedicated to the study and knowledge development in each of these areas. The Task Force also appreciates that Universities must become increasingly interconnected with the fabric of society and must provide ways for all members of society to engage with us. In this spirit, we have developed the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning upon four critically important foundations: interdisciplinarity, experiential learning, community engagement and lifelong learning. The latter three of these, have particular import to our vital role in connecting with our communities.