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The recommendations contained throughout this report are recognizably both substantial and ambitious. As a consequence, we have attempted to carefully think our way through at least some of the issues that will arise with the implementation of the initiatives and structural changes we have identified. Over the forthcoming sections we will discuss issues of impact on faculty, staff and student complements, assess logistical issues related to our multi-campus geography, provide our best assessment as to the potential cost implications of our recommendations, and propose an implementation timeframe for their execution. We will also outline the next steps in our process, identifying opportunities for consultation with the University community and the imagined timelines for consideration by Senate and the Board of Governors.

Implementation Issues

Implementation Issues for Students, Faculty and Staff

The most important implementation issue arising from our recommendations is the potential impact of our proposals on students, faculty, and staff. We assure all members of the University community that the work of the Task Force over the past year has been carefully guided by the Senate approved principles, and notably principle 8:

8. Any proposed change to the University’s academic structure should be based on carefully considered analysis of the reasons and need for change, its impact on members of the unit as well as other academic units affected by the proposed changes, its respectfulness of members of the University community, its transparency, and its opportunity for meaningful collegial engagement throughout.

Students

Throughout our process we have attempted to seek the input and engagement of students. There has been notable engagement by student representatives from Communication, Contemporary Arts, and various of the disciplines and programs in environmental areas, and the graduate student caucus of the School of Computing Science. The engagement of these students has been critical to our understanding and consideration of the potential impact of various proposals. Generally, students have encouraged us to be forward thinking, to increase visibility and profile in the areas that we have designated for new Faculty creation, and to provide more coherent and easily navigable ways for the pursuit of their studies in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary contexts. We have been buoyed by their enthusiasm and reminded of the critical mission of the University to provide outstanding educational opportunities and experiences for students.

The most critical issues of implementation confronting the student body with regard to the academic structure recommendations we believe are as follows:
• That there will be seamlessness in the implementation of new Faculty alignments, unit relocations, and new governance relationship and that these occur in a way that ensures that educational programming remains stable and of the highest quality.
• That the degree credentials in which students are currently registered remain intact, highly respected, and internationally recognized.
• That students registered in the Bachelor of General Studies, Applied Science, will be able to complete their program of study despite the dissolution of the Faculty of Applied Sciences.

We recommend that, should Senate approve the recommendations of this report, that the above three issues be accepted as commitments that must be guaranteed to students.

As the recommendations of the Task Force also include the onset of significant new opportunities for students in terms of experiential learning and new program opportunities, we further recommend that Senate recognize the following principles for students:

• That the introduction of a system of experiential credit initiative be undertaken with careful thought for undergraduate students in its relationship to the W, Q, B initiative, and for both graduate and undergraduate students in the ways in which it will provide a value-added component to the educational experience at Simon Fraser University without leading to an overall increase in degree credit requirements.
• That the opportunities for students to pursue new educational programming that may develop in each of the new Faculties, as elsewhere in the University, be designed with appropriate structures of transference that recognize the existing educational achievements and credit learning of students at Simon Fraser University.
• That appropriate “opportunity portals” be developed so that students have greater clarity in terms of the educational opportunities that exist for them in the areas of studying health, environmental issues, language training, and in the diverse array of experiential opportunities that are available across the University.

Faculty Members

We believe that the various processes of engagement we have undertaken prior to making our recommendations are the reason why the recommendations for new Faculties have been nearly unanimously supported by faculty members in all of the directly affected units. We take this as a very positive endorsement of the merit of our proposals and the view by the academic complement that our proposals will ensure a productive, creative, and stimulating research and teaching environment for faculty members’ careers at Simon Fraser University.

Nonetheless, we also recognize that there will be a very few faculty members within directly affected units who will not see the proposed Faculty location for them as being the opportune environment for their intellectual research and teaching development and career. We believe it imperative that the University work with these individuals to ensure that suitable academic homes are found. While we recognize that there is an existing University process for relocation from one academic unit to another, we would suggest that the University develop a streamlined and expedited process for relocation. Further, we recommend that the Vice-President, Academic
identify an appropriate bridge-to-the-future style financial strategy to facilitate a smooth transition without negative consequence for the unit of departure or reception.

Staff Members

The dissolution of the Faculty of Applied Sciences is the one recommendation of the Task Force that has a direct impact on administrative, professional, technical and clerical staff. This undoubtedly has led, and will continue to lead, to a period of anxiety and uncertainty for staff members in this area. We believe, therefore, that it is fundamentally important that if the recommendations of this report are approved by Senate and the Board of Governors, that the University establish, immediately upon approval, a process of engagement, opportunity assessment, and review with all affected staff.

It is not in our power to guarantee positions to all affected staff. However, notwithstanding the limitations of our power, the creation of three new Faculties, all requiring new administrative infrastructure, should actually lead to a substantial number of additional position opportunities. As a consequence, we are highly optimistic, that all staff affected by our recommendation to dissolve the Faculty of Applied Sciences will find an opportunity for a continued employment relationship with the University.

We have confirmed with the Vice-President, Legal Affairs, that the full extent of all staff related employment policies and provincial labour regulations will be the foundation for decisions and that the University will make considerable effort to find suitable employment opportunities for all affected staff.

Implementation Issues for Administrative Areas, Systems and Infrastructure Support

The comprehensive nature of our recommendations will lead to significant transitional activities in various areas of the University’s administrative offices, processes, systems, and infrastructures. Further, the interrelated and multifaceted nature of our recommendations will require concerted leadership, management and timely execution. To effectively steer this process forward, the Vice-President, Academic will establish a Senior Administrative Implementation Steering Committee that will oversee the management and implementation of the administrative changes. This Steering Committee will be comprised of the Vice-President, Academic, Associate Vice-President, Academic, Vice-President, Legal Affairs, Vice-President, Finance and Administration, Vice-President, Research, Associate Vice-President, Students and International, Chief Information Officer, Director, University Secretariat, Registrar and Senior Director, Student Enrollment, and Project Coordinator. A Working Group will also be established with membership from Human Resources, Academic Relations, Budgeting, Financing, Institutional Research and Planning, Graduate Studies, Student Services, and others as required.

While we cannot identify all administrative and implementation issues that will be undertaken, we are aware of at least the following categories:
• Academic leadership search processes for Faculty Deans, Dean of the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning, Director of Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration
• Staff searches for administrative offices of new Faculties
• Substantive changes to academic and research policies resulting from the direct recommendations of our report
• Changes to Senate Committee and Subcommittee membership and elections processes
• Editorial changes to academic, administrative and personnel policies that reference academic structural entities, bodies, or representatives
• Changes to registration systems, enrollment processes, calendar changes, advising, recruitment materials
• Degree designation matters including potentially new degree designations, grandfathering for Bachelor of General Studies, Applied Science and Applied Science degrees
• Financial systems changes and budget redistribution across new Faculties
• Personnel system changes and notifications for academic, professional and clerical staff
• Significant programming and reports changes by Institutional Research and Planning to ensure ongoing meaningful institutional data records
• Re-categorization process for Centres/Institutes
• Various new information documentation, media announcements, and publicity to prospective students, counselors, potential donors and the external community in general
• Eventual physical relocations of units to provide for clustering of Faculty activities

While the above represent the general implementation issues that will be required, we note two specific implementation issues that arise directly from the creation of new Faculties. First, the Deans’ search policy will need to be examined in terms of faculty member representation for Faculties with fewer than four units. Further, the anticipated asymmetrical configuration of the new Environment Faculty will require a further amendment to the ratification procedure so that each department and school has a meaningful voice in the selection of the Dean. Second, the relocation of the Environmental Science Program from the Faculty of Science to the new Environment Faculty as an independent program will require a 1-2 FTE faculty position commitment to ensure leadership and stabilization of the program.

**Multi-Campus Reality**

Unlike some other multi-campus institutions, Simon Fraser University has retained a firm view that we are a single, unified University with several campus locations. All Faculties have a core presence at Burnaby Mountain. All Faculties are now offering programming at Surrey. And most Faculties have at least limited programming in downtown Vancouver. This geographic spread of our activities raises questions for the University. How do we retain a unified vision of Simon Fraser University? How do faculty, staff and students retain a sense of connectivity to the University as a whole, and to their colleagues and fellow students when separated by distance? How do faculty and students participate in the programming and activities at all campuses? These questions are not new for the University. Nonetheless, they are critically important questions being asked by our colleagues, and the activities of the Task Force have provided a venue for them to be revisited.
While addressing University multi-campus identity and connectivity is not a direct area of our mandate, we believe that the issues do interweave with some of our recommendations. If we truly seek to effectively serve our diversely located communities and to retain the excellence and importance of our core commitments to the liberal arts and sciences and to the opportunity for students to have a rich, rewarding, experiential, and multi-disciplinary education, we must find ways to better facilitate the movement of faculty and students between our campuses. In our view this means we must explore ways to solve two critical issues: transportation and course scheduling.

The Skytrain provides an effective transportation bridge between our downtown Vancouver campus and the Surrey campus, but transportation between either of these campuses and the Burnaby Mountain campus must be improved. With the announcement on January 14, 2008 of over $14 billion dollars being committed to improving transportation in the Greater Vancouver Regional District over the next six years, Simon Fraser University must urgently and actively lobby for improved access to our Burnaby campus and better interconnectivity between campuses.

The second area of challenge for a multi-campus institution is to ensure that course scheduling occurs in such a way as to enable faculty and students to move effectively between sites to deliver or obtain programming. This is a complex process that will require the expertise of the University’s Registrar, the curriculum planning bodies of the University, and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. We recommend that the Vice President, Academic mandate the Registrar to undertake a review of course scheduling in consultation with the other areas identified and to prepare a report of recommendations for consideration by the Vice President, Academic.

In addition to these two critical areas of consideration, the vision of Simon Fraser University as a single institution with multiple campus facilities carries with it a requirement that each campus must be seen as embodying our core commitments and strategic priorities. As a consequence we must ensure that in addition to the defining features of each of our campuses and the unique populations they serve, that research and graduate level programming is a thriving and expanding component of all of our facilities.

Finally, while we must strive not to duplicate activities and functions, we must be mindful that in those Faculties with significant constituencies spread across campus sites, important segments of administrative operations of the Faculties must effectively serve each of the sites and have meaningful presence at them. This may require space planning to facilitate the presence of certain key members of the administrative team at each campus on a rotational schedule.

**Context for Costs**

When the Vice-President, Academic initiated the work of the first Task Force in the Fall of 2005, he did not do so in a context of financial crisis, crisis of reputation, or crisis of vision, that is often typical of restructuring exercises at other academic institutions. He did so in view of designing the best University for the future: a University that would be seen as a leader in the
liberal arts and sciences, in areas of great societal concern such as environment, education, and health, in recognition of the need for resuscitating the value and importance of arts and culture in society and in universities, and in areas of professional and applied fields. The Task Force has aimed to build upon our many and internationally renowned strengths and excellence. We have strived to enhance the environment for research and graduate education. We have sought to develop one of the most distinguished and exciting undergraduate student experiences in the nation. We have aimed to strengthen the environment for faculty members providing them with opportunities and support for discovery both within disciplines and in new interdisciplinary collaborations and it is envisioned that this will afford Simon Fraser University with the continued ability to attract and retain the world’s leading scholars and educators. And, finally, the Task Force has recognized that Simon Fraser University in the future will engage with our communities in unparalleled ways, revitalizing art and culture in society, opening our doors to diverse communities locally and internationally and truly be an institution that, by its actions, demonstrates it is “thinking of the world” and contributing to it.

At present, we are clearly feeling the forces of tight fiscal realities and the Task Force has been critically concerned with the current reality and the recommendations that we are proposing. We do not wish in any way to minimize the current budgetary context nor to downplay the fact that our recommendations indeed have cost implications for the University. We understand that there are competing views as to what the priorities for investment should be and we have heard the concerns about the financial climate of the University raised during Open Forums discussions and in other feedback to the Task Force. As this discussion has unfolded it has at times taken the character of a competition between financial commitment to the core liberal arts and sciences and commitment to new initiatives. We wish to comment briefly on this critically important issue and perception. During the five-year period 2002/03 to 2006/07 the academic operating budget of the Faculties has nearly doubled, growing from $88.5 million to $166.4 million; an 88% growth. During this time, the budgeted CFL faculty complement grew 22% from 714.3 FTE to 874.4 FTE; annualized graduate and undergraduate FTE enrolment grew by a more modest, but still sizeable amount, 14%. The growth in the academic operating budgets and CFL faculty complements of the Faculties is, in the view of the Task Force, a clear demonstration of the commitment by the University to support and develop our core areas of commitment. We would not be prepared to make the recommendations we do in this report if we felt that in doing so we would in any way compromise the core strength of the arts and sciences, applied and professional programming of the University. Our reputation for excellence will continue to depend on our strength in these areas.

The Vice President, Academic has for many years had a modest budget to direct to strategic new directions of the University. For at least the past five years, this fund (aptly named the Strategic Initiatives Fund), has had a continuing base budget of $600,000 to $650,000. This is only 0.7% of the amount dedicated to the academic operating budgets of the Faculties in 2002/03. In 2008/09, the Strategic Initiatives Fund was increased to $950,000, but in comparison to the significantly increased academic operating budgets of the Faculties, this investment has proportionally declined in comparison, and represents approximately 0.6%. In the past, the Strategic Initiatives Fund has been used to develop such initiatives as the Faculty of Health Sciences, the University Curriculum Initiative (W-Q-B), and new program development.
Ultimately, the Task Force believes that to stop investing in new initiatives chosen carefully in consideration of maintaining excellence for the University’s future would be a significant detriment to the institution. Over the past twenty years, the University has met several occasions of tight budgetary times with fierce resilience and pragmatic decision-making. Yet despite these belt-tightening periods, we have always continued to move the University forward. The Task Force believes we must continue this fundamental spirit of advancement.

We have noted that there will be costs associated with the recommendations we have proposed over the course of this report. We believe it essential to be open and transparent in our expectation of what the University may expect in terms of these costs. The costs notably are estimates based on our understanding of the scope of our recommendations and the current average costs in the University. The costs we identify should be understood to be the “costs of change” and do not represent long-term future development costs, just as our cost overview does not include the long-term future development costs of the already established academic Faculties and initiatives at the University.

We would also like to expressly note, that this cost summary is provided for information and disclosure purposes only. The Task Force does not have the power to recommend financial commitments of the University and thus this is not an element of our report for express consideration or approval by the University community or Senate. Budgetary decision making ultimately rests with the Board of Governors as part of the annual budget process. This will be independent of our report and the Task Force’s activities.

The Task Force also does not wish to leave an impression with the University community that it is only the Task Force recommendations that have a cost. The University is constantly investing in those areas of the University that are untouched by our recommendations, and in a variety of ways that seek to constantly retain and improve the overall quality of teaching, research and outreach at Simon Fraser University. Outside of the main budget provisioning to the Faculties, it is noteworthy that over the past few years, the University has invested nearly $1.4 million recurring dollars in the University Curriculum Initiative, nearly $400,000 base budget in the Student Learning Commons, almost $5 million in retention awards to outstanding faculty members, and significant other amounts in new faculty position creation, faculty start-up, and specific project support. These are clearly not insignificant amounts.

The Strategic Initiatives Fund is suggested by the Task Force as the primary vehicle for financing the recommendations of our report to ensure that our initiatives do not represent a direct call on the existing Faculty budget lines. As is clear given the value of the SIF and the cost of our recommendations, we are recommending a commitment against the SIF for several years. A second source of funding that is critically important to the Vice-President, Academic’s ability to support new initiatives, focused around technology, has been the Double the Opportunity (DTO) fund. This fund has not been fully expended in anticipation of potential developments from the Task Force and it could serve as the financial source for the creation of the Faculty of Engineering and Computing as well as the very nominal new positions expected in support of developing a new IT/ICT program.
In consideration of the work of the Task Force, the Vice-President, Academic has been conservative in his deployment of the 2007/2008 SIF, and has some funds remaining for dedication to the recommendations of the Task Force. This fund provides for both one-time non-recurring funding, which will be important for the transitional administrative costs of implementing our recommendations, as well as base recurring funding that would support the creation of the positions and annual budget of the new Faculties, College, and Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration.

Specific Costs

The Task Force imagines that each new Faculty will cost an average of $750,000 new base funding. Differences will exist between each of the three proposed Faculties based on the number of constituent units, the amount of decentralized budgeting already in place to the School/Department level, and the extent of administrative position start up cost requirements. This provides an estimated total for the creation of three new Faculties of approximately $2.25 million base funding. In addition to these administrative structure set up costs for the new Faculties, the Task Force report also calls for the dedication of 6-8 new FTE positions for new integrative programming in the Environment Faculty, which we predict will require an additional $750,000 base funding to the overall budget. The total budgetary costs of the three new Faculties, therefore is estimated to be $3.0 million.

The dissolution of the Faculty of Applied Sciences will provide $1.0 million toward this total. The unspent Double the Opportunity Fund will be able to cover the cost of the new Faculty of Engineering and Computing. This leaves a net base budget requirement of $1.25 million. The Vice-President, Academic has this base commitment available from outstanding funds from the 2007/08 Strategic Initiatives Fund, the dedication of the 2008/09 SIF fund and some portion of the future SIF fund for new position creation related to integrative programming in the Environment Faculty. The Task Force is aware that stipulating position growth of any magnitude for the Environment Faculty is a controversial commitment given the current freeze on faculty positions elsewhere in the University. We understand the concern of our colleagues in this regard. Nonetheless, we sincerely believe that there are several important reasons for proceeding with our recommendation for the commitment of faculty positions to the new Environment Faculty. First, the vision for the new Faculty is one that is intended to be inclusive of, and enhancing to, the existing strengths of the University. The integrative programming that is intended to emerge through the efforts of the Faculty Interdisciplinary Planning Committee is mandated to identify a modest number of core positions that will fill gaps, augment strengths, and enable new research and programming of an interdisciplinary character to flourish. This should have significant benefits to disciplines both within and external to the new Faculty. Second, the environment is clearly one of the most pressing societal issues of the 21st Century. There is near consensus that while progress in understanding is being made, solutions to issues of global climate change require new ways of thinking of environmental problems. The title of the New York Times article on December 25th, captures the direction that post-secondary educational institutions around the world are heading “Threat So Big, Academics Try Collaboration”. Third, evidence from new initiatives across the continent demonstrates that areas of environmental research and education are attracting external financial support.
Numerous examples can be pointed to, but locally there have been two important announcements that demonstrate the potential within British Columbia. The University has just received a donation for the establishment of the Libre-Ero Chair Coastal Studies. In addition, the Provincial Government announced on January 25, 2008 that it will seek legislative approval for $94.5 million to create the Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions (PICS). This Institute will bring together top scientists, government and the private sector to develop innovative climate change adaptation and mitigation solutions. Hosted by the University of Victoria, the collaboration includes the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University and the University of Northern British Columbia. These examples are illustrative of the potential for attracting significant external funding, a strategy which the Task Force believes can be actively pursued to assist with the costs of the new Environment Faculty proposed for Simon Fraser University.

Third, we note that the commitment of new positions to the Environment Faculty is dependent upon Senate approval of a blueprint for integrated programming that has a strong indication of future student enrolment demand and will require Board approval of the overall University’s Faculty Recruitment Plan in each year where positions are recommended. Finally, we note that this is a staged recommendation, with anticipated commitment of faculty positions occurring over a three year period between 2009/2010 and 2011/2012 which therefore calls for a very modest position commitment (approximately 2-3 positions) in any given fiscal year.

The creation of the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning has minimal establishment costs, expected to be approximately $150,000 in total. It does, however, have more significant longer term costs as the Experiential Learning Division, and the experiential credit initiative are each implemented. It is anticipated that the total costs for the staged implementation of these over the next 3-5 years would be approximately $500,000 to $750,000 in base funding.

The third substantive cost proposal of the Task Force is connected to the establishment of an Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration (OIC), the activities it is mandated to undertake and support, and the Centres and Institutes Support Centre within the OIC. It is anticipated that the development of this shared infrastructure as well as staffing positions (Director, and support staff) and interdisciplinary initiatives operating budget will be in the neighborhood of $500,000 base funding. In addition, the Task Force has called earlier in this report for a commitment of approximately $90,000 to $100,000 base funding per year for the establishment of three new funds to support interdisciplinarity (Small Interdisciplinary Project Funding, Interdisciplinary Conference Funding, and Interdisciplinary Teaching Development Fund). We wish to make two important clarifications with regard to the financial costs of the Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration. First, The OIC is intended to develop incrementally as strategic funding envelopes of the University permit. In the implementation timeline that follows this section, we recommend that the OIC be established in September 2010. Further, we believe that there are significant external fundraising opportunities for interdisciplinarity that would enable the OIC to develop modest shared facilities to support all research centres and institutes of the University. Finally, the Task Force is of the view that even when fully developed, the staffing of the OIC should be minimal in complement. We envision a senior level academic director and up to 2 support staff to assist researchers across the University with administrative activities related to research collaborations, develop profiling networks of academic programming and research activity in strategic interdisciplinary areas of the University, and to help reduce administrative
burdens of faculty members related to interdisciplinary collaboration so that they can focus their
time and energy on research and the development of interdisciplinary programming.

Perhaps the most ambitious cost item of the Task Force’s proposals, is the creation of a Simon
Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship. Preliminary cost calculations for creating
the program of distinction imagined, its state-of-the-art facilities, distinguished visitor housing
and salary costs, institute personnel costs, international conference and proceedings activities, are
significant. We imagine that an annual base operating cost of approximately $1.25 million is
required, with a capital facility cost of between $10 and $15 million. The Task Force sees such
potential of this initiative as advancing the University’s international research profile and
graduate education aspirations, that we have not shied away from our recommendation to
proceed despite the magnitude of our preliminary costs. However, we do not believe it possible
for the University to bear these costs directly, and therefore we recommend that this entire
initiative be the focus of a major fundraising initiative of the University.

A final cost component of our recommendations is the costs for the transitional implementation
of the recommendations. In consideration of temporary staff requirements for implementation in
our student, financial and personnel systems, as well as project coordination during the
implementation phase, we predict non-recurring implementation costs of approximately
$450,000 spread over the next two years. Further, we anticipate that the Vice-President,
Academic may need to dedicate up to $500,000 in a bridge-to-the-future program for non-
relocating faculty members and program stabilization. We understand from the Vice-President,
Academic, that these amounts can be identified through outstanding non-recurring funds
remaining from 2007/08 as well as modest amounts from 2008/09 and 2009/10 calls on recurring
funds of the University.

**Implementation and Prioritization of Recommendations**

The following schedule provides a projected ideal timeline for the implementation of the
activities that are embedded within the recommendations of the Task Force over the course of
our report.

I. **Cognitive Science Review**
   i. April 2008 – External Review of Cognitive Science

I. **Committees, Policy Changes, Academic Leadership Processes Begin**
   ii. June 2008 – Establishment of Committee on Experiential Learning (Report due
       August 2009)
   iii. June 2008 – Establishment of Student Mobility/Course Access Committee (Report
due August 2009)
   iv. June 2008 – Mandate given to VP Legal to negotiate with SFUFA revisions to
      joint appointments policy along the principles of change identified, creation of new
      internal secondments policy, team teaching policy, process for review of
interdisciplinary work, and modifications to other academic policies affected by the changes in academic structure
v. June 2008 – Mandate given to VP Research to make revisions to Policy R40.01
vi. June 2008 – Mandate given to Dean of Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to develop a comprehensive plan for Foreign Language Studies unit
vii. June 2008 – Establishment of Environment Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Committee
viii. June 2008 – Establishment of Mandate to Dean of Graduate Studies to review interdisciplinary graduate programming and graduate financial support
ix. June 2008 - Creation of Joint Planning Committee for IT/ICT Program
x. June 2008 – Vice-President, Academic initiates process to appoint Acting Deans for each new Faculty.
xi. September 2008 – Vice-President, Academic to revisit Report on English Language Learning
xii. September 2008 – Process for Reclassification of Existing Centres/Institutes under new policy begins

II. Faculty and Unit Alignment Changes Occur

xiii. April 2009 – School of Kinesiology moves to Faculty of Science
xiv. April 2009 – Establishment of Faculty of Engineering and Computing
xv. April 2009 – Network Support Group relocated to Faculty of Engineering and Computing
xvi. April 2009 – Establishment of Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Communication & Design (working name)
xvii. April 2009 – Master of Publishing Program and Contemporary Arts move from Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences to new Faculty
xviii. April 2009 – TechOne Program established in permanent location
xix. April 2009 – Establishment of Environment Faculty
xx. April 2009 – Department of Geography is realigned from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to the Environment Faculty
xxi. April 2009 – School of Resource and Environmental Managements is relocated from the Faculty of Applied Sciences to the Environment Faculty
xxii. April 2009 - Environmental Science Program becomes established as a new Department of Environmental Sciences within Environment Faculty
xxiii. April 2009 – Centre for Sustainable Community Development moves from Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences to Environment Faculty
xxiv. April 2009 – Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies is formally positioned within the Environment Faculty
xxv. April 2009 – Establishment of College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning
xxvi. April 2009 – Consolidation of Centre for Dialogue and Semester in Dialogue into Program in Dialogue within College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning
xxvii. September 2011 – Dissolution of Faculty of Applied Sciences (date to be finalized)
IV. Assessment Reports are Due

xxviii. December 2008 – Report on the future of TechOne Program provided to Vice President, Academic
xxx. April 2009 – Report on Foreign Language Study unit due from Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
xxxi. August 2009 – Report from Committee on Experiential Learning due to Senate
xxxi. August 2009 – Report from Student Mobility and Course Access Committee due
xxxiii. September 2009 – Report due from Joint Planning Committee for IT/ICT Program
xxxiv. September 2009 – Report due from Dean of Graduate Studies regarding interdisciplinary graduate programming
xxxv. September 2009 – Vice-President, Academic to have developed and begun execution of plan for English Language Learning

V. New Programming Commences

xxxvi. September 2009 – New Integrative Programming in Environment Faculty launched
xxxvii. September 2009 – Establishment of unit for Foreign Language Studies in Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
xxxviii. September 2010 – New IT/ICT Program launched

VI. Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration Established

xxxix. April 2010 – Search begins for Director of Centre for Interdisciplinary Collaboration
xl. September 2010 – Establishment of Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration
xli. September 2010 – Creation of SFU Health Network

VII. Development of Institute for Advanced Scholarship

xlii. September 2010 – Fundraising campaign begins for Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship
xliii. September 2012 – Establishment of Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship

Aside from the sheer pragmatic constraints on implementing the broad scope of recommendations contained in our report, we recognize that the University’s current year financial realities may require a more staggered implementation of the recommendations in this report, than might be ideally desired. Should that be the case, we would recommend the following priority implementation of our recommendations:

1st Priority: - creation of new Faculties and policy changes
2nd Priority: - creation of College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning
3rd Priority: - establishment of Office for Interdisciplinary Collaboration
4th Priority: - development of Simon Fraser University Institute for Advanced Scholarship
External Fundraising

We have noted the strong potential we believe the SFU Institute for Advanced Scholarship will have for attracting external donations. Equally, or perhaps even more likely, we believe that the new Environment Faculty that we have conceptualized will be highly attractive to external fundraising activities as well, perhaps, to new dedicated programs by provincial and national governments or organizations. We also feel that if the overall recommendations that we have made, combined with the existing strengths at the University, were packaged together, there could be a great opportunity for a campaign dedicated to the future of Simon Fraser University: a vision of social responsibility, community engagement, experiential learning, graduate education, research excellence, and leadership. We encourage the Vice-Presidents and Advancement office to explore such a potential.

Senate Consideration

In November 2006, Senate gave the Task Force a threefold mandate to review the academic structure of the university, evaluate the ways in which our academic structural elements are being deployed, and to determine if Simon Fraser University is effectively supporting, nourishing and developing interdisciplinarity. We have now, slightly more than a year later completed our report and have offered in its pages 25 recommendations in consideration of our mandate.

It is noteworthy as we draw our report to a close that our recommendations fall into three broad categories: (1) those that aim to directly change the academic structure of the University through the creation or dissolution of academic Faculties, a new College and the relocation of academic units; (2) those that require process review, program proposal development, or administrative action (such as a Foreign Language Studies program, an IT/ICT Program, a study and proposal on Experiential Learning, etc.) the fruits of which will require full development and future consideration by Senate; and (3) those suggestions to negotiated policies between the University and the Simon Fraser University Faculty Association that are the purview of the negotiation process.

We will leave it to the wisdom of the Senate Committee on University Priorities to whom we submit this report, to determine how best to develop motions to deal with the first two areas of our recommendations. We fully understand the need for the presentation of motions in accordance with the University Act and the powers and responsibilities of Senate. We ask though, that Senate and all of the readers of this report recognize that the vision the Task Force has set out for 2025, and the success we believe that can be achieved for the institution by its execution, is not a fragmented one. Our recommendations have been organized in sub-categories consistent with the three areas of our mandate. But really, it is a single vision, a single future, and we strongly believe that we have developed a carefully interwoven blueprint for Simon Fraser University’s overall success.