Simon Fraser University's Harbour Centre Campus and Recurrent Education

By

David B. Johnston

B.A., Simon Fraser University, 1980

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of Administrative, Adult and Higher Education)

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

November 1993

© David B. Johnston, 1993
In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

(Signature)

Department of Administrative Adult and Higher Education

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date December 17, 1993
ABSTRACT

In January 1989 Simon Fraser University opened a satellite campus in the City of Vancouver. This campus at Harbour Centre was designed and located, in large part, to attract adult students wishing to pursue university studies on a part-time basis.

While it was expected that this new campus would attract a different student than those at the main campus in Burnaby, there had been no work to determine whether there were real differences. In the Fall of 1992 a profile of all registered students was obtained from the SFU student database. Records for 17,205 individuals were examined and students studying at the two campuses were then compared.

The results of the study indicated that the students at the two campuses were substantially different. Specifically the Harbour Centre students were older, disproportionately female, more likely to study part-time and had more education upon admission than the students at the Burnaby campus.

This study concludes that, as intended, Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre is successfully providing educational services to the advanced recurrent learner. However, due to restrictive enrollment practices new recurrent learners are being denied access to the university. Should these practices continue it is probable that the Harbour Centre campus will cease to be as distinctive as it is. The profile of the Harbour Centre campus undergraduate student may eventually come to resemble that of the Burnaby campus student.
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CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Social change surrounds us. The rapid pace of technological advancement, the knowledge explosion and the changing job market all have adults searching for opportunities to continue and expand their education. Many of these adults have turned to the universities to seek additional educational credentials in an effort to enhance their employment opportunities and enrich their personal lives. This trend has led to an enormous growth in the number of part-time adult students at universities throughout Canada (Jasmin, 1992a). The traditional university student is becoming harder to find on today's campuses as students adjust to changing societal needs and attempt to combine their part-time studies with their personal and professional lives. Educational institutions are finding that providing daytime courses in the traditional disciplines is no longer, by itself, sufficient to meet the needs of society.

The increasing demand for access to courses by working adults has been established, and the increase in part-time enrolments discussed, in the literature on recurrent education. It is argued in the literature that if universities are to continue to serve a rapidly changing society they must be prepared to adapt to the evolving schedule and curriculum needs of today's adult student.
National Trends

Most compilations of statistics on university enrolments have identified the rise in the numbers of part-time students on campus and the increasing participation of adults. As figure 1 shows, part-time enrolments in Canadian university programs doubled between 1972 and 1990, and the greatest proportion of these were in non-degree (certificate and diploma) programs. In 1972, part-time students accounted for 28% of university enrolments but by 1990 this proportion had grown to 36% (Jasmin, 1992a).

Figure 1

Canadian universities are enrolling older students in increasing numbers. “The part-time population at the university
level is aging. The proportion of such students 30 years of age or older has increased substantially over the last ten years, in particular at the master's and doctoral levels” (Jasmin 1992a). While these figures document the national trend, the actual increase in part-time students has had considerable impact on individual institutions by shifting some of the student demand for courses from traditional day-time course scheduling to a more accessible and flexible system that will accommodate the needs of the part-time student.

The Case of Simon Fraser University

Although Simon Fraser University has long offered courses in the evening, these were at the somewhat isolated Burnaby Mountain campus, making it difficult for many working people to attend. In spite of this relative isolation, the university experienced significant growth in its part-time enrolment through the 1970s and this trend continues today. Figure 2 shows that part-time enrolments increased from 332, or 8% of total undergraduate enrolment in 1970 to 7,385, or 48% of total undergraduate enrolment in 1991.
The rapid growth of part-time students at the university led to an examination of how this growing segment of the student population could be better served. In the mid 1970s, a needs assessment was undertaken leading to a 1979 proposal to begin offering courses in downtown Vancouver (Hightower, 1979). Academic courses were first offered in January 1980 in rented space at a central location downtown in the City of Vancouver. Within three years student demand for courses was greater than the space available in courses due to space and resource limitations.

This quick success prompted further examination of the possibility of the University expanding to provide additional
educational services in the City of Vancouver. In 1982, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning (SCAP), the chief academic planning body for the university, created the SFU/Downtown Planning Committee. The committee's mandate was to assess the need and potential for a downtown campus, consider and develop program proposals, and make recommendations to SCAP. When this group, aided by an advisory body of community and business leaders external to the university (The SFU/Downtown Council), reported back to SCAP they recommended that the university locate a satellite campus in downtown Vancouver. This report established a framework of three distinct centres around which the academic programs could be developed: the Centre for Advanced Professional Studies, covering graduate degrees and post baccalaureate diplomas; the Centre for Liberal Studies, covering structured undergraduate certificate and degree programs; and the Centre for Continuing Studies, covering non-credit courses, special seminars and public events as well as small conferences. This framework provided that the campus would provide for a wide range of educational services that would include, but not be limited to, undergraduate and graduate programs. In 1983 this recommendation was accepted by both the University Senate and the Board of Governors. The process of fund raising and site acquisition then began.

The university finally acquired a site for this new campus in 1987, located just outside the historic Gastown district and at the hub of all public transportation links (buses, light rapid transit and the Seabus) in the downtown core of Vancouver. Private sector
funding for the necessary renovations to the building was secured and construction began in 1988. Phase 1 of the Harbour Centre campus opened in January of 1989 and has since expanded to occupy over 120,000 square feet of office and classroom space at the corner of Hastings and Richards Streets.

After the site had been secured, SCAP reconvened the SFU/Downtown Planning Committee which brought forward a report in July 1988 outlining the educational objectives for the new campus as well as program development guidelines. This committee accepted the program development framework put forward by the previous committee, although the name of the Centre for Liberal Studies was changed to the Centre for Liberal Arts and Science. These educational objectives and program development guidelines were subsequently accepted by the Simon Fraser University Senate in September 1988. Rather than simply replicating existing programs at the main campus the primary objective for this new campus was to build on the current strengths of the university while pursuing a distinctive mission to respond to the specific social and economic needs of the community in and around the city centre. This report specified that the Harbour Centre campus would be a centre to address the educational needs of the recurrent learner. This campus would provide "opportunities for adults possessing fundamental competence to return to university in order to keep up with evolving circumstances and conditions" (Simon Fraser University, Senate paper S88-33 1988).
Furthermore, it was emphasized that "Academic programs at Harbour Centre should serve the advanced recurring education needs of our community (local and national), within the bounds of Simon Fraser University's academic strengths and expertise to meet educational needs that embrace intellectual development, occupational competence and public responsibility" (ibid.). Programs and courses will be "for those already prepared or experienced, and generally at levels beyond preparatory education or skill training" (ibid.). The expectation at the time was that the students who would access the programs at Harbour Centre would be adults who already possessed a credential from an institution of higher education or some form of recognized professional certification. It was also expected that some students would be returning to the university environment to complete an unfinished educational credential, or to begin their first one, after a period of time away from formal education while they established themselves in their personal and professional lives.

**Statement Of The Problem**

The decision makers at the Simon Fraser University had a clear vision of what they wanted to accomplish when establishing a unique educational facility in downtown Vancouver. While courses have been offered at the Harbour Centre campus in a variety of programs since January of 1989, little effort has been made to examine the characteristics of the students to determine if they
resemble the type of student which the university originally sought to serve.

The purpose of this study is to determine if Simon Fraser University has met the stated goal of providing educational services to the adult recurrent learner, as described in the September 1988 Report on Objectives and Program Development Guidelines for Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre (appendix 1). The study will undertake this task by investigating if there are differences among students at an established suburban university campus, well suited to traditional students, and those at a new urban campus positioned to attract and accommodate non-traditional adult students.

As noted previously, it is widely believed that more and more working people need to return to university in order to remain competitive in the work force and satisfied in their personal lives. If this is true, it should follow that students at the urban campus should have different characteristics than do their counterparts at the suburban campus. It is suggested in the literature that these students will be older, disproportionately female, studying part-time and, for the most part, returning to higher education to complete unfinished credentials or to supplement credentials obtained earlier. It is also suggested in the literature that some adults without previous experience in higher education will be attempting to attain an initial university credential for the reasons noted above.
The unique case of a campus planned to provide educational opportunities for working adults, along with an easily identifiable student body, affords a great opportunity to test the theory of the recurrent learner in a specific instance. If there are identifiable differences among the various student groups, then it would indicate that the Simon Fraser University has been successful in its attempt to introduce an educational service to an important and productive sector of contemporary society.

As this was an exploratory study, a secondary purpose was to establish some baseline data so that in the years to come, as programs are developed and implemented, this work can be used to assess changes in the student composition. This study should also help facilitate future planning with respect to programs, curriculum design and student access to the downtown campus.

Research Questions

In order to compare the students at the two SFU campuses it is necessary to compile a comprehensive set of information about the students. The following research questions are designed to elicit information about SFU students so they may be compared to determine if the goals of Harbour Centre are being met. The research questions developed for this study are as follows:
1) Do the undergraduate students attending the Harbour Centre campus differ from those attending the campus in Burnaby?
Specifically:

Are they older?
Are they proportionately more female than male?
Are they enrolled more in part-time studies?
Are they enrolled in shorter academic programs?
Do they differ in the educational backgrounds they possess when they first are admitted to the university?
Do they live in close proximity to the Harbour Centre campus?

2) Do the graduate students attending the Harbour Centre campus differ from those attending the campus in Burnaby?
Specifically:

Are they older?
Are they enrolled more in part-time studies?
Do they differ in the educational backgrounds they possess when they first are admitted to the university?

Summary

Adults are returning to university in ever increasing numbers. However, because the majority have family and career commitments they are unable to devote themselves to full-time or traditional day-time studies. If universities are going to respond to this need they will have to offer courses in places and at times that are convenient and accessible to the adult learner.
Simon Fraser University has responded to this demand by establishing a satellite campus in downtown Vancouver expressly for the purpose of providing educational opportunities to the advanced recurrent learner. It was thought that the students who would access this campus would be adults who are returning to part-time university study after a period of time away from the education system. This study seeks to determine if the university has been successful in meeting these objectives.

Also this study, by providing a comprehensive understanding of the demographic characteristics of its current students, will aid the university in planning for the future development of the campus.

Outline of the Study

Chapter 1 introduced the concept of recurrent education and outlined the growth of part-time students in Canadian universities. This chapter has also briefly outlined the history of the development of Simon Fraser University's Harbour Centre campus. The research to be conducted was described and the research questions were stated.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature on recurrent education and relevant studies on part-time students. Chapter 3 provides details of the methods employed in the study. This chapter also discusses the elements of the data file that were used and defines key terms relevant to the study.
In Chapter 4 the research questions are tested using, for the most part, the data derived from the university's student information system. The data are summarized and presented in a series of tables. The findings are summarized and discussed in Chapter 5. Limitations to the study, implications for university planners and policy makers and suggestions for further research are also included in this final chapter.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

With the rapid growth of part-time students in Canadian universities it is becoming apparent that the traditional pattern of study for those seeking university credentials is changing. The evolving student demographics have been chronicled in regular compendiums of data on the university system. This change also has been documented in the literature which describes social changes pushing adults into a pattern of lifelong education enabling them to keep their skills relevant and up to date. Since the university campus under study here was developed in response to this changing need in society, it is important to set the study within the broader context.

The literature on recurrent education is first reviewed, setting out the theory of the recurrent learner and why this form of education is important to individuals and society. This writing generally focuses on the emerging need for advanced societies to continue to provide educational opportunities for people throughout their productive lives.

Following from this overview of recurrent education the general literature on student demographic characteristics is
reviewed. Generally, these studies tend not to set themselves within a theoretical framework but mostly are descriptive in nature.

The review is not exhaustive but is intended to provide sufficient information to understand the concepts being discussed, identify enrolment trends and support the purpose of the study.

**Recurrent Education**

The literature, at various times, uses a number of different terms when discussing or describing part-time higher education and the participation of adults: recurrent education, concurrent education, continuing education, lifelong learning, adult learning and mid-career education, among others. All of the terms are used to describe post-compulsory education that is entered into voluntarily and generally refers to education for persons who either combine work and studies or who interrupt their work for further study.

For this study the term recurrent education will be used throughout as it is the term used by Simon Fraser University when establishing the downtown campus. While there is not one concise definition it is generally agreed that it is "... education conceived and planned as something which will be experienced by people individually on-going, though (in a) discontinuous way, over the whole of their lives - and which will correspond with their emerging vocational, social and personal aspirations" (Stokov, 1975) Selected literature relevant to this concept will now be discussed.
A position often stated by educators, policy makers and economists is that working adults need a wide variety of educational services and opportunities to provide them with the skills and abilities to adapt to changes in their community and at their places of work. For example:

The demand placed on post-secondary institution for recurring education and up-grading of high level skills is growing rapidly . . . The emphasis appears to be more and more on programs that are designed to meet specific needs of employees and employers. There is also a strong demand for course offerings in formats and locations and at times which are convenient to employees working full-time. This last point is particularly important in a country where there is virtually no tradition of paid-leave opportunities and no fiscal incentives to training in industry, and where few workers are prepared to forego part of their full-time earnings while they upgrade their skills. (Jasmine, 1992b)

Another widely held view is that while traditional forms of education (K-12, College, technical/vocational and University) are essential building blocks for people's futures, without some form of formal learning after completion of the initial educational period one's skills become quickly outdated. This has implications from an educational policy perspective. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has defined recurrent education as:

A comprehensive educational strategy for all post-compulsory or post-basic education, the essential characteristic of which is the distribution of education over the total life span of the individual in a recurring way, i.e., the alternation with other activities
such as work, but also with leisure and retirement. (Cassidy and Ferris, 1987)

A 1988 longitudinal study sought to "... investigate the role of adult education in complementing and mediating the effects of formal youth education on life chances, job satisfaction and general well-being..." of a cohort of Swedish men (Tuinman, 1989, P. 221). While this was a wide ranging and complex study it has some findings that are relevant. A key finding of the Tuinman study was that adult education had a significant positive effect on occupational status and that this effect got stronger as the cohort got older. Further analysis found that adult education did not influence earnings, per se. However, because of the positive influence on occupational status, Tuinman concluded that adult education positively affected earnings over time, albeit indirectly.

This study also provided some evidence that those men who participated in adult education over their careers had enhanced and positive views of themselves and their "well-being" when compared with those who did not partake in these activities. Overall the Tuinman study supports the notion that there are positive social and economic benefits to be derived when adults participate in recurrent education on a regular, ongoing basis.

Patricia Cross has written extensively on the issue of adults returning to higher education (1987). She writes eloquently about the growth of the learning society as a function of the rapid
technological, social and demographic changes facing us today. She recognizes the need for adults to keep abreast of the knowledge explosion and rapid technological change through formal learning opportunities. However, rather than alternating periods of work and education throughout adulthood she acknowledges the realities of everyday life and argues that lifelong education is more likely to be concurrent rather than recurrent. That is, people will more likely fit or "blend" their continuing education in, on a part-time basis, with their careers, family and recreational pursuits as opposed to alternating periods of work and education. She sees this as an emerging North American trend with no signs of abating (Cross, 1987).

The trend towards part-time study by adults is not simply a North American phenomenon. A survey of 12 countries found that "... part-time students make up a substantial proportion, typically between one-third and one-half, of the total enrollment of most Western developed systems of formal higher education" (Tight, 1991). This study also found that "Part-time students are a much more heterogeneous group than full-time students. They are disproportionately female ... and significantly older than full-time students." An additional finding was that these part-time students tended to have either low or high admission qualifications relative to other students surveyed (Tight, 1991). That is, these students, as a group, tended to be on both ends of the educational spectrum upon admission to their institutions. There had either less qualifications (e.g. mature students without high school matriculation) or better
qualifications (e.g. already holding a university degree) at admission than did the full-time student group.

Based on this survey, Tight then concluded that part-time higher education will continue to grow in importance due to the social, demographic, economic and technological changes Western countries are experiencing. Specifically, "The nature of the relationship between higher education and the rest of society is changing. An increased emphasis is being placed on the individual being able to mix learning with work, domestic and social roles, at particular stages throughout the adult life-cycle rather than expecting one role to have a dominant position at a given time . . ." (Tight, 1991).

**Demographic Characteristics**

There are some Canadian studies that have investigated part-time adult education. A 1984 national study found that those Canadians most likely to participate in part-time adult education tend to be relatively well educated and employed full-time. Participation was highest among those in professional/technical and white collar occupations. This study found that, on an annual basis, 41 percent of those holding a university degree and 34 percent of those holding other post secondary credentials participated in some form of part-time education (Jasmin, 1993c).
A somewhat more recent (1986) survey found similar results. Those more likely to participate in part-time work related courses were employed, white collar workers. Moreover, this participation is associated with post-secondary attainment. The higher that initial attainment, the more likely they are to continue their education as adults (Jasmin, 1993c).

An important study was conducted in 1983 which provides some insights as to the demographic characteristics of part-time and full-time Canadian students (Porter and Jasmin, 1987). While the study looked at both college and university enrollees, this discussion will concentrate on the data for the university population. It should be noted here that there is no standard definition across Canada, or elsewhere, as to what constitutes full-time or part-time student status. Because of this lack of definition Jasmin and Porter had respondents self-report what they considered their enrolment status to be. This is one of several techniques researchers use to ascertain registration status.

The study found that 51% of male and 62% of female undergraduates studying part-time were over 30. Of these, 37% either held a university degree or had completed some university studies before embarking on their current program of studies. A further 35% had completed some post-secondary studies other than university. Those under thirty were more likely to have completed a University degree than those over thirty (34% to 21% respectively). When asked about activities previous to beginning their current
academic program the greatest majority (71%) said that they had been working. With respect to their reasons for embarking on their most recent program a majority again (54%) indicated it was for job related reasons such as upgrading skills, occupational change or obtaining occupational entry requirements. A further 31% said they were studying for the purpose of personal interest in furthering their education but not necessarily for the specific purpose of obtaining entry to other post secondary education programs. This study strongly supports the contention that a large portion of part-time university students are working people who are returning to higher education for job and career related purposes (Porter and Jasmin, 1987).

The above noted trend was also established some years earlier (Waniewicz, 1976). This 1976 study on the demand for part-time studies in Ontario showed that 30% of adults (age 18 to 69) were involved in some form of recurrent learning and an additional 18% planned to begin such studies within 12 - 24 months. Of those involved in educational activities, 43% were studying for job-related purposes and a further 18% were studying for personal development. Moreover, "The incidence of learning among those who are employed is higher than those who are not employed". The study found that adults with higher levels of education are more likely to participate in further part-time studies. An additional conclusion was that "... working adults need new and a greater variety of educational services and opportunities" (Waniewicz, 1976).
It is clear that part-time students constitute a significant and growing force in higher education. Of the over 800,000 university level students in Canada, 62% are studying full-time and 38% are part-time (Jasmin, 1992a). Overall, part-time enrolments have doubled since 1972 (Jasmin, 1992a). Much of this growth can be attributed to the increasing participation of women. By 1990 women accounted for 62% of part-time university students (Trends, 1991).

Simon Fraser University is no different. Recent figures show that part-time students account for fully 45% of the annualized undergraduate 1992/93 enrolment (Chan, 1993). Additionally, while the University registered over 15,000 undergraduate students in the Fall of 1992 just 46% were enrolled only in day-time courses at the main campus in Burnaby. The other 54% were taking their program through other modes of study the university offers such as courses in the evening, at the downtown Harbour Centre campus, through distance (correspondence) education, a variety of specialty courses at other locations in British Columbia and/or any combination of these.

Summary

The reviewed literature on recurrent education supports the objectives put forward by Simon Fraser University when establishing the Harbour Centre campus for the educational needs of adult students. "If the major societal change at present is the accelerated speed with which change occurs, then it ought to be
obvious that the accompanying educational revolution requires an acceptance of the view of education as a recurring phenomenon" (Rubenson, 1987).

The literature reviewed above provides strong support for the establishment of advanced academic programs for the recurrent learner. Large surveys have confirmed that there are many adults attending part-time university programs, in Canada and abroad. In addition, several studies have identified the key factors that characterize the advanced recurrent learner. These students tend to be adults, studying part-time, who are predominately female and returning to university studies to begin or complete academic credentials that will benefit them in their personal and professional lives.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research methods employed and the data used in the study. The selected variables are described and the important terms are defined. Some possible limitations to the study are explored as well as limits to the data and steps taken to gain access to secondary data sources.

The Study

Although Simon Fraser University publishes annual statistics providing detailed information about its students, the information is generally aggregated and differences between students at the two campuses and those studying through distance education are not analyzed. Therefore, it was necessary to assemble a data set that could be used to investigate the research questions as put forward in Chapter 1. A data file was obtained from the Office of the Registrar and examined to ensure the data were complete. Students were divided into groups depending on their mode of study, Burnaby, Harbour Centre, day, evening and distance education. The file was then analyzed to ascertain if there were differences among the various groups of students. Since this study covers the complete student population, differences are considered to be real.
differences. Inferential statistics are only used where it was felt they would provide additional and meaningful information.

Data Sources

The study population comprised all Simon Fraser University students enrolled in the Fall 1992 semester, except those in the Prison Education Program, the various off site native education programs and some other specific off-campus programs. These students were excluded because they are in unique programs not located at either of the campuses in question. Furthermore, admission to these programs is limited to specific targeted groups and registration is not open to all students. In total, 157 undergraduates were excluded.

The data were extracted from Simon Fraser University's student information system maintained by the Office of the Registrar. The data were compiled at the end of the third week of the semester (September 28, 1992) as this is when the university considers students to be officially enrolled. The data file contained records for 15,082 undergraduate students, 8,520 females and 6,540 males and 22 where there was no information pertaining to gender. The data contained records for 2,123 graduate students, 1,168 females and 953 males and two where there was no information pertaining to gender. Exact ages, as of September 1992, were calculated for most of the students as only seven had no data pertaining to age.
For the next section it is important to understand how students are admitted to the university and subsequently register in classes. Undergraduate students are assessed for admission based on their previous education. The university Senate sets out minimum standards that students must meet to be considered for admission. Generally, students are admitted first to the university and then, after taking a set of prescribed courses, are admitted to their chosen program (the exception being the Engineering Science program which admits students directly). Students are not admitted as part-time or full-time students nor to a particular campus. Courses are offered in the day and evening at the Burnaby campus, at the Harbour Centre campus and through distance education (correspondence). There are no preconditions, except for course prerequisites, to enrolling in any one of, or any combination of, these areas. Therefore, students are free to choose the type and location of the courses in which they wish to enroll.

Undergraduate students can be segmented into different groups depending on when and where they study. It is by identifying students in these categories that the different student groups can be studied and compared. For this study the various student groups were categorized in the following way:

---

1In recent years the University has experienced greater demand for new admissions than it can reasonably accommodate. A Senate committee now is empowered to set enrollment targets which are determined based on available resources for the coming year. The result of this is that admission requirements have been elevated well above those set out in the university calendar and many qualified candidates are being turned away.
1) Burnaby Only: All those taking courses only at the Burnaby campus.

2) All Burnaby: All those taking courses at the Burnaby campus and in one or more of the other categories.

3) Day Only: All those taking courses only at the Burnaby campus during the day (08:30 to 16:20).

4) All Day: All those taking courses at the Burnaby campus during the day and in one or more of the other categories.

5) Evening Only: All those taking courses only at the Burnaby campus during the evening (16:30 to 22:20).

6) All Evening: All those taking courses at the Burnaby campus during the evening and in one or more of the other categories.

7) Harbour Centre Only: All those taking courses only at the Harbour Centre campus.

8) All Harbour Centre: All those taking courses at the Harbour Centre campus and in one or more of the other categories.

9) DISC Only: All those taking courses only via correspondence.

10) All DISC: All those taking courses via correspondence and in one or more of the other categories.

11) All University: All undergraduate students taking courses in the Fall semester 1992.

Graduate students are more easily identified with a particular campus than are the undergraduate students. The graduate students were identified by degree sought (Master's or Ph.D.) and by where
they were studying, at Burnaby or at Harbour Centre. There were no doctoral students at the Harbour Centre campus. Harbour Centre has two programs unique to that campus, Executive Master of Business Administration (MBA) and Graduate Liberal Studies. The former enrolled 101 students in their evening program and 60 in their weekend program. The latter enrolled 37 students in their program, which can be completed only on a part-time basis. The courses in the Graduate Liberal Studies courses are offered in the evening, although students are occasionally required to attend classes on the weekend. In addition a number of academic departments offer graduate seminars at the Harbour Centre campus on a regular basis: Resource and Environmental Management, Fine and Performing Arts, Communications and Women's Studies. These seminars are, for the most part, offered in the late afternoon and evening.

This study focused on those studying at the Burnaby campus only and at the Harbour Centre campus only but comprehensive data on all student groups identified above are displayed for comparison purposes. These other student groups are discussed where necessary.

**Measurement**

There is a standard set of demographic information that is collected for each student enrolled at the university. In addition, information on the student's academic program and courses is also maintained. The file consisted of the following elements which were
selected to provide the information necessary to answer the research questions.

• Student Identification number: A unique identifier for each record
• Credit hours: The number of credit hours, by group, each student was enrolled in for that semester.
• Number of Courses: The number of courses, by group, each student was enrolled in for that semester.
• Student classification: Graduate or Undergraduate
• Semester of first admission: When students began their studies at SFU.
• Basis of Admission: The criteria that was used to admit the student to the university.
• Birth date: Day, month and year is recorded.
• Total credit hours: The total number of hours the students has accumulated, including credit transferred from other institutions and credits completed and in progress at Simon Fraser University.
• Sex: Male, female or unknown.
• Transfer credit: The number of credits received from institutions, other than Simon Fraser University, the student has accumulated toward his/her academic goal.
• Hours passed: The number of credits accumulated at Simon Fraser University.
• Cumulative Grade Point Average: The student's overall grade point average.
• Credential: The academic credential the student is pursuing.
• Faculty: The faculty where the student's primary credential resides.
• Program Subject: The specialty area the student is studying.
• Mailing Address: The student's mailing address was established using his/her postal code.
• Permanent address: A secondary address field.

The data file elements are described and defined below.

Age in years and months, as of September 1992, was calculated for all students who had valid birth dates on file.

A registration status, whether enrolled part-time or full-time, was calculated for all students. Registration status is a function of how many courses or credits a student is taking. For the purpose of this study a part-time undergraduate student is defined as one who takes 9 semester hours of coursework or less in a semester. As noted in the literature review, there is no provincial, national or international standard as to what constitutes part-time studies at the university level. While the Simon Fraser University calendar is silent on this matter, common practice has been to consider those enrolled in 9 credit hours or less as part-time. This is consistent with the definition student loan agencies and Revenue Canada uses. A part-time graduate student is one who is taking one course a semester. Graduate students taking two or more courses are considered full-time. These definitions for graduate students are used throughout the British Columbia university system.
The length of the student's program is determined from the academic credential he/she is pursuing. The university offers certificate and diploma programs that allow students to specialize in a field but without the depth and breadth of a degree program. These programs consist typically of eight to ten courses (after prerequisite courses, if necessary, are completed) and are normally expected to be completed part-time. The university also allows qualified students to take courses even though they are not following a specific academic program. This includes not only those taking courses for general interest but also those taking courses to fulfill the entrance requirements to some specific academic program (such as graduate school, medical school, law school etc.).

A student's previous education is estimated from the basis of admission recorded by the university. The basis of admission indicates whether a student was admitted immediately after high school, on transfer from college, after completion of a degree etc. For the purpose of this study, mature students are those who do not meet the published admission requirements of the university, but who are judged to be competent enough to begin university studies by virtue of a combination of their formal education and the skills gained through employment, non-credit education and professional training. These students fall into three categories: A) Those with no high school matriculation and no post-secondary education; B) Those with no high school matriculation and some post-secondary education; C) Those with previous post-secondary education but
without the grades required for admission. In this study, mature students will include those admitted under the university's existing mature student policy and those admitted at the discretion of the Director of Admissions or designate. Other students are described in the study by the type of education they completed before being admitted to the university, e.g. high school, college transfer etc.

To establish if there was a relationship between where people live and their choice of campus it was necessary to establish where students reside. The student's postal code was used as an approximation of where they lived. The residential categories were defined by easily recognizable municipal areas.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS®) was used for the analysis of the data. Frequency distributions were produced and summarized for the relevant variables. The data were displayed as percent distributions to show the relative differences. The main tables are summaries of the data and are presented as percentage frequency distributions. These tables were produced using Microsoft EXCEL®.

---

2 Students mailing address was used as an estimate of their residence. It is known that the majority of students use their home address to receive correspondence from the University. However, experience suggests that a small number of students use their place of business to receive mail and some of the out of town students use their parent's home address. While it is impossible to know how many students do this, it is felt to be a sufficiently small enough number to make the data meaningful for the purpose of this analysis.
Limitations of the Study

In some instances the data extracted were not sufficient to answer the research question. In these cases, where possible, secondary sources were utilized. For example, published figures from the University's Office of Analytical Studies were used to determine graduate part-time/full-time status. Informal interviews with university staff were held to gain an approximation of levels of previous study for graduate students.

It should be noted that the researcher is currently employed in a middle management position with Simon Fraser University. However, the researcher is not involved with curriculum decisions and only administers admissions and registration policies that are decided by the University's decision making bodies such as the Senate. Throughout the study the researcher has attempted to remain objective in analyzing and interpreting the data.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if the educational objectives behind the development of the Harbour Centre campus of Simon Fraser University have been met. This was done by investigating whether differences exist between Simon Fraser University students studying at the Harbour Centre campus and those studying at the Burnaby campus. The analysis primarily uses a data set obtained in September of 1992 from the main Simon Fraser University student database. However, where necessary, secondary data sources were used to address some of the research questions.

Analysis of Undergraduate Students

As noted in Chapter 1 there are two main questions that are addressed in this study. First, do the undergraduate students attending the Harbour Centre campus differ than those attending the campus in Burnaby? Second, do the graduate students attending the Harbour Centre campus differ from those attending the campus in Burnaby? These can best be answered by examining if one group have different academic and demographic characteristics than the other group. The characteristics that are important were identified in previous chapters. The detailed discussion of the results of this research project follows below.
Age

The first characteristic investigated was student's age. If the undergraduate students at Harbour Centre fit the profile of the recurrent learner then they should be older than those at the Burnaby campus. Table 1 shows the distribution of ages by student category. The full breakdown of ages is shown in Table 2. Additional information on mean and median ages of full-time and part-time students is shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Centre Only</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All University</td>
<td>15,082</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harbour Centre Only students were an average 14.7 years older than the Burnaby Only students. These data were analyzed and found to be statistically significant (t = 7.67, P < .001). Harbour Centre Only students were also found to be an average 13.4 years older than the general university population. Another interesting finding was that the mean age of the Harbour Centre Only students was greater than any of the other categories of students listed in Table 2. The only group that even approached the average age of the Harbour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Old</th>
<th>All Burnaby</th>
<th>Burnaby Only</th>
<th>All Harbour Centre</th>
<th>Harbour Centre Only</th>
<th>All Day</th>
<th>Day Only</th>
<th>All Eve</th>
<th>Eve Only</th>
<th>All Disc</th>
<th>Disc Only</th>
<th>All University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-59</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>12,277</td>
<td>6,881</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>15,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Old</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Harbour Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,138</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>9,330</td>
<td>7,353</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Centre Only students were those taking Evening Only courses at the Burnaby campus.

The mean age of students taking at least one course at the Harbour Centre campus (All Harbour Centre) was 5.1 years higher than the All Burnaby group and older than any of the other inclusive categories studied. (The inclusive categories were the ones where students took courses in two or more of the categories identified in the study.) As would be expected the day-time students at the Burnaby campus were the youngest group with an average age of 23.4 years old (see Table 3).

**Gender**

Next, differences in the proportions of males and females on each campus was investigated. The literature indicates that recurrent learners are disproportionately female. Thus, it was expected that Harbour Centre would have more female students than the Burnaby campus. It was found that 53.7% of Burnaby Only students were female while the comparable figure for Harbour Centre Only was 67%. The only group with a higher percentage of female students was the Correspondence (DISC) Only category, comprising 73.4% female students (Table 3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Centre Only</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All University</td>
<td>15,082</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More generally it was also found that the mean age of female students was higher than male students in all categories. In particular, the age of All Harbour Centre women were, on average, 14.9 years older than their counterparts at the Burnaby campus. This is consistent with national data which show similar characteristics (Jasmin 1992a).

Table 3 provides details of the male and female ages as well as the ages for part-time and full-time students. Again, as was expected, the Harbour Centre students were older in all categories than any other group of students.

Registration Status

The next characteristic examined was the student's registration status. That is, whether the student was enrolled at the university on a full-time or part-time basis. It was expected that the undergraduate student population at the Harbour Centre Campus would be involved more in part-time studies than those at the
Burnaby campus. Recall that part-time studies were defined as a course load of 9 credit hours per semester or less. Summary data is displayed in Table 5. The full data are displayed in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Centre Only</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All University</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 1992 Fall semester, university wide, 63% of students were studying full-time while 37% were studying part-time with an average course load of 10.3 credits. The Burnaby Only group were 30% part-time, taking an average of 11.1 credit hours. This is in comparison to the Harbour Centre Only students who were 97% part-time with an average course load of 3.99 credits. T scores were calculated and this was found to be a statistically significant difference (t = 42.67, P < .001).

The Evening Only and Correspondence Only students experienced full-time/part-time distributions similar to the Harbour Centre Only group. All other groups studied had over 50% of their students studying full-time with average course loads in excess of 9 credit hours (Table 6).
## TABLE 6

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF SFU UNDERGRADUATES BY CREDIT HOURS AND CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>All Burnaby</th>
<th>Burnaby Only</th>
<th>All Harbour Centre</th>
<th>Harbour Centre Only</th>
<th>All Day</th>
<th>Day Only</th>
<th>All Eve</th>
<th>Eve Only</th>
<th>All DISC</th>
<th>DISC Only</th>
<th>All University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>12,277</td>
<td>6,881</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>15,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>median</th>
<th>mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Length of Program

The next area investigated was the length of programs that students were pursuing to ascertain if there were differences between the two campuses. It was thought that the undergraduate student population at the Harbour Centre Campus would be enrolled in shorter academic programs than the undergraduate students at the Burnaby campus. SFU students can be enrolled in degree programs (four years, or equivalent, of study), certificate and diploma studies (one year, or equivalent, of study) or as unclassified students with no fixed length of time for completion of their studies. Summary data are displayed Table 5 and the full data are displayed in Table 8.

| TABLE 7 |
| Distribution of Selected SFU Students By Credential Sought |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Certificate/Diploma</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Centre Only</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All University</td>
<td>15,082</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that 92.2% of all undergraduate students were pursuing degree studies, 5.1% were in certificate or diploma programs and 2.7% had no fixed program. These data were similar
### TABLE 8

**DISTRIBUTION OF SFU UNDERGRADUATES BY CREDENTIAL AND CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>All Burnaby</th>
<th>Burnaby Only</th>
<th>All Harbour Centre</th>
<th>Harbour Centre Only</th>
<th>All Day</th>
<th>Day Only</th>
<th>All Eve</th>
<th>Eve Only</th>
<th>All DISC</th>
<th>DISC Only</th>
<th>All University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASC</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGS</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBD</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITING</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (n=)</strong></td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>12,277</td>
<td>6,881</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>15,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) BA, BASC, BBA, BED, BFA, BGS & BSC are all undergraduate degree programs.
2) CERT is all certificate programs.
3) PBD is all Post Baccalaureate Diploma Programs.
4) PDP is the Professional Development Program (teacher training).
5) SPECIAL AND VISITING are non-degree (unclassified) programs.
for the Burnaby Only students, however, the Harbour Centre Only students were substantially different: 70.2% of these were on degree programs, 17.4% were seeking certificate or diploma programs and 12.3% had no fixed program (Table 8). As these certificate and diploma programs are considerably shorter than a degree and many of those studying as unclassified are visiting students (taking a few courses for transfer back to their home institution) or are taking courses for specific short-term goals, the Harbour Centre Only students appear to be pursuing shorter academic programs in much greater numbers than the Burnaby Only students.

Previous Education and Basis of Admission

The next area of investigation pertains to the amount of education students had at the time of their admission to the university. It was thought that the undergraduates at the Harbour Centre campus would be comprised more of both mature students and degree holders than would the undergraduates at the Burnaby campus. The data are summarized in Table 9 and more fully presented in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
<th>Distribution of Selected SFU Students by Basis of Admission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Ctre Only</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby Only</td>
<td>10,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All University</td>
<td>15,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Admission</td>
<td>All Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Transfer</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Transfer</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Transfer</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree holder</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=)</td>
<td>13,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the data, there are clear differences evident in each of the High School, Degree and Mature categories while the transfer categories are remarkably similar. Although only 7% of all SFU students were admitted as Mature, fully 28% of the Harbour Centre Only students fall into this category. As for those already holding university degrees the university average is 5%, whereas Downtown Only and All Downtown students were 16% and 7% respectively.

Of further interest is the somewhat larger proportion of students who are transfers from technical institutes (see Table 8). 5% of the Harbour Centre Only students had a technical school background, while only 1% of the Burnaby Only students came from a technical school.

It is evident that the students who are taking courses only at the Harbour Centre campus have educational backgrounds different from that of the university population in general. There are greater proportions of degree holders and mature students studying at the Harbour Centre campus.

**Student's Residence**

The next area to be investigated was where students live relative to where they study. Once established, it was intended that the Harbour Centre campus would provide educational opportunities
to those that live closer to downtown Vancouver than to the Burnaby campus. Therefore, it was thought that the Harbour Centre campus would serve a more geographically focused student group than the Burnaby campus does. As this information was difficult to summarize meaningfully the complete data are displayed in Table 11.

For the Burnaby Only students 13% reside in North Burnaby and 12% reside in each of Coquitlam and East Vancouver. The remaining 63% are widely disbursed through the lower mainland. Of the Harbour Centre Only students fully 40% reside in the City of Vancouver and another 15% are nearby in North and West Vancouver. This pattern is very similar of the All Harbour Centre students.

These results show that each campuses draws heavily from people who live in the communities immediately surrounding the campus location. The Harbour Centre campus appears to be more dependent on the local community (City of Vancouver and the north shore) than is the Burnaby campus.
### TABLE 11

**DISTRIBUTION OF SFU UNDERGRADUATES BY MAILING ADDRESS AND CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>All Burnaby</th>
<th>Burnaby Only</th>
<th>All Harbour Centre</th>
<th>Harbour Centre Only</th>
<th>All Day</th>
<th>Day Only</th>
<th>All Eve</th>
<th>Eve Only</th>
<th>All Disc</th>
<th>Disc Only</th>
<th>All University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Burnaby</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burnaby</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley North</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley South</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver**</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side Vancouver</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Vancouver</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver City</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Island</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N = )</strong></td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>12,277</td>
<td>6,881</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>15,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
*Coquitlam includes Port Moody.  
** North Vancouver includes both the City and District of North Vancouver.
Analysis of Graduate Students

Age

The first area investigated was the age of the graduate students. It was thought that, like the undergraduates, the graduate student population at the Harbour Centre Campus would be older than the graduate students at the Burnaby campus. Table 12 provides the distribution of graduate students by age, campus and degree type. The average age of all graduate students is 33.8. When looking at the Ph.D. only students and the Non-Harbour Centre Masters only students, it can be seen that these two groups have similar age profiles with average ages of 33.6 years old and 34.6 years old respectively. However, the students taking their master's programs at Harbour Centre have a somewhat higher average age of 37.2 years old. Harbour Centre students are, on average, 2.6 years or 7.5% older than the other master's students. A t test was calculated and this difference was found to be statistically significant (t = 43.43, P < .001).
TABLE 12

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF SFU GRADUATE STUDENTS
BY AGE, CAMPUS AND DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HARBOUR CENTRE MASTERS</th>
<th>NON HARBOUR CENTRE MASTERS</th>
<th>ALL MASTERS</th>
<th>ALL PHD</th>
<th>ALL GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-59</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 +</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 37.2 | 32.9 | 33.6 | 34.6 | 33.8 |
Median | 36.4 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 29.0 | 29.0 |
Mode | 36.8 | 30.7 | 31.8 | 32.6 | 32.1 |
Std Dev. | 6.8 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 8.0 |

NOTE: There are 5 students (all masters, 1 at Harbour Centre and 4 at Burnaby) with unknown ages who are not included in this table.
Registration Status

The registration status of Graduate students was also investigated. It was thought that the graduate student population at the Harbour Centre campus would be enrolled to a greater extent in part-time studies than the graduate students at the Burnaby campus. Only the Masters level students were compared as there are no doctoral candidates or programs at the Harbour Centre campus. The data are displayed in Table 13.3

The original file used for the previous analysis was not able to provide reliable information on the registration status of graduate students. For this reason the study turned to data published by Simon Fraser University which does include this information. Table 11 shows that, overall, 88.4% of the masters students taking courses at the Burnaby campus only were in attendance full-time and 11.6% were part-time. For those studying at the Harbour Centre campus only 78.6% were full-time and 21.4% were part-time.4 There were 38 students, all full-time, who took courses at both campuses.

---

3 The total number of students in this table differ from the total in the previous table as the data were obtained on different dates during the semester.
4 97 master's students were on leave in the 1992 Fall semester. On leave students are those who are still registered in their program but will not be taking classes, conducting research or making use of University facilities during their on-leave semester. As such these students were not counted as either part-time or full-time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Total (n=)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Graduate Students</strong></td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Master’s Students</strong></td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Harbour Centre Only Master’s Students</strong></td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Burnaby Only Master’s Students</strong></td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 13**

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF SFU GRADUATE STUDENTS BY PART-TIME/FULL-TIME STATUS AND CAMPUS
Thus, the Harbour Centre Only students study part-time at a higher rate than do the Burnaby students. As previously noted, however, these above figures are somewhat misleading due to the Business Faculty's requirement that all the Executive MBA students be working to be eligible for the program. Thus, even though they are classified as full-time students since they take two courses a semester, they are not able to devote their full attention to their studies. This group of students, therefore, while categorized as full-time are, in fact, part-time students. Given this, the actual percentage of part-time masters students studying at the Harbour Centre campus is nearly 100% (204 out of 206 students).

**Previous Education**

The last area to be investigated was the educational background of the graduate students at the time of their admission to the university. It was thought that the graduate student population at the Harbour Centre campus would have had more formal education upon admission than the graduate students at the Burnaby campus.

Unfortunately, the data used for this study did not capture this information in a form which could answer the question on previous education. Therefore, it could not be studied in depth as the other questions were. This issue of the graduate students' previous education is discussed more fully in the following chapter.
Summary

This chapter examined a set of research questions about students at the two campuses of Simon Fraser University. There were two main questions with several sub-categories. There were sufficient data to reach conclusions about all but one of the areas under investigation. The results are summarized and discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

In 1989 Simon Fraser University established a satellite campus in downtown Vancouver. This campus was designed to provide a variety of educational services to adult recurrent students. The purpose of this study was to determine if the Harbour Centre campus is serving this particular student group, or if the students at the downtown campus are simply a subset of the students at the Burnaby campus. Specifically, it was thought that the undergraduate students at the new Harbour Centre campus would be older, be studying primarily part-time, be enrolled in shorter academic programs and have different academic backgrounds than their counterparts at the Burnaby Campus. Also, that the Harbour Centre campus would draw students largely from the surrounding community. Finally, that the graduate students at Harbour Centre would be older, have more education when admitted and be pursuing part-time studies in greater proportions than the Burnaby campus graduate students.

The literature on adult part-time students (recurrent learners) was reviewed, as well as studies describing the general characteristics of Canadian university students. Several research questions were proposed and data from the main student information system was extracted to answer those questions. Academic and demographic characteristics of the students at the Harbour Centre
The students enrolled only at the Harbour Centre campus were older than those studying only at the Burnaby campus. The Harbour Centre students were also older than any of the other identified student groups, such as day, evening and correspondence students. The average age of females at both campuses was older than that of males. In addition the females enrolled only at Harbour Centre were older than those enrolled at the Burnaby Campus only. Moreover, there was a higher percentage of females enrolled at the Harbour Centre campus than at the Burnaby campus. It was also found that part-time students were older than full-time students in all categories.

When registration status was examined it was found that those at the Harbour Centre campus were more likely to be part-
time students than those at the Burnaby campus. It also was found that Evening Only students at the Burnaby campus and Correspondence Only students study part-time in similar proportions to Harbour Centre Only students.

The study also explored the length of programs students were undertaking. It was found that Harbour Centre students were more likely to be following shorter programs (Certificate and Diploma) than students at the Burnaby campus or within the university in general.

Students' basis of admission was then analyzed. The study found that, proportionally, there were more people admitted under the category of mature student and degree holder attending the Harbour Centre campus than at either the Burnaby campus or in the university population as a whole.

Area of residence was investigated and it was found that Simon Fraser University students are widely dispersed throughout the lower mainland. However, the Harbour Centre Only students were clustered in relatively high proportions in the city of Vancouver and on the North Shore. Therefore, it was concluded that the University has been successful in attracting to the Harbour centre campus students from the local community.

The final portion of this research was devoted to the study of the graduate students at Harbour Centre. The Harbour Centre
graduate students are older than those at the Burnaby Campus. The Harbour Centre campus graduate students are almost all part-time students, while those at the Burnaby campus are predominately full-time (88.4%). The question concerned with graduate student's previous education could not be answered fully due to a lack of data.

Discussion of Findings for Undergraduate Students

Age was considered to be an important characteristic in differentiating students from the two campuses. As the central focus of the academic programs at the Harbour Centre campus is to provide opportunities for adult students to begin, or complete, a university program, it was thought that these students would be older than those at the Burnaby campus. Although the study does conclude that Harbour Centre students are significantly older, it should be recognized that the mean age is affected somewhat by the relatively high proportion of seniors in attendance, comprising 4.7% of All Harbour Centre students and 14.9% of Harbour Centre Only students. (All Harbour Centre students are those taking one or more courses at Harbour Centre, as well as at least one course at the Burnaby campus or through the correspondence program. Harbour Centre Only students are those that take all their courses at that campus.) Senior citizens are defined by the university as those 60 years of age or older. These senior students are concentrated at the Harbour Centre campus primarily due to the existence of targeted programs (e.g. Senior Citizen's Certificate) that form part of the Harbour Centre mandate. A special academic advising service for
seniors (staffed by volunteers) has been located at the downtown Vancouver campus to assist this group of students with their program planning. While some of these students are taking courses simply for interest, a large number (61 or 81.3%) are pursuing degree, certificate or diploma programs. Each year some of the senior students finish their program and graduate with their completed credentials. Those finishing their initial program often return for additional studies. Thus, these students form an integral part of the educational mission of the Harbour Centre campus.

On the question of registration status it was found that Simon Fraser University is fairly representative of Canadian universities. University wide, 63% of students were studying full-time while 37% were studying part-time during the 1992 Fall semester. This compares with national figures. As noted in Chapter 2, of the over 800,000 university level students in Canada, 62% are studying full-time and 38% are part-time (Jasmin, 1991). The data showed that Harbour Centre Only students study part-time in much higher proportions than those in the Burnaby Only campus category. Again, here the full-time/part-time distribution of the Harbor Centre Only students is similar to that of those studying through Evening Only courses at the Burnaby campus or through the Correspondence Only courses. This similarity was also expected as the above two programs pre-date the Harbour Centre campus and were also initially intended to provide access to educational services for the recurrent learner.
With respect to the length of program, it was found that a higher proportion of the Harbour Centre students enroll in short (less than four years) academic programs than do the students at the Burnaby campus. This results largely from the organization of the academic programs at Harbour Centre. Many of the courses offered are designed to support various academic programs that have been developed for the recurrent learner. It was, therefore, expected that the relative proportion of students pursuing these programs would be higher at the Harbour Centre campus than at the main campus.

A student's previous education, or lack thereof, was also thought to be an important component in identifying recurrent students. As has been seen, the Harbour Centre campus closely fits the anticipated profile of the target student group with more mature students and degree holders at the time of admission than the Burnaby campus. The downtown campus also appears to have attracted another group of students in greater proportions than was anticipated. While Simon Fraser University has only 1% of the student body transferring from a technical school program, the comparable figure for Harbour Centre Only students is 5%. The reasons for this phenomenon are difficult to discern without surveying the students directly. However, it likely has to do with the need or desire of the graduates of technical programs to supplement their technical training with advanced education in fields related to their current jobs. It can be argued that technical school graduates often find that their career path stalled by not having a degree. Their participation in studies at Harbour Centre in greater numbers than
were expected suggests that the campus is serving the needs of this important group of recurrent learners.

On the question of residence it was found that almost 40% of the Harbour Centre Only students originated from within the local community while the Burnaby Only students are more widely dispersed. However, some caution is urged in interpreting this result. It should be recognized that for those students who do not live at home Simon Fraser University has only a limited number of residence beds available at the Burnaby campus. The Harbour Centre campus does not have a student residence. There is space on campus for 915 single students with an additional 200 units available for families. This allows only approximately 6.5% of the student population to live on campus. Thus, for those who may prefer to live at the Burnaby campus but cannot, due to space limitations, the choice of where to live will be heavily influenced by factors such as availability of affordable housing, easy access to public transit and commuting time. For students living at home, the choices are even more limited, as they must live where their parents do, even though it may be inconvenient for commuting to the university campus. The older, more established, part-time students are more likely to have their own homes, or at least be renting in an area of their choosing, than younger, mobile and financially strapped full-time students. Therefore, while the study found that there were differences in where students lived it is felt that this may have more to do with external factors than with choice for many of the students at the Burnaby campus.
Moreover, the original planners of the campus thought that some Harbour Centre students would enroll because of the proximity to their work, not their residence. While 40% of the Harbour Centre Only students live in the City of Vancouver the remaining 60% are dispersed throughout the lower mainland area. Part of the motivation in locating the campus in the downtown area was to provide accessible education to working people. The location of the campus should allow these people to attend class after working hours then travel home, thereby avoiding the rush hour. Given the distribution of students noted above, this may well be the case. Further research is needed to confirm this proposition.

Discussion of the results would not be complete without some attention to the students in the other categories that were examined, in particular, the Evening Only students at the Burnaby campus and the Correspondence Only students. These students are also older than the Burnaby Only students, although the differences are not as great as with the Harbour Centre Only students. The Evening Only and Correspondence Only students are also overwhelmingly part-time, in proportions similar to the Harbour Centre students. They, too, are undertaking certificate and diploma programs in greater numbers than those in the general university population. Finally, on the measure of previous education, these two groups of students also have more degree holders and mature students than the general university population. Therefore, these results provide some evidence that the recurrent learner is not
restricted to the Harbour Centre campus. The evening and correspondence programs also appear to be serving a segment of the adult part-time student market, as was intended.

In spite of the forgoing it was also found that a number of full-time students also take courses in the evening and at Harbour Centre. This high proportion of full-time students taking at least one non-traditional course suggests that some are using these courses to either free up time during the day (possibly for employment purposes) or to fill out their program because required or desired day courses are not available (that is courses which are full or not offered in the day). The virtual 50/50 full-time, part-time split in the Harbour Centre group indicates that half the students are using the campus (by choice or otherwise) to round out their full-time schedules and half are using it as an integral part of part-time participation in their chosen program. It is assumed that the majority of students who want to study full-time have a high probability of getting a full course load, since they have a wide variety of course combinations from which to choose. Moreover, third and fourth year students have up to 8 weeks to arrange their course schedule and the first and second year students have between 5 and 6 weeks after initial registration. This includes the first two weeks of classes where students can move into courses that were formally full but where space has been freed up as students adjust their schedule during course change period.
Discussion of Findings for Graduate Students

The information about graduate students is less comprehensive than that for the undergraduates. However, it still provides some interesting findings. Harbour Centre graduate students are significantly older than those studying at the Burnaby campus. They also enrolled part-time in greater proportions than the Burnaby students, but it is evident that this is a function of program design and part of the educational plan for Harbour Centre. The two specific Harbour Centre graduate programs, Executive MBA and Graduate Liberal Studies, are available only on a part-time basis. These two programs alone account for 96% of the Harbour Centre Only graduate students. While a few graduate programs at the Burnaby campus allow part-time registration, the great majority are meant to be completed on a full-time basis. It is, therefore, not surprising that differences were found between these two groups of students.

In the matter of the student's level of education previous to being admitted to a SFU graduate program, there were not enough data to draw conclusions. However, informal discussions were undertaken with those responsible for administering graduate programs and limited details on graduate student's previous education were obtained. It is highly unusual for applicants to Masters' programs at the Burnaby campus to be admitted without having first completed an undergraduate degree. The two Harbour Centre graduate programs have a stated policy of admitting a proportion of their students who have not completed the first
Bachelor's degree. Approximately 10% of students admitted to the Graduate Liberal Studies program and approximately 5% of students admitted to the Executive MBA have not completed an undergraduate degree. It also was found that approximately 27% of the students admitted to the Liberal Studies master's program already hold a graduate degree. Although exact figures for other Simon Fraser University master's programs are not available, staff in the graduate section of the Registrar's Office thought the overall figure for students admitted to Master's program with previous graduate degrees was considerably lower than 27%, probably less than 10%. This provides some evidence that there are differences in previous education between the graduate students at the two campuses of SFU. However, further research needs to be conducted to confirm this.

Conclusions about Undergraduate Students

On the five key variables put forward in the first research question — age, gender, registration status, program length and basis of admission — differences were found for the Harbour Centre Only students on all five. Those studying only at the Harbour Centre campus were older, disproportionately female, predominately part-time and involved in shorter academic programs than the students studying only at the Burnaby campus. In addition, those at the downtown campus were more likely to have been admitted as mature students or after already having completed a degree than were those at the Burnaby campus. As well a large portion of the Harbour Centre
students live relatively close to the downtown campus. The above are all factors that were previously identified as being important in characterizing the recurrent learner.

Moreover, it was found that students taking some of their academic program at the Harbour Centre campus exhibited some of the same characteristics as the Harbour Centre Only students. Although the differences were not as great as the Harbour Centre only group, they were still large enough to suggest that this group too was largely composed of recurrent learners.

Based on the overall findings of this investigation it is concluded that the Harbour Centre campus has been successful in providing educational services to recurrent students at the undergraduate level.

Conclusions about Graduate Students

On the three key variables put forward in the second research question — age, registration status, and previous education — differences were found for the Harbour Centre Only students on two of the three. The Harbour Centre students were significantly older and were largely enrolled on a part-time basis. On the issue of previous education the data file did not have sufficient information to use for an analysis. However, information from several sources suggest that the master's level students at Harbour Centre differ somewhat in their level of previous education from the students at
the Burnaby campus. It is thus concluded that the Harbour Centre campus has been successful in providing educational services to recurrent students at the graduate level.

Implications for Policy Makers

While the study demonstrates that Simon Fraser University has been successful in its efforts to provide educational opportunities for adult part-time students, there are some cautionary notes.

Foremost is the issue of new student admissions. Current university policy on new admissions may be preventing new recurrent students from accessing either campus. Simon Fraser University has begun a program of strategic enrollment management in an effort to restrict uncontrolled and under-financed growth. To achieve controlled growth, admission requirements have been increased so that it is now much more difficult for mature students and degree holders to enter the university than when the downtown campus was originally conceived. This will adversely affect students who may have adequate grades and excellent experiential backgrounds, but who lack the high academic standing currently needed to be admitted to the university. In the four years that the Harbour Centre campus has been open, degree holder admissions have fallen from 21.1% to 9.5% of new admissions and mature student admissions have fallen from 7.4% to 5.1%. At the same time, the entering class has been reduced by 28%, or over 1,600 students, but
the proportion of students entering from high school has increased from 26% to 34% of the entering class (Chan, 1992). Therefore there has been a real erosion in both the absolute numbers and relative proportions of new students admitted as degree holders and mature students. This has important implications for the Harbour Centre Campus. If this trend continues the pool of adult part-time students will decline, leaving the campus to serve a student group that more closely resembles the students at the Burnaby campus.

This phenomenon is not restricted to Simon Fraser University. "Demand for education services increased over the period to the extent that many universities have not been able to accommodate all qualified applicants. The short-term coping response of many universities was to raise entrance standards and place enrollment restrictions on numerous programs" (Trends AUCC, 1991). While this may be an effective short-term coping strategy, the long term effects will be to seriously reduce the number of new adult students entering the university. If Simon Fraser University is committed to continuing to provide access to part-time adult students it should revisit its current admission practices and make provisions for increasing the number of mature students and students returning to continue or complete their education. The current restrictive admissions policies and practices are a decided barrier to the participation of the recurrent student.

Another factor that could affect the participation of adults is the lack of flexibility in the scheduling of classes. The existing
model has the university offering classes in the day or the evening. Those unable to attend at these times must take correspondence courses or go elsewhere. To continue to work towards the stated objective of being accessible to recurrent students it would be prudent to offer courses at other times. Some available options are courses early in the day (e.g. 7:30 a.m.), at noon-hour, on weekends or even on alternate weekends.\(^5\) This kind of scheduling could help those who have family or professional commitments that make the once-a-week evening classes and traditional day-time classes unattractive.

Also, the success of the graduate programs at Harbour centre should aid in convincing academic planners that there is a strong demand for graduate programs which can be completed on a part-time basis. Both of the existing programs continue to receive considerable interest from students inquiring about continuing their academic studies. Prospective students also often inquire as to the availability of other graduate programs which can be completed on a part-time basis.

**Limitations**

Although there is strong evidence that the adult student is well served by the Harbour Centre campus some caution should be exercised in interpreting the results of this study for the following

\(^5\)The Executive Master of Business Administration Program implemented a weekend MBA program in 1992. Classes are conducted Fridays and Saturdays on alternate weekends.
reasons. First, the present work was an examination of students enrolled in one particular semester. While there is no evidence to suggest that Fall 1992 was not a typical semester, whether it was in fact representative could be confirmed only through a longitudinal study.

A further consideration is that the complete range of undergraduate and graduate programs, as planned, is not yet fully developed or implemented. Academic planning is a long-term and continuous process and several programs intended for the Harbour Centre campus are yet to be approved. If the planning and approval process proceeds as intended, additional graduate and undergraduate programs will be available at the campus for the recurrent student market.

Finally, it should also be recognized that the scope of activities at Harbour Centre encompasses far more than undergraduate and graduate teaching. In addition to the undergraduate and graduate activity described in this study, the university provides continuing and professional education to more than 4,500 students annually. Some examples of courses offered are Asian language instruction, professional writing, tourism management, research in health care, urban studies and business studies. Courses are offered at various times during the day and week, and are generally organized so that working people are able to attend. There are few, if any, admission requirements for most of these courses and programs. As well, several programs leading to
professional certification are offered in conjunction with their respective associations such as the Institute of Canadian Bankers, the Association of Administrative Assistants, and the Purchasing Management Association of Canada.

The Harbour Centre campus also houses nine research centres. These centres draw together university faculty and members of the community in an effort to examine questions of current concern. These research centres are:

- Gerontology Research Centre
- Centre for Policy Research on Science and Technology
- Institute for Studies in Criminal Justice Policy
- Institute for Canadian Urban Research Studies
- Prison Education Research Project
- Canadian Institute for Advanced Research
- Centre for North American Business Studies
- Human Performance Centre
- Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing

The university also provides office space to three resource centres: the B.C. Educational Association for Disabled Students, the Confederation of University Faculty Associations of B.C. and the Society of Canadian Women in Science and Technology. Although not directly associated with SFU, these groups provide services to the community and the education sector. They pay rent in exchange for office space and ancillary services at the Harbour Centre campus.

In addition to the above activities and services the university offers a wide variety of free events to the local and academic
communities. These events range from small seminars for 20 people to large public lectures drawing 300 or more as well as cultural events and art displays.

The local business community uses the Harbour Centre campus for internal training and development programs and corporate meetings. The university is able to provide quality space and audio-visual services previously unavailable in the downtown Vancouver area. The space is rented to these groups when it is not needed for instructional purposes.

Given its close proximity to hotels and transportation routes, the campus is well suited to hosting small (academic and non-academic) conferences and workshops. The Harbour Centre campus is also often used for education sector meetings, when individuals from post-secondary institutions and government agencies need to meet in a central location.

While it is difficult to provide an exact number, it has been estimated (SFU, Office of Special Programs) that each year over 25,000 people attend the various courses, conferences, workshops, public events or private training sessions held at the Harbour Center campus.

All of these activities are an integral part of the Harbour Centre mission, yet this research project was unable to study them adequately. Any definitive conclusions about the long term potential
for success of the Harbour Centre campus in meeting its educational goals must take the full scope of campus activities into consideration.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

The university should continue to monitor undergraduate student enrolments to determine if the stated educational goals of Harbour Centre are being met. Within a few years, a longitudinal study should be undertaken to determine if, over time, the recurrent learner continues to participate in the educational programs at the Harbour Centre campus. A longitudinal study also could aid in determining the rates at which part-time students complete their programs, or if they complete them at all. Additionally, it would be useful to investigate how much of a student's program was completed by using courses at the Harbour Centre campus and how much was completed by using day-time, evening and correspondence study.

Research also could be carried out to examine more closely those students who combine the different modes of study. Little is known about why students combine evening courses with day courses or take courses at both campuses. Do they use these differing modes of study by choice or are they forced into course modes they do not want because their preferences are not available? Additionally, questions could be asked about why some students, who live within
commuting distance of the university, still choose to take courses by correspondence.

Further research on graduate students could be conducted to ascertain whether the campus location plays a factor in their choice of graduate program or whether they would attend the same program, regardless of campus location.

Another major potential area of investigation is the non-credit student the Harbour Centre campus serves (approximately 4,500 course registrations in fiscal year 1992/93). Continuing and professional education programs are included in the Harbour Centre mission statement, and it would be appropriate to know more about the students who study in these programs. Undertaking research on these students, however, is much more problematic than for the undergraduate and graduate students as computer records for non-credit students are very limited. For the most part, the non-credit student records contain only name and address information with no detail on age, gender or previous education. Informative research could best be carried out through participant surveys.

Conclusion

Of the research questions posed, the majority were able to be answered positively. There was a lack of data with respect to graduate student's previous education, however, secondary sources were consulted and estimates of their previous education were made.
This research project has confirmed that, as intended, Simon Fraser University is attracting adult recurrent learners to the Harbour Centre campus in the City of Vancouver. The study found that those taking their academic classes at the Harbour Centre campus are older, study more part-time, are disproportionately female and have different academic backgrounds when first admitted to the university than those studying only at the Burnaby campus.

This research project also found that the current admission practices of the university are preventing the very students that are likely to be attracted to the Harbour Centre campus from being admitted to the university. The long-term consequences of this will likely be that students at Simon Fraser University will become a much more homogenous group than has historically been the case. If this occurs, the Harbour Centre campus will simply be just another place to take classes rather than the distinct educational institution that was initially intended.

At present though, the university is successfully providing educational services to the advanced recurrent learner.
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APPENDIX 1

Senate Paper S88-33,

Report on Objectives and Program Development Guidelines - Harbour Centre Campus
The Senate Committee on Academic Planning met on September 14, 1988 to consider the Report on Objectives and Program Development Guidelines prepared by the SCAP/Harbour Centre Planning Committee. Action taken at that meeting gives rise to the following motion:

**MOTION:**

"That Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the Objectives and Program Development guidelines for Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre, as set forth on pages one through seven of the attached document, S88-33."

---

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To: Senate

From: Senate Committee on Academic Planning

Subject: Report on Objectives and Program Development Guidelines

Date: September 15, 1988
Memorandum

To: Dr. J.W.G. Ivany
Vice-President, Academic

From: Jack Blaney
Chairman,
SCAP/Harbour Centre

Subject: REPORT ON OBJECTIVES & PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES
Date: July 27, 1988

In preparing this report, Committee members were guided by the work of the previous SCAP/Downtown Committee, met with the Faculties and some departments, and held two open faculty forums (with Faculty Association assistance). Members of the Committee gave special attention to the central focus of an urban university centre. We considered this within the context of SFU's mission and strengths, and programs of other institutions, the needs of the community, the opportunities for institution-building, and the practical matters of doing whatever we do well and within accepted budgetary principles.

Since preparing this report, Committee members, in a preliminary way, have considered the programs, among the many that have been proposed for Harbour Centre, against the criteria promulgated in the report. Several programs (each dependent on adequate funding) clearly meet the focus we propose for Harbour Centre; others, with further development, likely will as well.

Further, Committee members plan to consider the kinds of programs that ought to be at Harbour Centre, in addition to those proposed by departments, as well as the important matter of building thematic linkages among programs and the need to establish as much program coherence as practical.

Any further work by the Committee, however, must await SCAP's response to our first, enclosed report. The Committee is unanimous in recommending the report to SCAP.

JPB/em
Encl.

cc: Committee members
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Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre: Objectives and Program Development Guidelines

The hallmark of universities is that they serve the advanced knowledge needs of society. Change -- in organizations, in technology, in responsibility, or in career, public and personal goals -- directs individuals to seek further education. Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre will serve this need by becoming an urban centre for the advanced recurring education of those who through previous education, intellectual growth or substantial experience have already established the necessary foundations for advanced learning. Simon Fraser University is institutionally committed to basic and graduate programs in the traditional liberal arts and sciences, to interdisciplinary professional and applied programs, and to the renewal of individuals and organizations through programs of lifelong learning. The programs offered at the main campus, in downtown Vancouver and through distance education each must respond to the geographical and demographic characteristics of the particular sites and their catchment areas. Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre, as an integral part of Simon Fraser University, will reflect our institutional characteristics, but it will also have a distinctive mission in response to the particular societal and economic needs represented within the city centre. The educational programs that will meet this mission will be a mix of selected programs now offered by SFU, together with others that will be expressly designed to respond to this particular mandate. Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre presents an opportunity for Simon Fraser University to achieve new distinction within the city, the province and the nation by becoming a recognized centre for advanced recurring and mid-career education.

Central Focus: Advanced Recurring Education

Universities, beyond their 'traditional' clientele, have for years served adults in two ways: first through offering non-credit self-development and personal enrichment courses on any variety of topics studied at university; and second,
through the provision of opportunities to start or complete a university degree. These continue to be important needs. But with accelerating change a third need has emerged -- that of providing opportunities for adults possessing fundamental competence to return to university in order to keep up with evolving circumstances and conditions -- much as university faculty members seek sabbaticals or specialized seminars to maintain their currency, vigour and competence. It is this third, emergent need, that we should primarily address in our programs at Harbour Centre.

Some individuals continue their intellectual development or establish new occupational competence through independent study alone, but many require or desire more formal instruction. At any one time this instruction may be best provided by graduate degree or post-baccalaureate diploma programs, through established university programs (accessible on a full or part-time basis), or at other times, by credit-free intensive seminars and courses.

Many of the best models of advanced recurring education are, not unexpectedly, at our best North American universities -- UCLA, Harvard, MIT, and Illinois. These institutions, and the mid-career educational centres they have established, such as the Sloan School of Management and the John F. Kennedy School of Government, have been leaders in responding to changes in society's emerging advanced educational requirements.

Establishing Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre as a centre for advanced recurring education will serve distinct needs in our community; it will, as well, build on the strengths that distinguish us from other educational institutions, while also enabling us to emulate some of the best North American universities in response to changing societal needs. Our downtown location, within the very heart of British Columbia's cultural and business centre, provides us with access to the province's strongest concentration of highly qualified individuals and organizations who offer both a clientele to be served and resources to assist in teaching and research.

In developing a centre for advanced recurring education we should focus on our particular mission and strengths, and concentrate on research and education rather than training. Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre must
not be lured by financial pressures into providing every short-term skilldevelopment workshop "needed" by the downtown community; it must, rather, focus on the areas in which it has developed special strengths. Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre cannot be all things to all people: other institutions are better equipped than we for many of the programs needed in our community.

Academic programs at Harbour Centre should serve the advanced recurring education needs of our community (local and national), within the bounds of Simon Fraser University's academic strengths and expertise to meet educational needs that embrace intellectual development, occupational competence and public responsibility. All departments of the University should be offered the opportunity to exercise their instructional and research initiatives within this framework. Programs should interrelate the city with the University, so that the unique characteristics of an urban location (ambience, clientele, resources, economic and cultural activity) may be foci for program development, study and research. Ideally, each program should advance the concept of education as a lifelong, recurrent process, and emphasize the University's unique role within this process.

It is essential that programs at Harbour Centre offer opportunities for faculty to test and apply concepts to urban, economic, social and cultural concerns, and to collaborate with expert practitioners. These programs should combine (wherever possible) teaching with research in order to capitalize on opportunities for providing policy analysis, technical guidance, consultations and research and development assistance so that the results of research are brought to the workplace, and the problems of the workplace to research.

Over time, Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre should become a major centre of intellectual and cultural activity, technical advance and economic renewal for our community. This cannot be achieved without an ongoing tenure-track faculty presence, however modest this may at the beginning be.
Program Development Criteria and Guidelines

A previous SCAP Downtown Program committee established a framework for program development, based upon three areas of University activity. These centres, selected to describe "program types and areas which could eventually be located downtown," were not meant to impose any particular organizational or administrative structure, but rather were chosen to indicate priorities in regard to program initiatives and to ensure balance in program offerings.

The committee recommended that a Centre for Advanced Professional Studies be employed to embrace graduate degree and post baccalaureate diploma programs, in professional and interdisciplinary areas, directed to professional development or career change; a Centre for Liberal Studies be established to provide a focus for a structured undergraduate program in the humanities, sciences and the social sciences; and that short, specialized courses, seminars and conferences emanating from the programs of the above two centres, as well as from all programs of the University, be offered by a Centre for Continuing Studies.

These three proposed centres of program activity provide a good foundation for developing Harbour Centre as a place for recurring education. They clearly suggest programs for those already prepared or experienced, and generally at levels beyond preparatory education or skill training. They exclude regular undergraduate degree programs, but represent the core of the university through the provision of access to knowledge from established programs. In keeping with this, the present committee recommends that the Centre for Liberal Studies program thrust be renamed the Centre for Liberal Arts and Science.

In order to achieve orderly program development, the SCAP Harbour Centre Committee recommends that the following general guidelines be established for the assessment of programs proposed for Harbour Centre:
1. Programs offered downtown should support the central Harbour Centre mission and have a good educational rationale (e.g. demonstrated need, anticipated audience) for being located there. Overall, balance and coherence in program offerings should be established.

2. Programs must have strong departmental and Faculty support.

3. Programs must have a realistic funding plan and be capable of being funded without cost to the main campus.

4. Offerings at Harbour Centre should complement rather than replicate main campus programs of study. Exceptions should be considered when there is a strong rationale and sufficient demand and departmental interest to maintain programs at both sites.

5. Programs must be capable of being served by the library, the Harbour Centre facilities and support services.

Put even more succinctly, the essential requirements for program development at Harbour Centre are these: departmental support; appropriateness to the mission of Simon Fraser University and SFU at Harbour Centre; realistic and acceptable funding.

Appropriate program development within Advanced Professional Studies and Liberal Arts and Science is obviously critical to the advanced recurrent education focus of Harbour Centre. The Committee recommends, therefore, that credit courses should be selected or designed for recurrent learners who are using the university to update skills or undertake career change. Such a goal will require the establishment of certificate and diploma programs, as well as an entry-level program focused primarily on liberal arts and sciences. The entry-level program will also provide the prerequisite courses necessary to support Harbour Centre diploma and certificate offerings. The downtown campus should, however, also be used to highlight unique SFU faculty and resources by offering special courses from time to time. While the normal path for degree completion will be at the Burnaby campus, individuals may elect to use courses offered in the certificate and diploma programs offered at Harbour Centre towards SFU degree completion.
In the long term, a number of specialized degree completion programs may be offered through the downtown campus. Graduate programs, with part-time access, should be developed which focus on distinct interdisciplinary programs of particular interest to urban professionals and programs which have a distinct urban focus.

The Program Development Process and Program Administration

As explained below, program development for Harbour Centre will proceed through the regular department - Faculty - SCAP - Senate route. The SCAP/Harbour Centre Committee will play a consultative and advisory role in this process. Another integral part of the program development process is the information obtained from ongoing consultations with community groups: business, cultural and government organizations; professional and voluntary associations; and special interest organizations such as labour organizations, the Business Council of B.C. and the Vancouver Board of Trade.

The SCAP Harbour Centre Committee will invite and receive proposals and evaluate them in terms of the guidelines outlined above. Following these deliberations the Committee will recommend to SCAP those programs and centres appropriate for further development under the University's usual and established development and approval procedures. In addition, the Committee will: 1) consult with SCAP and departments on program overlap and cross-departmental needs and services; 2) offer assistance as an iterative advisor to program developers; and 3) take a leadership role in identifying potential areas for program development by departments or by interdisciplinary program committees.

The Committee has received over 30 proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs, research centres and service units at Harbour Centre. A preliminary review of these proposals has been conducted and a more formal appraisal will follow the adoption of the Committee's recommendations on mission and criteria. A list of these proposals is presented as Appendix A.
It is important to note that in 1989 a fully developed program at Harbour Centre will not be in place. Program development and implementation necessarily will be phased in, over a three to five-year period, with ongoing assessment and change. It is not possible, or practical, to define fully in advance what programs should or could operate at Harbour Centre; much will be learned by being there. Further, the funding is not in place to support many of the initiatives and program needs already identified. For these reasons it is recommended that the SCAP Harbour Centre Committee should continue its work for at least one more year, with a longer term, and perhaps a revised role, to be considered at that time.

Programs at Harbour Centre will be developed, implemented and managed as they are on campus, by departments and Faculties, with the usual appointment and administrative reporting procedures of departments/Faculties/Vice President, Academic. The appointment of faculty will be by and to existing campus academic departments. Collaborative programs between departments and Continuing Studies also will follow established policies and procedures.

The Office of the Vice President, SFU at Harbour Centre will, to the extent of available resources, provide support for the provision and coordination of program services (library, information and registration, audio-visual) and will manage the facility. In addition the Vice-President for Harbour Centre, as Chair of the SCAP Harbour Centre Committee and as a member of the Office of the Vice President, Academic, will assist departments in the coordination of program development and, where possible, in program funding. In concert with the Committee and in collaboration with campus colleagues, it is also expected that the Vice President for Harbour Centre will provide leadership in outlining the Senate-approved mission and character of SFU at Harbour Centre, and will contribute to representing Simon Fraser University at Harbour Centre within the community.
Appendix A

PROPOSALS RECEIVED BY SCAP/HARBOUR CENTRE COMMITTEE
(Generally Categorized)

Centres, Institutes & Graduate Programs

1. Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing
2. Image/Sound Research Centre
3. The Canadian/American Business Studies Centre
4. Family Business Institute
5. Executive M.B.A.
6. Criminal Justice Administration
7. Tourism Policy, Planning and Research
8. Masters of Arts in Liberal Studies
9. Centre for International Communication
10. Masters of Fine Arts (Media)
11. Resource Management
12. Masters of Science (Math Education)
13. Human Performance Centre
14. Psychology and The Law
15. Centre for Education, Law and Society
16. Centre for Study of Financial Institutions
17. B.C. Business Studies Institute
18. Innovation & Entrepreneurship Centre
19. Centre for Professional Ethics
20. Praxis Film Development Workshop
Post Baccalaureate Diplomas, Certificate Programs and Individual Courses

1. Business Administration
2. Liberal Arts & Sciences (various departments)
3. Languages (for general and professional/business purposes)
4. Actuarial Mathematics
5. Computing Science
6. Gerontology
7. Family Studies
8. Social Policy Issues
9. Urban Studies

Seminar & Special Course Programs and Services

1. Community & Public Policy Studies
2. The City Program
3. The Writing Program
4. The Design Program
5. Statistical Consulting Service & Industrial Statistics
6. Management Skills for Advanced Technology
7. Professional Development Programs in Management
8. Educational Information Service
TO: Dr. J.M. Munro, Chairman
Senate Committee on Academic Planning

FROM: R.C. Brown, Chairman
Downtown Campus Planning Committee

SUBJECT: Interim Report of the Downtown Campus Planning Committee

DATE: January 3, 1984

Attached is the interim report of the Downtown Campus Planning Committee containing the objectives and principles under which a Downtown Campus should be established, and an outline of program types and areas which the Committee believes would be appropriate.

The first page of the report contains the general principles which the members of the Committee feel are essential to the establishment of a Downtown Campus. This part of the report has the unanimous support of the Committee.

The outline of program types and areas consists of an illustrative set of programs which could eventually be located downtown. The list is not thought to be exhaustive, nor is there consensus on all of the suggested components. In fact, there was extensive debate about the wisdom of having any non-professional undergraduate programming downtown at all, and two members of the Committee finally voted against the inclusion of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies. On the other hand, the majority of the Committee felt that the inclusion of this program would provide an important academic balance to the Downtown Campus.

There is strong unanimous support for the idea of a Centre for Advanced Professional Studies. The programs which eventually might be developed within this category will likely be the heart of the Downtown Campus.

There is also general support for the School for Continuing Studies. The idea here is that the School will support the programs offered by the two Centres, in addition to those programs being offered from other main campus departments.

Finally, we envision that any program started downtown will have to be phased into operation as resources become available.

RCB/1n
Attach.

cc: W. Wattamaniuk
Member's, Downtown Campus Planning Committee

(Note: Re-typed February 1, 1988 /em)
PREAMBLE
The need for the establishment of an SFU downtown campus has been accepted in principle by Senate (S.83-45 IV). The present Downtown Campus Planning Committee was struck by Senate to determine objectives for a downtown campus and to outline program types and areas. All objectives are encompassed within two essential and overriding principles, these being:
- all programs are of high academic quality and integrity and compatible with Simon Fraser University's commitment to excellence;
- the implementation of plans for a downtown campus are contingent upon the availability of sufficient private and designated funding, together with anticipated new and non-credit program revenue, for the establishment and continuance of programs. Such implementation should not be detrimental to present SFU programs and budgets.

Nothing hereinafter stated is intended or should be interpreted as an erosion of these principles.

RECOMMENDATIONS
(a) That the programs developed for the SFU downtown campus extend and enrich the present programs at Simon Fraser University.
(b) That the downtown programs not duplicate or conflict with those on the SFU campus.
(c) That programs developed downtown will be those whose character and objectives will be enhanced and strengthened by a downtown location.
(d) That programs developed downtown should be responsive to the specific needs and interests of the urban centre's institutions and population.
(e) That programs be consistent with SFU's academic mission.

CONDITIONS GOVERNING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION
(a) All downtown programs are subject to the approval of the SFU Senate and Board of Governors.
(b) Programs will be implemented when the resources required to ensure their quality are judged to be assured. Programs will be developed in a way such that they can be phased in over time as resources become available.
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY DOWNTOWN CAMPUS
(degree programs)

CENTRE FOR ADVANCED PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

- Criminal Justice Administration
- Communications Policy
- MBA Executive Program
- Recurrent Education
- Public Policy and Administration
- International Business/Pacific Rim
- Engineering Administration

CENTRE FOR LIBERAL STUDIES

Bachelor of Liberal-Arts
(Core Program)

SCHOOL FOR CONTINUING STUDIES

Functions:
- Support for programs offered by the Centre for Advanced Professional Studies and the Centre for Liberal Studies
- Support for programs offered by other main campus departments
- Support for programs using community resources for both curriculum development and instruction (SCCS and/or department approved)

Some Illustrative Programs:
- Corporate Communications
- Arts Administration and Policy
- Humanities - Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary
- Urban Studies/Civic Affairs
- Science for Non-Scientists
- Tourism
- Engineering Management
- Pacific Rim
- Health and Fitness
- Ethnic Studies
- Perception and Aesthetics
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