

For Information

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC
MEMORANDUM

S.93-4

To: Senate
From: J.M. Munro, Vice-President, Academic
Subject: External Review - Department of Political Science
Date: December 11, 1992

Attached for the information of Senate is the executive summary of the external review of Political Science which was carried out in March 1992. The report and the response of the Department were reviewed by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning at its meeting on December 9, and the Committee approved a motion to receive the report. The full report and the response by the Department are available from the Secretary of Senate for senators to review.

The review team had the following membership:

Chair: Dr. Hans Michelmann
Chair of Political Science
University of Saskatchewan

Members: Dr. Caroline Andrew
Former Chair Department of Political Science
University of Ottawa

Dr. Charles Pentland
Chair of Political Studies Department
Queen's University

Internal Member: Dr. John Hutchinson
Department of History



/pjs

Committee to Review the Department of Political Science
Summary of Proposals

1. That the Department offer two 200-level courses in each subfield.
2. That, given the prospect of diminution of short term teaching resources, the Department review all upper division offerings and retain only those that can be offered at least once a year by regular faculty.
3. That the Department relax size restrictions on all 300-level courses, allowing at least those in greatest demand to be given as lectures, while 400-level courses remain seminars with rigorously controlled enrolments.
4. That the Department put in place a system of prerequisites, albeit a fairly liberal one which required at least one 300-level course in the subfield for entry to any 400-level seminar. This would have to go hand in hand with greater frequency and predictability in offering courses, especially at the 300 level. In addition, while prerequisites, credits and GPA might continue to govern admissions to 300-level courses, it would make sense under the proposed system to give majors and honours students priority in admission to 400-level courses.
5. That either the honours programme be dropped or that it be redefined, in effect, as a variant on the major which would involve preparation of a thesis (either reduced to the weight of three semester hours, or increased to six) and the taking of 400-level seminars in the subfield of concentration.

6. That undergraduates be required to take a course in political theory while leaving them some latitude as to the choice of courses to meet the requirement.
7. That, first, in the context of of the structural changes discussed above the Department ought to cut the number of courses offered in the upper division so as to reflect more accurately what full time faculty can realistically be expected to teach on a regular basis. Second, with the exception of those doing the major administrative tasks, all faculty should be expected to teach the five course norm each year (at present about half teach only four).
8. Some thought should be given to a regular departmental bulletin to meet at least some of these needs.
9. That the Department continue the present course of systematizing the teaching evaluation process, and also commit itself to publish the results.
10. That TAs get clearer guidelines and better instruction and monitoring by the Department. One step, easily taken, would be to supplement the one day University wide orientation for TAs with a session in the Department more focussed on the particular needs of political science students and courses.
11. That the Department adopt the policy that final examinations are marked by faculty only, and that this policy be announced as a matter of pedagogical principle.

12. That the Department continue, first within field committees, then within the graduate programme committee and the full Department, discussion about the ways in which it wants to define the areas of strength within the two areas of concentration at the Master's level.

13. That POL 801-5 be reorganized in such way that the choice of thesis area not be dealt with in the course.

14. That biennial reviews of course descriptions and course materials be done by the Graduate Studies Committee so as make sure this material is up to date and reflects the teaching and research interests of the Department.

15. That the Department draw up a written document describing the planned MA in International Studies that calls for the participation of other departments and that this proposal serve as the basis of discussion with other departments.

16. That the Department proceed with their decision to assign supervisors to students upon entry to the programme and that this policy be consistently administered and monitored by the Graduate Studies Committee.

17. That the Chair monitor more closely the work loads of TA's.

18. That assignment of TA's be the responsibility of the Graduate Studies Committee.

19. That the Department discuss ways of encouraging its members to submit external research proposals.

20. That the Department instruct the Graduate Studies Committee to examine the procedures of the graduate programme in regard to deferred marks, length of time students take to complete their programmes etc. with a view to devising rules that will be adopted by the Department.

21. That additional continuing appointments be made in the Department of Political Science, at least so that the Department reach the average Faculty of Arts level of continuing faculty members per F.T.E. student.

22. That at least one of the new appointments in the Department of Political Science be made in political philosophy/political theory.

23. That the Department of Political Science be assigned a room that can serve as departmental library/seminar room.

24. That the Department, meeting collectively and regularly, should become and be recognized as the main legislative and norm-setting body within and for the Department.

25. That the Department set aside a time for meetings in which no teaching activities are scheduled, that this time be of sufficient length (at least 90 minutes) for conducting major business and that this time be clearly communicated to all members of the Department.

26. That the Department schedule a regular monthly Department meeting, and meet more often if the need arises.

27. That formal minutes of Department meetings be kept, that these be formally adopted at subsequent meetings, and that accepted rules of procedure be followed in meetings. We

further recommend that the Department forward copies of these minutes to the Dean for at least a year.

28. That Department committees be given clear terms of reference and that they be required formally to report back to the Department their findings and recommendations. Major Department decisions should normally be referred to the responsible committee for preliminary study and deliberation. In particular, the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees should be charged with monitoring and improving all aspects of their respective programmes including those arising out of the recommendations of this report.

29. That committees be required to give at least an annual formal accounting to the Department meeting of their activities.

30. That the Department review various areas of its functioning (teaching, its committee system, its relations with other university offices etc.) with the goal of more systematically developing and implementing sets of procedures in these areas.

31. That the Department initiate a regular faculty colloquium and/or speakers programme, and that it consider periodically organizing an academic conference.

32. That the Department increase contacts with the Office of the Graduate Dean and work with that office in the development of the graduate programme.

RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEWDEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE1. INTRODUCTION

I am pleased to send the response of the Political Science Department to the Report of its External Review Committee. We are grateful to the members of the Review Committee for the time and careful attention they have given to their task, and are pleased with the generally positive tone of the Report.

The Political Science Department has been discussing the recommendations of the Report, in a day-long Departmental Retreat and in other meetings of the whole Department. The Undergraduate and Graduate Program Committees have examined the recommendations dealing with their areas of responsibility and have reported to the Department.

The Report contains several detailed recommendations that deal with some general areas of concern. We thought it would be useful to discuss the general topics and give some idea of the steps we are taking to move in the directions suggested by the Report rather than to reply on a recommendation-by-recommendation basis.

2. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM RESPONSE

The Report has concluded that the undergraduate programme offered by the Department is sound and well-designed. At the same time it acknowledges the problems the Department faces in attempting to meet the high undergraduate demand for our courses given our limited full-time faculty component. As the Report indicates, one of the ways in which the Department has attempted to meet student demand has been to use limited term and sessional instructors. This has created problems for curriculum planning and continuity. Therefore, the external review committee has recommended that the Department's full-time permanent faculty component be expanded in order to reduce the Department's dependence on sessional and limited term instructors in accommodating some of the

high student demand. We strongly agree with their judgment that the administration "must take steps to expand the Department's faculty complement".

Other recommendations with regard to the undergraduate program include some directed toward the problem of our expanded undergraduate enrollment. The remaining ones are aimed to strengthen the curriculum and its delivery. In response to the review, and to our own interest in developing our curriculum to reflect our pedagogical concerns, the Department has begun a process of curriculum reform. We expect to retain those aspects of the curriculum structure on which the Report commented positively while amending others to reflect changes in our discipline and our faculty component.

Two of the Report's proposals address the number of course offerings in the undergraduate program. First, it recommended the Department offer two lower division courses in each subfield. There are two subfields with only one lower division course. The Department is generally agreed upon the desirability of offering two courses in each of these fields, however, we are also agreed that with our present faculty component, we have insufficient resources to do so. Second, the Report suggested we reduce our offerings to those courses which are regularly taught. Our own examination of our offerings indicated that only two courses have not been taught within the last four terms. In our curriculum review, some courses may be abandoned, but we do not anticipate decreasing our number of course offerings substantially. This is because we must retain a range of offerings within each subfield.

In order to alleviate some of the problem of student demand, the Report recommended that all faculty, except those doing the major administrative tasks, should be expected to teach a five course norm each year. The Department is concerned that this issue of teaching load be addressed in light of the principle of equity, both within the Department and between the Department and other units in our Faculty. A review of other Faculty loads outside the Department indicates that we are one of only two departments that has a five course norm for its full-time faculty members. In addition, within the Department, graduate supervision is not equitably distributed. The Department is currently examining alternative standards for faculty teaching load that will address both these issues of inequity but will do so with some recognition of our enrollment pressures.

The Report has also suggested enrollment pressures could be offset through a series of revisions to our upper division courses. It recommended that 300-level courses be largely lecture-type format and 400-level ones be strictly seminar format with prerequisites that include at least one 300-level course. The Department is agreed upon the general principle that size restrictions on some of our 300-level courses be relaxed. However, for pedagogical reasons, we are also committed to retaining as much of the seminar system as is realistically possible. As the review committee observed, this is a "unique and rightly cherished tradition" in the Department. Our curriculum review is currently addressing these issues of principle and new field committees will examine increasing the prerequisites for our 400-level courses.

The Report addressed two other, more specific, issues concerning our curriculum structure. The first was a recommendation that our majors be required to take a course in political theory. In our curriculum revision we are exploring the possibility of expanding the requirements for our majors, including ones which would require a political theory course and a methods course. However, we are keenly aware of the restrictions we face concerning the availability of faculty to teach such courses.

The second recommendation was that we redefine our honours course, or that it be dropped. We are aware of the limitations of the programme and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is looking at proposals that would give it greater prominence and would foster a more cohesive honours cohort.

The final set of recommendations concerned the delivery of our curriculum. One of them, on teaching evaluations, has already been addressed. The Department has adopted a computerized system of teaching evaluations and has a policy that promotion, tenure and merit pay will be tied to teaching performance as well as to research and the other criteria listed in university policy documents. Some documentation of teaching performance will therefore be requested by the Departmental Tenure Committee when a faculty member's case is being considered. The Department is generally favourable to the suggestion that final examinations be marked by faculty only, however our large lower division courses, combined with the requirements of the semester system which limit the time available for marking, pose serious implementation problems. Finally, the Department is addressing

the problems of Teaching Assistants' guidelines and instruction and is considering the proposal for a departmental bulletin to facilitate communication with our undergraduates.

3. GRADUATE PROGRAM RESPONSE

The Report notes that the Department has made a real commitment to its graduate programme and that there is a strong sense in the Department that the continued development of that programme is, and should continue to be, a high priority (pp. 14-15). This certainly is a correct reading of the situation. We have been able to attract good students and we continue to receive applications from an increasing number of very well qualified Canadian and foreign students.

It is suggested (p. 16) that the Department seek ways of defining areas of strength within what the reviewers identified as the two areas of concentration at the Master's level, namely "Comparative Politics/International Relations" and "Canadian Politics/Public Policy." We would like to reply that any further specialization would be inappropriate insofar as the interests of both faculty and graduate students are too diverse and far-reaching to allow for this kind of hyperspecialization. Nevertheless, it is true that there is room for closer cooperation among faculty members interested in overlapping issues (e.g., the problems of "governance") and such a cooperation is already under way; the newly created Field Committees are the ideal vehicle for that purpose.

As far as the graduate curriculum is concerned, the suggested changes to POL 801 have been implemented already and a committee has been formed to rethink our approach to the development of an MA in International Studies.

We recognize that support for graduate students and the monitoring of their progress through the programme are critical areas that require further attention. As far as the work load of TAs is concerned, we comply with the new TSSU contract rules which in effect achieve the goal suggested by the report. We also have implemented the recommendation that the assignment of TAs be the responsibility of the Graduate Studies Committee. In addition to this, the new awareness of the importance of obtaining external research funding in order to provide our graduate students with

additional means of support should improve the situation in future years. Finally, efforts will be made to obtain support for graduate scholarships from the community at large.

The course work MA option which already has gone through several critical review and approval stages in the Faculty of Arts and Senate should, when and if it becomes available, enable students who chose this option to complete their degree in about five terms.

4. GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. Size, Background of the Faculty Complement

The Report is particularly concerned about the discrepancy between enrolment pressures at the undergraduate level and the faculty resources available to cope with those pressures. It states that the Department is well worth the allocation of further resources and recommends that the Department be given more continuing appointments. Naturally, we agree with this recommendation.

In fact, the faculty resource situation, already at a critical level when the Review Committee visited us in the spring, has become even more serious with the loss of five full-time Limited-Term positions and two full-time Post Retirement positions. We also lost a potential appointment in this spring's hiring freeze. In other words, at the time of the Review Committee's visit the Political Science Department had 22 full-time members. We now have 16.5 full-time members. We agree whole heartedly with the Review Committee's recommendation that we be given the faculty resources to cope with our enrolment pressures, beginning with the position in International Relations that we lost last year and the position in Political Theory recommended by the Review Report.

B. Research and Teaching Contributions of Faculty

The Report's overall assessment of Departmental research contributions is very positive, and the Reviewers point to one of the Department's great strengths: the fact that it is not divided into "stars" and "toilers". Rather, there are strong research accomplishments across the Department.

The Report does suggest two areas where improvements could be made: collaborative research among Department members, and external funding. There has been an increase in joint research

projects as we have hired more people with overlapping research interests to the point where, as the Report notes, about half the faculty are involved in such projects. This has been particularly the case in the Public Policy area, and we hope that collaborative research will increase as we add more members to the Department and develop critical masses of faculty with related interests in other areas of the discipline.

The low level of external funding has been, in part, the result of the nature of faculty research, which has tended not to be very expensive and which, in general, has been carried out with the support of internal funding. However, since the Reviewers' visit one member of the Department has received a SSHRCC grant for \$94,000, and we have sent several applications to SSHRCC and other funding agencies this fall. We are aware that this funding is of importance not only to our own efforts but also as a potential source of support for our graduate students, and hope to increase the amount of external funding we receive in the future.

The comments on our areas of strength in the discipline are useful and correspond to Departmental perceptions. The Report also identifies areas, especially in International Relations and Comparative Politics, that need additional faculty resources, both to meet student demand and to create the possibility of research interaction, and we agree with these recommendations. It should be noted that we have added a faculty member with a specialization in Soviet foreign policy and the international relations of the Pacific Rim.

The Report's comments on the teaching contributions note a "strong impression" that "commitment to teaching is high and pervasive" in the Department. However, the Reviewers also note that the reputation of the Department among students does not appear to match this reality. They have made several suggestions to remedy this situation, an area dealt with in the section on the undergraduate program.

C. Size and Distribution of Support Staff

We agree with much of this section of the Review Report, particularly the remark about overload in the Departmental Assistant's office. Since the current Departmental Assistant started in that position

to the Spring of 1992, our total of Majors/Minors has increased from 251 to 511 and the number of faculty to September 1992 from 11 to 16. The Review Committee did not comment on the load carried by the Secretary to the Chair/Graduate Program, but this load is also excessive, and will increase as we carry out the expansion of the M.A. program recommended by the Report.

It should also be noted that the Departmental Assistant is very scrupulous in referring students seeking advice about the academic content of courses and about vocational goals to faculty members. Also the Department has moved to install a local area network.

D. Resources Supporting Teaching and Research

We agree that the adequacy of library resources is a major area of concern, and will try to improve our interaction with the Library so we can make the best use of the limited resources available.

E. The Provision of Office Space and other Facilities

We agree with the Report's comments on the need for more Departmental common space, since this type of space greatly increases the possibilities of interaction among colleagues. We have received renovation money to combine two small offices to create a faculty coffee room, but in the long run, we will need a larger space as well as common rooms for graduate and undergraduate students and a seminar/meeting room.

Increasing the amount of common space, and providing more adequate space for Teaching Assistants is an important goal for the Department as is the provision of adequate computer facilities. However, here as in other areas we do operate under conditions of limited resources.

F. Administration of the Political Science Department

The Report devotes a considerable amount of its attention to issues of Departmental governance. They note the existence of an overall spirit of good will and respect in the Department, but also record some discontent over procedures that are considered to be excessively informal and not always clear. In part, this situation is the result of growth in faculty numbers coming after a relatively long period of stability. Policies and procedures that work in a small department of people with a long

history of interaction are no longer suitable in a larger department with significant numbers of new members. Since Departmental cohesiveness forms the background for the successful performance of many other activities, we have considered the remarks and recommendations of the Reviewers very carefully.

We are moving to implement several of the recommendations of the Report. Field committees have been established and given terms of reference that will, we hope, allow them to function and to be integrated into the overall Department decision-making process. Other Committees are reviewing and updating their terms of reference, and we will draw up terms of reference for meetings of the whole Department. These terms of reference and other components of the Department "constitution" will be assembled in a form in which they will be easily available. A Departmental implementation of the Governance Committee has been created to oversee the recommendations of the Review.

The Report's discussion of the role of the Chair also calls for some comment. Although practice may vary from department to department, it is not at all unusual at Simon Fraser University for an associate professor to hold the position of Department Chair. It seems to us that the authority of the Chair is more properly founded on the ongoing support of the Department and the support, where necessary, of the higher levels of the University administration.

Most of the recommendations of the Review are fairly straightforward and largely consist of urging the establishment of more formal procedures. We agree that the Department is now at a size where formalization of Departmental procedures is necessary and are moving in that direction, as I have noted above.

We will also take steps, as the Report suggests, to provide opportunities for non-permanent instructors to be better integrated into the life of the Department. However, with the disappearance of our limited-term contracts, most non-permanent instructors are teaching only one or two courses, and it seems unfair to urge them to participate. Providing the opportunity to participate in, for example, Department meetings and the activities of field committees should meet the spirit of the Report's recommendations.

G. Relations with the University

This section of the Report mainly discusses the relationship between the Department and the University Administration and notes that there are problems on both sides of the relationship. It is true that the Department believes that its actions in meeting the pressures of student enrolments have not been rewarded by the provision of adequate and necessary resources (although we are aware that we are probably not the only Department in the University with this perception). In the areas of staff and operating budget resources have been brought into closer relationship with needs. The gap between faculty complement and student enrolment remains and has even, as I noted above, grown since the visit of the Reviewers.

The dissatisfaction of the University Administration with the Department is not something I can comment on in detail - and this fact may in itself have some significance. It might be very useful to have a meeting between the Department and members of the University Administration to discuss problem areas in our relations with each other and ways that the problems might be dealt with.

In general, the experience of the Review has been a positive one for the Department. The Reviewers' Report contained a large number of useful suggestions and has provided the impetus to undertake many needed reforms.

EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MARCH 1992

Carolyn Andrew, University of Ottawa
John Hutchinson, Simon Fraser University
Hans J. Michelmann, University of Saskatchewan
Charles C. Pentland, Queen's University

1. Introduction

In assessing the present state and future prospects of any institution, reviewers and reviewed alike tend to reach for the imagery of crossroads or turning-points. At the outset of this exercise we heard strong suggestions that indeed the Department of Political Science at Simon Fraser was at such a critical stage in its development. Indications were that the Department was at last ready to emerge from the shadows of its troubled past; the reviewers' task was to determine if, judged by the research performance and potential of its faculty, the quality of its teaching programmes and the capacity to govern itself efficiently and harmoniously, the Department was now ready to move on to bigger and better things.

An earlier review, conducted in 1984, took place in rather different circumstances and with different prospects before it. It called for major changes in the undergraduate programme and for a series of measures to correct what it saw as a tendency to collective, as opposed to individual, under-achievement. In the ensuing years the Department responded constructively to many of these recommendations, especially with respect to undergraduate teaching.

Like generals, however, reviewers have a tendency to plan for the previous war. In the years since 1984 the Department's situation has changed in a number of ways that were difficult to predict. A new and harder period of financial stringency has descended. Disproportionate enrolment pressures in political science, now more than ten years old, have shown no signs of abating. The discipline itself continues to evolve in its cross-fertilization with other fields, in the relationship between theory and policy, and in the definition of, and balance among, the subfields. And as we head deeper into the 1990s the first major wave of faculty retirements, flowing from the first post-war expansion some thirty years ago, has begun to crest. Thus, however well the Department has responded to the earlier review, inevitably it now faces new challenges.

The Department's principal achievement over the past several years, in direct response to that review, has been to put in place the foundations of undergraduate curriculum reform. In the course of our own review we found a department engaged in delivering a well-designed, robust and heavily-subscribed undergraduate programme. Reform has already been a positive experience. Nevertheless, it remains incompletely realized. New full-time teaching resources and a willingness to make some tough choices, particularly about the upper division, are now required, in our view, to make the undergraduate programme a truly first-rate operation.

A number of major questions, however, centre on graduate studies. The Department's relatively modest M.A. programme is clearly in need of some attention with respect to its design and administration. In light of its unaccountably difficult history, the worthy project for a Master's programme in International Studies needs serious rethinking and a renewal of collective commitment. A better-structured M.A. programme, with closer integration of teaching and faculty research, would be prime evidence of the Department's capacity to undertake, eventually, a PhD programme which would signal its emergence in the front rank. In this respect, however, the Department has some distance yet to travel.

The 1984 reviewers necessarily found themselves responding to a complex or organizational problems and communal tensions that had persisted from the Department's early years. Some of these personal and ideological disputes seem to have disappeared, or at least diminished, since that time. Unavoidably, however, a major theme from that earlier review recurs in our report. The Department is an ensemble of talented and committed scholars whose research productivity, particularly in recent years, has been impressive. Nevertheless, despite notable progress in the past decade, it does not seem yet to have gelled as a collective enterprise. There are, in our view, some concrete, common-sense steps it can take to foster a greater sense of community among faculty, staff and students and to institutionalize more effective forms of departmental governance and management. These

changes would be required even of a Department with no aspirations to greater size or status. For a Department which seeks a presence both at Simon Fraser and in the Canadian political science community commensurate with the sum of its individual talents, and which, moreover, does so in the context of financial crisis and persistent enrolment pressures, such reforms become vital.

2. The Undergraduate Programme

The previous review recommended a number of far-reaching reforms to the undergraduate programme, many of which have since been implemented. The most important of these are the establishment of a common first year course and the rationalization of the second year offerings. There is a clear and generally compelling set of principles underlying the structure of the programme, with respect to such matters as distribution requirements, prerequisites and the like. Much remains to be done, however, particularly with upper division courses, to bring those principles closer to realization in practice. While university rules may place some constraints on what can be done, for the most part the required changes are within the authority of the Department to make.

The logic of the programme is that all students proceed from a common first year course (Pol 100) to a limited selection of second year courses introducing the five subfields (theory, Canadian, comparative, international and public administration/policy). Of these courses, which are prerequisites for entry to upper division courses in the subfields, minors must take at least two, majors or honours students at least four. Except for the significant number of students entering after two years of community college, and for those who have taken Pol 151 (an alternative prerequisite for some second year courses), political science undergraduates now work from a common general introduction to government and politics, through a choice at the 200-level of three theory and methods courses, two Canadian courses, one comparative, one international and two public

administration courses, after which they proceed to a much broader range of upper division courses in all five subfields. This system of common foundations, streaming and prerequisites makes a great deal of pedagogical sense, and strikes a commendable balance between professional direction and student choice.

With respect to the lower division courses there is still some room for improvement. We heard some comment that in Pol 100 there could be considerable variability from instructor to instructor and from semester to semester with respect to topics, texts and approaches, frustrating the purpose of laying a common foundation. Similarly the somewhat anomalous position of Pol 151 as an alternative entry route to some 200-level courses may need examining in light of scarce teaching resources. Third, it is not clear why there should be as many as three 200-level courses in one subfield (the least subscribed of the five) and as few as one in two other subfields. In the latter cases it is a common complaint that too much is attempted in the space of 13 weeks, resulting in broad surveys which are weak on theory and method and of dubious pedagogical value as introductions to upper division courses. The optimal solution here, in the spirit of a recommendation made to us about comparative politics, would be to offer two 200-level courses in each subfield, differentiated along some "natural" fault-line (e.g., in comparative, between industrial democracies and developing countries, or in IR between the international system and comparative foreign policy) and infused with increased, albeit basic, theoretical content. In the case of theory, the choice would be reduced to 210 and 211 (required, as mentioned later), with 213 moving to the 300-level. We recommend, therefore:

That the Department offer two 200-level courses in each subfield.

The more serious structural issues arise in the upper division. Some of these centre on the number of courses offered - a concern likely to become more acute, at least in the near future, as teaching resources diminish. Despite the Department's efforts to respond to the previous review's recommendations, there are still too many 300 and 400-level courses on the books, many of which are offered infrequently and unpredictably. Undergraduates commented that the Department tries to offer too much, at the expense of depth in any area. (On the other hand, they also wanted more courses in political economy, IR and comparative politics.) We were not able to determine if in fact every one of these courses has been offered at least once a year for the last few years. We do recommend, however:

That, given the prospect of diminution of short term teaching resources, the Department review all upper division offerings and retain only those that can be offered at least once a year by regular faculty.

At present, to judge from course calendar descriptions and outlines, there seems to be little to distinguish 300-level from 400-level courses, apart from some tendency to greater generality and theoretical content in the latter (most evident in comparative politics). Only two 400-level courses (433 & 443) have 300-level courses as prerequisites. It seems to us to be in the spirit of the ongoing reform of the programme to create more of a distinction between the two levels. One way to do so, we recommend, which also bows to the seemingly inevitable pressures of growing enrolments and declining resources, would be:

To relax size restrictions on all 300-level courses, allowing at least those in greatest demand to be given as lectures, while 400-level courses remained seminars with rigorously controlled enrolments.

That the Department put in place a system of prerequisites, albeit a fairly liberal one which required at least one 300-level course in the subfield for entry to any 400-level seminar. This would have to go hand in hand with greater frequency and predictability in offering courses, especially at the 300 level. In addition, while prerequisites, credits and GPA might continue to govern admissions to 300-level courses, it would make sense under the proposed system to give majors and honours students priority in admission to 400-level courses.

In this connection it is worth mentioning the honours programme, presently a source of bemusement or dissatisfaction for students and faculty alike. Currently it requires an extra twenty semester hours, including a thesis worth five semester hours, and an extra term beyond the major. It was instituted in this form to meet the unusual requirements of Simon Fraser's student constituency and of the trimester system. Since, however, it is an option rarely taken (six Honours graduates in the last seven years) it is not clear whose needs, if any, it is meeting. We recommend, therefore:

That either the honours programme be dropped or that it be redefined, in effect, as a variant on the major which would involve preparation of a thesis (either reduced to the weight of three semester hours, or increased to six) and the taking of 400-level seminars in the subfield of concentration.

The Department should also consider creating a mandatory honours seminar, worth three semester hours, in which honours students would engage the theoretical and methodological issues arising from their thesis research. Such reforms would give the honours programme a meaning and a prominence, not to mention the enrolment, it presently lacks.

We believe that these recommendations for change in the undergraduate programme carry to a logical conclusion the reforms already begun. Although the opening-up of all 300-level courses would do violence to the unique and rightly cherished tradition of seminars and tutorials, it seems to us to be a realistic concession to the force of numbers. At the same time the proposed changes in the upper division and the recasting of the honours programme would infuse undergraduate education in political science with greater cumulativeness and professional rigor at minimal cost to flexibility and breadth.

From these matters of structure we now turn to questions of coverage and to areas of strength and weakness in the undergraduate curriculum. The previous review found no reason to dispute the Department's claim to cover adequately the five subfields distinguished by most Canadian departments of political science. Neither do we. The Department offers --reasonably regularly as far as we can tell -- a respectable number of courses in each of these subfields, ranging from a low of 13 in political theory to a high of 23 in comparative politics. Enrolments appear to be distributed fairly evenly across four of the five subfields, ranging in 1991-2 from a total of 824 in comparative to 1264 in international relations (the mean for the four is 1068). Undergraduate courses and enrolments, at least, bear out the Department's claim to strength in Canadian and public policy, and in IR and comparative politics.

Political theory is the exception. Its total enrolment for 1991-2, at 436, was about half that of the next smallest subfield. We heard from several faculty that normative and empirical theory, especially the former, had tended to get short shrift when it came to hiring and the allocation of resources, partly because it lacked a "constituency" among faculty and students. At the same time, many argued, it should be top priority in future hiring. The case for giving priority to theory cannot, it is clear, lie in student demand. If that were the sole justification no department in Canada would be hiring theorists or methodologists. The case rests, rather, on the sound premise that theory is essential to the core or to the foundations, of an undergraduate political science education. If this be the

case -- and we believe it is -- then the argument for hiring a political theorist is also an argument for making some political theory compulsory for undergraduates (or at least for majors and honours students). It would seem reasonable to require one of Pol 210, 211 or 213 of all students wishing to take 300-level courses, and perhaps a 300-level theory course (especially the new Pol 314) for entry to 400-level courses. If such requirements were put in place the case for hiring a theorist would be self-evident, and the Department would, in effect, have legislated (to the worthy end of strengthening the professional core or spine of the programme) a better balance among the five subfields in terms of course offerings and enrolments. Our recommendation here extends and reinforces that of the previous review with respect to the place of political theory. We believe it is possible -- indeed necessary --:

That undergraduates be required to take a course in political theory while leaving them some latitude as to the choice of courses to meet the requirement.

The Department sees its requirements as "designed to balance concentration in one of the fields of Political Science with experience of the broad scope of the discipline" (Information Booklet, 1991-1992, p. 14). We believe this to be an appropriate objective for an undergraduate programme and that the existing design in Simon Fraser's Department serves quite well in that respect. There are, of course, geographical areas and themes that a department of this modest size cannot claim or aspire to cover. Critics will always have such 'gaps' to point to, -- and the undergraduates did so -- but there is little that can be done about them in a climate of scarce resources. Other criticisms, however, centred on the lack of depth or intellectual weight in established areas. Students and faculty alike often referred to the limitations of the 13 week semester in this connection. It would be worthwhile exploring the possibility of mounting two semester courses in some areas to meet this demand for greater depth, although we recognize the limitations imposed by

staffing requirements and by the in-and-out pattern of student enrolment. We were not able to get a clear sense of how serious the "breadth-over-depth" problem is, although we heard references to it several times. Resource constraints may, in any case, force some contractions of the Department's reach.

The foregoing observations begin from the premise that in its objectives and design the Simon Fraser Department's undergraduate curriculum is basically sound and centred in the mainstream of Canadian political science. (We should add that not all faculty consider being in the mainstream a good thing). Our recommendations aim, for the most part, at nudging the curriculum a bit further in the direction proposed by the earlier review and stated by the Department itself, strengthening somewhat its cumulative, professional quality and responding, at minimal cost to its pedagogical traditions, to rising enrolments and declining teaching-resources.

We turn now to a number of problems relating to the delivery of the undergraduate programme and its responsiveness to the needs of its constituency. The origins of some of these problems may indeed lie beyond the Department, in the University at large (e.g., in the trimester system or the reward structure for faculty performance). Others can be traced to departmental practices which are more susceptible of prompt reform. There is no doubt that chief among these problems over the past few years has been the large proportion -- upwards of 40 percent -- of teaching done by limited term and sessional instructors. For the Department, the advantages are obvious: when the expansion of its undergraduate enrolment under the Access Programme was not rewarded by new tenure-track appointments to the extent expected, short term hiring was a way to fill the gaps flexibly and cheaply from a large pool of qualified people. Although the Department has had some success in converting sessional to limited term appointments, providing somewhat more stability in teaching arrangements and a less exploitative employment situation for the instructors concerned, the situation remains, on balance, unsatisfactory. In taking otherwise commendable steps to humanize the working conditions of its limited term

instructors (lightening teaching loads and adding a research term) the Department has, in effect, made them too expensive to continue on the same scale. Even without impending budget cuts, then, there has been pressure to phase out limited term instruction and, at best, return to the cheaper sessional format.

Quality of instruction, it must be said, is not the issue here. We were assured repeatedly that the variability in this respect among short term instructors was no greater than that among regular faculty. The central issue, rather, has been the lack of continuity or predictability in the delivery of undergraduate teaching from one year (or even one semester) to the next. If the Department is unable to predict, with respect to a large portion of its programme, who will teach what for the next 12 to 24 months, students are frustrated in trying to plan which terms to be on campus and which to take off to work. The presence of so many instructors with uncertain future prospects has other costs for students: they cannot count on continuing counsel from instructors they get to know, and they question the value of letters of reference from people without seniority or "standing" in the Department. Such things do not enhance the sense of community felt by students in the Department.

It might be said, of course, that having over 40 percent of teaching done by sessionals and limited term instructors is better than the alternative, which is to have less instruction. Indeed, the real prospect is that the budget for such teaching will virtually disappear, if not this year then soon after. The Department ought, in our view, to plan for such an eventuality in two ways. We recommend:

That, first, in the context of of the structural changes discussed above the Department ought to cut the number of courses offered in the upper division so as to reflect more accurately what full time faculty can realistically be expected to teach on a regular basis. Second, with the exception of those doing the major

administrative tasks, all faculty should be expected to teach the five course norm each year (at present about half teach only four).

This implies that the practice of granting relief from one course for every two MA supervisions completed, should be abandoned.

We are also convinced, however, and we argue elsewhere in this report, that the University administration must take steps to expand the Department's faculty complement. Such a commitment would go some distance to alleviate the Department's lingering sense of grievance over the outcome of the Access Programme. More important, it would ease a burden of undergraduate enrolment now bordering on critical and it would be concrete acknowledgement that the Department has escaped its past and become a solid growth area worthy of investment.

However it is achieved, a solution to the chronic instability represented by the heavy reliance on short term instructors would help ease the problems of scheduling about which we heard numerous complaints from undergraduates. For reasons they, at least, do not understand Political Science is the only department not to have its fall schedule posted on time. One student described the Department's scheduling of courses as "completely random". While acknowledging the real limits to long term rational planning of the undergraduate programme, faculty and the Departmental Assistant assured us that standard courses were in fact offered at least once a year and that systematic planning was alive and well in the DA's "black book" which matched teaching needs with faculty several terms ahead. The greater the proportion of teaching done by regular faculty, the easier such planning will become.

In addition to scheduling there are a number of other problems relating to the administration and delivery of the undergraduate programme which tend to suggest to students that their needs are not foremost in the Department's consciousness. Undergraduates will acknowledge that Political Science professors are generally

approachable and available; nevertheless, many hold the view that what is taught, when and how often, is a function primarily of faculty research priorities. As in the case of scheduling, there is clearly an element of student folklore about this impression. Some of the evident malaise may be a reflection of the anomie and powerlessness inevitably felt by an on-again, off-again, commuter student body. On the other hand there is considerable room for improvement in the two-way flow of communications between the Department and its undergraduate constituency.

In the first place, the flow of information to undergraduates concerning curriculum and departmental life in general (seminars, visitors, faculty activities, and the like) could be more timely and comprehensive. We recommend that:

Some thought should be given to a regular departmental bulletin to meet at least some of these needs.

The Department should also make it clear to undergraduates that their evaluations of courses and professors are an integral part of assessments concerning tenure, promotion and salary. We recommend:

The Department continue the present course of systematizing the evaluation process, and also commit itself to publish the results.

Teaching assistants, finally, play a vital role in the delivery of the undergraduate programme and as intermediaries between faculty and undergraduates. We comment elsewhere on graduate students' views of their situation. From the undergraduate "consumers" perspective two issues emerge. First:

TAs need clearer guidelines and better instruction and monitoring by the Department. One step, easily taken, would be to supplement the one day University wide orientation for TAs with a session in the Department more focussed on the particular needs of political science students and courses.

The other issue concerns marking. We were surprised to discover that TAs routinely grade not just term papers but final examinations, and that there is no formal requirement that only professors mark exams. While TAs may well have good judgement in these matters it does convey an impression of professorial remoteness and perpetuates the view that faculty cannot be bothered with the often tedious but vital process of evaluating students' work. We recommend:

That the Department adopt the policy that final examinations are marked by faculty only, and that this policy be announced as a matter of pedagogical principle.

Such an action would send an important message about the Department's commitment to undergraduate teaching.

3. Graduate Programme

There is a widespread feeling in the Department that a higher priority - both in terms of increased attention and increased resources - should now be given to the development of the graduate programme. The number of students is growing and there is a sense that a larger programme fits both the University's and the Department's objectives. There is, of course, a concern about resources, particularly given the immediate pressures, but there is a strong sense that continued and increased development of the graduate programme is the top priority for the Department. Certainly the review

committee did not get the same sense of that of the 1984 review, that the graduate programme was largely being driven by the departmental desire to recruit TA'S for undergraduate courses. The graduate programme now appears driven by objectives intrinsic to its own development, by the desire to provide education in political science that is both more research oriented and more theoretically informed than that which is possible at the undergraduate level. The major strength of the graduate programme is the research strength and vitality of the individual professors. As we have indicated elsewhere in this report, all the members of the Department range from respectable to very productive in their research activities. This gives a good base for the graduate programme in that it allows the graduate activity to be distributed widely in the Department and also in that it gives the proper message to the graduate students of the importance of research as an integral part of political science graduate education.

Another strength of the programme is a growing sense of definition of departmental concentrations and areas of strength. The Department identifies two clusters - Comparative/IR and Canadian/Public Policy. Within the Canadian/Public Policy area, one can see developing an interesting area of expertise combining interest in institutions, Canadian federalism, intergovernmental relations, provincial politics, urban government, political economy, economic policy, environmental policy plus interests in the theory of public administration and public policy. This emphasis on questions of governance (institutions and the administration of policy, particularly in the interrelations of politics and the economy) gives a particular thrust to the Department and one that is quite different from the areas of strength of the UBC Political Science Department (which, within Canadian politics, is much stronger on questions of "politics" than of "policy" and/or "governance"). These questions of definition and of strengths clearly need to be discussed further within the Department. A number of people made very interesting suggestions, for instance, about areas of emphasis within the Canadian Politics/Public Policy concentration and the ways in which these areas could be translated into course or research proposals.

These suggestions need to continue to be discussed, first of all within the field. The recommendation about the formalization of field committees would give a place for these discussions to continue. The particular emphases decided upon should be reflected in the graduate courses so that students get a sense of the particular strengths of the Department. This requires some discussion, first by the field committees, of material covered in the various courses and of ways of highlighting the Department's areas of strength.

The same question of the evolving definition of the Department's concentration in Comparative/IR can also be raised, in part because of the rapid and dramatic changes in the world and also because of the changes within the Department. We therefore recommend:

That the Department continue, first within field committees, then within the graduate programme committee and the full Department, discussion about the ways in which it wants to define the areas of strength within the two areas of concentration at the Master's level.

The strengths of the MA programme are therefore important - the research strengths of the individual members of the Department with, in addition, a growing concentration of resources around the two major poles of the Department. However, there are also weaknesses in the programme - particularly related to the administration of the programme and to the will of the Department to adopt a more rigorous and more activist stance vis-a-vis the programme. Most of this relates to the progress of students through the programme and will be dealt with in section 3 below but some relates to the definition of courses and to the structure of the programme.

The one required course at the graduate level, POL 801-5: Scope and Methods, as it is now organized fulfills two kinds of requirements - those of content (questions of methods particularly as these are not dealt with elsewhere) and those of process (choice of thesis areas). This creates problems of overloading the course but also of diffusing the focus. It

would seem more appropriate to deal with choice of thesis area outside a course format, by requiring students to choose thesis topics by a certain date (end of first semester or a specified time, one or two months, after the end of the first semester of registration) and have this choice confirmed by the student's supervisor. The Department's decision to assign supervisors to incoming students is a good step towards the implementing of this policy. Removing this question from POL 801-5 would allow it to focus on an overview of scope and methods. We recommend:

That POL 801-5 be reorganized in such away that the choice of thesis area not be dealt with in the course.

A somewhat more impressionistic recommendation would relate to the content of the courses. Our sense of discussions with Department members is that people are involved in research and reflection in political science that is more at the cutting edge of the discipline than what emerges from course descriptions, course outlines and calendar descriptions. The only possible recommendation in this area is that people be encouraged to discuss these questions and to integrate them into course descriptions and course material. The Department's public presentation of itself (in terms of course descriptions but perhaps also course contents) is somewhat more conventional, if not clearly more old-fashioned, than the reality would appear to be. We recommend:

That biennial reviews of course descriptions and course materials be done by the Graduate Studies Committee so as make sure this material is up to date and reflects the teaching and research interests of the Department.

The Department is planning an MA in International Studies. The Review Committee was given a written progress report which indicated that the development of the

programme would be pursued over the course of the summer of 1992 by contacting chairs of other departments and by elaborating the proposal within the Department. It is the opinion of the Review Committee that the participation of other departments (particularly Economics, History, Sociology and Anthropology, Geography but also Languages and Communications) would create a much better International Studies MA and we would suggest that the Department consult with other departments on the basis of a written document that proposes a programme involving other departments. Only if this avenue proves impossible should the Department redo the proposal in terms of a departmental programme. The MA in International Studies should be clearly something broader than an MA in Political Science and something that builds on an interdisciplinary structure. Simon Fraser already has strength in Latin America as an area as well as the obvious interest in building on the Pacific Rim focus. The exact focus of the proposal is clearly up to the Department but we would recommend that the proposal on which discussions are held this summer be based on participation from other departments. In the opinion of the Review Committee this will create a programme that will be attractive to students and that will be more than a minor variation on the MA in Political Science. In a six course programme, one could imagine a minimum of two courses outside the Department plus the possibility of a second language requirement. We recommend:

That the Department draw up a written document describing the planned MA in International Studies that calls for the participation of other departments and that this proposal serve as the basis of discussion with other departments.

The Review Committee agrees with the Departmental view that the question of establishing a PhD programme should be postponed. This recommendation should not be seen as suggesting a waiting period in the development of the graduate programme but rather that the Department should accord greater priority and greater attention to its

development and that once the Department is more satisfied with its MA programme the question of further expansion can be raised. Development of the MA programme will result in even more clearly defined areas of strength and it would then be possible to think of creating a specialized PhD programme in those areas of strength.

4. Graduate Students - Support and Progress

The question of support for graduate students and the monitoring of their progress through the programme is clearly an area that needs improvements. The Department has already recognized this and the Review Committee recommends that the Department see this as an area for immediate action and close monitoring. The Department's decision to assign supervisors to students on the basis of areas of interest as they enter the Department is a good one and one that should be administered strongly. Given that it represents a change from past practice it should be implemented in such a way as to clearly change past practice - professors should understand that the supervision of entering students is to begin right from the start of the first semester and that the definition of the student's thesis topic involves clear supervision on the part of the professor. Without being inflexible, the policy should be administered to minimize changes in supervisors. It is important that it be clearly understood that the current system of total student initiative for selecting supervisors is being changed to a more activist Department stance. We recommend:

That the Department proceed with their decision to assign supervisors to students upon entry to the programme and that this policy be consistently administered and monitored by the Graduate Studies Committee.

The policy should also be administered to bring about a more equal distribution of graduate supervision. Students are often hesitant to ask professors who have only been in the Department for a short time to act as supervisors (because they are seen as unknown quantities) and this does not lead to the best use of Department resources. Indeed, the active research profile of the members of the Department suggests that a more equal distribution of graduate supervision would be possible than in many other departments of political science.

In terms of support for graduate students, we were constantly told that TA'ships were essential as students were dependent on the financial support to continue their studies. On the other hand, it is clear that the time taken up with the TA work is a factor in slowing down the progress of the students. University wide policies of reducing TA hours will help in this regard and the Department should very carefully monitor this question to make sure that professors are not overworking their TA's. It is our opinion that this is occurring and we recommend that the Department take a strong line in monitoring its members. TA's get very involved in the work they are doing and are therefore rather easy to exploit but this must be resisted strongly by the Department. The progress of the students in the MA programme is related to this. We recommend:

That the Chair monitor more closely the work loads of TA's.

We note that the assignment of TA's to their responsibilities is done by the Departmental Assistant. It is our view that the TA's should see their assignment as coming from the professoriate, and it appears that the Graduate Studies Committee, or its chair, should have that responsibility. Hence we recommend:

That assignment of TA's be the responsibility of the Graduate Studies Committee.

Additional support to students can also come through research grants to professors. Indeed, in that research work can often be more closely related to the student's thesis subject than the TA work, it can facilitate more rapid completion of the degree. This is also fully in line with the latest objectives of SSHRC which wants to increase the training given to graduate students through research projects. We suggest that the Vice-President Research prompt the Department to apply for increased outside funding and recommend that the Department encourage more professors to request outside funding for their research and to include support for graduate students in the research proposals. As stated earlier, members of the Department are active researchers but the level of outside funding of research is low. Indications suggest that the numbers of requests to SSHRC are increasing but they could increase still further. This should be a subject for discussion in the Department. We recommend:

That the Department discuss ways of encouraging its members to submit external research proposals.

Another dimension that is crucial in the support of graduate students is people's willingness to give time to graduate students. Clearly the principal role in this respect falls as the advisor of each student but other Department members can also play a role. It was not possible to properly study this question but the impression of the Review Commission was that the present situation could be improved in this respect.

The Department should be encouraged to take a more active stance in relation to rules for the graduate programme. Examples of this are in tightening up the delays for deferred marks, length of time to complete degrees, etc. The sense from some Department members was that University-wide rules had to be followed whereas it appeared to the Review Committee that it was possible for Departments to define more stringent rules within the overall University policies. We encourage the Department to do this. This

would also reinforce the impression that the Department sees the MA programme as an important and significant endeavor and not something simply added on to the undergraduate programme. We sensed a real will on the part of the Department to have the programme seen in this way; it remains for the Department to act administratively to realize this. This is all the more important since there exists outside the Department the view that the Department has been somewhat lax in the administration of this part of its mandate. We recommend:

That the Department instruct the Graduate Studies Committee to examine the procedures of the graduate programme in regard to deferred marks, length of time students take to complete their programmes etc. with a view to devising rules that will be adopted by the Department.

5. Size and Background of the Faculty Complement

To assess the faculty complement needs of the Department of Political Science one must define for this purpose what the Department's responsibilities are. We will make the assumption here that the primary factor determining departmental responsibilities in this context are needs relevant to the Department's instructional programme since there are no clearly defined targets either for the type or amount of research or community service work to be carried on by a typical university department. There are, of course, research and publication requirements that individual Department members must meet to negotiate successfully the various career hurdles that they encounter and those they may wish to fulfil to obtain special increases based on merit. But these have no direct bearing on the resource base of the Department itself other than perhaps, in the broad sense that if the Department is productive in research and publication, to leave a favourable impression among those in the University who have the responsibility for deciding on the allocation of

financial resources. Given the Department's strong research performance, we make the assumption that such a favourable climate exists. Further, there may be considerations concerning the adequacy of the existing faculty complement to carry on collaborative research in certain areas, but such collaboration is a tradition not strong in the Department and would probably be a criterion of secondary importance given the expectations by those in government about the primary role of the University's teaching contribution to society.

We also wish to articulate the assumption that the development of a doctoral programme should not part of the department's responsibilities for some time to come. Before such a step is undertaken, the Department should ensure that the undergraduate and Master's programmes are functioning smoothly; particularly the Master's programme will require some work before this is the case. Further, in our view it would be necessary to increase the faculty complement and also to increase resources in the library before a viable doctoral programme in Political Science could be established at Simon Fraser University. It may well be that a doctoral programme can be developed in areas of departmental strength in which there are important "market niches" in the supply of Canadian doctoral-students in political science. But this should wait until the requisite commitment of resources is possible and until such market niches can be demonstrated.

What follows, then, is guided by the assumption that the Department of Political Science is responsible for maintaining a strong undergraduate curriculum, and a well-functioning Master's programme that can accommodate an annual intake of some ten to fifteen students, i.e., slightly less than one graduate student per regular faculty member.¹ (This seems to be close to the present pattern, although enrolment figures for graduate classes in some recent years lead one to assume a slightly lower average annual intake).

¹We use intake figures in this report since the measure in Table III of Appendix B, *Political Science Internal Review*, enrolment, includes students who may be inactive and in that sense create no burden for the Department.

We do not think it unreasonable to assume an intake of one Master's student per regular faculty member: indeed a slightly higher load might well be considered. The Department has provisions for course reductions based on the number of successfully supervised theses. This is a provision that is not found in all political science departments and a more balanced assignment of graduate students to faculty members, a practice that the Department is beginning to implement, will reduce the heavy load that some members of the Department presently have and make more justifiable the abolition of reduced class loads for MA supervision recommended in another section of this report. Furthermore, the enrolments in graduate classes are in many instances modest and could be expanded, and the requirement that each Master's student take four half classes does not place undue strain on the Department's course offerings, provided that these remain, at the graduate level, concentrated in areas of the Department's strength. In short, the Department seems sufficiently well staffed presently to manage the Master's programme or could even expand it slightly.

The undergraduate programme is a very different story. Enrolments in this programme have increased considerably in recent years. Unfortunately, figures provided for the review allow us to calculate the ratio of full time enrolments per continuing faculty member only for 1990/91, but they do allow us to make a point. There were 14 regular Political Science faculty members in that year and 388.4 F.T.E. enrolments for a ratio of 27.7 F.T.E. students per regular member. This ratio was exceeded in the Faculty of Arts only by the Psychology Department whose F.T.E. per continuing faculty was 32.75. All other departments had lower ratios, most significantly lower. While we are aware that the Department of Political Science has had a large number of limited term and sessional appointments to help in undergraduate teaching, we consider this to be an undesirable state of affairs primarily in terms of the potential of its negative implications for the quality of education but also because, as we will state elsewhere in this report, this places a great burden on the administration of the Department. Hence we would recommend strongly:

That additional continuing appointments be made in the Department of Political Science, at least so that the Department reach the average Faculty of Arts level of continuing faculty members per F.T.E. student.

As for the sub-disciplinary background of the faculty complement, we note that there is only one faculty member who lists political philosophy as his primary field. This area should be strengthened especially since the political philosopher teaches in other areas and has pursued a research agenda only in part related to political philosophy. The case for reinforcing the political philosophy complement in the Department has also been made in other sections of this Report. We recommend, therefore:

That at least one of the new appointments in the Department of Political Science be made in political philosophy/political theory.

6. Research and Teaching Contributions of Faculty

Measured by the standard indices of research performance this is an active, productive department. Although it is difficult to test, we see no reason to question the claim, made during our interviews, that the Department is now above the University average in research output. Individually and collectively the performance of its faculty members also seems on a level competitive with the better Canadian departments of political science.

Since 1985 the fifteen regular faculty (excluding the three emeritus professors) have authored, co-authored or co-edited some twenty-seven books. Only one has not done so; six have published one book, and others' totals range from two to four. To this total should be added about thirty articles in refereed journals and over eighty assorted book

chapters, articles and other scholarly publications. This productivity is fairly evenly distributed across the Department; it is not a case, as sometimes occurs, of a few prolific scholars standing out against a mediocre landscape. Those very few, on the other hand, whose recent productivity, as measured by those crude indices, lies below the departmental norm, are either relatively senior (with a rich corpus of earlier work) or have lost productive time to illness.

Assessment of the quality of published research is, of course, a more difficult and sensitive exercise, based on such considerations as the scholarly standing of book publishers and journals, the impact of research on the field and the reputation of the scholar among his or her peers nationally and internationally. By these impressionistic measures we can reasonably conclude that roughly half the members of the Department have attained national and international repute in their prime areas of scholarship. Moreover the Department has in recent years made some first rate new appointments, whether of sought-after new PhDs or of somewhat more senior faculty attracted from other institutions. These newer appointees have established, or embarked upon, strong publications programmes.

In assessing faculty research productivity it is important to ask about the implications for the general work of the Department, specifically, whether there is any sign of a division of labour between those who do research, on the one hand, and those who teach and do the departmental "chores", on the other. If we put the research record of each faculty member alongside his or her recent teaching commitments it appears -- within the limits of the evidence available -- that there is no such division of labour. On the contrary, there is a strong positive correlation between research productivity and teaching load (measured by number of courses and enrolments). The half dozen most productive scholars, at least in quantitative terms, tended also to have among the heaviest teaching loads. We can extend the analysis to include the distribution of departmental administrative chores. While the range of variation among faculty is greater in this area, and the pattern

less clear, there is no sign of the inverse correlation between research and citizenship which marks many departments and which clearly has a history in this one.

Perhaps in contrast to earlier days, then, research in Political Science is relatively evenly spread across the Department, and appears not to be viewed as something to be done at the expense of teaching or administrative service. Even more striking is the contrast between this high degree of productivity and the relatively modest levels of external financial support. Statistics on research awards to related departments at Simon Fraser show, for example, that Economics and History, both roughly twice the size of Political Science, received in 1990-91 over three times the external funding and four times the total funding. Geography, about forty percent larger, received 2-1/2 times the funding, while Sociology and Anthropology, of comparable size in faculty complement, had about the same external funding as Political Science but far outstripped it in funding from University sources. Most faculty have been successful at getting a variety of small internal grants or modest support from SSHRCC for travel or conferences. Few, however, have won the sort of large external grant, whether for individual or cooperative research, that is characteristic of major departments. Until this past fall applications to SSHRCC from Political Science at Simon Fraser have been sparse, and successes few.

Levels of external funding are commonly used as an index of both the quantity and the peer-judged quality of a department's research. Viewed this way the pattern of funding suggests that Political Science is below average at Simon Fraser and probably below the national average for political science. On the other hand the high level of publications may be taken as evidence that research in the department is unusually cost effective. For us, this latter measure is what counts.

In collaborative research -- about the dearth of which the previous review was critical -- the Department appears now to be doing much more. Some still comment on "lone-wolf" tendencies among their colleagues, but the fact is that about half of the regular faculty have recently been or are presently involved in joint research and publication with

other members of the Department. One notable collaborative enterprise was the 1987 project The Vision and the Game, involving three Political Science faculty in the production of a six part television series and book on Canadian constitutional issues. Subfields particularly active and productive in joint research are Canadian politics and public policy.

A half dozen members of the Department have been engaged in joint research and publication with political scientists from other Canadian departments. Such activity makes eminent sense, and should be encouraged further. It allows Simon Fraser to share resources with other departments (particularly in the BC system) to the benefit of both, and it projects the Department positively in the wider academic community.

We commented earlier that the Department's claim to offer sound undergraduate teaching in the five "mainstream" subfields was credible, although theory and methodology needs strengthening. The same is true, by and large, for research. Canadian politics, public policy and administration, and comparative politics (especially Europe, Asia and the Pacific) continue to be the three dominant areas of research, with international relations clearly poised to join them. For stimulating research as much as for ensuring effective teaching, subfields -- particularly in relatively isolated departments -- require a certain "critical mass". We see Canadian politics and public policy and administration as secure in this respect, while comparative may soon need some shoring up with respect to Asian area-studies and possibly Latin America. (And there is a still-unrealized potential for a strong Pacific Rim research programme which would be a mark of distinction for Simon Fraser in BC and the rest of Canada). International relations is overrun with students while still, in our view, falling short of the critical mass of faculty needed for a productive research environment. An appointment to strengthen the theoretical and methodological component of international relations would be a major step toward this goal.

Much of what needs to be said about the teaching contributions of faculty members has been covered in our discussion of the undergraduate programme. One point, however,

needs further development. During our visit to the Department we heard repeatedly -- and not only from students -- that this was a department many of whose faculty, driven by their individual research ambitions, showed little commitment to the collective good. Research, it was frequently said, took clear precedence for most faculty not just over administrative service (which is perhaps understandable and not uncommon) but over teaching. Our own investigations and reflections suggest that this image of the Department may be a caricature, based in part on the legacy of a receding past and on the negative impact of the problems of delivery referred to earlier (such as with timetabling of courses).

The impression, nevertheless, is abroad that whether in rational response to the "real" (as distinct from the fictional) reward structure of the University or as a reaction to recurring conflict in the Department, most faculty give clear priority to their research, at the expense of teaching. Graduate students, for example, suggest that the MA programme is less important to the Department than the undergraduate programme. Its prime function, some of them implied, is to provide overworked TAs to further ease faculty's fairly light teaching load. Undergraduates, on the other hand, see teaching schedules as driven not by student demand or departmental priorities but primarily by the research and leave plans of faculty. While they acknowledge the presence of high calibre, committed teachers in the Department, students note that no political scientist at Simon Fraser has ever won a University award for teaching.

These impressions may be unfair. They are certainly not the product of a systematic survey of students. And they have a certain mythic quality suggesting origins in the dark past of the Department. Nevertheless, they persist, and should not be left unattended in the expectation that they will die a natural death. Implementation of our earlier recommendations about teaching evaluations, the selection, training and monitoring of TAs, and the marking of examinations, could give a signal as to the real importance of teaching. Insistence that all faculty except those burdened with major chores teach a full five course

load, and reinforcement of the commendable practice of assigning senior faculty on an equal footing with their junior colleagues to teach the introductory courses, would underline the point. Our strong impression is that although there are stronger and weaker teachers here as elsewhere, commitment to teaching is high and pervasive in the Department. The problem is to bring the reputation into line with this new reality.

7. Size and Distribution of the Support Staff

There are two perspectives to take on this question. Outsiders are tempted to compare the Department's support staff complement with what they have in their home departments: from that perspective the Department seems well served with a Department Administrator and with three secretaries. Departments of similar size elsewhere tend to have somewhat less support staff, but then expectations about the proper division of labour between faculty and staff vary. Hence it is best, in our view, to examine these matters from the perspective of what appears to be normal at Simon Fraser University. For example, at Simon Fraser, much at least of the routine student advising is done by the D.A.; at other universities some or most of this work is done by the faculty and hence a D.A. can do other things. Given the division of labour in that regard at SFU and given her other responsibilities, the Department's D. A. appears to be working at or beyond the level of reasonable expectations, especially given the amount of advising that is associated with the three term system.

One might wish to consider whether some of the advising duties beyond the routine checking of requirements and the assignment of students to sections, particularly the advising having to do with the academic content of courses and appropriateness of students' programmes of study given their academic or vocational goals, be shared with faculty members so that students speak formally to a faculty member about such issues at least a few times in their undergraduate career, if not once a year. Over and above the devolution

of some of these advising duties, it seems wise to attempt the delegation of some other routine duties now performed by the D. A. to another member of the support staff, always keeping in mind the job descriptions of these other persons and university procedures regarding what is to be expected of various categories of personnel. We were favourably impressed with the staff's willingness to share the Department's work and to be flexible in meeting its needs. We feel sure that in consultation with them it will be possible to undertake any organizational changes that may be required.

There was a hint that the Department could be losing one of its secretaries. It appears most equitable, given the resources of similarly sized department elsewhere in the University and the present expectations about the duties of secretaries, that the Department maintain its full complement of four support staff. It might be said in addition that supplying all faculty members with computers and installing a local area network would allow the faculty to do a good deal more "typing" of even routine work such as letters and memos by themselves, thus at least in part unburdening the support staff.

8. Resources Supporting Teaching and Research

The overwhelming preoccupation of faculty and students alike with respect to resources is the library. Of all the social sciences, political science is arguably the most dependent on books, serials and documents for teaching and basic research. Faculty in particular were critical to the point of being dismissive concerning the capacity of Simon Fraser's library to serve anything but the most basic teaching needs, let alone to be a resource base for advanced research in political science. Faculty and students - particularly graduates - consider the UBC library an essential part of their professional lives, and make frequent, time-consuming trips across town to use it.

This situation clearly cannot be sustained indefinitely without some continuing cost to Simon Fraser's credibility as a front rank institution and to its ability to attract good students and faculty. It is undoubtedly true, as we were told, that the chances of improving the library in the near term are very poor. Moreover, some cost-sharing and division of labour among the B.C. university libraries (especially in the Lower Mainland) will continue to make sense. Simon Fraser should obviously not aspire to duplicate UBC's extensive political science holdings. Nevertheless the University, on the advice of the Department, should undertake to determine selected areas of established research interest and future potential to which funds could be directed to develop serious collections of monographs, serials, documents and electronic data. If the Department is to undertake even the modest expansion we have recommended, and if it is eventually to bid for a PhD programme, investment in a solid, if selective, base of library resources must begin now. Other problems of resources pale into normality compared to those of the library. Space is scarce, as we note elsewhere in this report. Faculty seem to have adequate access to computing facilities and equipment, although one member of the Department complained of inequities in how new equipment was made available.

9. The Provision of Office Space and other Facilities

Continuing faculty appear to be adequately accommodated in offices. The space available for teaching assistants is very limited and could be increased. The most glaring inadequacy in terms of space is the lack of a departmental library/seminar room in which meetings can be held, in which students can access reserve materials for courses, and in which some widely used reading materials such as major journals and reference books are housed. We recommend, therefore:

That the Department of Political Science be assigned a room that can serve as departmental library/seminar room.

It is also necessary to help faculty obtain adequate computer resources. At least one faculty member feels that the lack of adequate computer resources has hampered his work considerably. It has been the experience elsewhere that faculty access to P.C.s and the attendant peripheral equipment (printers etc.) has decreased significantly the pressure on support staff.

9. Administration of the Political Science Department

It is difficult to speak with finality and great authority about as complex a subject as the style of collective decision making in an organization if one has studied that organization for only a short period while not observing its functioning first-hand. Nonetheless, our meetings with faculty members, administrative and support personnel, students and with other members of the University community who have dealings with the Department, as well as our examination of some of the written material at our disposal, have left us with a number of mutually reinforcing impressions that lead us to feel reasonably confident in outlining the following characterization of the Department's administration and drafting a set of suggestions for change.

Traditions and history play major role in determining the functioning of any organization, and they have played their role with respect to the Political Science Department. Established as a separate entity in the confusion of the break-up of the PSA Department, the Department's experience in self-directing and casting of organizational expectations and norms got off to a rocky start. Its leading members, distinguished professors with national and international reputations, helped set the norms that define the culture and expectations of any academic department: in this case that of high flyer and

highly visible achievers whose set of priorities was focussed more on such very worthwhile activities as publishing, lecturing at universities abroad, consulting with governmental organizations and participating in professional meetings that attract the attention of the academic community outside the university. Such strong personalities often fail to see eye to eye on a large number of things, and their disagreements can lead to difficulties in defining procedures and policies as well as a sense of common purpose. They may also not contribute to what may be termed the citizenship aspects of a department's collective existence and, because they are prominent members of the Department, may thus help establish a set of expectations and norms that lead to their devaluation.

Citizenship in the sense that it is used here involves a large number of activities and a mind set that is bent toward developing collective goals and interacting with colleagues in ways that lead to mutual benefits or the benefit of, perhaps, the less established members of the collectivity. Such activities include contributing to the decision making and management aspects of a department's functioning such as participating on committees, counselling students, doing programme reviews of existing courses of study, and proposing new programmes and/or courses. They also include taking the initiative or at least becoming involved in matters that are not usually specified as part of the formal duties of academics because they are less directly related to the central and formal goals of the organization but which, for all that, help to create a sense of common purpose and enrich the academic atmosphere of a Department; for example, attempting to help junior faculty members with their careers by offering to read their papers and giving them advice, if asked, about research funding and submitting papers for publication. Organizing seminars and colloquia on an extra-curricular basis in which faculty and students interact are also examples of good citizenship. Speakers may include Department members or colleagues from across town as well as from government or NGOs. Organizing conferences on topics of major importance which bring in scholars from across the country or even from abroad is more nearly related to the more formal requirements of scholarship

and can lead to the publication with reputable presses of conference proceedings. Sponsoring a conference aimed at members of the community outside the university is a service that academic departments often perform and one that, like others just outlined, can help to bring a sense of community to a department. Such activities seem not to have been frequently pursued in the past and appear not to be prominent presently.

Whatever the genesis of the present organizational culture, it was striking and a bit discouraging to hear present members of the Department make reference such as "meddling in the affairs of others" when asked to express themselves about joint decision making, Department meetings and other collective activities. Members were surprisingly uninformed about even formal departmental procedures, and members of committees were at times unable to clearly articulate their responsibilities in that context even though, judging by the practice of giving relief from teaching for the chairpersons of the graduate and undergraduate committees, at least these two committees must be considered important departmental structures. When volunteering suggestions about the context in which changes might be discussed, members appeared as often to think about committees composed of individuals teaching and researching in sub-disciplines (e.g., Canadian government and politics, international relations) as they did about fora that involved, or represented the Department as a whole. In one or two instances the expression of disenchantment with decision making structures and functions in the present Department (although not necessarily with such activities in principle) were striking. Participating in meetings or in administrative activities more generally is not necessarily highly prized by academics anywhere, but this is an important part of academic life which, if it is not carried out effectively, has negative implications for the unit.

The ambivalent attitude about collective decision making in the Department has coincided with the practice of frequently appointing relatively junior members of the Department to the chair. In recent years, Professors T. Cohn, P. Smith and the present incumbent, Professor M. Covell, have held that position while associate professors. This is

obviously not a reflection on them as chairs; indeed it is clear that they must have been considered trustworthy by members of the Department to have the support to be asked to hold that position and they are to be commended for taking on a duty that may well not have appeared terribly rewarding. If a department is to function well, especially a department in which the sense of common purpose is not overly strong, someone must take responsibility, and see that decisions, even unpopular decisions, are taken and are implemented, ensure that common procedures are applied in similar situations so that there is not a sense of grievance among members of the department or its clients, develop procedures where these are lacking, protect the less senior members of the department if that is necessary and harness the energies of those reluctant to serve, not give in to the temptation to assign the less desirable duties to those who, for a sense of duty or for other reasons can be persuaded to contribute, assure that rewards and resources are equitably allotted, and give a sense of direction to committees and to the department as a whole.

It is not easy for associate professors to lead in this regard. They have not achieved the visibility and status of a full professor and are thus in an exposed position when dealing with senior colleagues or even their rank equals. If they are ambitious (and one hopes that department chairpersons harbour such drives) they will wish to continue with their research to advance their careers and to meet the requirements for promotion which, in most university settings, depend on publications and very little else. They will be less able than would a full professor to afford the sacrifice of time for the exigencies of their office which, experience demonstrates, is more than a full-time position. This essential investment of time is never adequately compensated by the course-load reduction that accompanies the office. For all these reasons, it is striking that the Department has so frequently had a relatively junior person as chair, but it may well be the case that no-one else had sufficient support to be appointed or that some persons were unwilling to serve.

Further, the duties of the chair of the Political Science Department at Simon Fraser University have been made more onerous than in many other departments elsewhere and

the creation of a sense of common purpose and direction made more difficult because of the large number of non-regular, non-tenure track members teaching in its programme. For one thing, these persons are not involved heavily, if at all, in administrative responsibilities because it is felt, for understandable reasons, that they are not adequately compensated for such activities or are not in the Department long enough to know it and have the incentive to learn its procedures. Hence the number of persons available for committee work and related activities is small compared to the level of teaching activity. Because they are not involved in departmental activities other than in teaching, they feel little sense of belonging. Non-regular members also impose another heavy burden on the chair and the administrative structure generally: their recruitment takes an inordinate amount of time because they are not easy to find and assuring that they are of sufficient quality for their teaching tasks is not easy to do. Integrating them into the regular teaching programme is difficult because one cannot be sure, as one can be more or less certain about regular members, what they stress in their teaching and what their strengths and weaknesses are. Hence it is not easy to predict what their students will have learned in their courses which, typically, are junior (prerequisite) courses. Supervising them and giving them the orientation that is required so that they may carry out their duties well is challenging. Simply achieving this task of managing the non-permanent members of the Department reasonably well would tax anyone's skills: carrying out the regular burdens of the Department Chair in addition must greatly add to that challenge.

Finally, and a question that was extensively dealt with in the previous evaluation, the Department has had a long history of conflicts that have added complications to the chair's role.

Thus far we have outlined what we see as some of the difficulties and challenges facing departmental governance. But while these are not inconsiderable, they are not severe and far from insurmountable. While there were expressions of concern about the Department by some of its members, while students expressed criticism regarding a

number of departmental practices and while there were some complaints by outsiders of Department administration, the degree of good-will and respect shown by most members toward each other is encouraging and even gratifying. Indeed, we are of the opinion that the Department, because of this generally positive atmosphere and because of recent developments, presently finds itself in a situation which will allow it to deal with some organizational problems and prepare itself for future challenges.

The most important developments in this respect are the turnover of departmental members and the growth in the number of faculty members that has taken place and that is continuing. While the retirement of distinguished members weakens the Department in one sense, the arrival of new members provides the opportunity to make changes in decision making and governance which can strengthen its functioning and its sense of common purpose. It was apparent in our visit that the group of new Department members is highly qualified and eager to continue as well as to strengthen its tradition of research productivity, and that its members are equally eager to help in making the Department into an organization with such a strong sense of common purpose and identity. The opportunity must be grasped speedily to harness and channel that energy and enthusiasm so that the Department will be in a strong position to face the organizational challenges of the future and to manage further potential growth. The acquisition of new teaching positions and the establishment of new programmes and centers will add vitality and capacity to the Department; however this growth will be most fruitful and indeed will be properly undertaken only if effective decision making structures and practices to manage such growth exist.

A number of fairly straightforward changes that will require little effort can be suggested in this regard. First is an adjustment of practices having to do with Department meetings. We note that the previous set of reviewers also addressed themselves to this issue. They were concerned that a forum be created in which a sense of common purpose is nurtured, in which individual interests are expressed and defended, in which common

decisions are made, and in which departmental decisions, because they were made in that context, are legitimized. Further, it is of great importance that a set of accepted procedures be adopted which give everyone a sense of what is acceptable behaviour and what is unacceptable. While it is difficult to gauge what progress has been made in the direction of creating such a well-functioning institution in the ensuing years because we cannot judge the situation that obtained at the time of the last review, it appears from our interviews and from other evidence that there may well be some distance still to travel along this road.

We feel it useful, in this regard, to repeat the relevant recommendation of the previous departmental reviewers, viz.:

That the Department, meeting collectively and regularly, should become and be recognized as the main legislative and norm-setting body within and for the Department.

We also feel it serves a useful purpose to make somewhat more detailed recommendations to achieving this goal. First, it was not clear to all members of the Department whether a regular time has been set aside for departmental meetings. Having a time slot of sufficient length for a fairly lengthy meeting in which teaching activities are not scheduled makes possible attendance by everyone, not only at meetings of the whole Department but also of committees because it means there are no conflicting teaching obligations. Hence we recommend:

That the Department set aside a time for meetings in which no teaching activities are scheduled, that this time be of sufficient length (at least 90 minutes) for conducting major business and that this time be clearly communicated to all members of the Department.

Second, it does not appear that the Department meets frequently. This is not in and of itself a failing in some departments. But in one in which a sense of common purpose is not strongly established, it is useful to make provision for at least a monthly meeting. We recommend:

That the Department schedule a regular monthly Department meeting, and meet more often if the need arises.

Interviews established that minutes of Department meetings are not kept, at least not regularly. This makes it difficult to determine with authority what past decisions have been taken and hence to develop common policies and procedures, let alone resolve disputes over interpretation of what has come before. It is essential that proper procedures for the Department meetings and important meetings of committees be followed: i.e., that there be an agenda which includes as its first item consideration of the minutes of the previous meeting, the adoption, after any amendments, of these previous minutes, the consideration of business arising out of these minutes, etc., and that proper procedures for arriving at important decisions, including formal motions that are seconded and duly approved, be followed. Experience has shown that such procedures help to focus meetings and make more effective the process of arriving at decisions. The minutes of departmental meetings should become a main part of the corpus of decisions, policies and procedures, to wit, the constitution, of the Department. In a number of universities, these minutes are forwarded to the dean's office so that he/she is apprised formally of major developments in the Department. We recommend:

That formal minutes of Department meetings be kept, that these be formally adopted at subsequent meetings, and that accepted rules of procedure be followed in

meetings. We further recommend that the Department forward copies of these minutes to the Dean for at least a year.

It is also essential to have a well-functioning committee system because it is wasteful of time to deal with complex matters in a Department meeting if these have not been previously examined by a number of persons who can focus on researching an issue in some detail and who can make recommendations from among which the Department can choose a course of action or policy. Committees with an ongoing mandate require clear terms of reference that are formally spelled out after due deliberation by the Department. They can have responsibilities of an ongoing or recurrent nature as well as for other matters that fall in their area of jurisdiction. Committees established for a limited (ad hoc) purpose should be instructed either by the Chair or by the Department acting collectively through a resolution taken by a Department meeting to undertake one or a number of actions. The committee chair should report its deliberations to the Department meeting, which deliberations become the basis for discussion and ultimately final decision making in the Department. We recommend:

That Department committees be given clear terms of reference and that they be required formally to report back to the Department their findings and recommendations. Major Department decisions should normally be referred to the responsible committee for preliminary study and deliberation. In particular, the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees should be charged with monitoring and improving all aspects of their respective programmes including those arising out of the recommendations of this report.

When members of the Department expressed themselves about or made reference to committees, it appeared that they frequently thought about committees established along

sub-disciplinary (e.g., Canadian politics and government, international relations) lines. Since this type of committee structure seems to have considerable support, it might fruitfully be formally institutionalized to allow for preliminary consideration of certain issues such as curriculum development. However, overemphasis on sub-disciplinary committees may unduly fracture the Department along lines of sub-disciplinary interests, hence they should not by themselves be allowed to make final decisions but be required rather to report to committees that represent the entire Department such as the undergraduate or graduate committee, or the Department meeting itself. Whenever possible, the more inclusively structured committees should be given the more important tasks.

To counteract a tendency toward informality in the Department, a tendency that may not have served the best interests of the Department because it allowed matters to "slip through the cracks" and perhaps to lead to a situation where some are dealt with ineffectively or not at all, it would be useful for committee chairpersons to formally report to the Department committee once or twice a year about the work of their committees and the progress they have made on those matters which they have been assigned. We recommend:

That committees be required to give at least an annual formal accounting to the Department meeting of their activities.

The informal manner in which the Department operates may also have had the effect of impeding the communication process both within the Department and to those who deal with the Department externally. We have already mentioned that regular members of the Department were sometimes unaware of procedures, and this state of affairs certainly applied with respect to non-tenure track members. Further, outsiders, including deans,

complained about the tardiness of decision making in the Department and the lack of follow-up on requests for action or information.

It is difficult to make a specific recommendation or set of recommendations to rectify such shortcomings. Clearly, a well-institutionalized committee system allows the chair to assign duties to others so that she/he is not overburdened and hence to have matters dealt with in an expeditious fashion. Certainly, for example, most graduate matters should be dealt with by the graduate committee chairperson with or without the participation of committee members, depending on whether implementation or decision making is involved. Again, it is useful to have spelled out in advance what is expected of various participants in the decision making process. The assignment of a specific task should also be accompanied by the setting of a target date for its accomplishment: this will help to ensure, for example, that a request for action by a graduate dean or college dean will be followed by an expeditious response.

There appears to be need for the formulation of policies for another, and equally or more important reason. We saw evidence of a considerable degree of variation in practices among persons performing similar duties, for example teaching. Thus essays are required in certain sections of a course, not in others, or when a certain instructor teaches a course but not when that course is taught by someone else. In some senior courses the entire grade is determined by performance on a final examination, in others there are two or more methods of evaluation. Some teaching assistants are instructed in detail about their work, others are not; not infrequently there are substantial differences in the way teaching assistants in the same course section perform their duties. Sometimes teaching assistants are not required to attend lectures given by the course instructor in part, it was thought by undergraduate students and some teaching assistants, so that T.A. time could be freed for research assistance. As a result, they are not satisfactorily able to respond to students' questions about course material. Such practices have led to feelings of resentment by undergraduate students in these courses; they have also prompted teaching assistants to

complain about such inequities or the absence of clear instruction and/or supervision from the instructor responsible for the course. While these issues are addressed in other parts of this report dealing with the graduate and undergraduate programmes, it is necessary here to make the general point that the Department would do well to review its policies and to ensure more uniformity in practices through setting, communicating and implementing policies and procedures, especially given the large number of non-permanent persons teaching in the Department who appear often to be left with comparatively little guidance. Without a more rigorously defined set of procedures on such matters, the unintended and no doubt false impression may be left that the Department is run in the interest of its regular members and is little concerned about what is happening in the teaching trenches in terms of common standards and equitable practices.

In order to help non-regular members to be more aware of common standards and to help them feel part of the Department, it is advisable to consider having them participate in committee and/or Department meetings, or at least to have representation from among their number active in departmental affairs in this fashion. It appears that though they are aware that they can participate, they are reluctant to do so. With some encouragement and a request to participate formally in Department structures or to be involved in some other way in departmental activities their considerable talents could be harnessed in the Department's interest. It is also easy for these non-regular members to feel that their contribution to the Department is seen exclusively in teaching terms: they have little sense of connection to the Department in terms of research or sharing of ideas. In later paragraphs we will make some suggestions as to how, without necessarily integrating such members of the Department into ongoing research projects, they might nevertheless be more involved in the academic life of the Department.

Finally, it is important to recognize that the allocation of resources to members of the Department, for example funding for computers, be made on the basis of regular procedures and well-understood rules.

In summary, we recommend:

That the Department review various areas of its functioning (teaching, its committee system, its relations with other university offices etc.) with the goal of more systematically developing and implementing sets of procedures in these areas.

The impression that there is a tendency toward individual as opposed to collective departmental action is reinforced by the absence of jointly organized and jointly implemented activities beyond teaching. There is some limited joint research activity, although its scarcity is not uncommon elsewhere in political science departments. What is more striking, though, is the absence of such institutions as an organized speakers programme in which regular Department members, limited term appointees, sessional lecturer, interested members of cognate departments as well as graduate and undergraduate students meet to attend a presentation and to discuss the ideas introduced by the speaker. It is common in some departments to have at least four or five such events each term, which typically do not involve large or even any expenses since local speakers are called upon, or speakers sponsored by their organizations, such as federal government agencies or foreign governments, can be invited. In addition, departments or a sub-set of their members, frequently organize major conferences at which members and visiting speakers present papers. Non-permanent members of a department can be fruitfully involved in such activities. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council has a programme which will subsidize academic conferences. In many instances such major conferences result in the publication of conference proceedings. Experience shows that activities of this kind help to create a sense of common purpose among department members, and of course also to further the dissemination of knowledge. Hence we recommend:

That the Department initiate a regular faculty colloquium and/or speakers programme, and that it consider periodically organizing an academic conference.

10. Relations Within the University

Our visit to Simon Fraser unfortunately did not allow us time to look at perceptions of the other departments as to the participation of Political Science in these programmes. However, we are unable to comment very much on this question and will in fact focus more on relations between the Department and the senior governing structures of the University.

It is clear that this is not an altogether happy or successful relation. The majority view in the Department is that the Department, certainly in the past but perhaps even up to the present, has not received adequate resources from the University. To some extent, one can talk of mixed messages - the Department felt that it was being encouraged to very rapidly increase student enrolments on the promise that this would be rewarded in terms of new positions. Although some new positions have been obtained by the Department, the Department does not feel that the implied promises were fulfilled in that other departments, perceived to have taken in less new student enrolments, are perceived to have been rewarded more than Political Science. The on and off-expansion messages are also seen to have added to the ambiguity of the messages - the University's messages about the importance of an expanded graduate programme are interrupted by periods of severe financial restraint. The ambiguity is also sometimes felt by members of the Department in terms of questions where the University-wide rules are not felt to be supportive of stated objectives (lack of University-wide teaching evaluations etc).

If the Department feels that the University has been unclear or mixed in its messages, the University seems to feel some level of discontent about the administrative laxity of the Department (slowness in scheduling, budgetary problems, etc). Both sides seem to wish for greater clarity and strength of initiative from the other - the Department

seems often to feel that the University-wide rules make initiative on its part difficult and the University seems to feel that the Department is lacking initiative. However there are also some factors that would suggest improved relations are possible. The Department has suffered in the past from having had members that by-passed the Department level in dealing with the University administration. The 1984 evaluation is quite detailed on this point and our Review Committee clearly confirmed this problem. To the extent that some of the members involved are no longer with the Department should improve the collective decision-making capacity of the Department. Both Department members and the University should be aware of the importance of building this collective decision-making capacity in the Department and should work to realize this objective.

One particular aspect of this broad question should be mentioned specifically and it is the relation between the Department and the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Given what we perceived to be the overall Department view that the development of the graduate programme is a priority for the Department, it is unfortunate that this view has not transmitted itself to the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies. We recommend:

That the Department increase contacts with the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and work with that office in the development of the graduate programme.

Finally, and with particular reference to the present exercise, it appears that there was only limited follow-up in implementing the suggestions for change made by the previous review committee. It is our hope that the recommendations of the present report will not meet such a fate but that, instead, a monitoring procedure be established in consultation between the Senior Administration and the Department so that the agreed-upon changes are undertaken and given a chance to succeed.

11. Relations Outside the University

The Review Committee looked at the question of the relations of the Department outside the University only in terms of examining the cv's of the members of the Department plus our own personal knowledge of the activities of Departmental members. Generally speaking the members of the Department have not played a very active role outside the University. There are a few notable exceptions but as a rule this has not been true. Department members have been widely used as reviewers for academic journals and research proposals and this is in keeping with their general activity as researchers.

The explanations given for this come back to the history of controversy within the Department - this led to people going off to do their own research and to tend to individual rather than collective intellectual enterprises. Once again, and one of the recurring themes of this report, the time for redressing the balance towards greater emphasis on collective intellectual enterprises would seem to be ripe. New members of the Department are in many cases regular participants in the major Canadian meetings (CPSA, IPAC) and greater departmental visibility should both build on this participation and facilitate it. This greater visibility is obviously a question of degree; no department wants all its members active in professional associations and in the organizing of professional conferences and, indeed, several of the members of the Department are already active. What needs to happen is for the more recent members of the Department to feel that this activity is positively encouraged by the Department.

Committee to Review the Department of Political Science
Summary of Proposals

1. That the Department offer two 200-level courses in each subfield.
2. That, given the prospect of diminution of short term teaching resources, the Department review all upper division offerings and retain only those that can be offered at least once a year by regular faculty.
3. That the Department relax size restrictions on all 300-level courses, allowing at least those in greatest demand to be given as lectures, while 400-level courses remain seminars with rigorously controlled enrolments.
4. That the Department put in place a system of prerequisites, albeit a fairly liberal one which required at least one 300-level course in the subfield for entry to any 400-level seminar. This would have to go hand in hand with greater frequency and predictability in offering courses, especially at the 300 level. In addition, while prerequisites, credits and GPA might continue to govern admissions to 300-level courses, it would make sense under the proposed system to give majors and honours students priority in admission to 400-level courses.
5. That either the honours programme be dropped or that it be redefined, in effect, as a variant on the major which would involve preparation of a thesis (either reduced to the weight of three semester hours, or increased to six) and the taking of 400-level seminars in the subfield of concentration.

6. That undergraduates be required to take a course in political theory while leaving them some latitude as to the choice of courses to meet the requirement.
7. That, first, in the context of of the structural changes discussed above the Department ought to cut the number of courses offered in the upper division so as to reflect more accurately what full time faculty can realistically be expected to teach on a regular basis. Second, with the exception of those doing the major administrative tasks, all faculty should be expected to teach the five course norm each year (at present about half teach only four).
8. Some thought should be given to a regular departmental bulletin to meet at least some of these needs.
9. That the Department continue the present course of systematizing the teaching evaluation process, and also commit itself to publish the results.
10. That TAs get clearer guidelines and better instruction and monitoring by the Department. One step, easily taken, would be to supplement the one day University wide orientation for TAs with a session in the Department more focussed on the particular needs of political science students and courses.
11. That the Department adopt the policy that final examinations are marked by faculty only, and that this policy be announced as a matter of pedagogical principle.

12. That the Department continue, first within field committees, then within the graduate programme committee and the full Department, discussion about the ways in which it wants to define the areas of strength within the two areas of concentration at the Master's level.

13. That POL 801-5 be reorganized in such away that the choice of thesis area not be dealt with in the course.

14. That biennial reviews of course descriptions and course materials be done by the Graduate Studies Committee so as make sure this material is up to date and reflects the teaching and research interests of the Department.

15. That the Department draw up a written document describing the planned MA in International Studies that calls for the participation of other departments and that this proposal serve as the basis of discussion with other departments.

16. That the Department proceed with their decision to assign supervisors to students upon entry to the programme and that this policy be consistently administered and monitored by the Graduate Studies Committee.

17. That the Chair monitor more closely the work loads of TA's.

18. That assignment of TA's be the responsibility of the Graduate Studies Committee.

19. That the Department discuss ways of encouraging its members to submit external research proposals.

20. That the Department instruct the Graduate Studies Committee to examine the procedures of the graduate programme in regard to deferred marks, length of time students take to complete their programmes etc. with a view to devising rules that will be adopted by the Department.
21. That additional continuing appointments be made in the Department of Political Science, at least so that the Department reach the average Faculty of Arts level of continuing faculty members per F.T.E. student.
22. That at least one of the new appointments in the Department of Political Science be made in political philosophy/political theory.
23. That the Department of Political Science be assigned a room that can serve as departmental library/seminar room.
24. That the Department, meeting collectively and regularly, should become and be recognized as the main legislative and norm-setting body within and for the Department.
25. That the Department set aside a time for meetings in which no teaching activities are scheduled, that this time be of sufficient length (at least 90 minutes) for conducting major business and that this time be clearly communicated to all members of the Department.
26. That the Department schedule a regular monthly Department meeting, and meet more often if the need arises.
27. That formal minutes of Department meetings be kept, that these be formally adopted at subsequent meetings, and that accepted rules of procedure be followed in meetings. We

further recommend that the Department forward copies of these minutes to the Dean for at least a year.

28. That Department committees be given clear terms of reference and that they be required formally to report back to the Department their findings and recommendations. Major Department decisions should normally be referred to the responsible committee for preliminary study and deliberation. In particular, the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees should be charged with monitoring and improving all aspects of their respective programmes including those arising out of the recommendations of this report.

29. That committees be required to give at least an annual formal accounting to the Department meeting of their activities.

30. That the Department review various areas of its functioning (teaching, its committee system, its relations with other university offices etc.) with the goal of more systematically developing and implementing sets of procedures in these areas.

31. That the Department initiate a regular faculty colloquium and/or speakers programme, and that it consider periodically organizing an academic conference.

32. That the Department increase contacts with the Office of the Graduate Dean and work with that office in the development of the graduate programme.