

To: Senate

FOR INFORMATION SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S77-132

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. H.M. Evans

From: Sheila Roberts, Secretary

Registrar

Faculty of Arts Graduate Studies
Committee

Subject: COURSE NAME CHANGES

Date: October 19, 1977

As the Department of Modern Languages will become the Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics January 1, 1978, it will be necessary to change all occurrences of the name in both the Undergraduate and the Graduate Calendars. In the Graduate Calendar the courses in the M.A. Teaching of French Programme will have to be renamed as follows:

FROM	-	TO
DML 600 (10)	-	DLLL 600 (10)
DML 601 (10)	-	DLLL 601 (10)
DML 602 (10)	-	DLLL 602 (10)

I have made the required changes on the calendar sheets.

Sheila Roberts

S. Roberts

cc. P. Dobud

RECEIVED

30 OCT 1977
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE
VANCOUVER

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

*Not formally
distributed by
Secretariat*

To: All members of Senate

From: Ross Powell, student Senator

Subject: Appeal procedures for
practicum courses

Date: 3 Nov. '77

This memo is intended to provide background for a question being submitted for consideration at the next meeting of Senate concerning the failure of the university to provide an appeals mechanism for withdrawals from practicum courses.

In the fall of '76 SCUS was asked to recommend to Senate the establishment of a practicum in Criminology and was told in the accompanying documentation that "Every student is insured the right to appeal after a request to withdraw. The appeal procedure used will be identical to the standard procedure presently in effect at this university." Student members of SCUS at that time asked what this appeal procedure is and were told that Criminology would use the same one as was in effect in the PDP program.

During the spring I was involved in assisting a student in the PDP program with an appeal of her withdrawn status. Her case revolved around the contention that the Faculty had not met their responsibilities in the procedure which was laid out in a document filed in the Student Society. It was established in the course of the appeal by the Director of PDP that, in fact, no policy was in force within the Faculty which spelled out this procedure and he had never seen the procedure presented by the Student Society (copy attached).

When this was discovered, I attended a meeting of SCUS to bring this situation to their attention, but was refused recognition by the chair and so no record exists in the minutes. Nevertheless, I presented him after the meeting with the information I had collected and was told that something would be done about the situation. I subsequently received a copy of a memo to Dr. Fattah (and the Deans) suggesting that something should be done to establish a university-wide procedure for such situations. This was in the summer of '76.

When the first course in the Criminology practicum was offered I asked a student in the program to enquire about the appeal procedures for students asked to withdraw. He was told they had the same appeal procedure as in the PDP program. In the spring of '77, in a chance encounter with the chairman of SCUS I asked about the progress in dealing with this situation and was again told that work would be done in the near future to resolve the

matter.

I would now like to ask the chairperson of Senate: Have appeal procedures been established for practicum courses in PDP and Criminology, and if not when will this be attended to?

Withdrawal from a course or a program seems to me to be a question of academic discipline and not a question of grading. The student has paid to receive instruction. In such situations it would appear that Senate firmly established the principle that students should have the right to appeal withdrawal in the terms of reference set down for the Senate Appeals Board. Granted, practicums present somewhat different problems from those brought before the SAB; nevertheless withdrawal from PDP is no less serious a step than being put on Required to Withdraw status. Equitable appeal procedures should be laid out which ensure that students whose ability to perform in a practicum situation is in question receive adequate notice of the perceived problem and assistance in overcoming any difficulties they may be having. The procedure which was in force in PDP (as attached) would seem a reasonable way to try to deal with this situation. The idea that our senior administration has been aware of the lack of policy in this area for a year with possibly very little being done to resolve the matter disturbs me greatly and has prompted my question at this time.

If you have any comments about the question of establishing such appeal procedures, I would welcome a response to this memo.

PROCEDURES FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM EDUCATION 401 OR 405

Primary emphasis in the Professional Development Program at Simon Fraser University is on the development of persons as mature, competent teachers. Competition for admission is keen and most students admitted complete the Program successfully. A few students do not complete the Program. They withdraw either voluntarily or by request. The Pass/Withdraw procedures are such that students' grade point averages are not affected by their withdrawal from the Professional Development Program.

VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWAL

Students may withdraw voluntarily from the Program for a variety of reasons including those of health, personal, dislike of teaching

Procedures for Voluntary Withdrawal

To formalize voluntary withdrawal from the Program

1. The student informs his school associate, the school principal, his faculty associate, a coordinator, and the Registrar's Office of his intention to withdraw;
2. The student completes withdrawal forms required by both a coordinator and the Registrar's Office;
3. A coordinator sends the Professional Development Program withdrawal form, including a statement regarding readmission to the Program, to the Faculty of Education's Admissions Office.

RECOMMENDED WITHDRAWAL

Teaching competence is the criterion to be used in making a withdrawal recommendation. A few students prove to be unsuited for teaching. To assist those who may have to recommend that a student withdraw from the Program, a tentative classification of students is suggested.

1. Those whose overall teaching performance is considered satisfactory. These students continue in the Program.
2. Those whose overall teaching performance is not quite satisfactory but whose inadequacies seem likely to be remedied later in the Program. These students should pass Education 401 but specific recommendations should be made regarding remedial procedures. After reasonable opportunity for improvement, Education 405 students, whose teaching performance is less than satisfactory, should be recommended for withdrawal.

3. Those whose overall teaching performance is clearly unsatisfactory. These students should be asked to withdraw as soon as possible following procedures set out below.

Judgments made about the minimum acceptable degree of teaching competence are based on numerous observable acts and are necessarily subjective. For this and other reasons, check lists of specific criteria for judging acceptable teaching performance have been found satisfactory. The consequences of mistaken judgment are so serious for the student teacher, his future students, and the teaching profession that extreme care must be taken in reaching a decision.

In Education 401 the judgment must be predictive, since some deficiencies may be remedied later in the Program. However, associates are cautioned against passing students who are unlikely to succeed since this will probably result in a waste of time and effort for the student and faculty and more serious disappointment later in the Program.

In Education 405 the judgment which must be made is whether the student has at least the minimum acceptable competence for entry to the teaching profession. Useful considerations here are whether you would welcome the person concerned as a colleague or as the teacher of your own children. If through observation and interaction with the student you come to believe that your answer to either of these questions would be negative, the matter should be discussed with the student and the faculty associate. At this time, the Notice to Student form should be completed to provide everyone with clear goals for improvement. If no significant improvement occurs within the specified time withdrawal procedures should be initiated.

Procedures for Recommended Withdrawal

When a student lacks competence or when his competence is in doubt the following procedures are initiated.

1. Either the school associate or the faculty associate informs the student that his competence is being questioned and discusses with him the specific nature of the deficiency. The reasons for notice, examples of observed teaching practises, and goals to guide the student towards improvement, are recorded on the Notice to Student form, and form is then signed by those concerned.
2. Both associates ensure that the student is given adequate time and opportunity to overcome the deficiency, and discuss the student's progress with him.

3. During the time given to the student to overcome the deficiency, second opinions from the school and the University are sought, e.g., another teacher, or principal from the school, and another faculty associate or the coordinator from the university.
4. If the deficiency is not remedied, specific examples of inadequate teaching performance to be used in supporting a recommendation for withdrawal are conveyed to the student.
5. The Recommendation for Withdrawal form is completed by the associates and submitted to a coordinator.
6. A decision is made by a coordinator in consultation with the student and all informed persons.
7. After the student has read and signed the Recommendation for Withdrawal form, the form is signed by a coordinator.
8. The student has the right of appeal.