Date......... MARCH 11, 1971

## MOTION:

1. "That the new course proposal for Chemistry as out1ined in Paper S.71-60 be approved."
2. "That the new course in Chemistry as outlined in Paper S.71-60 be designated 501-4."

If approved, the following motion will be made:
3. "That Senate suspend its rules with regard to the two semester time lag requirement for the offering of courses in order that Chemistry 501-4 may be first offered in the Summer Session, 1971."

Mr. II. Evans,
Secretary of Schate
Nei Course Proposal -
Continuing Education-Chemistry 601-4
3.1. Funt,

Dean of Scicnce.
tharch 11, 1971.

The new course proyosal contained in peper F-E1-9 was approvei by the Fsiulty of Seience at its neeting of Niarch lst, and is shiaittéd to senate for its consiceration.

BLF/1r

## NEW COURSE PROPOSALS: CONTINUED EDICATION - CHEM 601-4

This course was considered and approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting of February $22 n d$.

In addition to recommending some editorial changes which have been considered and implemented by the Department, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee brings to the attention of Faculty the following requirement on Page Two of the proposal:
"Note: This course will not be available for credit to students registered for a B. Sc. degree in Chemistry."

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee of Faculty does not agree with this stipulation and recommends that this stipulation be removed.

B. L. Fund

## SIMON ERASER UNIVERSITY

Dean of Science

Subjed .....Nen. Course... Proposal

From..... T.M. Bell, Acting Chairman
Department of Chemistry
Date..... 9th February, .... 1971.

I submit a new course proposal to be implemented during the Summer session 1971, as a contribution from the Department of Chemistry to the Continuing Education program. This proposal was approved at the Chemistry Department meeting held on Friday, February 5th, 1971.

In view of the short lead time, a special waiver will be required from Senate in order to $\mathfrak{g}^{e t}$ that bodies approval.

- Thus, I request that you deal with this proposal at the Faculty level as soon as possible. I enclose a memorandum from Dr. McClaren which is self explanatory with regard to the approval sequence.

Dr. KcClaren's comment about the course number is now irrelevant; I have since spoken to the Registrar about the contents and intent with regard to this course, and as I understand it a 600 type number is in order.

We are able, by adjusting various faculty members' research semester sequences, to mount this course using our present resources. I believe this is in keeping with the University philosophy of making the best use of our resources in those areas of student demand. Thus, we will not be requiring additional stipend in order to mount this course, and unless the enrollment is high, we intend to utilize the equipment and resources available in the Department. We will require the services of a teaching assistant for this course, and will utilize one of those allotted to the Department. :

On a general point of philosophy, the Undergraduate Studies Committee and myself: all agree that additional payment to memoers of faculty involved in Continuing Education is not in the best interests of this Department. Clearly we would extend this point of view in the wider University context.

In the interests of economy, we feel that a lower limit enrollment of 6 should be set for this course.

Should you require any further information, please let me know.

## FACULTY OF SCIEICE

NEU COURSE PIOPOSAL

CAIEMDAR INFOFURTION
Department: Chemistry Course Number: 601.Title:
Fundamental concepts and classroom demonstrations in High School.
Chemistry; Selected Modern Topics in Chemistry.

Credit Hours: 4
Vector Description: 4-1-4
Pre-requisite(s):
Intended primarily for candidates with school teaching credentials.
II ENROLEET AND SCHEDULITG
Estimated Enrolment:
Semester Offered (e.g. Yearly, every Spring; twice yearly, Fall and Spring):

When course will first be offered: 1971-2 (Summer intersession)

## III JUSTIFICATION

A." What is the detailed description of the course including differentiation from lower level courses, from similar courses in the same department and from courses in other departments in the University?

Outline: This course will review the fundamental concents of chemistry and particularly those basic to him school chemistry. Modern topics ir nuclear and radiochemistry will alro be presented. The associated laboratory course will deal with the technical and pecagosic aspects of classroom demonstrations. Experimonts will de developed irom those in the literature with particular empllasis on overnead projector tecnniauss There is no similar course within the university.
B. What is the range of topics that may be dealt with in the Course? See III A.
C. How does this course fit the roals of the department?

The provision of this course fits the goals of the department in threc ways: (J) it interacts with the interests of the Divicion of Continuing Education; (a) it extends the offering of chemjstry to a public other than the conventional student; (3) it is of particular signiricance to high schocl teachers.
D. How does this course affect desree requirements?

No efrect.
Note: This course will not be available for credit to students registered for a B. Sc. degree in Chemistry.

Explanation: This course has been planned specifically for school teachers; it contains review material, and some advanced topics, which already cxist in the courses of the core proframmes of honours and majors candidates for the B. Sc. degree. Hence, for reasons of duplication of course work and credit, is not appropriate for credit toward, such degree. This constraint, however, does not preclude the application of credit for this course toward some other degree or diploma.
E. What are the calendar changes necessary to reflect the addition of this course?

Add this course.
F. What course, if any, is being dropped from the calendar if this course is approved?

None.
G. What is the nature of student demand for this course?

Student damand as determined by questionnaire conducted by the division of Continuing Education.
H. Other reasons for introducing the course.

## Iv BUDGETARY AND SPACE FACTORS

A. Which faculty will be available to teach this course?

Dr. B. D. Pate
B. What are the special space and/or equipment requirements for this course?

No special requirements other then laboratory space and equinment vithin the Department of Chemistry.
C. Any other budgetary implications of mounting this course:

One fifteen-hour Teaching Assistantship.

# APPROVAL - Faculty Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: February 22, 1971 Faculty: 

.Senate:
'Co: SENATE

Subject: New Course Proposal - Chenistry and Numbering of: Courses

From: H. M. EVANS
RECISTRAR

Date: April 26, 1971

1. The Faculty of Science, following recommendation by the Jepartment of Chemistry and Faculty Undergraduate Studies Comittee recommends to Senate the approval of a new course currently identified as Chemistry 601-4 to be first offered for the Summer Session 1971.
2. The course is of particular significance to high school teachers of Chemistry who normally are expected to have graduated with a major in Chemistry. The course provides opportunity for bringing teachers up to date.

It is intended that it may be utilized in some cases by teachers to upgrade their qualifications for salary purposes in the Province.
3. As it assumes that normally the enrollee will have a major background in Chemistry the Department has stipulated that it will not be available for credit to students registered toward a B.Sc. degree in Chemistry and have recommended numbering of the course beyond the 400 Bachelor's series of numbers.

It has been recommended by the Faculty Undergraduate Studies Committee and is not a "graduate" course as a part of "Graduate Studies" although normally intended for those who have graduated in Chemistry.
4. Similar types of courses can be offered at the University of British Columbia for graduate credit in the Faculty of Education, but not normally for graduate credit in the Department of the discipline, e.g. "Education 565-3 Special Course in Subject Matter Field - Courses in various subject matter fields designed to bring teachers up to date in new advances and recent findings in each field. See also Physics 430 (Recent Developments in Physics)'.
5. At Simon Fraser University in some earlier instances, and at present in the M.B.A. programne, "Graduate Studies" courses have been numbered in the 600 series.

To date the 500 series has not been utilized for either "undergraduate" or for "graduate studies" purposes.
6. It is recommended that the 500 series be utilized for courses of the type proposed in the current submission Chemistry 601-4, and that this course be numbered Chemistry 501-4.

## SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY -

EAEAORARDURA
commonest ion

Dr. B. Wilson
Vice-President Academic

Subject... Senate Meeting May 10,1971 -
Chemistry $6001(501)$ - Withdrawal of Proposal.

* Attached is a copy of the communication received from T.N. Bell, Acting Chairman, Department of Chemistry, requesting that the proposal for Chemistry 601(501) be withdrawn from consideration at Senate. In telephone conversation with Dean Font today he has indicated concurrence with the request.

When the item comes forward on the Agenda this evening you may wish to indicate withdrawal.


Enc: *
HME: ib
cc. Dr.B.L. Funk

## SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

B.L. Punt

Dean of Science
Subject.. Chemistry 601 or 501

From T.N. Bell, Acting Chairman
Department of Chemistry
Date. Eth May, 1971.

I note from the Senate agenda that Chemistry 601 (501) is being presented to Senate at its May meeting.

Because of the poor enrollment response, this course has now been cancelled, and as this course was proposed as a trial offering in the Continuing Education Program, it would seem best to me at this stage, to withdraw this proposal from the Senate agenda.

If the low enrollment was due to the nature of the proposed offering, then any future offering would be different from this course or contain sufficient modifications as to require a new proposal.

I would be grateful therefore if you would take the action I have suggested.

$$
\therefore K h e l
$$

TNB:mlh
T.N. Bell
cc: B.G. Wilson
H. Evans


The ronal

## 

MEMBERS OF SENATE AND THOSE NORMALIY RECEIVING SENATE PAPERS

Subject

From.... .... I. . B. KELSEY

DIRECTOR OF SECRETARIAT SERVICES

Date.... ... MAY 28, 1971

Attached is Senate Paper S.71-71 distributed at the Senate meeting of May 10, 1971 for information only. There was no discussion on the paper.

The paper is being distributed at this time for your records.

To: The Academic Planning<br>Committee<br>Subject: Charge concerning the referral, by Senate, of Paper S. 71-51, Reorganization of Educational Foundations Centre and approval of courses.<br>From: K. Strand President<br>Date: April 28, 1971

Senate, at its meeting of April 5th, 1971, passed the following motion:
"That the four motions contained in paper S. 71-51 be referred to the Academic Planning Committee for comment."

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide to the Academic Planning Committee a more specific and detailed charge.

## BACKGROUND

The charge, which appears at the end of this memorandum, derives from the fact that Senate did not include a specific charge in its referral of the four motions contained in S. 71-51.2

An event has occurred since the Senate action of April 5, 1971-namely, the fact that the Faculty of Education failed to ratify the Search Committee's nomination for a Dean of the Faculty of Education.

There has been some discussion as to whether it is proper to decide first on the organization of the Faculty and then search for a Dean of Education, or alternatively, whether it is proper to find a Dean of Education and then decide upon the structure of the Faculty. It is my view that either of these two mechanisms is proper and that I see no great overriding principle which favors one to the detriment of the other. The point, however, is that the Faculty of Education by its

1. The minutes of the Senate meeting of April 5th, 1971 accompany this charge. If desired, a transcription of the relevant portion of the Senate meeting can be provided to the Academic Planning Committee.
2. Perhaps in all cases the Chairman of Senate, as part of his general responsibilities to Senate as Chairman of Senate, should draft a charge to a Committee on the basis of the debate that occurs in Senate.
failure to ratify the nomination of the Search Committee, has created a situation where pursuit of the second alternative is not immediately available.

## CHARGE TO THE ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

1. The Academic Planning Committee is charged to bring forward to me, for referral to Senate, a recommendation as to the role of Fine Arts courses within the University. This recommendation should contain a specific recommendation as to whether the re should be Fine Arts courses within the University, and if so, the following specific recommendations should be brought forward:
(i) what the curriculum should be;
(ii) whether this curriculum should consist of credit or non-credit courses, or both;
(iii) whether any or all of the staff who teach these courses should have faculty status;
(iv) where this curriculum should be taught within the University; and
(v) whether this program should be subject to review at some specified interval and, if so, what that interval should be.

In preparation of this recommendation the Academic Planning Committee is charged with consulting, through the Academic VicePresident, with the Advisory Council on The Arts.
2. The Academic Planning Committee is charged to bring forward to me, for referral to Senate, a recommendation as to the administrative placement of the Kinesiology program/Physical Development Studies within the University. This recommendation should specify whether this program should be subject to review at some specified interval and, if so, what that interval should be.
3. The Academic Planning Committee is charged to address itself to the quantitative and qualitative needs of the Province in the area of teachers ${ }^{1}$ education. It is specifically charged to report to me on its assessment of the quantitative needs for teachers within the Province of British Columbia.
4. The Academic Planning Committee is charged to bring forward to me, for referral to Senate, a recommendation as to the role, structure and organization within the University, of the Educational Foundations Centre of the Faculty of Education.

The Academic Planning Committee should take as its first premise that the present role of the Faculty of Education within the University is to provide training for teachers. While this should be the first premise, alternative and supporting premises should also be evaluated. In the absence of alternative or supporting premises, all proposals should be evaluated in terms of how they contribute to that goal.

The Academic Planning Committee may consult externally to the University, subject to the approval, including budgetary approval, of the Academic Vice-President.

The Academic Planning Committee may consult with the Joint Board on Teacher Education which may, under Section 74 of the Universities Act,
make such recommendations to the Board of Governors, the Senate and the President of each University, and to the Minister of Education, as are within the legal purview of each in respect of the following:
(a) The curriculum of the Faculty of Education;
(b) Appointments to the staff of the Faculty of Education;
(c) Facilities for the Faculty of Education;
and in respect to teacher-training, to the governing body of any other institution of higher learning in the Province.

I will send to the Joint Board a copy of this charge and inquire whether it wishes to make comments or recommendations to me on the points contained in this charge. If so, these will be forwarded by me to the Academic Planning Committee for its consideration.

## GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. The Academic Planning Committee may bring forward other recommendations that follow from the recommendations called for under the above charges.
2. The Academic Planning Committee is charged to consult widely within the University through such mechanisms as hearings or submission of briefs.
3. If, in the judgement of the Academic Planning Committee, the nature of the charges permits or requires separate or earlier consideration of specific recommendation, the Committee is not required to bring forward all of the stated recommendations at the same time.

However, the Academic Planining Committee should remain cognizant that, at its meeting of April 5, 1971, Senate passed the following motion:
"That Senate extend for three months, to the July, 1971 meeting of Senate, the continued de facto departmental recognition of B.S.F., S. P. F. and C.S., and continue to recognize for this period the organization of the three divisions into an Educational Foundations Centre under the following constraints:
(i) single undergraduate education committee
(ii) single graduate education committee
(iii) a single spokesman for relations external to the Centre."
4. If questions arise within the Academic Planning Committee concerning specific aspects of these charges, I will, if necessary, amend or interpret these charges.
5. In order to provide additional background information, the minutes of Senate meeting of March 16,1970 and the relevant Senate papers accompany this charge.

K. Strand

President

## SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

OFFICE ()F THE
VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC

BURNABY 2, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Telephone 291.3111 Area code 604

May 3, 1971


As a result of recent actions by Senate to refer certain programs and structural reorganization within the Faculty of Education to the Academic Planning Committee, the President has charged the Academic Planning Committee to make four reports, as set out in the attached memorandum.

In summary, the Academic Planning Committee is charged to make recommendations regarding the role of Fine Arts Courses within the University, to bring forward a recommendation regarding the administrative placement of the Kinesiology Program/Physical Development Studies within the University, to report regarding the quantitative and qualitative needs of the Province in the area of teacher education and to bring forward a recommendation regarding the role, structure and organization within the University, of the Educational Foundations Centre of the Faculty of Education.

The Academic Planning Committee at its last meeting considered these four charges and decided to ask for comments or briefs from interested individuals within the University. In order that there should be no undue delay in coming to grips with these problems, I would therefore invite you to make recommendations, through written papers, to the Academic Planner, Dr. John Chase, as soon as possible and not later than May 21, 1971. Briefs may address one or more of the points raised in the President's memorandum to the Academic Planning Committee. It is hoped that there can be a full exchange of views between the Academic Planning Committee, Faculty, students, and appropriate members of the wider community.

B.G.' Wilson

Chairman, Academic Planning Committee.

