

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Academic Planning
S. 327

MEMORANDUM

To Members of Senate

From K. Strand

President

Subject Academic Planning

Date 28th January, 1970.

14733-PC

On March 19th, 1969, I submitted to Senate for its consideration a paper entitled "Academic Planning" and at the March meeting Senate referred the paper to Faculties for comment. The paper was considered by Senate on July 14th, 1969 at which time it was accepted in principle. During the debate I stated that adoption in principle would mean that Senate adopted the following three principles:

1. that a distinction be made between new and on-going programs,
2. that a system of priority academic planning be followed (rather than incremental growth at all levels) and therefore approval of a program by Senate would not constitute authority for immediate implementation nor would it establish its priority, and,
3. that there was a need for a channel to Senate for programs of an interdisciplinary nature.

In my original covering note, I stated that if the paper was adopted in principle, I would prepare a proposal for the implementation of the above three principles. An outline of the proposal is attached. The formal action requested of Senate is:

1. that Senate instruct its nominating committee to come forward at the March meeting of Senate with nominations to fill the three Senate positions on the Academic Planning Committee
2. that the Senate dissolve its Long Range Academic Planning Committee.

K. Strand

K. Strand.

Att.
ih/-

ACADEMIC PLANNING

Outline: The basic idea is that all new programs go to the Academic Planning Committee for review prior to submission to Senate, and if passed by Senate return to the Academic Planning Committee for assignment of academic priority.

The Academic Planning Committee is an Advisory Committee to the President. Its formal terms of reference and membership are presented in Appendix I. Its first responsibility is to review new programs and to advise the President in his role as Chairman of Senate.

The second responsibility of the Academic Planning Committee is to consider annually all new programs approved by Senate and to recommend to the President both academic priorities and implementation priorities. This provides the system of priority academic planning approved by Senate in July, 1969.

The membership of the Academic Planning Committee would be the same for both responsibilities; however, the Deans would not have a vote with regard to the first responsibility, i. e. recommendations on individual proposals that are under review.

New Programs: It is recognized that a distinction between a new program and a change in an existing program is not always clear. Yet, a combination of several criteria such as number and content of courses, requirements of faculty, space and finances can provide a reliable guide to identification of a new program. Therefore, for planning purposes, a new program is defined as any proposal involving a restructuring of existing courses or the introduction of new courses which would result in a major shift in emphasis of the existing program, which would result in a new degree being granted by Senate, or which would require additional staff, funds or space. All proposals falling within this definition would require review by the Academic Planning Committee. Other proposals would go directly to Senate without review by the Academic Planning Committee. However, if in the submission to Senate no present or anticipated financial commitments are identified, approval by Senate will not constitute a commitment to subsequently fund a program. This provides the distinction between new and on-going programs that was approved by Senate in July, 1969.

Channels to Senate: Proposals will originate from faculty members. These faculty members may be within a Department (Departmental proposals), within two or more Departments within the same faculty (Intra-Faculty proposals), or within two or more Departments in more than one faculty (Inter-Faculty proposals). No matter where they originate all new programs must be reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee prior to submission to Senate.

By allowing Inter-Faculty proposals to be submitted directly to the Academic Planning Committee, the channel for inter-disciplinary proposals that was approved by Senate in July 1969 is established. A schematic diagram of the proposed planning process is attached as Chart I.

January 28, 1970

APPENDIX I

ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Membership

- | | |
|--|----------|
| Academic Vice-President | Chairman |
| Dean of Arts | |
| Dean of Science | |
| Dean of Education | |
| Dean of Graduate Studies (when appointed) | |
| Three Senators (a fourth to be elected concomitant with the appointment of a Dean of Graduate Studies) | |
| Academic Planner (non-voting) | |

Terms of Reference

1. To review and recommend to the President, as Chairman of Senate, all new program proposals submitted to it.
2. To develop annually a recommendation to the President concerning academic and action priority listings.
3. To undertake such other duties as are assigned to it by the President.

Further Conditions

The full committee will review all proposals which come before it. However, the Deans will be non-voting as regards the recommendation on individual program proposals that are under review within the first of the terms of reference.

CHART 1

