

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

S.71-130 and
S.71-130a

To SENATE

From B. G. WILSON

VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC

Subject CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR CHANGES

Date NOVEMBER 25, 1971

- FACULTY OF ARTS

MOTION: 1. "That Senate refer the broad issues set forth in Papers S.71-130, 130a, and related issues, to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for its consideration and recommendations to Senate.

2. That Senate now consider directly each of the current proposals from the Faculty of Arts submitted by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies."

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.71-130

MEMORANDUM

To SENATE

From B. G. WILSON

VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC

Subject CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR CHANGES
- FACULTY OF ARTS

Date NOVEMBER 25, 1971

The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies recently reviewed a large number of proposed curriculum and calendar changes proposed from the Faculty of Arts and encountered some difficulties. Attached is a report to me from the Chairman of the Committee raising a number of issues, and a further report from the Secretary requested by the Senate Agenda Committee.

The Committee has made specific recommendations concerning the submission on Archaeology, Economics and Commerce, and the Department of Modern Languages. It has also transmitted to Senate for Senate's direct action the submissions of Philosophy, Psychology and PSA. The two attached reports identify a number of reasons for the actions taken by the Committee following its considerations. It is to be noted that some of the issues raised apply to the submissions for which specific recommendations are made, and not only to those without specific recommendations. This was recognized by the Committee.

The Committee was established during the current year to consider Undergraduate submissions and to coordinate these. Its first meeting was held in June. A number of issues which have been raised have been with the University for some time, but without being directly considered. As suggested by the Committee, principles and policies are unclear in a number of areas. It is my view that it would be inappropriate to expect immediate resolution of each of the stated and related issues, and that due time is required for satisfactory resolution and coordination.

Senate could deal with the specific recommendations, and not consider those items for which specific recommendations have not been made by SCUS pending such recommendations. It will be noted that the recommendations have been approved by the Faculty of Arts - the only procedure which would have pertained prior to the establishment of SCUS. Alternatively Senate could consider each of the submissions, utilizing such information as provided by SCUS. The Committee could then be given broad charge to consider all items already approved by Senate including any new approvals now made, or to further consider those new items about which Senate may have doubt at this time and which it may refer to the Committee.

It is my intention to ensure that there is resolution as rapidly as possible of a number of the issues raised, to clarify policies to ensure that similar difficulties will be unlikely to be encountered in submissions for future years.

I recommend:

1. That Senate refer the broad issues set forth in Papers S.71-129, 129a, and related issues, to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for its consideration and recommendations to Senate.
2. That Senate now consider directly each of the current proposals from the Faculty of Arts submitted by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

| | |
|---|--|
| To..... Dr. B.G. Wilson..... | From..... Dr. J. Chase, Chairman..... |
| Academic Vice-President..... | Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies..... |
| Subject..... CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR CHANGES..... - FACULTY OF ARTS..... | Date..... November 17th, 1971..... |

The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies at its meeting on November 15th, 1971 considered recommended calendar revisions submitted by Departments in the Faculty of Arts and approved by the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee. In the course of its review, a series of issues were raised for which there are no corresponding University policies. In the absence of such policies, and given the time constraints confronting the Committee, the recommendations from the Departments of Philosophy, Psychology and Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology have been forwarded without action from the Committee to Senate for its consideration. While the Committee took specific action on the proposals submitted by the Departments of Archeology, Economics and Commerce and Modern Languages, the issues raised below should be considered applicable to these departments as well.

Issues Arising from Consideration of Calendar Revisions

1. Course Numbering - there is a total absence of stated University policy relating to the differences between courses at the 100, 200, 300 and 400 level. In the absence of policy, it is difficult if not impossible for any University body to rule on the merits of proposed numbering changes when there is no clear rationale offered for the changes proposed or when there are no criteria against which to evaluate a rationale when offered.

Several examples may suffice to demonstrate the nature of the problems involved:

Discontinue Ec/Com 235-3 and renumber as Ec/Com 332-3
Discontinue Ec/Com 236-3 and renumber as Ec/Com 333-3
Discontinue Ec/Com 380-3 and renumber as Ec/Com 280-3
Discontinue Ec/Com 323-5 and renumber as Ec/Com 223-5
Discontinue Phil. 205-3 and renumber as Phil. 341-3
Discontinue Phil. 208-3 and renumber as Phil. 344-3
Discontinue Psych.*220 and renumber as Psych. 302
Discontinue Psych.*230 and renumber as Psych. 303
Discontinue Psych.*240 and renumber as Psych. 304

* The rationale offered by the Psychology Department is that there is no real difference in the level of these 200 level courses as compared with the level of the 300 level courses.

2. Permission of Instructor - under the mail pre-registration system, the accomodation of the requirement of "permission of instructor" and/or "permission of the department" has been identified as a significant problem area. While a student who is currently on campus may seek approval of the instructor/department prior to the pre-registration procedure, this provision may cause some concern for students not on campus with potentially adverse results in enrollments in those particular courses.

While some departments have taken steps to specify their course requirements with maximum clarity, others continue to rely heavily on the use of permission of instructor/department.

For example:

Philosophy 150-3 at least 1 - 100 level course, or permission of instructor
Philosophy 203-3 Philosophy 100 or permission of instructor
Philosophy 210-3 Philosophy 110 or permission of instructor
Philosophy 250-3 Philosophy 150 or permission of instructor

For admission to its upper level seminars, the Department of Psychology proposes that a minimum of fifth level standing be required for admission and that in addition, admission to any upper level seminar require the permission of the instructor.

While the Committee believes there is some merit in retaining "permission of the instructor" for directed readings and directed studies courses, it is not convinced of the necessity of its utilization in other circumstances, e.g., the cases cited above.

3. Permission to Waive Requirements - both in the current calendar and in the calendar revisions proposed, numerous course descriptions continue to provide for either fulfillment of course pre-requisites or "permission of the instructor." University policy is silent on the general question of whether the instructor alone shall have the right to waive pre-requisites for the particular course which he or she is teaching although in practice this right has been acknowledged. Furthermore, can an instructor waive course pre-requisites only when "permission of instructor" is stipulated?

4. For Approval? For Information? By Whom? To Whom? - under present operating procedures of the Registrar, a change in title, major change in course description, or change in credit hours requires a new course number and approval of Senate. The rationale for this approach is that information on courses is contained in the University's calendar; because the calendar is the official publication of the University, significant changes thereto require approval of the University's Senate.

The recommended calendar revisions for the 1972/73 year contain the following kinds of changes:

- a) new course proposals
- b) changes in course pre-requisites
- c) major changes in course descriptions
- d) changes in course title
- e) changes in course credit hours
- f) changes in the general requirements for majors or honors in individual departments
- g) major changes in general calendar statements

Present procedures require that all of the above be submitted to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for review and then to Senate for approval. Because all of the above changes now are given equal consideration, it is extremely difficult for Faculty or University bodies external to the department to determine what substantive changes are being proposed and to assess in any meaningful way the impact of those changes.

We believe that evaluation of proposed curricular changes would be enhanced by clarifying:

- a) which curriculum changes require approval and by whom, and
- b) which curriculum changes can be submitted for information only and to whom

The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies is prepared to take up immediately each of the above issues and prepare recommendations for consideration by Senate. However, given deadlines for submission, approval and publication of calendar materials, there is insufficient time to both resolve the aforementioned issues and review in any meaningful way the submissions from the Faculty of Arts (it is understood that submissions from the Faculties of Science and Education will be forthcoming). Under these conditions, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies agreed to request that the recommendations from the Faculty of Arts be submitted to Senate and to further request that they be accompanied by a copy of this letter to you.

John Chase

S.71-130a

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To SENATE

From SECRETARY

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

Subject CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR CHANGES

Date NOVEMBER 25, 1971

- DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
- DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
- DEPARTMENT OF PSA

The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies gave consideration to the submissions of the Department of Philosophy and of Psychology and noted that a number of issues raised to a limited degree in the discussions on the proposals from Archaeology, Economics and Commerce, and the Department of Modern Languages continued in these proposals, some were intensified and additional ones were observed.

Lengthy discussion was held to determine the most appropriate action to be taken. This discussion included:

1. Some consideration of earlier actions as taken by Senate, e.g. the numbering of courses, and lack of clear policy, as debated recently on Kinesiology, with approval of the submission then made; Philosophy 207-3 - Selected Topics which was approved by Senate some considerable time ago, but the concern of some of the members in providing selected topics at that level, now brought to attention by the renumbering system in Philosophy; the frequency of use of "permission of instructor," as exemplified in the Psychology submission as a requirement for admission to any upper level seminar, but already approved by Senate and appearing in the calendar as it does for many courses.
2. Some discussion of the matter of items which clearly must be placed before Senate and some which might not, but without clear delineation - resulting in large volume of materials difficult to follow, under time constraints, lacking clear policy.
3. The difficulty of identifying what clearly is policy, what might be policy because of precedent actions, or what might have been single action without policy implication.
4. A consideration of the terms of reference of the Committee, of which body appropriately would undertake to clarify a number of the issues raised, and desirability of clear charge from Senate to undertake study.

5. A concern that holding the material in attempt to consider and resolve all possible policy issues would constitute significant change in practices without reasonable notification of policies which might be applied - a change of rules in mid-flow.
6. The standard operating procedures of the Committee, as announced to the University, that if substantive changes were made or proposed by the Committee the item would be referred back to the initiating body for its acceptance of the changes, or for further modifications, but with the proviso that if the initiating body desired the original submission to go forward to Senate this would be done, with the Committee presenting its position with the submission and the initiating body adding to its submission any further data it desired. (The lack of clarity on policies would inhibit clear-cut statements.)
7. The lack of members in attendance from the Faculty of Arts to respond to questions of concern to the Committee, and the impossibility of scheduling a special meeting to provide for this prior to consideration of the material by the Senate Agenda Committee for presentation to the December meeting of Senate, as generally desired.

Following consideration of the above and other factors, the Committee agreed that all of the submissions received from the Faculty of Arts be sent forward to Senate for its consideration, with the Chairman of the Committee to write to the Vice-President, Academic identifying a number of the issues, notably those arising from lack of clear policies, and identifying the willingness of the Committee to take up the issues to make recommendations thereon to Senate. It was understood that resolution of a number of the issues would take considerable time, but that it was desirable that they be initiated quickly for resolution hopefully in time that similar issues would not arise in consideration of items for the 1973-74 calendar.

It was requested that copy of the communication from the Chairman to the Vice-President, Academic accompany the bulk submission of the Faculty of Arts proposals to Senate.

(This explanation is provided at the request of the Senate Agenda Committee.)

HME/rn