

## SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S. 423

## MEMORANDUM

To.....Chairman of Senate.....

.....

Subject Reconsideration in Selection of.....  
Department Chairmen as Outlined in

From.....B.G. Wilson.....

.....Vice-President, Academic.....

Date.....October 30, 1970.....

S.224

I have reviewed Senate Paper S.224 concerning the appointment of Department Chairmen, together with subsequent action of Senate relating to its implementation, the development of these proposals dates from the establishment by Senate of the Tuck Committee on March 4, 1968, almost 3 years ago, while discussion of their implementation has continued from July 7, 1969.

It is clear that the delay in implementation is due in large measure to the attempt made in S224 to achieve two goals through one policy instrument, that is, the tying together of the concept and development of the chairmanship role and the reviews of the functioning of departments within the University. While these topics are certainly not unconnected, I am unconvinced that they must necessarily be considered at the same time.

The main point of my concern, however, is not a philosophical one but a practical one. The undertaking of departmental review will be time consuming for the committees involved, for department members, and for Senate when it finally considers the reports. By the terms of S309, however, review committees may not deal with the academic competency of faculty within a department nor the merits of "a particular academic program or course" although they are required "to assess the stated objectives of each department and their successful fulfillment by the departments".

While this mechanism may have had obvious merits during the period of its formulation, I would appreciate the advice of Senate as to whether, at the present time, the advantages of conducting what must be somewhat trivial department reviews, in the light of restrictions pointed out in the last paragraph, outweigh the expenditure of faculty time involved. Taking into account the disadvantages of maintaining the use of the "Acting-" prefix for all Chairmen in the interim period, suggesting administrative instability which I feel is quite undeserved, what I would prefer is to separate the two issues of chairmanship and review.

With the experience gained in the chairmanship system, it should now be possible to devise a satisfactory conceptual framework and appointment mechanisms for a chairman while the concept of departmental review could well be linked with the review of graduate programs, required under recent Senate action, in order that effective and comprehensive assessments of departments could be made over a period of, say, two years, of department goals, of programs, and competencies.