

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S 215 6

MEMORANDUM

E

To: The Registrar
 Secretary of Senate
 Subject: Academic Planning -- Paper S.215

From: Dean D.H. Sullivan,
 Faculty of Arts
 Date: June 27, 1969

Attached is the preliminary report of the Faculty of Arts concerning Senate Paper S.215.

Please distribute this paper to Senate members for the regular meeting in July.

DHS:btbd
 encl.

D.H. Sullivan

June 27, 1969

PRELIMINARY REPORT FROM THE FACULTY OF ARTS CONCERNING SENATE PAPER S.215

At a meeting of Senate on April 8, 1969, Paper S.215, a report by the Chairman of Senate for discussion on "Academic Planning at Simon Fraser University," was referred to the Faculties for comment.

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts referred this paper to all departments for their comments and held a Dean's Advisory Committee meeting to discuss the President's proposal. The Faculty of Arts Academic Planning Committee was asked to deliberate on the paper and to make a preliminary report to the Dean for inclusion on the Senate agenda. They were asked to examine the paper and present responses to the following:

1. Any weaknesses or deficiencies in the nature of the process as spelled out by the President, and
2. The role of the Faculty of Arts Academic Planning Committee in any planning process.

A copy of the relevant points of the deliberations of the Faculty of Arts Academic Planning Committee is attached. In addition to the comments of the Faculty of Arts Academic Planning Committee, the following points were raised in the Dean's Advisory Committee for forwarding to Senate.

It was on the matter of interdisciplinary studies and programs that the Dean's Advisory Committee differed widely from the PROPOSAL in Paper S.215. (The Faculty of Arts Academic Planning Committee also comments on the interdisciplinary programs in the attached excerpt from their meeting on June 12th.) In Paper S.215, it states on page 3: *"What is proposed is that, in the case of new programs proposed by a group of faculty members who are not in the same department, they would first go to a Senate Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies (to be established) for preliminary analysis and, if approved by this committee, the proposal would go directly to Senate for approval in principle."*; and after approval in principle, *"In the case of new programs originating from members of faculty who are not in the same department, i.e., interdisciplinary programs, priorities would be assigned by the Senate Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies."* It is then proposed that these priority ratings would go to the University Planning Committee to generate, along with priority ratings from the Faculties, the academic priority list; i.e., to be ranked in terms of university priority. In other words, an interdisciplinary program proposed by individual faculty members (once having been approved in principle) is assigned a priority by the Senate Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies, then goes directly to the Academic Planning Committee to be assigned a university priority. Paper S.215 states

that new programs proposed by departments (some having first come from individual faculty members within that department) would, once having been approved in principle, be ranked by priority within that department, then be assigned a priority at the Faculty level, then at the university level.

In relation to the above process, the significant points made at the meeting of the Dean's Advisory Committee are as follows:

- a. Consideration should be given to the distinction between an interdisciplinary course of studies and an interdisciplinary course as such.
- b. Concern was expressed that an interdisciplinary program could be forwarded to the proposed Senate Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies, without being first approved by the relevant departments or Faculties.
- c. One suggestion was that a University Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies, as well as the proposed Senate Committee, be established.
- d. It was suggested that the University Committee should be composed of Faculty. There was concern that a Senate Committee might not be wholly academic and, thus, the argument for setting up a University Committee solely concerned with interdisciplinary studies. Such a University Committee might act as an advisory board to all Faculties.
- e. Concern was expressed over the processing of inter-Faculty programs. One question raised was: who would approve such programs and whose responsibility would such programs fall under?

From the above, it is apparent that the Faculty of Arts wishes to retain the right to approve and some jurisdiction over interdisciplinary programs fully or partly within the Faculty of Arts (i.e., programs originating from more than one department or between departments in the Faculty of Arts), rather than having proposals going directly to the Senate Committee from individual faculty members. Any proposal concerning the Faculty should first of all be scrutinized in the Faculty by its Academic Planning Committee before it goes to the Senate Committee. This would have several advantages in that it would relieve the Senate Committee from receiving a mass of submissions on programs that have not been examined to a sufficient degree at a lower level. If submissions are presented directly to the Senate Committee, good ideas may be rejected because of inadequate arguments in their presentation or inadequate support.

- f. With respect to priority ranking, it was noted that ranking across departments was essential. There was concern expressed that ranking might be done solely on the basis of enrolment predictions, or pressure which would militate against departments with low enrolments or new programs designed for a small enrolment. It was also noted

that Paper S.215 does not give criteria for priority ranking.

- g. Regarding the President's role in academic planning, misgivings were expressed about the cumbersome procedure detailed on page 3, last paragraph of Paper S.215. It was suggested that the President's role was implicit and did not have to be made explicit.
- h. In general, the Dean's Advisory Committee was in agreement that an academic planning function, including an independent priority setting body, was needed.

Excerpt from the meeting of June 12, 1969, of the Faculty of Arts Academic Planning Committee:

We discussed (1) The President's proposal regarding academic planning; (2) Interdisciplinary activity in the Faculty of Arts; we recommend the following:

1. That the Faculty of Arts Academic Planning Committee vigorously pursue and study the suggestions set forward to it on interdisciplinary programs in the faculty and that this Committee take on itself the responsibility and jurisdiction for and of any criteria for such programs as they apply to arts. We call your attention to paragraph 5 of President Strand's proposal where he acknowledges the role of planning at level of individual faculties. We also feel it necessary to continue studying President Strand's proposal in order to assess its possible effect on our own long-range plans.
2. That the role of this committee be as follows:
 - to initiate, generate and receive practical ideas and priorities for the Faculty of Arts. These ideas need not be tied to the immediate goals of various departments whose projected needs we feel are too strictly tied to budget potential. We are anxious to plan for and analyze utopian suggestions. A specific agenda for 1969-70 will be forthcoming.
 - to advise the Dean on matters of planning.
 - to establish some criteria for our operations.

MC:btbd