

# SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.74-143

## MEMORANDUM

To SENATE

From SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

Subject FACULTY OF ARTS - PROPOSAL FOR  
REGULAR STATUS -  
PHIL 300-3 INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

Date November 12, 1974

MOTION ~~4~~: "That Senate approve - and recommend approval to the Board - the course proposal, as set forth in S.74-143 for PHIL 300-3 Introduction to Philosophy and that it be given regular status."

574-143  
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

SENATE

From Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

Subject

Date November 12, 1974

At its meeting of 29th October, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies considered the attached proposal for Philosophy 300-3: Introduction to Philosophy.

It should be noted that this course has been discussed by both the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and by Senate on previous occasions but that it has hitherto been included in the Philosophy Department's program on an experimental basis only. On this occasion, however, the Department of Philosophy and the Faculty of Arts were recommending that the course be finally approved, without further review by Senate.

The propriety of offering an introductory course at the 300 level was once again questioned; but the Committee was assured by the representatives of the Philosophy Department that the original objective of the course to offer a general introduction to Philosophy for advanced students who did not intend to major in the subject had proved to be a reasonable and useful one and that the Department therefore wished to continue it. The Committee is now forwarding this course to Senate for its consideration, with its recommendation that it be given regular status.

*I. Mugridge*

I. Mugridge

:ams

# SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

SCUS 74.43

## MEMORANDUM

Dr. R. Brown, Acting  
Chairman, SCUS  
Subject PHILOSOPHY 300

CONFIDENTIAL  
From L.A. Boland, Chairman,  
Arts Curriculum Committee  
Date October 10, 1974.

The Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee has instructed me to re-submit Philosophy 300-3 to be reviewed by the Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee in accordance with the directive from Senate in December 1972 that the course be reviewed in the spring of 1973, before it is offered again. This review is long overdue.

The Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee recommends that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies approve Philosophy 300-3 and give it regular status.

*L.A. Boland*  
for L.A. Boland

LAB:vp  
Attachments  
cc: Mr. H.M. Evans, Registrar  
Dr. Norman Swartz, Philosophy Department

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

NEW COURSE PROPOSAL FORM

Calendar Information

Department: PHILOSOPHY  
Abbreviation Code: PHIL Course Number: 300 Credit Hours: 3 Vector: 2-1-0

Title of Course: INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

Calendar Description of Course:

An introductory course specifically intended for upper level students in other departments. This course is more advanced than 100 and 200 division courses and is of interest to students not only in the humanities, but in the natural and social sciences as well.

Nature of Course LECTURE/TUTORIAL

Prerequisites (or special instructions):

(1) At least 60 semester hours credit.

(2) Normally

students who have taken Phil 100 may not take this course for further credit;

(3) This course does not count towards the upper level requirements in philosophy for a minor, major, or honors degree in Philosophy.

What course (courses), if any, is being dropped from the calendar if this course is approved:

NONE

2. Scheduling

How frequently will the course be offered? Once a year.

Semester in which the course will first be offered? 75-3 or 76-1

Which of your present faculty would be available to make the proposed offering possible?

Every member of the Department

Objectives of the Course

The course is intended to allow upper level students who missed philosophy 'the first time through' (i.e. in their lower levels) to sample and savour the field of philosophy in their pursuit of a liberal education. The course is not equivalent to any of our introductory courses since it is designed to sample issues from several of them.

4. Budgetary and Space Requirements (for information only)

What additional resources will be required in the following areas:

Faculty

Staff

Library

NONE

Audio Visual

Space

Equipment

5. Approval

Date: 10 Oct 74 10-10-74

L. Resnick  
Department Chairman

W. G. D. Brown  
Dean

Chairman, SCUS

SCUS 73-34b:- (When completing this form, for instructions see Memorandum SCUS 73-34a. Attach course outline).

Oct. '73

# SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

## MEMORANDUM

DR. L. BOLAND, CHAIRMAN, FACC

From N. SWARTZ, CHAIRMAN USC

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Subject REVIEW OF PHILOSOPHY 300

Date OCTOBER 10, 1974

The Department of Philosophy would like to see Philosophy 300 become a permanent offering of the Department. So far, it had been offered four times on a 'trial' or experimental basis.

As you know, the principle of having an introductory course in the upper division which has no specific course prerequisites, only that the student should have upper level standing, has been queried and challenged within the University. I would like to defend the principle on two grounds, one on its intrinsic academic merit, and two, on its demonstrated success in practice.

The University is engaged in trying to satisfy two (among more) different desiderata. It tries to provide specialist knowledge in various fields and it also tries to provide a broad overview of the world of learning and research. There is room in our curriculum for courses which are designed for the non-specialist. Indeed, the number of such courses probably ought to be increased. The question arises as to what division such courses ought to be assigned. The 100 - division has a prima facie claim, because 100 - division courses normally have no prerequisites - but this is only a prima facie claim.

Upon examination, the rationale for assigning all introductory courses to the 100 - division appears dubious. If a course is designed for the non-specialist in a field, then it can be adjusted to his general level of intellectual sophistication and maturity. And if there is no difference between the general level of intellectual sophistication and maturity of a first-year student and a third or fourth, then this University is failing miserably in its attempt to educate its students. In short, if students are being successfully educated here, then there is no reason whatever why an introductory course could not be designed for any one of its four divisions we recognize. As students achieve greater intellectual sophistication they deserve and are capable of handling introductory material in a more sophisticated way.

Practice has shown that upper level students can master more sophisticated material than newcomers to the University scene. This is attested to by students' comments, which are attached, and by the comments of faculty members who have taught the course.

I regret not having more students' comments. But perhaps you know, last year I wrote a questionnaire specifically for students in Philosophy 300, which I then turned over to the FACC for distribution under its aegis. In the ensuing controversy in SCUS, the existence of that questionnaire seems to have been overlooked. In any case, I expect that with the

- 2 -

addition of these new materials, the former unanimous endorsement of the course by the FACC will now be even more enthusiastic.)

*Norman Swartz*

PHILOSOPHY 300

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

FALL SEMESTER 1973  
(EVENINGS)

D.D. TODD

REQUIRED TEXTS:

PLATO (ed. Cornford)     Republic

HUME, D.     Dialogues concerning Natural  
Religion

RUSSELL, B.     The Problems of Philosophy

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

An introductory course specifically intended for upper level students in other departments. This course is more advanced than 100 and 200 division courses and is of interest to students not only in the humanities, but in the natural and social sciences as well.

N.B. *There are no prerequisites for Philosophy 300. Students who have taken Philosophy 300 may not take this course for further credit.*

PHILOSOPHY 300

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

SPRING SEMESTER 1973

D. FINN

REQUIRED TEXTS:

CORNMAN & LEHRER

Philosophical Problems and  
Arguments

HAMLYN, D.W.

The Theory of Knowledge

RUSSELL, B.

Problems of Philosophy

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Some basic problems in epistemology treated basically. Diverse and contrasting theories of mind, and theories of knowledge, will be considered.



PHILOSOPHY 300

Introduction to Philosophy

Fall Semester 1972

D. Finn

REQUIRED TEXT:

CORNMAN & LEHRER

Philosophical Problems and  
Arguments

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Some basic problems in epistemology treated basically. Diverse and contrasting theories of mind, and theories of knowledge, will be considered.

PHILOSOPHY 300

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY

SPRING SEMESTER 1974

D. FINN

REQUIRED TEXT:

SPRAGUE & TAYLOR, eds.      Knowledge and Value

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

An examination of central problems in theories of knowledge and metaphysics. Historical and contemporary philosophical selections will be discussed. Some of the topics covered will be the role of sensation, observation and perception in knowledge; the mind, body, self and immortality; faith, reason and falsification; the problem of miracles.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Three short papers, one of which will be written in class.

# SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

## MEMORANDUM

TO: WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

From: D.R. FINN

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Subject: PHILOSOPHY 300

Date: OCTOBER 9, 1974

I have taught Philosophy 300 on three occasions. The course was conceived to allow senior students who might otherwise not have been exposed to philosophy to gain some appreciation of the discipline.

In my experience the course has almost invariably attracted appropriate students. They are, by and large, senior students whose motivation for taking the course seems to be intellectual curiosity. In that respect they differ happily from many students known to attend lectures at Simon Fraser. That quality of intellectual curiosity together with their wider experience conspired to produce lectures and discussions of somewhat higher tone than might ordinarily be expected with novice philosophers. Characteristically the students were both mature and demanding (in an honorific sense).

If mature and intellectually curious students deserve to have satisfied their academic interest in philosophy, I believe this course deserves perpetration.

mn

December 19, 1973

EVALUATION OF PHILOSOPHY 300

This course was an introduction to Philosophy designed for students at the 300 level and was taken by regular university students and several off-campus students not working for a degree. The texts used were the same as those used in Philosophy 100, but the lectures were pitched at a higher and more difficult level, and more stringent criteria were used in grading course work.

There was a high drop rate. Most of those who dropped the course were off-campus students. Apparently they found the course too demanding. There was a much lower drop rate among regular university students. The students who remained were, on the whole, a lively bunch. Classroom discussion was generally more interesting and more sophisticated than usual in an introductory course, and this made the course a pleasure to teach.

Perhaps considering merely enrollment figures and service to the off-campus community, this course was not terribly successful, but I believe that it was useful for the regularly enrolled university students who took the course, and pedagogically quite successful.

D.D.TODD

PHILOSOPHY 300\*\*

This course is advantageous for upper level students in that it gives them an introduction to philosophy at a level better suited to them.

The class is small and therefore each student is given an opportunity to contribute to the lectures.

I think it would improve the course if it was completely a seminar course.

The textbook is difficult to understand. I often have to read sections over several times and they are still not always clear.

The lectures stimulate the students into thinking.

\* \* \*

Pro:

- Good instructor
- Allows upper level students a look into philosophy and I feel this is valuable
- Topics are highly interesting but there must be a better book
- Good course!

Con:

- Format could be changed to seminar course - take it out of room 5030 and put it in seminar room
- The book is unintelligible!

\* \* \*

\*\*Student reaction elicited in

Nov. 72.

I think the idea of the course is basically sound. It enables students to meet specific upper-level requirements in a course that requires no pre-requisites. The subject matter is perhaps slightly over-ambitious for a one semester course - especially a survey course. The textbook leaves much to be desired; it seems both too elementary and too complex at the same time. Perhaps a better idea would be to explore the same subject matter as it is presented by the people who did some of the original work in the various fields, i.e., look at some primary sources.

It is worth exploring the idea of a seminar rather than two lectures and a tutorial although the present method is adequate.

\* \* \*

I think the idea behind Philosophy 300 is a good one. I feel that the course would be most effectively conducted as a seminar - more or less the same way that it is conducted presently.

I have a low opinion of the course text - it is very poorly written and dull.

It is too bad that a grading system requiring essays, etc. has to be used. I feel I have derived a lot of benefit from discussions in the course, but little from doing essays - little exercises in mental gymnastics.

I feel the professor has been excellent and wouldn't hesitate to recommend courses given by him. I don't think Philosophy 300 would have been so successful as it was (for me) with a different professor (from my association with out-of-philosophy department professor anyway).

\* \* \*

I think that the basic idea of Philosophy 300 is worthwhile. I've found this the most enjoyable course I've ever taken, both in form and content. I think the emphasis on thinking process, as opposed to context, is very valuable and is all too seldom seen at the university level. I think that a lot of this is due to the instructor. The format could be changed from a lecture/tutorial to a seminar, although the course was conducted practically in a seminar fashion this semester anyway. As a basic text, the

book is a little vague, but it's all right as a background if it's supplemented and explained in the lectures. In general, I think it's an excellent course.

\* \* \*

Since I began this course with less than a knowledge of philosophy having been misled by the likes of Toftler, I am satisfied with having my total incomprehension of philosophy exposed.

As I would prefer to under-go a purge of mind among more understanding persons than generally attend 100-level courses, Philosophy 300 has also satisfied that preference.

I have very much enjoyed the course primarily because of the instructor and the informal nature of the structure. I find the book without illumination, uninterpreted by the instructor, but not completely useless.

I haven't the faintest idea if I have learned anything. Everytime I think or assume I have moved forward, I seem to have gone backwards. The fault lies with me, however, not with the class.

I would like to see the course based upon more extensive background material that could fill in substantial gaps in the text-book.

The instructor, not being omnipotent, can't always carry the weight of explaining everything in a manner that can be readily understood by all.

\* \* \*

Necessarily, this is based on personal reaction, and so, as a "last-semester" DML student, this course is adequate (perhaps even more than that) to my needs. It's an upper level course worth three units (outside my major!); it has touched, though slightly, on a few points covered in semantics in linguistic courses; but, best of all, to one who has had only Philosophy 102 (in the way of philosophy courses), this course, (300) has introduced me to a range of philosophical problems I had previously only imagined might exist(?), - actually, had only passed over briefly in past reading and study. Being no

deep thinker (intellectual type), I have nevertheless gotten quite a bit out of the course I believe. If this weren't my last semester, I'd give serious thought to taking another philosophy course, just for "the joy of it all".

The only problem with the course is the text, - better to have several authors, with selected readings from each, or a collection of essays, etc.

As to the Lecturer/T.A., no problem. Having had a sum total of two philosophy courses, two philosophy lecturers, one philosophy T.A., (and exposure to a substitute philosophy lecturer!), I come to the astounding conclusion that these guys are "okay" guys (except for that one substitute lecturer)!!

In all seriousness -

(Is this a perfect hallucination?)

\* \* \*

Basically, the idea of giving an introduction to philosophy at the 300-level is a good one. However, the course might be made more enjoyable if the book were changed in favour perhaps, of a set of notes mimeographed by the lecturer. Though some grasp of technical terminology is essential to a study of any field, the course as it stands, is too cluttered up with it. Since only a clerical distinction exists at present between tutorials and lectures in this course, there is no need to perpetuate the "two-lectures, one-tutorial" concept. Instead, three seminars a week would be more suited to the spirit in which the course has been and should be given.

\* \* \* \* \*



FACULTY OF ARTS

NEW COURSE PROPOSAL

November, 1969

1. CALENDAR INFORMATION

Department: Philosophy Course Number: 300-3 Title: Introduction  
Sub-title or Description: An introductory course to Philosophy  
specifically intended for upper level students in other departments.  
This course is more advanced than the 100 and 200 level courses and  
is of interest not only to students in the Humanities, but Natural  
and Social Sciences as well.

Credit Hours: 3 Vector Description: 2-1-0

Pre-requisite(s): <sup>NEW</sup> THIS COURSE DOES NOT COUNT TOWARDS THE UPPER LEVEL  
REQUIREMENTS FOR A MAJOR OR HONOURS IN PHILOSOPHY.

Students who have taken Philosophy 100 may not normally register  
in this course.

2. ENROLMENT AND SCHEDULING

Estimated Enrolment: 20 - 30.

Semester Offered (e.g. yearly, every Spring; twice yearly, Fall  
and Spring):

Once Yearly (Fall or Spring)

When will course first be offered?

Spring 1973

3. 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? The course is specifically intended for  
upper level students in other departments who need upper level  
electives and would like to take some philosophy. The course will  
cover major philosophic concepts at a more advanced level than the  
introductory courses at the 100 level. Moreover, the course will be  
taught in such a way that it will be of interest to the advanced  
general student. Thus, our Philosophy 201 is primarily intended  
for prospective majors and honors students, and 300 is not.

B. What is the range of topics that may be dealt with in the  
course? The topics considered will be broader than in 201.  
In addition to introducing problems in epistemology and metaphysics,  
Philosophy 300 will introduce basic problems in the philosophy of the  
natural and social sciences. It is possible that certain topics in  
morality may be discussed as well. There are, in particular, major  
contemporary questions about the uses to which technology may be  
put and their effects upon man. These questions have philosophic  
aspects and would be of interest in such a course.

C. How does this course fit the goals of the Department?

Philosophy 300 is a service course filling a gap we see existing not only in our upper level offerings, but in the university curriculum in general. Such a course has been taught successfully at UEC.

D. How does this course affect degree requirements?

No effect.

E. What are the calendar changes necessary to reflect the addition of this course?

See calendar submission.

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?

There has been student interest in such a course.

H. Other reasons for introducing the course.

None.

## 4. BUDGETARY AND SPACE FACTORS

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

All staff.

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

None.

C. Any other budgetary implications of mounting this course:

None.

Approval:

Curriculum Committee:

Dean of Faculty:

Senate: