

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.84-51

MEMORANDUM

To..... SENATE.....

From..... CHAIRMAN OF SENATE.....

Subject..... MEMBERSHIP ON SENATE -
VICE-PRESIDENT UNIVERSITY
DEVELOPMENT

Date..... 24 AUGUST 1984.....

MOTION: "That, pursuant to the provisions of Section 34(2)(1) of the University Act, the Vice-President University Development hold membership on Senate, with such membership adding two to the faculty members to be elected under Section 34(2)(g), and one to the student members to be elected under Section 34(2)(h)"

(Explanatory note:

If the above is approved, election would be called for two faculty members to be elected by and from the faculty members jointly, and for one student member to be elected by and from the students at large.

The Act permits Senate to add to its membership but requires that such addition be made without altering the ratio set out in Paragraph G covering the number of faculty members and in H covering the number of student members.)

**RATIONALE FOR THE VICE-PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT
AS A MEMBER OF SENATE**

The Vice-President, University Development, has special responsibility for the presentation of the University in the community (local, regional and national). Objectives which concern this office include: informing our publics of the University's mission, strengths, and contributions to the community; strengthening the public's acceptance of and support for universities, and for Simon Fraser University in particular; establishing collaborative and mutually beneficial relationships with alumni, governments, and community groups; and attracting private, corporate and government gifts to the University. Each of these tasks is directed towards enhancing the University's principal functions of teaching, research and service.

The Vice-President, University Development's primary task is to work towards the strengthening of the University's academic programs. He/she can do this best when fully informed about academic activities and priorities, and when the background to academic decisions is understood. Further, those responsible for establishing academic program policies and priorities should have the opportunity to directly inform and question the development activities of the University.

For these reasons, the University would be served if the Vice-President, University Development were a member of Senate.

JPB/lm

September 13, 1984

FOR INFORMATION

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To Vice-Presidents, Deans and Directors

From William G. Saywell

President

Subject

Date September 13, 1984

Attached are copies of the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on University Priorities. Attached to the report are three discussions papers on related issues. A fourth discussion paper on work-load will be made available to the Vice-President Academic shortly. As you know, the program evaluations have already been sent out to each program.

WGS:jp
Att.



THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY:
GUIDING PRINCIPLES, WITH ELABORATIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Report
of the President's Advisory Committee
on University Priorities

Simon Fraser University

1984

Members of the President's Advisory Committee on University Priorities

John Chant, Department of Economics
John Ellis, Faculty of Education
Glen Geen, Department of Biological Sciences
Dennis Krebs, Department of Psychology (Chairman)
Nikki Strong-Boag, Department of History and Women's Studies

Pat McCann, Executive Assistant

Preface

The President's Advisory Committee on University Priorities (PACUP) was created in November, 1983 and given two charges -- to "review the existing academic programs and services of the University" and to "advise the President on the development of an academic mission statement." Early in its deliberations the Committee decided to confine its review to academic programs, and recommended the creation of additional committees to review the library and computing facilities. These committees have been created and will report to the President in the near future.

Deadlines notwithstanding, the Committee met on an ongoing basis for ten months. The Committee met an average of three times a week and consulted in person with more than fifty people. In addition, it conducted three open hearings and received submissions ranging from less than one page to more than thirty pages from approximately sixty individuals.

The first step taken by the Committee to fulfill its mandate to evaluate the 34 academic programs at SFU involved the selection of appropriate criteria of evaluation and the development of a formal procedure. Members of the Committee surveyed the literature on program evaluation, examined the systems employed by other universities, consulted with experts in the area and ultimately produced an evaluation scheme that is notable in three respects. It contains nine criteria of evaluation. It is dependent primarily on two types of information: statistical data supplied by the Office of Analytical Studies and information supplied by program representatives. And, finally, it encourages representatives of programs to read and respond to preliminary evaluations, and thus is more open to feedback and consultation than most evaluation systems. (See Appendix)

In addition to consultations with representatives of programs, the Committee discussed its preliminary evaluations with the Deans of each respective faculty and with the VP (Academic).

The Committee did not examine the vita of individual faculty members. For this reason, the Committee did not obtain a data base for discovering whether there are faculty at SFU who have failed to meet their responsibilities. It should be emphasized, however, that it is the strong opinion of the Committee that such a data base should be developed. The Committee questions the effectiveness of the present system of evaluation, recommends that the President examine it, and, if it is judged as deficient, develop procedures that supply a more valid indication of the performance of individual faculty.

A valuable by-product of the development of the system of evaluation developed by the Committee was the organization of data from the Office of Analytical Studies in a form in which it can be used in the future for planning and decision-making.

The results of the Committee's evaluation of each program have been forwarded to the President. Representatives of each program have received a copy of the evaluation of their program and an accompanying recommendation. The reports will not be released to the public at large.

In general, the Committee found the quality of the programs at SFU to be high. The Committee failed to find a basis for recommending the discontinuation in whole of any major program at SFU, although it did recommend that parts of a small number of programs be considered for discontinuation and that significant cuts be considered in a few others. The Committee also recommended that some programs be considered for restructuring.

In addition to the conclusions drawn about the 34 programs, four general observations emerged from the program evaluations. First, there appears to be considerable inequity among departments in the teaching loads of faculty. Second, there is wide variation in the structure of the curriculum across programs. As with workload, some variation is to be expected by virtue of differences in the nature of disciplines. However, it is the opinion of this Committee that a university-wide review of the curriculum is needed. In addition to the obvious benefits to students of a more rational and consistent curriculum, the university can save money by decreasing the number of unnecessary courses, course repetitions, and low enrolment courses. Third, the University would benefit from a more efficient system of management and planning. Although this Committee did not evaluate the administrative sector of the university, it recommends strongly that it be reviewed. The common opinion that the University has been "over administered and under-managed" should be examined. If it is valid, changes should ensue. If it is invalid, it should be disavowed. Finally, during the course of program review, it became apparent to the Committee that more should be done to enhance the "sense of community" at SFU.

These four general observations -- about teaching load, curriculum, the administrative structure of the University, and sense of community -- have been elaborated by members of the Committee in four discussion papers.

The report that follows is the Committee's response to the second part of its mandate -- "to advise the President on the development of an academic mission statement." It consists of some 25 principles that, the Committee submits, should guide the future of SFU. Because such principles tend to be abstract and truistic, the Committee has attempted to flesh them out with elaborations, implications and recommendations. The degree to which each principle is elaborated is variable, determined in many cases more by the areas of expertise on the Committee and the sophistication of the input it received than by the significance of the principle.

In closing, it should be emphasized that this Committee is advisory to the President. The recommendations contained in this report are the Committee's advice. The Committee has attempted to structure its advice in a manner that would make it easiest for the President to act on; however, ultimately the President will submit his own statement of mission to the University community and set in motion the procedures that will enable the University to meet its objectives.

The Future of the University:
Guiding Principles, with Elaborations, Implications,
and Recommendations

PRINCIPLE 1

The University should seek to fulfill its responsibilities to its students, faculty, staff, and alumni, to the people of British Columbia and Canada who support it, and to the international community of scholars in several inextricably connected ways: by developing the intellectual capabilities of students, by preserving, disseminating, refining, integrating, and elaborating existing knowledge, by creating and discovering new knowledge, and by supplying constructively critical commentaries on prevailing beliefs and values.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 1

- 1.1 Different constituencies view the purposes of SFU in different terms. For example, the general public tends to be most aware of its teaching function, whereas scholars from other universities tend to be most cognizant of its research contributions. However, there need be no conflict between the different purposes that guide SFU; each should complement the others.
- 1.2 Universities are places where individuals are encouraged to question accepted truths. As such, universities become a sanctuary for social criticism and innovative thought. The value of free and questioning thought must be preserved. Some of the radical ideas of today will become the accepted truths of tomorrow.
- 1.3 There is a continuing need to provide the public with information about the purposes and achievements of SFU. In particular, "products" that are not generally appreciated, such as the products of research and other scholarly activities and the value of a liberal education should be communicated regularly to the public (see Mennell report, 1982).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the policies and procedures of SFU, both formal and informal, be carried out in ways that maximize the fulfillment of its fundamental purposes. The principles, elaborations, and recommendations that follow specify ways in which this goal may be achieved.

2. That a coordinated plan to inform the public of the purposes and products of SFU be developed and implemented. This plan should begin with a consideration of the recommendations of the Mennell (1982) Report dealing with alumni ties, public involvement in SFU activities, links with government, business, and labour, media coverage, and an emphasis on quality and mission.

PRINCIPLE 2

The University should allocate its resources in a manner that preserves and strengthens its academic areas of excellence and fosters those that show promise.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 2

- 2.1 When resources are allocated, both in times of abundance and in times of scarcity, they should be allocated in a manner that preserves and strengthens those aspects of the University that have an established reputation for excellence and those that show the greatest promise of fostering excellence. In general this means favoring programs that have achieved excellence or show promise of excellence over those that have not or do not, favoring academic functions over nonacademic functions, and favoring essential services over desirable services and amenities.
- 2.2 Essential services are those without which the fundamental purposes of the University -- teaching, research and other scholarly activities -- could not continue. Research equipment, the library, computing capability, audio-visual resources, and some support staff are essential. Heated rooms, food services, record keeping, clinical services, and parking are necessary at some minimal level. Desirable amenities and services are those which tend to make the University a more comfortable and enjoyable experience, but without which the fundamental purposes of the University could still be fulfilled. Recreational, athletic, religious, and counselling facilities and various artistic events are examples of desirable services and amenities.
- 2.3 In times of financial restraint, all aspects of the University should be called upon to increase the efficiency of their operations, performing their functions with fewer resources. Desirable services and amenities should be reduced or eliminated first, as long as their reduction or elimination does not jeopardize essential services or the integrity of the academic core. Were the University forced to strip itself of all recreational, athletic, day-care, artistic, religious and social amenities and services, it would be immeasurably poorer and less attractive to students, faculty, and staff. Inevitably, the quality of the University would suffer. At that point the University should shrink essential services, but not to a point where it jeopardizes its areas of excellence. Past that point it is best to make cuts in the academic programs that contribute least to the mission of the University and show the least promise of achieving excellence.

RECOMMENDATION:

3. That resources be allocated in a manner that maximizes the excellence of teaching and scholarship at SFU, both in times of abundance and in times of restraint. If cuts must be made, they should be deepest in areas most peripheral to the academic core of the University, then in the academic areas of lowest quality and promise. Specifications of this general recommendation are contained in ensuing points.

PRINCIPLE 3

The University should continue to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs already adequately provided in the province. Each of the institutions and agencies that contribute to the educational well-being of British Columbia should defer to the others in terms of competence and acknowledged mission.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 3

- 3.1 All aspects of overlap among the three B.C. universities cannot and should not be eliminated. All universities must offer some of the same fundamental or core programs to ensure that their students have an appropriately rounded education. In addition, certain specialties should be offered by more than one institution if student demand is high and if alternative approaches taken by the different universities provide fresh and interesting options for students.

PRINCIPLE 4

The University should not aspire to cover all areas of knowledge. It should preserve the areas in which it already has established strength, and, in addition, emphasize two types of programs: fundamental and innovative.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 4

- 4.1 Fundamental programs are those that are widespread in their application, pervasive in their influence, and supply the traditional academic foundation for other programs. Innovative programs are those that are not readily available elsewhere, meet emerging social needs, and build on fundamental programs. They are emerging fields of study, applications of established disciplines, professions, or near professions which, while developing their own knowledge base, use as a foundation the information, theories and tools of fundamental programs. In general, they reflect responses to a changing social context and provide learning and research opportunities not readily available elsewhere.

- 4.2 By virtue of the fact that it is a University bound by tradition and its own history of development, SFU must and should continue offering basic programs in fundamental or "core" areas. It is difficult to imagine a university without programs in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. The subject matter of fundamental programs will and should overlap with the subject matter of programs at UBC and UVic. Although existing departments offering programs in the traditional areas should be preserved, they should not necessarily be preserved in their present form. Not all departments need offer undergraduate major, honors, or graduate programs. Not all departments need offer all their present "streams". Successful aspects of core departments should be preserved and strengthened. Unsuccessful aspects of core departments should be decreased or eliminated. Departments offering programs with traditional content have a special responsibility to distinguish themselves in other terms, especially the quality of their scholarship and instruction.
- 4.3 Fundamental programs are important in their own right, for the contributions they make to a liberal education, and for the contributions they make to new areas of inquiry and application. Fundamental programs should provide the foundation for applied studies and emerging disciplines.
- 4.4 The capacity to develop innovative programs should be prized as evidence of SFU's vitality, its commitment to advancing knowledge and its responsiveness to the evolving needs of society. The relationship between innovative and fundamental programs should not be competitive, even in times of financial restraint. Each should augment the other. The continuing association should be one of sympathy and shared resources, made manifest through mechanisms such as common curricular components, joint appointments and collaborative research. Cooperation between fundamental and innovative programs should instill a greater degree of integration in the University and foster the most efficient use of its resources.
- 4.5 From its beginnings SFU has resisted pressures to develop large numbers of traditional professional faculties. That policy should be continued as long as other universities are able to meet the demand for professional training. Consistent with its emphasis on innovative programs, SFU should offer a small number of relatively unique professional programs associated with areas of excellence in the University.

PRINCIPLE 5

Because the quality of the University will be most readily apparent in the achievements of its faculty, students and alumni, the University must be ever more energetic in attracting the best possible professors and students.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 5

- 5.1 SFU should develop organized and active programs for the recruitment of excellent faculty and students. This will involve the coordinated effort of departments and the administration, and the investment of resources.
- 5.2 The efforts of the Faculty of Science in encouraging able high school students to enrol at SFU are to be commended. Other faculties should be encouraged to emulate its example. Such efforts should be extended to college students and mature students as well.
- 5.3 The success of certain departments in attracting graduate students of superior ability is to be commended and should be emulated. The University should supply the resources and the departments the energy for the active recruitment of superior graduate students.
- 5.4 The University should endeavour to recruit world-class scholars whenever the opportunity arises. In the ordinary course of recruiting faculty, the University should place particular emphasis on quality. On occasion this may involve hiring a professor of truly outstanding research potential who does not fit the precise teaching needs of the department. The costs of reassigning teaching responsibilities within a department are minimal relative to the benefits derived from the acquisition of an outstanding scholar.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

4. That a coordinated, university-wide set of policies and procedures be developed for the recruitment of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty; and that the resources necessary to implement these policies and procedures be made available to departments. The recommendations of the High School Recruitment Committee (1983) should be considered as part of this process.
5. That funds be set aside to enable departments at SFU to hire faculty of extraordinary accomplishment or potential when special opportunities arise.

PRINCIPLE 6

The University should reaffirm its commitment to high quality scholarship. It must ensure that opportunities and incentives are provided for faculty to improve their scholarly productivity, that the scholarly contributions of faculty are evaluated in the fairest and most valid ways, and that excellence in scholarship is adequately rewarded.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 6

- 6.1 The advancement of knowledge by members of the University is one of its primary responsibilities. Knowledge may be advanced in a number of ways: through experimentation, through the analysis of published and archival material, by synthesizing and analysing existing scholarship, by developing integrative theories, and so on.
- 6.2 A professor's contribution to the advancement of knowledge entails communication with other scholars. Most often this finds expression in publication. Publication will occur in different forms and at differing rates depending on the discipline. Although it is pointless to attempt to establish productivity "norms" across the University, the standards appropriate for evaluating scholarship in each discipline should be specified.
- 6.3 A distinction should be made between the quality and quantity of scholarship. Professors at SFU should be encouraged to emphasize quality over quantity, and evaluations should reflect this emphasis. In some instances a modest volume of work may prove to be of signal importance. In other cases, a considerable volume of work may fail to make a significant contribution.

RECOMMENDATION:

6. That the President, as the academic leader of the university, assume a central role in developing incentives to enhance the scholarly productivity of faculty and students at SFU; that he ensure that the best possible methods are employed to evaluate the scholarly contributions of faculty, that policies which reward scholarly achievement or its absence (promotion, tenure, salary) are applied rigorously, and that formal and informal ways of encouraging, recognizing and publicising scholarly achievement be developed.

PRINCIPLE 7

The University should reaffirm its commitment to high quality teaching. It must ensure that teaching is evaluated in the fairest and most valid ways, that opportunities and incentives are provided for instructors to improve their proficiency, and that excellence in teaching is adequately rewarded.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 7

- 7.1 The University's reputation among academics is based primarily on research and scholarly activity; however, its reputation in the community is based primarily on the experience of the many people who take its courses and programs.

- 7.2 Teachers at SFU include professors and a variety of other instructors such as teaching assistants, faculty associates, and laboratory instructors. Teaching involves much more than lecturing, important as that may be. University teachers have an obligation to keep themselves abreast of new developments in their fields, to strive to improve their methods of instruction, and to encourage the free exchange of ideas between themselves and their students. Teaching involves preparing new courses, updating existing courses, leading seminars and tutorials, supervising research, meeting with students informally, assisting students with term papers and the like, evaluating performance, supplying constructive feedback, and, in general, helping students improve their basic academic skills. Teaching involves a commitment to students that extends well beyond formally scheduled contact hours (see C.A.U.T. Guidelines concerning Professional Ethics and Professional Relationships).
- 7.3 A number of different methods of teaching evaluation are employed by different units at SFU, some undoubtedly more valid than others. Recognizing the difficulties inherent in the evaluation of any performance -- scholarly productivity and course achievement are two important cases in point -- SFU should seek to employ the best available methods. A large body of research has been conducted on this issue.
- 7.4 Students have a legitimate and important role to play in evaluating most, but not all, aspects of teaching. Although, for example, the choice of subject matter for a specific course is best evaluated by the faculty member or his or her colleague, students are in a good position to comment on whether an instructor sets clear objectives, abides by his or her course outline, shows up on time, inspires enthusiasm for the subject matter, speaks clearly and coherently, answers questions adequately, and, in general creates an atmosphere conducive to learning. Students should have the opportunity to offer their views on all courses, anonymously, using an instrument appropriate for the purpose.
- 7.5 The Chairs of departments and other colleagues should play a more active role in evaluating teaching. The present use of student evaluations and casual observation should be augmented by consultation and classroom visitation. In particular, Chairs and peers should insure that professors update their courses appropriately.
- 7.6 The evaluation of teaching should serve two purposes: it should supply a basis for assisting instructors to improve their performance and it should supply a basis for decisions about salary, tenure, and promotion. These purposes should be kept distinct. Appropriate resources should be associated with the former, and appropriate procedures and incentives with the latter.
- 7.7 A variety of relatively simple and inexpensive procedures could be employed to raise the overall quality of teaching at SFU. More extensive and systematic feedback could be given routinely to instructors by Chairs and colleagues; the teaching assistant training program could be reinstituted; professors of acknowledged competence

could serve as mentors to more junior faculty; an unobtrusive and non-threatening consultative service could be instituted; workshops in teaching skills could be provided, etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

7. That a task force be created to make specific recommendations about ways of improving the quality and evaluation of teaching at SFU. Initially it should consider four matters: training for teaching assistants, ways of assisting instructors to improve their teaching techniques, policies and procedures for evaluating the teaching effectiveness of professors, and an effective system through which students can voice their complaints about faculty. The task force should be asked to make recommendations that are as simple and cost-effective as possible, taking into account the findings of Senate paper 83.56 and other relevant material. This task force should include students, faculty, administrators, and a member of the Office of Analytical Studies.
8. That the President direct the Deans of each faculty to ensure that valid and representative information is provided about the teaching effectiveness of every faculty member who is evaluated for purposes of promotion, tenure, or salary.

PRINCIPLE 8

The University should insure that modes of instruction that contribute most fully to the education of its students are employed. Instructors should be encouraged to explore new pedagogical approaches as need and opportunity arise.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 8

- 8.1 SFU should remain receptive to new teaching approaches. For example, advances in computer technology should be kept in mind as a means of improving teaching in selected courses.
- 8.2 The tutorial system is a distinguishing feature of the University. It is valued by many students, but it has never undergone a thorough evaluation. It now appears to be under some challenge both financially and pedagogically.
- 8.3 The tutorial system as it is generally thought of -- a small discussion group matched with larger lectures -- is but one of many possible approaches intended to assist students in the clarification of concepts in small group settings. Individual consultations, drop-in tutoring sessions, student-led tutorials are instances of alternative arrangements which have merit.

- 8.4 A variety of options to the now standard tutorial arrangements should be encouraged and examined. Different disciplines, different levels of study, different class sizes, and different instructional styles are all likely to call for different arrangements in assisting students to gain mastery of course material.

RECOMMENDATION:

9. That an expert committee evaluate existing modes of instruction at SFU, including the tutorial system, and propose improvements and modifications.

PRINCIPLE 9

The University must ensure that Professors make significant and ongoing contributions in the areas of teaching and scholarship. An adequate or even superior performance in one area cannot fully compensate for inadequacies in the other.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 9

- 9.1 Over a career a professor should devote approximately equal time to teaching and research, and significantly less to administrative and other matters. However, this division need not be applied inflexibly to every professor in every year. There will be times when extraordinary levels of scholarly activity justify a decrease in a professor's responsibilities in other areas; and there will be times when it is appropriate for a professor to assume additional teaching or administrative duties.
- 9.2 Policies and procedures related to salary, tenure, and promotion should reflect the necessity for all faculty to make ongoing contributions to both the teaching and scholarly functions of the University. Thorough reviews of the accomplishments of faculty over extended periods of time, such as for example every five years, may supply a more adequate perspective on their overall performance than one, two, or three year reviews.
- 9.3 There is considerable variation in the workload of professors, both between and within departments. Teaching responsibilities vary widely in terms of courses taught, graduate students supervised, directed readings courses provided, etc. Similarly, research activities and administrative duties vary considerably. The total workload of some professors appears to be much heavier than that of others. In the interests of equity this problem requires resolution.
-

RECOMMENDATIONS:

10. That, with the assistance of the Office of Analytical Studies and in consultation with Deans of faculties and Chairs of departments, the Vice-President, Academic be directed to produce a set of criteria specifying the teaching load for faculty in all departments at SFU. These standards may or may not vary from department to department, but in any event should be made explicit. In general, all faculty should teach an average of four regular courses per year. Exceptions to this principle should be made on clearly defined grounds.

PRINCIPLE 10

The University must protect the rights of its faculty to engage in unconstrained intellectual inquiry and insure that this right is not abused. After the scholarly productivity and teaching competence of professors are clearly demonstrated, they are entitled to receive an appointment without term; however, tenure must not be permitted to shield those who are negligent in their duties.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 10

- 10.1 The award of an appointment without term represents a major obligation undertaken by the University and a major benefit bestowed upon the individual. Professors must establish that they have the ability both to teach well and to make significant scholarly contributions before they receive tenure. A somewhat greater length of time than the present minimum may be necessary to supply new members of faculty with the opportunity to demonstrate their ability. In view of the magnitude of the commitment of the University to tenured faculty, it would seem appropriate for the award of tenure to be accompanied by promotion -- at least from Assistant to Associate Professor.
- 10.2 Tenure provides professors with the freedom necessary to pursue intellectual endeavors, but it carries with it a continuing obligation to "use that freedom in a manner consistent with the scholarly obligation to base research and teaching on an honest search for knowledge" (CAUT model clause on academic freedom, 1977), and to maintain an active program of scholarship and high standards in teaching. The University should offer encouragement and assistance to professors who experience difficulty in meeting their responsibilities. In cases where professors do not respond constructively to such assistance, the University should apply sanctions such as negative salary adjustments. Failing these measures, the University must be rigorous in the implementation of procedures of dismissal. To permit tenure to protect those who are negligent in their duties is to jeopardize the future of tenure and to dilute the quality of the University as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION:

11. That Policies AC2 (Renewal, Tenure and Promotion) and AC22 (Salary) be revised and applied to reflect the foregoing principles.

PRINCIPLE 11

The University should admit as students those most likely to benefit from a university education. Individuals who display outstanding promise should be sought out and actively encouraged to enrol. Others of promise should be given full opportunity to develop their capabilities. Mature students should not be denied opportunity by arbitrary barriers to access.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 11

- 11.1 Raising standards for admission or instituting an admissions testing program have been suggested as devices for improving student continuance rates. These suggestions require further study. Good predictors of success are elusive. Sound standards for continuance are, in the long run, more humane and defensible than artificial barriers to access.
- 11.2 The early decision to modify entry requirements for mature students and to offer courses at convenient times and locations has served SFU and the community well. Although drop-out rates of mature students are worrisome, many mature students reap great satisfaction from their studies. Contact with those with more experience also enriches classes for other students.

PRINCIPLE 12

The University should ensure that it fulfills its particular responsibility to Canadian students, while at the same time, within responsible limits, fulfilling its obligation to help educate students from other nations. The University should attempt to preserve a balance of students from other countries.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 12

- 12.1 The University has taken ad hoc but generally responsible steps to ensure that Canadian students have priority in high-demand programs.
- 12.2 The University should not be reticent in pointing out the advantages both to the University and to Canada of providing educational opportunities to a representative mix of students of high ability from other countries. It should not be forgotten that thousands of Canadian students have attended and continue to attend British and American universities.

RECOMMENDATION:

12. That Senate review the principles it has established for enrolment limitations and insure that they foster an acceptable balance of Canadian and non-Canadian students in all programs.

PRINCIPLE 13

Although the University must fulfill its responsibility to discontinue students who fail to meet its standards, it should make every reasonable effort to minimize such failure.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 13

- 13.1 The number of students who drop out or experience difficulty in continuing at SFU should be a source of concern and an object of study. Not all those admitted can be expected to complete degrees: they may have neither the inclination nor the aptitude. However, every effort should be made to supply assistance to those who are motivated to do well.
- 13.2 Underpreparation in university level learning skills is a problem amongst some students at all universities. SFU is no exception. SFU should not ignore this problem; it should address it directly, particularly in its introductory courses. Even good students could benefit from improvements in basic skills.
- 13.3 The financial problems of students are a cause of concern. SFU has a record of contributing more to student aid from its base budget than most universities. This policy should continue. The University should endeavor to increase scholarship, bursary and loan funds.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

13. That lower levels courses, in addition to addressing disciplinary concerns, be so designed as to provide students with necessary basic skills for learning, and that the need for additional resources devoted to remediation be evaluated.
14. That efforts to acquire additional funds for financial aid to students be intensified.

PRINCIPLE 14

The University should ensure that the quality of education it offers is not compromised by enrolment pressure, and that a balance is preserved among the programs it offers. It is better for SFU to be small but good than large and mediocre.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 14

- 14.1 There is a variety of opinion concerning the appropriate future size of the University. The determination of size, however, is not solely the responsibility of the University. Social and economic forces also play a role. A desire for growth on the part of the University, for example, which is not matched by student demand and economic resources, could not be realized. Similarly, the decision to remain small in the face of a demand for academic services accompanied by fresh resources might be irresponsible.
- 14.2 Of overriding importance on the question of size is a commitment to quality in the advancement and dissemination of knowledge. Excessive enrolments must not be permitted to compromise the quality of teaching and scholarship.
- 14.3 The University will be hard-pressed to continue what it is presently doing given the current level of support. The expansion or addition of programs must be matched by fresh resources for personnel, facilities, and equipment or by the termination of existing activities.
- 14.4 The size of individual programs and the balance between them are as important concerns as the size of the University as a whole. Rules of thumb on size and balance are elusive and simplistic. There are times, nevertheless, when a program is too small to permit a coherent effort. Similarly, there are times when the unfettered growth of a program can disrupt the balance and integration needed by the University to achieve its broad purposes.

PRINCIPLE 15

The University must ensure that the primary purpose of all of its programs is to advance and disseminate knowledge. Although some programs may supply artistic and technical training as part of their curriculum, they should not permit such training to compromise their fundamental responsibilities.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 15

- 15.1 Practical, artistic, and vocational training are inextricably connected to the advancement and dissemination of knowledge in several disciplines. It is as foolish to say that a university has no interest in practical or artistic matters as to say that a vocational institute or conservatory can ignore academic concerns. However, artistic and practical training that does not contribute to the advancement of knowledge is inappropriate at SFU.

PRINCIPLE 16

The University should examine its commitment to existing programs and establish priorities for the implementation of new ones.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 16

- 16.1 A program can be defined as a coherent grouping of courses which, upon its completion, satisfies the requirements for a degree, a diploma, a certificate, or a major or minor within a degree.
- 16.2 Most programs at SFU are well established, involve a significant complement of faculty and attract considerable student interest. Others are in the process of establishing themselves, and aspire to grow. In addition there is a fairly large and growing number of small programs, some attracting strong student interest, and others that appear to have little appeal to students. Further, a number of programs are at varying stages of the approval process, some with departmental backing, others supported by Continuing Studies.
- 16.3 The present state of affairs raises three general concerns. First, several of the emerging programs are making or about to make significant claims for new resources -- personnel, space, equipment. It is unclear whether the needs of these programs over a period of emergence were either specified or taken into account in planning the University's financial future. Second, it is unclear what principles have guided the approval of some of the smaller programs. Some contribute elements of coherence and integration to existing course offerings. Others appear to reflect a narrower interest. Third, most new programs draw teaching personnel from established programs. This, of course, is preferable to hiring teaching personnel for an uncertain future; however, past a point, resources diverted from central programs will weaken the core of the curriculum.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

15. That Senate declare a moratorium on the introduction of new programs; and that the moratorium not be lifted until an adequate appreciation is obtained of the fiscal, personnel and space requirements of existing programs, particularly the newer ones.
16. That the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be more proactive, encouraging when appropriate, the development of new programs. Proposals in the form of prospectus should be examined en bloc at specified intervals, perhaps twice a year. Certain proposals should be encouraged and others discouraged. Subsequent, more detailed proposals should include resource implications and, again, should be considered en bloc to encourage priority setting.

PRINCIPLE 17

In order to insure that it has the resources necessary to continue mounting innovative programs, the University must devise procedures that enable it to terminate unsuccessful programs at minimum human and financial cost.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 17

- 17.1 A major strength of SFU has been its willingness and ability to mount innovative programs. It should maintain this strength in the future. However, procedures must be developed that make it easier to terminate programs that prove unsuccessful.
- 17.2 There are two reasons why universities find it difficult to terminate programs. The first is to be found in the tendency of organizations to retain functions, once established, whether they are needed or not. The second is related to faculty personnel policy: it is difficult to discharge tenured faculty.
- 17.3 New programs should be staffed with the smallest possible number of new tenure-track faculty. In some cases professors with the necessary expertise and interest from existing programs could help staff new programs on a seconded or joint appointment basis, with their numbers augmented by visiting and term faculty. Once a program has proven its quality and attractiveness (say, after 5 years), its staffing and organizational arrangements could be changed to a more conventional form. If the program were unsuccessful, it could be terminated with minimal human and financial cost.
- 17.4 A viable mechanism for terminating unsuccessful programs is a positive way of ensuring the capability to mount innovative programs in the future.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 17. That conditions under which a new program will be terminated, together with mechanisms for making termination possible, should be specified by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning before additional programs are approved.

PRINCIPLE 18

The University should evaluate its programs periodically. The criteria on which programs are evaluated should include the following: the quality of teaching and research, student demand, contributions to British Columbia and Canada, contributions to other programs, efficiency of curriculum, cost-efficiency, and efficiency of management. Though not all criteria of evaluation are equally important in every case, any deficiency should supply a stimulus for correction.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 18

- 18.1 All programs at SFU should set objectives and assess the extent to which they have met their objectives on an ongoing basis. Programs should be evaluated in terms of both general criteria such as the quality of teaching and scholarship and criteria specific to their particular objectives.
- 18.2 SFU should employ two kinds of program review: informal and formal. Informal reviews should be conducted annually on two bases. First, each department should review objectives set the previous year, assess its success in attaining the objectives, examine relevant issues respecting the management and operation of the department, and set objectives for the forthcoming year. Second, each Chairman should meet with the Dean, discuss performance in the previous year against specified objectives and review objectives set for the following year. Informal reviews, to the extent possible, should use objective information and specific objectives.
- 18.3 Formal reviews should be conducted every five years or more frequently if required by the Dean or Vice President, Academic. First, a committee drawn from members of other departments within SFU should review the program in terms of its internal functioning and its functioning within SFU. A review format similar to that used by PACUP (see Appendix) should be considered. Second, an external committee of peers should review the research and scholarly activities of the department and its members.
- 18.4 The Office of Analytical Studies should supply the data that serve as the quantitative basis for program reviews. These data should be updated and made public on an annual basis. Conclusions and programs should, of course, be based on qualitative judgments as well as statistical data.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

18. That a schedule and format for the setting of objectives and regular review of all programs at SFU be established.
19. That the Office of Analytical Studies report to the Vice-President (Academic) and publish the quantitative data it collects on programs at SFU at least once a year.

PRINCIPLE 19

The curriculum -- courses, sequences, programs, requirements -- should be as spare, simple, and uncluttered as possible. Cumbersome regulations, questionable prerequisites, needless courses, premature specialization, and overly lengthy and complex sequences should be eliminated.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 19

- 19.1 The undergraduate curriculum is showing clear signs of dysfunction. The curriculum is complex in terms of requirements and sequences and is offered in a complex manner through the trimester system, day and evening offerings, and the like. Those two complexities make it especially important to ensure that the curriculum is efficient as possible. These points and others are elaborated in the attached discussion paper, Undergraduate Curriculum.

RECOMMENDATION:

20. That an expert committee review the structure of the curriculum in the University as a whole, with the intent of making recommendations that lead to its simplification and an improvement in its efficiency.

PRINCIPLE 20

The University should enunciate principles and regulations that ensure that students attain a breadth of education that extends beyond the specialization advocated by individual departments. It should ensure that familiarity with a range of knowledge and the acquisition of a solid foundation for future learning should not be crowded out by premature specialization.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 20

- 20.1 There is considerable variation in the number and degree of specificity of requirements in the various programs at SFU. Some programs at SFU require and specify significantly more courses than comparable programs at UVic or UBC. Although the number of courses required in some programs should be greater than in others by virtue of the subject matter, all programs should seek to minimize their requirements in order to maximize the flexibility of the curriculum and students' freedom of choice. In no case should the requirements of a program deprive students of the opportunity to obtain a broad foundation for future learning.
- 20.2 In view of the speed with which knowledge is changing in various fields, it is becoming increasingly important for students to obtain basic skills in learning. Courses that are especially designed to supply a solid foundation for future learning facilitate the mastery of more specialized subjects, and, therefore, should be taken primarily in the first two years.
- 20.3 A solid foundation for future learning involves at least the following:
- a) the inculcation of attitudes and values such as a respect for truth and an openness to new ideas;

- b) training in the methods of advancing knowledge (research design, statistical inference, critical and creative thinking, logic, theoretical synthesis, problem solving, decision-making);
- c) training in methods of communication, especially reading and writing;
- d) training in the understanding and manipulation of numbers (basic mathematics, computer skills);
- e) acquaintance with the major themes and styles of inquiry of the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities.

RECOMMENDATION:

21. That the expert committee on curriculum reform make recommendations that (a) enable SFU to provide the courses necessary for students to acquire a strong foundation for future learning; (b) ensure that SFU invests adequate resources in these foundation courses (some will require small tutorials or labs and individual instruction); and (c) ensure that the requirements of the various specializations offered at SFU do not deprive students of the opportunity to obtain basic foundational skills.

PRINCIPLE 21

The University should continue to remain as open as possible to those who are qualified to attend it. Subject to sufficient demand to ensure cost effectiveness, courses and degree completion programs should be offered at times and places convenient to those carrying home and/or vocational responsibilities.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 21

- 21.1 When it was instituted in 1965, the trimester system was seen as having two potential benefits: it would provide students with flexibility in undertaking programs and it would make year-round use of the physical facilities. It has succeeded in the first and to a lesser, but still significant, extent in the second.
- 21.2 The trimester system is costly in at least two ways. It requires an elaborate administrative provision in registering, scheduling and record keeping, and it requires a frequent offering of essential courses. Enrolment patterns and numbers of students differ from program to program with some making more, some less, use of the trimester arrangement.
- 21.3 On balance the trimester system has proven its usefulness and thus should be retained in its essential form; however, modifications in the system should be considered. Greater use of the summer session and the restriction of some programs to the fall and spring semesters are examples of such modifications. Courses should continue to be offered in the Summer Session and the Intersession to the extent that student demand warrants.

- 21.4 The campus on Burnaby Mountain is the core of SFU, and the University must protect the quality of its core. Credit courses and programs should be offered off-campus only when they serve the needs of students better than they would if offered on-campus. The quality of off-campus offerings should be as high as the quality of on-campus offerings.
- 21.5 Departments and the Division of Continuing Studies have worked together to increase the accessibility of the programs offered at SFU. The practice is now so well-established that departments should assume greater responsibility for it. Faculty Deans should ensure that departments continue to meet necessary commitments. The allocation of resources by the Deans should be contingent on the cooperation of departments.
- 21.6 All credit courses offered by the University -- day, evening, off-campus -- should be of equal quality. Undue reliance on temporary staff for off campus and evening credit courses should be avoided.
- 21.7 Ultimately, the ability of the university to extend high quality instructional services is dependent on the strength of its scholarly and research activities. Care must be taken to avoid long-term damage to the university by diverting resources to shorter-term instructional activities.
- 21.8 The reform and simplification of the curriculum would be beneficial to the operation of the trimester system and credit extension activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 22. That the demand for courses and programs in the evening, off-campus, and summer semester be assessed and, with this information in hand, each department develop a coherent plan for the offering of courses and programs. This plan should be responsive to student demand and sensitive to the need to insure quality in the summer, evening, and off-campus.

PRINCIPLE 22

The University should, with appropriate safeguards, encourage the provision of its problem-solving capability to industry, government, labor, and voluntary organizations. Interactions between the University and outside institutions should be mutually beneficial.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 22

- 22.1 Individual professors should be free to offer consulting services to agencies and organizations in the community as long as these activities do not detract from the fulfillment of their responsibilities at SFU. This arrangement, given existing safeguards, should be of benefit to the university, the community, and to participating professors.

- 22.2 There is an increasing recognition that Canada's efforts in research and development are inadequate to meet the challenges of a competitive world economy. Related to this is the urgent need to increase employment opportunities, particularly for youth. The University's graduates are obviously part of this group. Various national bodies are encouraging a closer interaction between universities and industries that addresses economic and employment concerns. SFU should endeavor to make its highly-trained problem solvers available to industry. In return, industries should be encouraged to increase the number of jobs they make available to graduates and to contribute resources to the University.
- 22.3 In entering into collaborative relationships, the University must ensure that its integrity is maintained and its autonomy protected. However, the University should not ignore the serious problems the nation faces nor pass up opportunities that have the potential to strengthen its academic programs.

RECOMMENDATION

23. That the University encourage the activities of its Research Investment Task Force and request it to bring forward proposals for policy consideration.

PRINCIPLE 23

Resources devoted to the administration of the University should be kept to a minimum. This principle has implications for the management of departments, the central administration, and Senate.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 23

- 23.1 Like academic programs, administrative units and functions should be reviewed periodically to assess their quality and effectiveness. Regular reviews and budgetary openness would allay concerns and suspicions about the cost, efficiency, and priority of administrative services.
- 23.2 Like academic units, administrative units should establish goals and objectives against which their performance can be judged. This should assist the University administration to ensure balance between resources allocated to academic programs, physical facilities, and support staff. It might also provide a means of curtailing the tendency of bureaucracies to expand.
- 23.3 Academic departments should review their management procedures, minimize the number of committees, and leave detailed department management to the Chair. Having selected Chairs by a widely participatory process, the departments should give them a mandate to manage during their term of office, subject to positive annual reviews of their performance by the members of the DTC in their departments and by the Dean of their faculty.

- 23.4 As a widely applicable principle, the responsibility for decisions should be delegated to those in a position to make the most informed decisions. The movement toward decentralization instituted by the outgoing Vice-President, Academic should be continued. Decision-making should be decentralized to the lowest possible level and the individuals responsible held accountable.
- 23.5 All administrators should be evaluated annually.
- 23.6 Senate should clarify and simplify its goals and procedures as much as possible within the terms of the University Act. To the extent possible, academic decisions should be delegated to the lowest reasonable level and subjected to minimal review thereafter. Minor changes in the curriculum should not, for example, be of concern to Senate as a whole. A small faculty or Senate committee would better serve that purpose.
- 23.7 Careful re-examination of the function of Senate is long overdue. The principal function of Senate should relate to planning and major academic decisions. The planning function is probably best carried out by a Senate Committee (a revitalized SCAP?).
- 23.8 As part of the review of Senate activities, there should be a redefinition of the function of and necessity for its numerous committees. Each committee should be instructed to review its operations. Goals and objectives should be established and efforts made to minimize the number of faculty members and students involved. An ad hoc committee should then examine the committee structure of Senate as a whole and produce a set of recommendations for increasing its efficiency. It seems possible that some committees could be eliminated entirely and most reduced in size. These points and others are elaborated in the attached discussion paper, University Management.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

24. That all administrative units develop goals and objectives against which their performance can be evaluated on a regular basis.
25. That all departments review their management procedures and attempt to reduce the time devoted by faculty to administration.
26. That an ad hoc committee of Senate be created to examine the structure and function of Senate and its related committees with the goal of making recommendations to increase the efficiency of Senate and redirect its focus to major academic decisions and planning.

PRINCIPLE 24

The University should, on an ongoing basis, attempt to enhance the sense of community experienced by its members.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 24

- 24.1 Faculty, students, staff and alumni exist as essential and associated components of the University community. Yet, even within these groups and very definitely among them there is often a lack of understanding. Hard times may exacerbate these relationships and drain the University of the goodwill and trust without which it cannot prevail. While maintaining its commitment to its central purposes of scholarship and teaching, the University also should insure that it provides the type of experiences that promote loyalty and cooperation among its members.
- 24.2 A sense of common purpose and mutual goodwill can be encouraged in a variety of environments -- from the seminar room, to the athletic field, to student society meetings, to the Childcare Centre. Such occasions may not themselves be at the heart of the academic enterprise to which SFU is committed, but they do much to guarantee its ultimate success. Opportunities to experience SFU as a comfortable, attractive and exciting location for work and study need the University's full support. Without vital and viable amenities and services, SFU's citizens would quickly fail to know or to value other faculty, students, staff or alumni or the common enterprise itself.

These points and others are elaborated in the attached discussion paper, The Sense of Community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

27. That the President meet with the Faculty Association, the Student Society, the Alumni Association, TSSU, APSA, AUCE 1 and 2, Polyparty, and other interested groups on campus to discuss the coordination of efforts to strengthen community feeling and loyalty. This should be a cooperative enterprise.
28. That the means by which the university may be made a more comfortable and satisfying environment for work and study be investigated. The provision of more lounges and common rooms would be one step in that direction.
29. That efforts to provide more student housing be intensified, seeking assistance, as appropriate, from the public and private sectors. The possibility of creating a university village on Burnaby Mountain should be actively pursued.

PRINCIPLE 25

The University must maintain a sense of intellectual and educational adventure, even in times of financial restraint. SFU should remain at the forefront of universities in the creation and application of new technologies for teaching and research, expending every effort to preserve the spirit of innovation in which it was founded. It should be responsive to the growing need for life-long learning and recurrent education for older and part-time students. It should become a university of the future, not the past.

Elaborations and Implications: PRINCIPLE 25

- 25.1 The context within which the University operates is changing. If the University fails to adapt to this changing context it will serve the society which nurtures it with decreasing effectiveness. But adaptation does not necessarily imply transformation. It is important to preserve the essential values and purposes of the university. Developing the intellect, disseminating and advancing knowledge will continue as in the past, modified only by changing objects of attention and tools of inquiry.
- 25.2 The population is aging. By the end of the decade, those between 35 and 44 will increase in numbers by 30 percent. Society will become increasingly technological and information-based. Because of these changes, the resources of the University will be required by individuals who have life and working styles that will necessitate the delivery of programs in non-traditional ways. As we move into the next decade, universities will have less and less of a monopoly on the provision of sophisticated educational programs. SFU should endeavor to cooperate, not compete, with institutions that provide alternate learning opportunities.
- 25.3 Women constitute a growing proportion of the paid labour force and this trend will likely continue through this decade. Women, however, do not share proportionately in the higher paying occupations. SFU should be at the forefront in assisting women to improve their educational qualifications.
- 25.4 Technology can be used to offer courses or segments of courses either on or off campus at acceptable levels of quality and to enhance research programs. The beneficial consequences of this in reducing instructional and research costs could be substantial. SFU should be at the forefront in developing ways to enhance instruction and research productivity through technology.
- 25.5 Recurrent education and educational leave are attracting increased interest from individuals, organizations, and government. A challenge to SFU is to ensure that the new/non-traditional students become scholars as well as course-takers. SFU should establish appropriate programs for those students. In return, these new students will bring fresh and worthwhile interests to the university, not the least of these will be improved opportunities for interaction in research between the University and the community.
- 25.6 In responding to needs presented by changes in demography, the workforce and technology, the University needs to ensure that the traditional and non-traditional do not come into conflict -- that both work together to foster teaching and research.

APPENDIX

PROGRAM EVALUATION: PACUP PROCEDURES

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To..... Deans of Programs, Chairmen, Directors Heads of Programs at Simon Fraser University	From..... President's Advisory Committee University Priorities
Subject..... REQUEST FOR INFORMATION	Date..... February 13, 1984

As you know, the President has formed an advisory committee ("PACUP") to draft a statement of purpose for Simon Fraser University and to review its academic programs and services. The members of PACUP intend to consult widely within the university community about the academic mission, purposes, goals and objectives of our university while reviewing its academic programs. We will need your cooperation and assistance in the program review. Would you, therefore, consult with members of your department and respond as frankly and clearly as possible to the attached request for information?

In evaluating programs, we intend to adopt the following procedures:

A Information gathering phase

1. Solicit qualitative information from program representatives (see attached request).
2. Obtain quantitative information about the demand, curriculum efficiency, and cost of each program from the Office of Analytical Studies.

B Evaluation phase

1. On the basis of our interpretation of the information obtained from the Office of Analytical Studies and from program representatives, evaluate the contributions of each program to Simon Fraser in relation to its cost.
2. Send a copy of our first, preliminary evaluation to program representatives for comment and correction.

C Follow-up phase

1. Read reactions to the preliminary evaluation from program representatives and, when required or requested, meet with program representatives to discuss the evaluation.

D Final evaluation

1. Write final evaluations of programs accompanied by one of the following recommendations:
 - a) That this program be continued at higher levels of activity and complement.
 - b) That this program be continued either at current levels of activity and increased complement or at lower levels of activity and at current complement.
 - c) That this program be continued at current levels of activity and complement.
 - d) That this program be continued at current levels of activity and complement, but that faculty replacements and visiting and other temporary appointments be controlled until levels of activity increase.
 - e) That this program be continued, but at lower levels of activity and/or complement.
 - f) That this program be continued, but restructured in some specified manner.
 - g) That this program be considered for discontinuation.

PLEASE NOTE: The President's Advisory Committee on University Priorities is empowered only to make recommendations to the President. In all cases where the President considers reducing, reorganizing or discontinuing programs, members of the affected programs will be fully consulted. In addition, the discontinuation of programs requires both Senate and Board approval.

2. Send copies of the committee's evaluation and recommendations to the President with a copy to each program representative.
3. Integrate selected aspects of program evaluations in a final, public report.

Would you provide Pat McCann, AD 3191, with the information requested in each of the ten categories contained in the attached request. We realize that some dimensions may be largely irrelevant to some programs, and that others may need to be qualified, redefined or amplified in terms of the particular program under consideration. It should be clear what we want -- a valid indication of the functions, costs and benefits of each program. We are depending on you to provide that for us in the most representative way possible. As you can imagine, the task of organizing and interpreting input from some three dozen programs is demanding. Therefore it is important for us to receive your responses at the earliest possible date, and in any event not later than March 12, 1984. Please be concise.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES

Request for Information from Academic Units

In one or two pages, please outline the program or programs in your department (or equivalent unit)¹. Use a diagram when appropriate.

The information requested below should be supplied in terms of the largest representative academic units for which you are responsible. In most cases, the unit will be a department as a whole. However, in some cases it may be necessary to distinguish between graduate and undergraduate programs; and in other cases it may be necessary to distinguish between "streams" or areas of specialization within undergraduate or graduate programs.

A QUALITY

What levels of excellence have been attained within your department

It is notoriously difficult to determine the quality of departments and programs and to reach verifiable conclusions about excellence. However, you are in the best position of anyone to do it. Recognizing that different criteria may apply to different departments, you may wish to address some of the following indices: the number of eminent scholars (as evidenced by the number of publications, quality of journals, book reviews, citations, etc.), honours received by faculty and graduate students, success of graduate and undergraduate students, research grants, rank of department in discipline, membership on editorial boards, evaluation panels, and other distinguished positions, fellowships, scholarships and other awards, creative performances, invited presentations, etc.

Although scholarly and artistic excellence tend to make a special contribution to the quality of a department, we are equally interested in the quality of teaching, service and consulting. If there are any faculty members in your department whose service to the university through teaching is so exceptional that it offsets a less than adequate contribution through scholarship, we would be interested in hearing about them.

The quality of a department may be diluted by faculty who contribute less than their share. Do you have any underachieving or unproductive faculty in your department? If so, how many? What can be done about the problem of unproductive tenured faculty?

Although general conclusions about quality and excellence are necessarily subjective, we are interested in specific objective and verifiable evidence. If your department has attained excellence in some areas, there must be ways to document it. Please provide us with the supporting evidence.

¹Note: If the academic unit you represent is not a department please substitute the appropriate label (e.g. Faculty, program).

B UNIQUENESS

Is your department (or are aspects of it) unique or of special significance in B.C., Canada, or the world?

1. Identify characteristics such as distinctive approach, demand, or especially high quality.
2. What are the number and location of similar departments or programs in other Canadian universities?
3. Are there any demographic, industrial, geographic, or cultural attributes of the area which make it essential to maintain your programs at this university or which endow them with special regional significance?

C CONTRIBUTION TO AND FROM OTHER PROGRAMS AT SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

What contributions does your department make to other academic units at Simon Fraser University and what contributions does it receive from them? Please distinguish between contributions made by your department as a whole and contributions made by faculty as individuals.

1. What is the nature and extent of the contributions this department makes to other academic units of Simon Fraser in terms of teaching, service and research? (For example, cross-appointments, service teaching, collaborative research, supervision of graduate students, service.)
2. What is the nature and extent of the contributions this department receives from other academic units at Simon Fraser?
3. Assess the benefits and costs to your department from its associations with other programs at Simon Fraser.

D CONTRIBUTIONS BEYOND SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

What formal contribution does your department make to professional bodies, research centres, other universities, or the community?

1. Are any programs in your department directly or indirectly preparatory or integral to a professional qualification or to programs outside of Simon Fraser? What is the nature of this relationship?
2. Does your department have a formal relationship with a research centre, community or government body or similar entity? What is the nature of this relationship?

E DEMAND FOR INSTRUCTION

What is the extent and nature of student demand for the services of your department?

1. The Office of Analytical Studies will be providing us with statistical material on the extent and nature of student demand for services in your department (number of declared and intended majors and minors; number of B.A., M.A., Ph.D degrees awarded, etc.). Should you wish to review this information, please send a note to Pat McCann, AD 3191. Please apprise us of any special circumstances of which we should be aware in interpreting statistical data on the demand for your programs.
2. If you limit enrolment in any of the courses in your undergraduate or graduate program, please estimate, with appropriate justification, the extent of unrestrained demand. What means do you use to limit enrolment? How much demand is there for admission to your graduate program?
3. Describe in qualitative terms the nature of the demand for instruction in the undergraduate and graduate programs in your department (e.g. preparation for employment, general education, other). If preparation for employment is an important justification for your program, please comment on the current state of and likely trends in need for your graduands.

F CURRICULUM EFFICIENCY

How efficiently is the curriculum of your department offered?

1. The Office of Analytical Studies will be providing us with material concerning the curriculum of your department (e.g. number of courses, number of courses offered, class size, program requirements.) Should you wish to review this information, please send a note to Pat McCann, AD 3191.
2. Please describe and explain the patterns of course offerings in your undergraduate and graduate programs in terms of the curriculum needs of these programs. Discuss any significant increase or decrease in your offerings over the past five years.
3. Does the trimester system, the evening program or the downtown campus have consequences for the course offerings of your department? If so, what are the consequences, and how have you dealt with them?
4. Which streams within your department could be dropped without major harm to your overall program? If some streams had to go, which would be the first?

5. Do other academic units at Simon Fraser duplicate parts of your program offerings? If so, why? What, if anything, should be done about it?

G COST

What are the costs associated with offering the programs in your department

1. The Office of Analytical Studies will be providing us with statistical and financial information relating to the costs of offering your programs (direct instructional costs, instructional support, relevant ratios, etc.). Should you wish to review this information, please send a note to Pat McCann, AD 3191.
2. If there are unusual or exceptional costs incurred in the offering of your undergraduate or graduate programs please indicate their nature and magnitude.
3. What are your perceptions of the costs of operating the programs in your department compared to those in other Canadian universities?

H AMENABILITY TO COST REDUCTION

Could the programs in your unit be offered in a less costly manner without a significant loss to the contributions they make to Simon Fraser?

1. Could parts of your program be offered by or in cooperation with other academic units at Simon Fraser? Should they be?
2. Could your department offer courses or elements of other programs at Simon Fraser? If so, why hasn't it?
3. Could the number and frequency of your course offerings be reduced without major harm to your programs?
4. Could less expensive instructional methods be adopted with little harm to your programs?
5. Are there ways in which economies could be realized with respect to your support staff?
6. Please evaluate the benefits to your programs of our tutorial system.

I DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

How have the department's decision-making processes contributed to the effectiveness of the use of its resources?

1. How are teaching credits assigned to faculty for teaching various courses?

2. How many courses have been cancelled in your department in the past two years? What criteria are used for cancelling low enrolment graduate and undergraduate courses? What happens to faculty members affected by course cancellation?
3. How are faculty assignments among courses and semesters determined?
4. What criteria are used to assign teaching assistants?
5. How much of a reduction in teaching load is granted to members of your department each academic year for administrative responsibilities in your department or elsewhere in the university? Please specify.
6. What criteria are used to establish the frequency of offering of courses at each level of your undergraduate program? Graduate program?
7. Have there been any special circumstances over the past five years which have affected the ability of this department to manage its resources effectively. If so, please describe.

J OTHER MATTERS

1. Does your department have a statement of goals and purposes? If so, please forward it.
2. Are there at present any areas in which, relative to others, a current lack of resources curtails severely your contribution to the university? Explain, showing how additional resources would strengthen your contribution.
3. We would appreciate any additional suggestions, comments and ideas which you think we should consider, whether these relate to your department, other departments or the university as a whole. To illustrate: Are the existing faculties and departments aligned in the most appropriate way? Are there major aspects of the university's operation which should be reconsidered (trimester, tutorial system, etc.)? Is our university administered efficiently?

We realise that completing this request for information will involve considerable time and thought. We assure you that we will treat the information you provide with due respect.

February 13, 1984

DISCUSSION PAPER

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ON UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To..... Dr. W.G. Saywell, President

From..... President's Advisory Committee

..... on University Priorities

Subject..... Undergraduate Curriculum

Date..... August 3, 1984

During our deliberations it became increasingly obvious to us that the undergraduate curriculum had become large and complex, was difficult to manage, was costly to administer and offer, and was creating accessibility problems for students.

Accordingly, and in an effort to give greater tangibility to our general concerns, we produced the attached "PACUP Working Paper on Undergraduate Curriculum." The working paper has four sections:

- I - Introduction -- This section makes the point that we have developed a very complex curriculum and, simultaneously, a complex way of offering it. In our view this is a mismatch which yields unfortunate consequences.
- II - Some Random Observations -- This is a listing of 17 observations or "facts" which illustrate a variety of problems with the current curriculum. The listing is far from exhaustive.
- III - Some Assumptions -- This listing of 6 assumptions suggests a point of view or a potential consensus against which curriculum reform could proceed. Again, it is suggestive rather than exhaustive.
- IV - Some Principles Relating to Undergraduate Degree Structure -- This listing of 13 principles is an attempt to set forth some working "rules" which, if broadly agreed to within the university, would guide the process of curriculum review and reform within the various programs. Up to this point, departments have been free to set requirements subject to only the most general university-wide requirements. We believe that this largely unfettered freedom has led to great unevenness in requirements, program to program, and, in some cases, to programs that are overly complex, specialized and extensive. It should be borne in mind that the University awards the degree.

In brief, then, the PACUP Working Paper is not a blueprint for reforming the curriculum. Rather, it is a starting point for preparing the needed blueprint and, as such, might be useful to the expert committee on curriculum reform which we recommended elsewhere.

Some Additional Comments

1. Cost Implications -- In our discussions with Deans and Chairs we have encountered some skepticism concerning the beneficial effects on instructional costs of curriculum simplification. We find this difficult to understand given the inevitability of the increasing numbers of low enrolment classes which result when more and more courses are offered to the same number of students, and given the simple fact that the more courses that are offered, the more instructors are needed.

A precise estimate of cost savings could probably be obtained through a computer simulation of curriculum simplification. This might be worth attempting. But the point could be made by considering the following simple illustration concerning the fictional Departments A and B.

1. Both departments offer one-half their lower division curriculum each fall and the other half each spring.
 2. Both departments offer their programs in the evening and cycle the required lower division required courses over a two-year period.
 3. Both departments offer their programs downtown and cycle the required lower division required courses over a three-year period.
 4. Department A has 4 lower division required courses and Department B, 6 lower division courses.
 5. Over the 3 year period, Department A must offer 22 lower division courses and Department B, 33 courses. Thus, instructional costs in B are 50% higher than A.
2. Management Implications -- Several Department Chairs have mentioned the difficulty they were experiencing in arranging teaching schedules for department members. Varying patterns of research semesters and sabbaticals, the need to provide required courses on a predictable basis semester by semester, day, evening, and off-campus all combine to create formidable management problems. The response by some Chairs has been to place heavy reliance on sessional instructors and to request additional faculty.

The foregoing problems afflict fictional Department X. Its staffing problems would be eased or eliminated if curriculum changes were made:

1. This is a mid-sized department with 14 members. It lists in the calendar 15 lower division courses and 60 upper division courses (plus graduate courses). Department X requires 18 semester hours of lower division coursework (6 courses). It offers 4 "streams" or emphases and requires Majors to take electives from all streams at both lower division and upper division. At the 1984 convocation, 30 students graduated with a Major in "X."

2. Department X should make most or all of the following changes in its undergraduate curriculum:
 - 2.1 Reduce its lower division requirements from 18 to 12 semester hours.
 - 2.2 Either increase the number of courses specified for intending majors in the lower division or reduce the number of electives.
 - 2.3 Defer specialization in the four streams until the third year.
 - 2.4 Specify one or more courses to be required of all majors in the upper division.
 - 2.5 Reduce the number of streams.

Concluding Comment

It is our firm belief that reform of the undergraduate curriculum will have beneficial consequences: instructional costs will be reduced, scheduling problems will be eased for departments, and students should find it easier to obtain the courses they need. In addition, if the process of curriculum reform is carefully planned and well executed the quality of our undergraduate degrees should be improved.

DISCUSSION PAPER

PACUP WORKING PAPER -- UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

I. Introduction

In an earlier day, the offering of the curriculum of a given department was a fairly simple matter. A group of students would enter from high school each September, would stay for eight months, would work or travel during the summer, and would repeat the process three more times, emerging with a B.A. or B.Sc. four years after entry. The department would offer courses at predictable intervals to fairly predictable numbers of students who had fairly uniform patterns of prior experience.

Consider SFU today. Only 27% of our students enter directly from high school. More of them transfer from B.C. colleges bringing course credits with them. Still others enter as mature students or as transfers from other universities. And although most newly admitted students still register in September of a given year, numbers of them commence their studies in January or May or July.

Having gained entry, the student is not required to follow any particular pattern of semester registration. He/she can study this semester, work the next, or study for three semesters in a row and travel the next two. The patterns of registration are virtually infinite.

Further, the student is permitted to take a full or partial study load (the average semester credit hour load is 10) and he/she can undertake studies in the daytime or evening, either on-campus or off-campus, or in any combination of these.

This extremely flexible system has great advantages for students. They need not take their degree exclusively at this institution. They need not commit themselves to full-time study but, if they do, they need not commit their resources for more than four months. And to some extent, given the availability of courses, they need not commit themselves to day-time study.

The arrangement also has advantages for SFU. We can be seen as an accessible, humane institution which has removed arbitrary barriers to learning. However, in comparison with, say, UBC we must make elaborate and costly administrative provision for several registrations, timetablings, room assignments, exam schedulings, etc. per year. Further, again in comparison with UBC the relative homogeneity of student groups (Freshmen, Sophomore, etc.) simply does not exist at SFU. This, of course, removes from the students a certain sense of community ("the class of '84") but more important, it means that the cycling of course offerings is much more complex than UBC's where students move as relatively homogeneous groups through successive 8-month years of study.

In a word, then, SFU has chosen to make itself readily accessible to qualified students who wish to be admitted and to this end has put in place the necessary broad organizational and administrative arrangements. But if SFU permits flexible means, patterns, times and locations for student

enrolment and study it has made an implicit commitment to offer its curriculum in a similarly flexible manner so that students can get what they need, when and where they need it. Otherwise, flexible admission arrangements become an empty gesture. How flexible is the offering of our curriculum?

The University of Pittsburg faced this problem in the '60s. In the interests of improving its accessibility to students, it established a trimester system. In order to make its curriculum accessible year-round, it offered all or most of its courses every semester. As a consequence, classes were uneconomically small and staffing levels uneconomically high. The university came close to bankruptcy by using this means of attempting to match enrolment flexibility with curricular flexibility. We do not know whether anyone thought of reducing the number of courses in the curriculum. Had this been done, class size would have increased and staffing levels would have decreased.

SFU has avoided much of the Pittsburg error and instead has employed a mixture of procedures in an attempt to make its curriculum reasonably accessible at less than excessive cost. First, high need courses (not necessarily high enrolment courses) are offered several times a year. Second, course offerings are made known in advance so that students can plan ahead. Third, course-equivalent transfer credit is awarded fairly liberally for foundational studies undertaken elsewhere. This relieves students of the need to make up lower division requirements at the same time they are embarking on more specialized studies. Fourth, many departments and professors waive prerequisite requirements in individual cases in order to accommodate a student's need for a given course.

There are clear signs, however, that our attempts to make the curriculum accessible are not working well. For example, only about 58% of students received all their first course choices in semester 84-1. This, of course, resulted from limitations on class size. In addition, course time-conflicts, determined from reading the Course Guide, denied students the opportunity of even requesting certain required or desired courses. Obviously the probability of time conflict increases as more courses are offered at the same time. The extent of this problem is difficult to determine but conversations with students suggest it is substantial. A further indication of its extent can be implied from the fact that three-quarters of B.A.'s and B.Sc.'s graduate with more than the specified required hours. Presumably this is because, in some cases, students take additional options when required courses are unavailable.

At the same time that we impose enrolment limitations on certain courses we permit substantial numbers of low enrolment courses to be offered. Approximately 28% of undergraduate courses had enrolments of 10 or fewer students (Fact Book 1982-3). Some would argue the pedagogical virtues of small classes. But their number, particularly in view of course space shortages elsewhere, is likely less a product of conscious choice than it is a simple matter of too few students chasing too many courses and too many courses, required or optional, being offered too frequently.

Given the foregoing there is a reasonable basis for supporting two contentions. Our curriculum is less accessible to students than it needs to be. And our curriculum is being offered in a costly manner.

The matter of students gaining access to the curriculum appears, on the face of it, not to be a problem. After all, the calendar lists an immense number of courses in total and every department has significant numbers of courses. However, the seemingly vast array of options proves to be illusory when one views it through the eyes and experience of a student. In fact, student choice is severely constrained by the following factors, some of which operate singly, some in combination.

- Constraint #1** - Only some of the array of courses are offered in the given semester.
- Constraint #2** - Only some of the courses offered are in the student's area of interest.
- Constraint #3** - Only some of the courses offered which are in the student's area of interest are at the required level (upper division, lower division).
- Constraint #4** - Some of the courses the student would like to take in other departments he is unable to because of the numbers of courses his department requires.
- Constraint #5** - Some of the courses the student would like to take he is unable to because of the numbers of courses his department requires to satisfy "stream" or "group" requirements.

Assuming now that the student's course selection exercise has survived these first five constraints, he is now faced by the following.

- Constraint #6** - The course he desires is in time conflict with another he desires.
- Constraint #7** - The course he desires is closed to him by reason of enrolment limitations.
- Constraint #8** - The course he desires has a prerequisite which he has not satisfied (or been able to satisfy).
- Constraint #9** - The course he desires has a corequisite which he has not yet taken and is not being offered.
- Constraint #10** - The course he desires is offered at an inconvenient location (downtown or on-campus).
- Constraint #11** - The course he desires has been cancelled unexpectedly because the professor is unavailable.
- Constraint #12** - The course he desires has been cancelled because of low enrolment.

Given this listing (probably incomplete) it is relatively easy to understand why such a high proportion of students are unable to obtain entry to the courses they choose. The apparent breadth of choice and ease of access are illusory, to some extent at least.

It should not be inferred that all the constraints are illogical or irrational. Not all courses can be offered every semester. Some prerequisites and corequisites are educationally defensible. Some instances of class-size limitation are necessary. Some reasonable numbers of lower division courses are needed to provide a foundation for upper division study. And, in any case, given the virtually infinite possibilities in course-choice combinations, it is impossible to eliminate all course selection problems for students.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that we simultaneously have a surplus and a shortage of class spaces. This is costly to students in lost access. And it is costly to the university in low resource utilization. Its causes are complex and multiple. But one avenue to solution is in the removal or softening of the 12 constraints. Our report would be incomplete if we failed to address this matter in a vigorous and specific manner.

II. Some Random Observations Regarding SFU's Undergraduate Curriculum

1. Departments report difficulties in managing the offering of their curriculum.
2. Students report difficulties in gaining access to elements of desired programs.
3. Students who complete lower division requirements in a given discipline are sometimes unable to gain entry to the major in that discipline. They are dead-ended.
4. Lower division requirements show considerable variation across the university; there is often considerable variation between similar disciplines.
5. Lower division requirements in certain disciplines at SFU differ substantially from those of the same disciplines elsewhere in B.C.
6. Some departments commence specialization in the lower division; others do not.
7. The structure of majors differs widely department to department. (Some permit wide election, others have independent streams, still others have core requirements plus either electives or streams.)
8. Prerequisites and corequisites at times are precise and have face validity; in other cases they are so broad as to lack utility.
9. Honours programs are typically undersubscribed; some differ only quantitatively from the major.
10. Breadth (Group) requirements are so general as to be little more than an administrative hurdle.
11. The locus of decision-making in degree structure as well as content is mainly in departments; Senate's role is mainly reactive. Overall, principles which transcend departmental wishes are largely absent.

12. The B.G.S. is so underdefined that in different hands it can be simultaneously well-structured, or very concentrated, or very superficial.
13. Students entering the same major frequently have differing subject matter preparation. This causes problems for students and professors.
14. In certain disciplines, community colleges do not offer courses needed to enter the upper division at SFU.
15. Except in the sciences, lower division requirements (as distinct from suggested electives) seldom require specific courses outside the given discipline.
16. Extensive lower division and upper division requirements make the offering of evening and off-campus degree completion programs more complex and expensive than would be the case if requirements were less extensive.
17. Numbers of students (perhaps three-quarters) take significantly more than the minimum semester hour requirement for degree completion.

III. Some Assumptions Governing An Approach to Curriculum Reform

1. Current degree requirements are more numerous and extensive than they need be. A reduction in and a simplification of requirements would reduce costs and administrative complexity. It would also improve the accessibility of the curriculum to students. It need have no adverse educational consequences.
2. We do not have the luxury of starting afresh in curriculum building.
3. It is possible to state principles which will gain support from our community and which show promise of improving the quality and cost effectiveness of our undergraduate programs.
4. The principles and proposals should have the twin virtues of sound academic practice and common sense. They need not rely heavily on ideological and philosophical argumentation.
5. The principles and proposals should fit existing structures (trimester, tutorial system, space, access) and should, in sum, recognize the university's ability to pay.
6. The principles and proposals should be capable of implementation without administrative convulsion or the addition of further complexity.

IV. Some Principles Relating to Undergraduate Degree Structure.

1. The content and experience of a degree are more important than its structure. All things being equal, form should follow function. Nevertheless, function can be enhanced by appropriate structures and inappropriate structures can inhibit and distort function. Thus, a degree

structure, when devised in such a way as to reflect academic intent, will support and enhance academic intent.

2. For the majority of students, the Bachelor's degree will be the highest degree obtained. Its attainment should indicate that the student has had broad but meaningful contact with a range of human knowledge and more intense contact with one or two areas. In addition, the student will have developed habits of thought, inquiry and expression generally regarded to be the hallmarks of the educated person.
3. For a significant minority of students, the Bachelor's degree will provide entry to post graduate study. They will have obtained the same things from their studies that have been obtained by those not proposing to continue formal study. But in addition, they will have demonstrated through superior achievement an ability and an interest in further study.
4. Since students cannot always foresee future interests and possibilities, the Bachelor's degree, except perhaps in its late stages, should not attempt to differentiate between those for whom the degree will provide entry to graduate or post-baccalaureate professional study.
5. Though the degree should be viewed in its entirety there is some usefulness in distinguishing between the purposes of the first two years (lower division) and those of the final two years (upper division), with the former being preparation for specialization (among other things) and the latter being engagement in specialization.
6. Lower division studies, at a minimum, should permit the following:
 - 6.1 The inculcation of attitude and values such as a respect for truth and an openness to new ideas.
 - 6.2 Training in the methods of advancing knowledge (research design, statistical inference, critical thinking, logical inference, theoretical synthesis, problem solving, decision-making, creative thinking).
 - 6.3 Training in methods of communication, especially reading and writing.
 - 6.4 Training in the understanding and manipulation of numbers (basic mathematics, computer skills).
 - 6.5 Acquaintance with the major themes and styles of inquiry of several disciplines including at least one of the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities.
 - 6.6 Preparation in the subject matter of one or, desirably, two disciplines sufficient to engage in more specialized studies of the disciplines at the upper division.
7. It is desirable and useful for all students entering a given Major to have similar academic preparation. Students entering the Minor should have similar preparation to those entering the Major because they will be taking the same (though fewer) courses than Major students.

8. A clearer and simpler specification of lower division requirements would be helpful to both the significant numbers of college students who may wish to transfer to SFU and to the colleges themselves who must devise and offer functional transfer programs.
9. The consequences of the foregoing for the lower division curriculum of individual departments are the following:
 - 9.1 The recognition that requirements for entering the Major should not be so extensive as to crowd out the other purposes noted above.
 - 9.2 The recognition that lower division course offerings should meet the academic needs both of students who will later enter the department's Major and those who will not.
 - 9.3 The recognition that the offering of specialized courses should be eschewed in favour of courses which engage the student in the major themes and styles of inquiry of the discipline, and (desireably) encourage the acquisition of foundational skills of thinking, inquiry and expression.
 - 9.4 The recognition that the requirements of departments with quotas or enrolment restrictions at the upper division should be modest at most.
10. Current upper division requirements for the Major (or Minor), department by department, are generally similar in extent but different in pattern, with some departments permitting a wide latitude of choice, others permitting the choice of one stream (to the exclusion of others), and others specifying a core and then permitting the choice of electives and/or streams. Though identical programs for all Major (or Minor) students in a given discipline may not be desirable, neither is it desirable for Major (or Minor) programs in the same discipline to be so idiosyncratic that graduates of the department have no disciplinary language in common.
11. Thus, it is desirable that both Majors and Minors have a common upper division requirement. This requirement, perhaps even a single course, should stress, at an advanced level, the major themes and styles of inquiry of the discipline.
12. The Honours degree, as it is presently constituted in many programs tends to be more different quantitatively from the Major than it is different qualitatively. It is desirable that mere quantitative differences be reduced and qualitative differences increased. Means such as admission by invitation, student attendance at faculty colloquia, student involvement with faculty research, etc. would help to realize the point. A graduating essay or project might further emphasize the qualitative difference and, perhaps, would be the sole quantitative difference from the Major. Not all departments need offer an Honours program.

13. Except in the Sciences, most departments make slight call on the offerings of other departments except to suggest electives. Where appropriate, and without increasing intra-departmental requirements, departments should use courses from other departments to satisfy their own requirements. Interchangeable cross-listings are a potentially useful device in this regard. In highly specialized or derived programs, the lower division requirements of a core discipline might provide appropriate preparation for undertaking the Major.

DISCUSSION PAPER

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ON UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES

U N I V E R S I T Y M A N A G E M E N T

DISCUSSION PAPER

UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT*

It is hardly necessary to state that Simon Fraser University is under unprecedented pressure. It will become increasingly difficult to maintain academic quality and launch new programs. If we are to maintain the spirit of innovation that has characterized SFU, we will have to find ways to harness our resources more effectively and to obtain new resources.

This Committee received a great deal of input about the management of the University. The following points were frequently noted:

- the university is overadministered and undermanaged
- unimportant matters take up too much committee time
- decisions are reviewed at too many levels
- there is too little consultation on major decisions
- the size of committees obstructs effective decision making
- departments have too little autonomy

Although most of these criticisms can be levied against the administration of any university, they may be more applicable at SFU because of its early history. The past is now far enough behind to be put aside. Indeed, we must put it aside. Our ability to weather the current constraints, to build on our strengths and to foster new ones depends in part on our ability to find better ways to manage our affairs.

It is clear that there is no single panacea which will simplify bureaucracy and foster more effective administration. However, certain principles can make a beginning in this direction. Important among these principles are the following:

- i) the use of an effective incentive system
- ii) decentralization whenever possible
- iii) the review of performance rather than decisions.

Incentives

Any structure of governance creates its own set of formal and informal incentives. With regard to SFU, for example, one might ask the following types of questions: What financial incentives are there for faculty to be productive? If few faculty are denied merit increases, and if many of our most productive faculty are in the range of half-steps, where are the financial incentives to increase or maintain productivity?

*Note: This is a preliminary draft.

What incentives are there for departments to use resources efficiently? Do departments themselves benefit from the elimination of waste and inefficiency? What incentives are there to use services such as the Instructional Media Centre and the Computing Center efficiently?

An essential element of any incentive system must be the ability to discriminate between individuals whose performance is superior and those whose performance is not. Consider salary increments for example. As much as possible, merit increments should distinguish between individuals who differ in merit. Given a fixed sum for salaries, this means that individuals whose performance is mediocre will receive less and individuals whose performance is above average or exceptional will receive more. Policies that (a) enable the Deans to allot a larger or smaller merit increment to departments on the basis of confirmed judgements of their quality and productivity and (b) enable Chairs to reward productive faculty, even if at expense of those who are less productive, should be explored.

Some will object to these proposals because they imply an enhancement of the discretionary powers of Deans and departmental Chairs. This Committee believes that Deans and department Chairs should have more discretionary power than they do at present, subject to proper checks on their performance, both by those below and above them in the administrative hierarchy. Counteracting the potential problems associated with increased discretionary power are three considerations. First, faculty may well take more seriously the types of people they choose as Deans and Chairs. Second, such discretionary powers should be accompanied by effective appeal procedures. Finally, the performance of Deans and Chairs should be reviewed regularly.

In addition to salary, there are other areas in which the University should differentiate between more productive and less productive faculty. Sabbatical leaves give scholars an opportunity to use an uninterrupted stretch of time for the development of their research and scholarship. Such leaves seem inappropriate for faculty who do not conduct research or make scholarly contributions. The University should review the research plans of sabbaticants in more than a perfunctory way and obtain evidence that their sabbaticals will be productive before granting sabbatical leaves.

The University should be more active in rewarding productive scholars and outstanding teachers. Release time may enhance productivity at critical times in the careers of good scholars and teachers. In addition, the University could foster scholarship and outstanding teaching in other ways, such as the temporary provision of secretarial or research

assistance. In all these cases the prime criterion should be the potential for scholarly productivity and excellence in teaching rather than the desire to treat all departments or faculties equally.

There is one caveat that should be made. Units or individuals without a proven scholarly performance may come up with promising initiatives. In these instances, the university may wish to provide seed money to such initiatives.

In concluding, it should be said that many incentives are informal and cannot be captured in any university policy as such. Initiatives such as the recent reception and certificates for faculty participating in the Speakers' Bureau and the award for outstanding teaching are good examples of informal incentives. Another example might involve the establishment of a series of President's Lectures in which faculty who have gained external recognition would give a public talk on campus to convey the nature of the contribution.

Decentralization

Some decisions must be made at the highest level of university governance, especially those that determine overall university policy and those that direct the distribution of resources among the major components of the university. However, unnecessary centralization of other decisions may be problematic for at least three reasons: (1) it causes decision makers to be diverted from their major responsibilities, (2) it cultivates a lack of responsibility at other levels and (3) it encourages decisions to be made by individuals who are not the best informed. Every decision maker or decision making body should ask "Could this decision be made at an earlier stage?"

In part, excessive centralization of decision making may be the result of lack of clarity with respect to role. Consider Senate for example. The central concern of Senate should be to establish policy, not to implement it. For example, Senate should set the framework in which departments and faculties develop curricula and in which new programs are approved. Such a framework would make it easier to determine whether proposals are consistent with the intent of Senate. Lack of this framework forces Senate into the detailed and ad hoc review of specific proposals, and diverts it from examining proposals in the context of the University as a whole.

Another example relates to the way in which new programs are approved. At present, a large number of programs have been approved in principle or are scheduled for consideration. Many of them claim that they will not cost the University any more money. No one has examined the implications, either budgetary

or for the identity of the University, of approving these programs en bloc. Senate, or perhaps first SCAP, should. Principles must be developed that both encourage the development of innovative programs and control the tendency to approve all programs that are proposed. Perhaps, for example, Senate should ensure that the resources for all new programs are obtained either from external sources or that the existing areas that will be cut, shrunk, restructured or discontinued to provide them are identified. It is not enough to affirm that programs are worthy of support, they must be more worthy of support than the programs from which resources are diverted.

Reviewing Performance

Two contrasting approaches to university governance can be characterized as review of performance and review of decisions. The former requires the formulation of objectives, whether formally or informally, the granting of discretion for decision-making, and the subsequent periodic review of performance. In contrast, review of decisions requires systematic review of all decisions by bodies or persons at other levels of the university structure. This Committee endorses the review of performance, from both above and below.

All units of the University, including Administrative units, should draw up a formal statement of their objectives for the next year and, perhaps for the next five years. Appropriate bodies should evaluate these statements and make decisions about the allotment of whatever resources are needed to obtain them. At the end of a specified period, the units should be evaluated in terms of their objectives. Resources (incentives) should be contingent on fulfillment of objectives.

As should be apparent, this Committee believes that departments should be given greater responsibility for a broader range of decisions than they are at present. Deans, as a consequence, should be involved not in the review of these decisions on an individual basis but rather on the outcome of these decisions in aggregate. Deans and Vice-Presidents would become to a greater degree appraisers and evaluators and, to a lesser degree, decisions-makers.

DISCUSSION PAPER

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ON UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES

THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY

DISCUSSION PAPER:

THE SENSE OF COMMUNITY

Some sense of community undeniably exists at Simon Fraser University. Some sections of the university also evidently feel it more than others. The feeling of common membership in/or sympathy for an endeavour of merit has inspired individuals among students, faculty, staff, alumni and even the wider public, to reflect positively on the university and, from time to time, to intervene actively on its behalf. Many submissions to PACUP have commented on the importance and the possible mechanisms for generating such loyalty. The following memo takes up some of these suggestions.

Much sympathy is generated by observation of or participation in only a small part of the university. Good will inspired by particulars -- a helpful lecturer, stimulating colleagues, employer encouragement or a helpful public relations officer -- can develop to embrace the university as a whole. Indeed, perhaps the emergence of a strong sense of community feeling owes most to the accumulation of a host of small events and incidents -- and the absence of recurring aggravations and omissions.

For students the classroom at its best introduces them to a world of scholarly enquiry and excitement. Their identification with SFU begins with actual experience of instructors' concern and attention to the major task at hand. Good teachers create loyal students and loyal alumni. Associations with other students through the student society, clubs, recreation, etc. also foster critical ties and relationships. Flourishing student organizations are a good index of the commitment made to the university. Like good teaching they should be encouraged.

The rewards of the classroom are also essential in fostering commitment by faculty. Just as critical is an active community of colleagues. Mutual sympathy and support can be encouraged within and across department and faculties. The Distinguished Visitor Programs like departmental colloquia are valuable reminders of the common exercise. Extra-departmental groupings such as the Faculty Association or membership in the University Club may also generate enthusiasm. Introduction to the concerns of faculty in other disciplines and faculties also seems a good way to sensitize everyone to the variety of forms in which talent, energy and dedication may be expressed. Ignorance of matters outside one's own field of reference often lies at the base of lack of appreciation of SFU. SFU WEEK has been extremely valuable in offsetting isolation and introducing readers to the range of talent available at the university. Mechanisms to encourage collegiality constitute an essential step toward sponsoring a strong sense of community among faculty members.

Staff people are frequently the critical contacts with the university for students, faculty and the public at large. Their sense of commitment to and appreciation by the university colors views about the merits of the collective endeavour. Good working environments and positive labour-management relations go a long way toward furthering loyalties whose benefits to the university may be returned many times and in many forms over the years.

The day-by-day accumulation of positive observations and experience -- gathered from student daughters and sons, from relaxed tours of campus, from the opportunity to hear SFU speakers on the radio, television and in person, or from a helpful referral or consultation by telephone -- nourish sympathetic attention from the public. Outreach efforts such as the University Speakers' Service marshall SFU's resources to useful effect. Favorable impressions bring their special harvest of

taxpayers' support, new students and future bequests.

On many occasions these groups and the individuals within them act as disparate even discordant elements, sharing or communicating little of their own experience of SFU. There are occasions, events and locations, however, which offer opportunities to experience and affirm a common connection. At present the pub, the University Club, the Women's Centre, the Theatre, and Art Gallery, the archaeology museum, fitness classes, athletic events, the daycare centre, the cafeterias and the residences provide the major, and unfortunately the all too rare opportunities for interaction across SFU's diverse constituencies. They offer concrete reminders in the form of service, entertainment, assistance and information of reasons to come and to remain on Burnaby Mountain. Such affirmations of a collective identity beyond the formal contacts of classroom and office ought to be systematically encouraged, all the more so since inducements, common to many universities, in the form of easy physical access, residences, comfortable lounges, coffeehouses and study areas are so notably absent. More than offsetting the costs of SFU's present commitments is the fact that sponsored centres, classes, events and other services help to fill in, albeit inadequately, for a whole host of options which students, staff, faculty and the general public may discover at older and richer institutions. It is important that in the pressure to have costs retrieved, that SFU not force the few situations in which community solidarity is actually fostered to become so expensive to the individual user as to jeopardize their survival.

Reiterating briefly, it is essential to maintain and, if at all possible, improve SFU's commitment to:

1. high standards of teaching

2. active student associations
3. faculty colloquia and scholarly communication
4. good labour-management practices
5. an active program of community relations
6. existing community resources.

Such a commitment is not, however, sufficient. Indeed, it often appears terribly inadequate to those familiar with other universities. To meet the challenge of this invidious comparison and to ensure the greatest possible degree of commitment SFU should design a long term plan to augment its presently rather meagre incentives to community. This should include not only adding to the resources already in place but, inter alia, in the area of

1. Transportation

Bringing to SFU a rapid public transportation system with regular connections to city suburbs and the valley. The present large scale dependence on cars with all the costs in deterrents to possible students and in the provision of parking by the university, ought not to be regarded as ideal.

2. Physical Plant

- a. Enlarging the presently inadequate residences to aim for accommodation for perhaps 10% of the student population, with particular attention to the needs of students with children. Preferably additions to the present stock of housing could take the form of a university village with accommodation available to certain numbers of staff and faculty. The potential for faculty serving as dons within the student residences should also be explored as one mechanism for integrating scholarly and residential concerns.
- b. Supporting proposals for the creation of a substantial student centre on campus.
- c. Providing for the establishment of comfortable and accessible study and informal discussion space both in the library and elsewhere. In principle much of this could be decentralized to offer students opportunities for study and conversation near to the

office of their own department or program. Each of these should have space assigned for a student common room.

- d. Special space and resources should be allocated to graduate students.

3. General Community Enhancement

- a. Giving consideration to establishing a highly visible President's Honor Roll with a special dinner or some other form of public recognition of achievement.
- b. Focusing the attention of SFU WEEK on one section of the university each week.
- c. Cooperating with the Faculty Association, APSA and AUCE to sponsor special seminars and colloquia exploring the role and concerns of members.
- d. Exploring possibilities for the donation of furniture and trappings for student areas.
- e. Organizing departments and programmes during the period of pre-registration to offer 'flagship' introductory lectures to their subject to which the university community and the public could be invited. Plan the Open House to coincide with these lectures and pre-Registration.
- f. Inviting the municipal councils of the surrounding area to convene their meetings or public events occasionally on Burnaby Mountain.
- g. Urging faculty in departments and programs to invite their counterparts in local junior colleges and high schools up for a set of seminars and discussions about subject area.

One last point. During their deliberations, the members of PACUP have been struck not only by the fragility of the existing sense of community but by the possible limitations in the cultivation of this sense associated with DISC and the Downtown campus. The benefits of the alternatives in terms of enhanced accessibility are clear. However, students who avail themselves of them may well not develop the same sort of identification with SFU as on-campus students. Moreover, faculty and staff who teach these courses may not maintain the type of presence on the main campus that fosters a sense of community, both in them and in students.