

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Memorandum

To: Senate
From: Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
Date: February 20, 1995
Subject: Amendment of SCAP's Terms of Reference and Membership

Action undertaken by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning at its meetings of December 14, 1994, February 8, 1995, and January 11, 1995 gives rise to the following motions:

Motion #1 "that Senate approve that the terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be amended with the following addition to section 1:

- e) to advise the President annually through the Vice-President, Academic on the priorities which should be attached to the central allocation of resources which are required to implement approved new programs"

Motion #2 "that Senate approve that the terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be amended with the following change to section 2:

- 2. To consider and make recommendations to Senate on all proposals involving new undergraduate and graduate programs and courses, or major modifications to existing programs and courses according to the criteria *and the guidelines specified in S.81-157*, and to report, *in summary form, to Senate (for information) and the Board (for ratification) revisions to existing courses and programs which have been approved by SCUS or SGSC acting under delegated authority.*"

Motion #3 "that Senate approve that Continuing Studies representation on the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be changed from the Vice-President Harbour Centre and Continuing Studies to the Director of Extension Credit Programs."

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To: Senate
From: J.M. Munro, Chair, Senate Committee on Academic Planning
Subject: Amendment of SCAP's Terms of Reference and Membership
Date: 14 February, 1995

~~~~~

1. Addition of 1 e) to Terms of Reference

Action undertaken at the meeting of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning on December 14, 1994 gives rise to the following motion:

**Motion:**

That the terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be amended with the following addition to section 1:

- e) to advise the President annually through the Vice President, Academic on the priorities which should be attached to the central allocation of resources which are required to implement approved new programs."

In the fall, Senator Swartz raised a question at Senate and then wrote to the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules concerning the process of program approval and implementation of approved programs.

This matter was discussed at SCAP twice in the Fall semester. SCAP considered and recommended approval of a revision of its terms of reference as shown above.

The revision to the terms of reference would require that prior to the allocation of new funds to any new program, the Vice-President, Academic would bring this matter to SCAP for consultation. It would leave the approval process for new programs as it stands, separate from the process of program implementation, but would provide a mechanism for the prioritization of programs which require university funds. This revision is consistent with the recommended revisions to the terms of reference of the Senate Committee on University Budget.

Two additional comments are required. First, new programs which do not require allocation of University-level funding will be implemented by decision of the Dean of the Faculty. Second, enrollment growth funding for expansion of existing programs (as opposed to enrollment growth through new programs) would not be included in the consultation process, since these programs are not new.

Finally, I should add that my practice with programs which require University-level funding has been to consult with the Committee before implementation. An

example of this was the procedure we followed in discussing allocations from the 1994/95 Academic Enhancement Fund.

2. Item 2 of SCAP's terms of reference

Action undertaken at the meeting of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning on February 8, 1995 gives rise to the following motion:

**Motion:**

That the terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be amended with the following change to section 2:

2. "To consider and make recommendations to Senate on all proposals involving new undergraduate and graduate programs and courses, or major modifications to existing programs and courses according to the criteria *and the guidelines specified in S.81-157*, and to report, *in summary form*, to Senate (for information) and the Board (for ratification) *revisions to existing courses and programs which have been approved by SCUS or SGSC acting under delegated authority.* "

S.81-157 contains the current guidelines SCAP uses for dealing with new program approval, including the current approval in principle guidelines. This needs to be included in SCAP's terms of reference. In addition, the end of the paragraph has also been reworded (also in italics) for clarity.

3. Revision of membership

Action undertaken at the meeting of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning on January 11, 1995 gives rise to the following motion:

**Motion:**

"That Continuing Studies representation on the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be changed from the Vice-President Harbour Centre and Continuing Studies to the Director of Extension Credit Programs."

In forwarding this recommendation to SCAP, Dr. Blaney noted that the Director of Extension Credit Programs works with all Faculties with regard to the planning and offering of their extension credit programs and should be fully informed of all Senate approved policies and regulations.

4. Senate Committee on University Budget - Terms of Reference

The proposed revision of the terms of reference of the Senate Committee on University Budget are consistent with the proposed revision of SCAP's terms of reference.



**2. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING (SCAP)****- Standing (Reporting Category "B")**

| <u>Members</u>                                          | <u>Conditions</u>                     | <u>Term</u> | <u>Expiry Date</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Vice-President,<br>Academic                             | Ex-officio,<br>Chair                  |             |                    |             |
| Associate Vice-<br>President, Academic                  | Ex-officio,<br>Vice-Chair             |             |                    |             |
| Vice-President Finance<br>and Administration            | Ex-officio<br>(Non-voting)            |             |                    |             |
| Dean of Applied Sciences                                |                                       |             |                    |             |
| Dean of Arts                                            |                                       |             |                    |             |
| Dean of Bus.Admin.                                      |                                       |             |                    |             |
| Dean of Education                                       |                                       |             |                    |             |
| Dean of Science                                         |                                       |             |                    |             |
| Dean of Graduate Studies                                |                                       |             |                    |             |
| Vice-President Harbour Centre<br>and Continuing Studies |                                       |             |                    |             |
| Senator                                                 | Elected                               | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/96          |             |
| Senator                                                 |                                       | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/96          |             |
| Senator                                                 | by                                    | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/95          |             |
| Senator                                                 |                                       | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/95          |             |
| Senator                                                 | and                                   | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/95          |             |
| Senator (Lay Member)                                    |                                       | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/96          |             |
| Senator (Lay Member)                                    |                                       | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/95          |             |
| Senator (Student)                                       | from                                  | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/96          |             |
| Senator (Student)                                       |                                       | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/95          |             |
| Senator (Student)                                       | Senate                                | 2 yrs       | Sep 30/96          |             |
| Librarian<br>(or designate)                             | Ex-officio<br>(Voting)                |             |                    |             |
| Registrar                                               | Ex-officio<br>(Non-voting)            |             |                    |             |
| Director<br>Analytical Studies                          | Ex-officio<br>(Non-voting)            |             |                    |             |
| Director<br>Academic Planning<br>Services               | Secretary, Ex-officio<br>(Non-voting) |             |                    |             |

**Terms of Reference**

1. To be responsible for the implementation of a system of academic planning based on S.80-98. Specifically, the Committee will undertake the following responsibilities:
  - a) to provide periodic assessments of the present and probable future environments of the University, its students, and its community;
  - b) to identify priorities for the development of new academic programs and emerging research areas;
  - c) to gather information concerning initiatives in the development of programs at all levels in the University;
  - d) to ensure coordination of academic planning with the provision of facilities and services, with financial

- resources, and with planning for the total post-secondary education system in British Columbia.
2. To consider and make recommendations to Senate on all proposals involving new undergraduate and graduate programs and courses, or major modifications to existing programs and courses, according to criteria specified in S.80-98, and to report to Senate for information and the Board for ratification, in a summary form, all proposed revisions to an existing course or program for which SCUS or SGSC, acting under delegated authority, has concluded all matters.
  3. To review existing programs according to the criteria set out in S.80-98 for the purpose of assessment and, in some cases, possible expansion, curtailment, or discontinuance.
  4. To receive and review recommendations for the establishment of centres and institutes under AC 35 and forward recommendations to Senate and the Board of Governors.
  5. In carrying out its responsibilities, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning may establish task forces or sub-committees to deal with particular tasks.

Delegation of Senate Authority to SCAP:

Senate approved on April 6, 1987 that SCUS become a subcommittee of SCAP (S.87-8), thereby having reporting responsibilities to SCAP rather than Senate, and that responsibilities previously delegated to SCUS by Senate be delegated to SCAP with the understanding that SCAP might further delegate appropriate responsibilities to SCUS.

At the meeting of SCAP on September 16, 1987, SCAP approved the delegation of those responsibilities to SCUS, with appropriate amendments to require that such items be reported to SCAP in a timely manner.

Notwithstanding this authority, SCAP retains the right to forward for consideration by Senate any matter which, in the judgement of the Committee or its Chair, requires such consideration.

Approved by Senate at its meeting of October 6, 1975 to replace the former Presidential Committee - Academic Planning Committee. Changes in membership and changes in terms of reference approved by Senate, December 1, 1980. Revision in membership approved by Senate, October 4, 1982 (S.82-99). Revision in membership to reflect University reorganization approved by Senate, May 13, 1985 (S.85-33). Senate approved that the delegation of Senate authority previously granted to SCUS, be transferred to SCAP with the understanding that SCAP may further delegate appropriate responsibilities to SCUS - April 6, 1987 (S.87-8). Responsibilities delegated to SCUS at the meeting of SCAP on September 16, 1987 (SCAP 87-4). Revision in membership approved by Senate October 1, 1990 (S.90-41). Revision in terms of reference approved by Senate July 6, 1992 (S.92-52). Revision in membership approved by Senate June 6, 1994 (S.94-46)

Committee meetings normally are scheduled monthly on Wednesdays, two days after the scheduled meeting date of Senate, at 2:00 p.m., with adjournment not later than 5:00 p.m.

SCAP reports to Senate in May of each year.

## MEMORANDUM

SENATE

From J. MUNRO, CHAIRMAN

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING

Subject PROPOSED REVISIONS TO GUIDELINES FOR  
PROGRAM REVIEW: SENATE COMMITTEE ON  
ACADEMIC PLANNING

Date NOVEMBER 17, 1981

Actions taken by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, at its meetings of October 7 and November 4, 1981 give rise to the following motion:

MOTION: That Senate approve, as set forth in S.81-157, the revised Guidelines for Program Review, as follows:

REVISIONS TO GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

As revised in Paper S.80-166, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning has three major terms of reference. The first of these, the implementation of a system of academic planning, is presently being addressed by a series of planning task forces. The second and third involve reviewing and recommending to Senate concerning proposals for new programs or major modifications to existing programs and the review of existing programs for the purposes of assessment, expansion, curtailment or discontinuance. In paper S.81-81, Senate approved guidelines for the review of programs by SCAP. Subsequent expressions of concern by members of the Committee and other members of Senate over the impact of increasing fiscal constraints on the operation of existing academic programs have led to the following proposal to revise the Guidelines for Program Review. It is also intended that SCAP will revert to the practice of closing its meetings during the final consideration and voting on program proposals.

1. According to the definition of Universities Council, "A program is a sequence of credit courses leading to a University credential. A credential is a diploma, certificate, degree or other type of official recognition awarded to a student by a University."
2. Decisions concerning whether proposed changes to existing programs are "major," and therefore fall within the terms of reference of SCAP, will be made jointly by the Secretary of Senate and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning.
3. New Programs are to be brought forward for approval in principle well in advance of detailed program preparation. The purpose of seeking in-principle approval is to guide departments and individual faculty members away from program planning that is inconsistent with long-term University goals and resources. In-principle approval does not bind SCAP to recommending full approval under 6. below.

Programs brought forward for approval in-principle shall:

- a) Have received endorsement by the Faculty and, in the case of graduate programs by the Senate Graduate Studies Committee;
- b) Be accompanied by information establishing the need for the program and describing its impact on, and relationship to, existing programs;
- c) Be accompanied by an outline of anticipated development of the department over the next few years;
- d) Be accompanied by information concerning the objectives of the program, an outline of its structure, enrolment estimates, and resources required.

4. When a program is given in-principle approval, SCAP shall assign one of the following priority classifications to the program, based on 3a) - d), above: "essential," "important," "desirable."
5. Once approval in-principle has been given, detailed program planning can commence. Liaison should be maintained with the Offices of the Vice-President, Academic and Analytical Studies during the program planning phase. The information that is required for consideration of new programs at the UCBC level is contained in the Program Coordinating Committee Guidelines. Program proposals should be prepared following the topical outline used in the PCC Guidelines. It should be noted that outside consultation and review are expected in the case of significant new programs.

6. When a program that has received in-principle approval is presented for full approval by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, the following information will be included:

- a) A statement on the academic merit and importance of the program and its impact on other programs in the University.
- b) Enrolment projections.
- c) Staffing and other operating budget requirements. The Dean of the Faculty may be requested to indicate the source of required new expenditures.
- d) Space requirements.
- e) Equipment requirements.

In considering its recommendations, the Senate Committee on Academic Planning will follow the "Criteria for Program Assessment" contained in paper S.80-98 (see Appendix A to this memorandum). The responsibility of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning is to assess the academic merit of programs but not to make a decision as to whether funds should actually be spent on the program. However, SCAP does have a role in assessing the reasonableness of estimated resource needs of new programs. Also, this information does interact with considerations of academic merit.

7. The Senate Committee on Academic Planning will recommend to the President on the priorities to be attached to new programs as required (usually by March 31) by the UCBC Program Coordinating Committee.
8. The Committee will, by January 31 each year, recommend priorities for the implementation of all new programs approved by Senate, Board, and Universities Council and scheduled for implementation in the next fiscal year.
9. In recognition of the deadlines of the UCBC Program Coordinating Committee, the annual deadline for receipt of new program submissions for final approval by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning will be October 20.
10. The Senate Committee on Academic Planning may initiate the review of an existing program:
- a) on its own motion;
  - b) at the request of the Vice-President, Academic or the appropriate Dean;
  - c) as requested by Senate.

The Committee shall, when it initiates a review, approve the composition and terms of reference of the review committee, including the distribution of the committee's report. The review committee may include persons from outside the University. The criteria attached in Appendix A will guide the review of existing programs.

11. The Program Guidelines of the UCBC Program Co-ordinating Committee are attached for information, Appendix B

The reason for the suggested revision in item 10 is to make the procedure for initiating, carrying out, and reporting the review of existing programs more workable. The provision of the UCBC Program Co-ordinating Committee Program Guidelines is intended to make this information more generally available to the University.

*J. M. Munro*  
J.M. Munro

CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

It is expected that the identification of the purposes to which Simon Fraser will direct its efforts and energies will encourage and facilitate the development of a number of new and innovative programs. Assigning priorities to various proposals will be a difficult task. Ranking should be based partly on how a proposal is measured against the following characteristics.

1. The program has intrinsic academic excellence and is something this University can expect to do well.
2. The program substantially enriches the existing teaching programs of the University.
3. The program builds upon existing programs and resources in the University.
4. The program anticipates provincial or national needs.
5. The program does not unnecessarily duplicate existing programs at other universities in the Province.
6. The excellence of the program attracts students to the University.

Existing programs should also be subject to periodic review. Such reviews provide an opportunity to assess individual programs and to provide a basis for recommending their expansion, curtailment or discontinuance.