

CONTENTS

<i>Editorial</i>	1
<i>Letter to the Editor</i>	3
<i>A Process of Curriculum Analysis</i> , by Joan Crook, Associate Professor, School of Nursing, McMaster University	5
<i>Pouvez-vous décrire la nature des différentes théories qui sous-tendent votre curriculum?</i> par Jeanne Reynolds, Doyen de la Faculté de Nursing, Université de Montréal	11
<i>The B.Sc.(N) Curriculum at McGill</i> , by Margaret Hooton, Chairman, Curriculum Committee and Associate Professor, School of Nursing	14
<i>Curriculum of the Basic Baccalaureate Degree Program at Dalhousie-Mount Saint Vincent</i> , by Hattie Shea and Marguerite Muise, Program Coordinators	20
<i>A Framework for the Nursing Curriculum at St. Francis Xavier University</i> , by Sister M. Simone Roach, Associate Professor and Chairman, Nursing Department	23
<i>Developing a Conceptual Framework</i> , by Kathleen E. Arpin and Nora I. Parker, Professors, Faculty of Nursing, University of Toronto	28
<i>Curricular Theories for Nursing as Process</i> , by M. Kaye Fawdry, Assistant Professor, School of Nursing, University of Windsor	35

EDITORIAL

In preparing for this special issue, we invited the twenty-two university schools of nursing to describe the philosophical and theoretical basis for their curricula. With the seven papers that follow, we are dealing with approximately one-third of the schools in Canada. There are similarities in these papers, both in what the schools chose to write about and in the nature of the content they included. However, there are also differences and undoubtedly, one has some idea in studying the seven that there are varying degrees of wholeness and logic in the presentations. One might say, using the criteria of our

Committee on Accreditation of the Canadian Association of University Schools of Nursing, that there are differences in the extent to which these papers reflect the criteria of *relevance*, *relatedness*, *accountability* and *uniqueness*. However, the most critical criterion here from the viewpoint of clarity of meaning and the reader's comprehension is that of *relatedness*, the extent to which the parts of the paper relate to each other or fit together for a common purpose or goal.

During the coming year there is opportunity for classes in teaching and curriculum as well as faculty to analyze these first position papers and to respond to them in *Nursing Papers*. We hope that other schools will study these statements and then provide a second series of position papers on the theoretical basis of their curricula for an issue of *Nursing Papers* in 1977.

We noticed recently that *Nursing Research*, that long-established journal published by the AJN, launched a question and answer column in September-October 1975 called "Research Q and A". I wonder if they are experiencing the same difficulty we do with ours? Since launching the "Query and Theory" column in Spring, 1974 we have received over a hundred offers of assistance in replying, but only a half-dozen questions. We have all kinds of faculty members who have the answers, the *Theory* side, but no faculty to ask questions, the *Query* side. Yes, forever, NURSES!

—Moyra Allen

EDITORIAL

En vue de ce numéro spécial, nous avons invité les vingt-deux écoles universitaires de nursing à nous décrire l'aspect philosophique et théorique de leurs programmes. Les sept articles qui suivent représentent environ un tiers des écoles du Canada. Certaines similitudes apparaissent dans ces articles, en ce qui concerne leur contenu et l'objet de ce contenu. Néanmoins, on y trouve aussi quelques différences et il est indubitable pour quiconque étudie ces sept articles que la logique et l'intégrité de chacun diffèrent à des degrés divers. On pourrait même dire, en reprenant les critères de notre comité d'accréditation de l'Association canadienne des écoles universitaires de nursing que ces articles diffèrent quant aux critères de *pertinence*, *connexité*, *responsabilité* et *unicité*. Toutefois, le critère essentiel ici, du point de vue de la clarté du sens et pour la compréhension du lecteur, est celui de la connexité des idées, c'est dire la façon dont s'alignent les différentes parties du texte dans un objectif commun.

Au cours de l'année à venir, professeurs, étudiants et éducateurs auront la possibilité d'analyser ces premiers articles et de leur répondre dans *Nursing Papers/Perspectives en Nursing*. Nous espérons que d'autres écoles étudieront ces critiques et nous fourniront une deuxième série d'articles de fond sur les aspects théoriques de leurs programmes, articles qui seront publiés dans *Perspectives en Nursing* en 1977.

Nous avons remarqué, il y a peu de temps, que *Nursing Research*, journal établi de longue date et publié par l'AJN, a lancé une rubrique de questions/réponses "Research Q and A" dans son numéro de septembre-octobre 1975. Je me demande si cette publication rencontre les mêmes difficultés que nous. Depuis le lancement de notre rubrique *Query and Theory* au printemps 1974, nous avons reçu plus de cent offres de réponses; contre une demi-douzaine de questions seulement. Tous les membres de notre corps enseignant peuvent nous fournir les réponses, le côté *Théorie*, mais nous n'avons personne pour poser des questions, le côté "on veut savoir". INFIRMIERS, INFIRMIERES, remuez votre matière grise!

— Moyra Allen

LETTER

To the Editor:

The article by Lindstrom (1975), "Holistic Nursing: A Basis for Curriculum" prompts several major concerns. These concerns, in turn, suggest some of the recurring dilemmas of nursing and nursing education.

Attridge (1974), in discussing the bandwagon approach to behavioral objectives, notes "It is typical of nursing education, and indeed a very human characteristic, that when we find a valuable and useful idea, approach or tool, we overuse it. We seem to suspend critical judgment; we try to make it fit every circumstance or make every circumstance fit it. No where is this so evident as in curriculum planning in schools of nursing". Is the current use of "conceptual frameworks" another illustration of this approach, with a framework developed for one nursing programme being 'made to fit' another programme without due thought as to whether it is consistent with the philosophy and objectives of the latter? The assertions that "the theory of holistic nursing provides a philosophy of nursing which can be easily carried from the beginning of the course to the end" prompted this question. Surely a philosophy of nursing, explicit or