

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1969, FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P. M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT:

Strand, K. T.

Chairman

Baird, D. A.
Burstain, K. R.
Campbell, M. J.
Carlson, R. L.
Cole, R. E.
Drache, Mrs. S.
Freiman, Mrs. L.
Funt, B. L.
Hamilton, W. M.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Kenward, J. K.
Kirchner, G.
Lachlan, A. H.
MacKinnon, A. R.
Munro, J. M.
Rogow, R.
Sayre, J.
Srivastava, L. M.
Stratton, S. T.
Sullivan, D. H.
Turnbull, A. L.
Vidaver, W.
Walkley, J.
Wassermann, Mrs. S.
Webster, J. M.

Evans, H. M.
Norsworthy, Mrs. R.

Secretary
Recording Secretary

ABSENT:

Caple, K. P.
Claridge, R. W.
Collins, M.
Hean, A.F.C.
Korbin, D. G.
Lebowitz, M. A.
McDougall, A. H.
McLean, C. H.
Perry, G. N.
Tuck, D. G.

Professor Leigh Hunt Palmer was in attendance from 9:50 p.m. until 10:22 p.m. to speak on Paper S.281.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OPEN SESSION OF OCTOBER 6, 1969

M. Campbell requested that the first sentence at the top of page 4 should read "M. Campbell asked the Chair to direct the speaker to speak to the motion."

The minutes were then approved as corrected.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman was asked whether or not he had circulated information on the use of a Point of Personal Privilege as outlined in Robert's Rules of Order. He replied that he had not done so and apologized to Senate for failing to do so.

D. Sullivan asked the Acting Academic Vice-President to inform Senate of the action that had been taken by his office with regard to the cancellation of PSA courses, the transfer of students from these courses to others, and the refunding of appropriate monies to those students requesting refunds.

L. Srivastava replied that approximately 650 students had transferred out of PSA courses into other courses, and this had been accomplished with a great deal of co-operation among students, faculty and administration. He added that the B.C. Government has approved the request of the University concerning the granting of scholarships and bursaries to those students deemed to have qualified for them even with a reduced number of courses. It is hoped also that a similar arrangement will be approved by the Government for those applying for Government loans. A letter of approval has yet to be received, however. It was pointed out also that the Senate Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries will make its decisions on a similar basis.

The Acting Academic Vice-President stated that there were only two remaining problems with regard to cancelled PSA courses, the first dealing with the disposition of graduate students who have lost their supervisors and the second with regard to the use of teaching assistants. Finally Senator Srivastava explained that refunds are being made to students where appropriate along the lines laid out in his memorandum to students dated October 13, 1969.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

The Acting Academic Vice-President was asked to report to Senate on several items. He spoke first of all on departmental reviews. He said that when Senate adopted Paper S.224 it did not include the exact items for which departments were to be reviewed, and as a consequence he asked the Deans to set up criteria which could be used in a review of departments. Reports have been received from the Dean of Arts

S.M. 10/11/69

and the Dean of Education. When the report from the Dean of Science has been submitted, the three Deans and the Acting Academic Vice-President will see if there can be agreement on the criteria or whether it will be necessary for each Faculty to adopt its own criteria.

The second item dealt with progress made in implementation of the Ellis Report. According to L. Srivastava a list of courses offered by the B.C. Regional Colleges and Grade 13 has been prepared and has been circulated to the three Faculties for designation of unassigned credit. He reported that this had been sent to the Faculties about eight weeks ago and that as yet nothing had been received from the Arts or Education Faculties. He pointed out that when these lists have been returned to him the University will then have a course equivalent list for all courses listed in the 1968-69 calendars of the B.C. Regional Colleges and Grade 13. Clarification will have to be sought also on equivalent courses offered by these Colleges and Grade 13 in 1966-67. When these lists are completed the information will be published for the benefit of students.

L. Srivastava stated that recommendations were required on two items mentioned in the Ellis Report, the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and the Appeals Board, but for which no provisions on procedures had been made. He hoped to present the recommendations at the next meeting of Senate, and that Senate could then dissolve the Implementation Committee working under the direction of the Acting Academic Vice-President.

The third item presented by L. Srivastava dealt with pre-registration, and in this regard he pointed out that in his meetings during the past few weeks with people from a local computing firm it has become clear that pre-registration is an extremely difficult matter. He said that departments will have to commit themselves to setting up programs at least two semesters in advance, that is, commit themselves with regard to courses, faculty and teaching assistants, and ensure appropriate procedures for student counselling. Advance planning is necessary for pre-registration to be successful.

The final item dealt with by the Acting Academic Vice-President was approval of undergraduate courses. It was pointed out that there is no adequate screening method of courses as there is at the graduate level and that Senate should seriously think of establishing a committee to examine all undergraduate course offerings before they come to Senate, and charge this or some other committee with the job of revising the calendar and separating the calendar revision from course offerings.

At this point D. Sullivan reiterated the need for a firm time lag between Senate's approval of courses and the actual offering of these courses. L. Funt claimed that there was an adequate system at the

moment for screening of undergraduate course offerings before they come to Senate, pointing out that all proposed changes are sent to the Deans of Faculties, the Vice-President and President, and that there is ample opportunity here for discussion and debate after the material has come from the Faculties themselves. He pointed out also that it takes between three to six months for material to reach Senate after leaving the departments.

K. Burstein added that a suggestion had been made several months ago that a survey be conducted among other universities in Canada and the United States to discover what practices were being followed with regard to curriculum and calendar changes, faculty hiring factors and time-lags, and related matters, and that data was required. He wished information on advantages and disadvantages of various approaches.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Paper S.277 - Report of Senate Nominating Committee - Elections to Senate Committees.

The Chairman noted that in two elections nominations received coincided with the number of vacancies existing on these Committees, and therefore these vacancies were filled by acclamation.

The following individuals were elected by acclamation:

1. Senate Committee to Review Senate Procedures and Establish Codification.

Election of one Senator to replace A. R. MacKinnon. Elected by acclamation: K. R. BURSTEIN.

2. Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures Pertaining to Professional Conduct.

Election of two members to temporarily replace C. R. Day and R.J.C. Harper from the present until April 30, 1970. Elected by acclamation: E. COLHOUN
J.P.M. MACKAUER

A ballot vote was held for replacements on the following Committee:

Senate Nominating Committee

Election of five Senators to replace the present members whose terms expired October 31, 1969. Term of office for this next year is from November 1, 1969 to September 30, 1970, with the candidates being D. A. Baird, D. G. Korbin; G. Kirchner, A. H. Lachlan, A. H. McDougall, J. Sayre and S. Wassermann. Individuals receiving the highest number of votes and thereby elected:

D. A. BAIRD
G. KIRCHNER
A. H. LACHLAN
J. SAYRE
S. WASSERMANN

Paper S.278 - Report of Senate Library Committee

Moved by S. Stratton, seconded by D. Baird,

"that the Report of the Senate Library Committee
contained in Paper S.278 be received."

In reply to a question with regard to publication and circulation of information contained in this Report, it was stated by the Librarian, D. Baird, that the information had gone to the Student Newspaper, Departmental Library representatives, and Senate itself.

J. Kenward asked for clarification on Items 6, 10 and 12, and in replies to these questions K. Strand stated that his response to Item 10 would be in the negative, and later added that the money collected for fines and lost books go to general revenue as it is, he felt, better to place all types of income in general revenue rather than to have income go to specific areas such as the replacement of lost, stolen or damaged books.

S. Stratton added that the Committee is looking into the possibility of extending a grace period for the return of books.

In reply to clarification of Item 6, D. Baird stated that funds for the acquisition of materials for the past five years have progressively gone down and he hoped that in the next fiscal year the trend would be reversed. With regard to Item 12, dealing with library privileges outside the University community, he stated that he hopes to recommend in November of this year that alumni be granted borrowing privileges.

At this point D. Sullivan expressed his concern about the large fines of some students and hoped that there was some way in which these large sums of money could be reduced. He added that perhaps the fines could be based on the cost of the book plus accounting and processing costs.

J. Hutchinson asked if Item 15, dealing with Departmental Libraries, reflected a decision in principle or only with regard to the Department of Philosophy. It was pointed out by the Chairman of the Library Committee, S. Stratton, that the Committee was unanimous in support of the principle that Departmental Libraries should not be approved, and that the University retain a centralized library system.

Question was called on the motion to receive the Report of the Senate Library Committee, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED.

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by A. Lachlan,

"that course changes for Mathematics as presented in Paper S.279 be adopted."

L. Funt stated that these courses had been considered at every level within the Faculty of Science and that the recommendations were in harmony with the spirit of the Ellis Report. L. Srivastava noted that the courses were planned for the Fall of 1970 and requested that these not be offered prior to that time. He was assured by L. Funt that the courses would not be offered before that time.

Discussion continued on the paper, and then the question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED.

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by R. Carlson,

"that the course changes in Physics (Physical Science in Archaeology) as outlined in Paper S.280 be adopted."

L. Funt noted that this course is a new one as a result of demand by students in the Faculty of Arts. L. Srivastava noted again that this course was to be offered for the first time in the Spring of 1971 and requested assurance that it would not be offered before the Fall of 1970 at least. Again he was given this assurance by L. Funt.

It was pointed out by K. Burstein that the University does not have a program in modern Archaeology, that there are no Archaeology major or honor students as stated and implied in the supporting paper from R. Carlson. R. Carlson replied that there is an Archaeology major or honors program of sorts but it is not structurally organized as such.

Question was called on the adoption of this course in Physical Science in Archaeology and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED.

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by A. Lachlan,

"that the course changes for Physics, as noted in Paper S.281, be adopted."

W. Vidaver noted that the course changes proposed by the Physics Department might be quite valuable, but that the changes represent an extreme departure from the practice within the Faculty of Science where most of the undergraduate courses in Physics are made up of 3 or 4 unit courses rather than the 2 as now proposed. He stated also that he had reservations about dividing the physics program into small courses. He recommended that this be examined very thoroughly by the University to determine whether or not this was an advantage to the University. He also noted that this change had been passed in the Faculty of Science when there was barely a quorum, and that there had been divided opinion about the desirability of this change.

The Dean of Science, B. L. Funt, indicated that this item had been referred back to the Department two or three times and that it had received considerable examination with the Faculty itself, and that the recommended proposal does reflect the majority view within the Faculty of Science. He pointed out that he himself at one time had reservations about this change from 3 or 4 unit courses to 2 units, but after careful examination had come to accept this as a desirable change.

At this point J. Sayre asked if the Dean of Science was prepared to give reasonable assurance that the change of courses from 3 to 2 hours would not adversely affect Regional College students who transfer to Simon Fraser University. L. Funt replied that all the new programs and courses within the Faculty of Science are within the spirit and substance of the Ellis Report, and that it is his understanding that the course changes proposed here would favorably affect transfer students. J. Sayre asked that both his and Dean Funt's remarks be recorded in the minutes.

Moved by J. Kenward, seconded by L. Srivastava,

"that this item be postponed for further consideration."

It was pointed out by L. Funt that Professor E. H. Palmer, Chairman of the Faculty of Science Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, was available and could be at Senate within five minutes to answer questions Senators may have on some of the details contained in the paper.

After considerable discussion on the propriety of postponement, an amendment was moved by L. Freiman, seconded by S. Drache,

"that this item be postponed for one hour for further consideration."

Question was called on the amendment and a vote taken.

S.M. 10/11/69

AMENDMENT FAILED.

8 in favor
14 against

Question was called on the main motion to postpone, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO POSTPONE
FAILED.

6 in favor
18 against

Further discussion ensued with regard to the relationship between Regional College courses and those courses offered by Simon Fraser University. Eventually Professor L. H. Palmer was invited to the meeting to answer questions on details of the paper. The Chairman stated that Senators could ask questions of Professor Palmer and then Professor Palmer would incorporate his answers into a single statement.

A number of questions were raised and adroitly answered by L. Palmer to the satisfaction of the assembly.

Question was called on the main motion that the course changes for Physics, as noted in Paper S.281, be adopted, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED.

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by W. Vidaver,

"that the proposed course in Contemporary Natural Science, as outlined in Paper S.282, be adopted."

Discussion followed on the merits of this course as an experimental course designed for the university as a whole and to be classed as a general education course. Although it was agreed that this was a desirable course, reservations were voiced by several Senators that it should be examined in greater detail, and that there should be more structure to it than is apparent.

Amendment was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by J. Sayre,

"that the course number be changed to OXX numbers to indicate that it is part of the general education series."

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

Question was then called on the main motion to adopt the new course outlined in Paper S.282, and a vote taken.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED.

*
OTHER BUSINESS

a) Notices of Motion

i) Paper S.285 - Provisions for Increased Senate Membership

Moved by J. Kenward, seconded by J. Sayre,

"that Motion 1, 'that Senate, under the provisions of Section 23(i) of the Universities Act, increase the number of members by one, to provide for membership of the person duly elected President of the Student Society of Simon Fraser University, whosoever he/she may be from time to time' be approved."

J. Kenward stated that students have a great deal to offer Senate and it would help in the way of communication if the President of the Student Society were seated on Senate.

M. Campbell voiced his opposition to the motion on the basis that Senate is even now too large to deal effectively with some of the problems brought before it and that an increase in membership would make it that much more unwieldy. He pointed out also that Senate cannot afford to have any more "minority representatives."

Amendment was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by M. Campbell,

"that a three man Committee be established to consider whether or not Senate should seat on Senate the President of the Student Society and whether or not Senate should enlarge its membership by two."

Questions were raised with regard to the action taken on similar requests for representation on Senate, including one from the British Columbia School Trustees' Association and one from the Simon Fraser University Alumni Association. The Chairman indicated that these two requests were still under examination.

Question was called on the amendment to the motion for the establishment of a three man committee to consider enlargement of the Senate by one or two members, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

7 in favor
14 opposed

* moved by S. L. Funt, seconded by A. H. Kachler "that the Graduate courses in Physical Chemistry as outlined in Paper S.283 be adopted" Question was called on the motion and a vote taken. Motion Carried.
* moved by S. L. Funt, seconded by M. Campbell "that the Graduate courses in Physics as outlined in Paper S.284 be approved." Question called and a vote taken. Motion Carried.
* Paper S. 284a

Question was then called on the main motion and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

10 in favor

12 opposed

At this point J. Sayre stated that he thought the President of the Student Society should be on Senate and that he would resign his seat in favor of the Student Society President if this could be done legitimately. The Chairman replied that he would have to look into whether or not this could be done, but did not believe it could be.

ii) Paper S.286 - Actions on Academic Gradings for 69-3

Moved by J. Kenward, seconded by J. Sayre, that

"whereas the current concern of the University Community over the PSA question has led to an atmosphere not conducive to study and the normal program of courses, be it resolved that the Senate of Simon Fraser University instruct the Registrar's Office that no student currently on academic probation be required to withdraw from the University and that no student be placed on academic probation as a result of grades this semester."

It was pointed out by H. Evans that there could be administrative problems of accommodating all returning students.

Several Senators voiced concern over passage of the motion, stating that the University should not relax its standards for special circumstances such as this one. It was added that students are not required to withdraw solely on academic performance in one semester.

Question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED.

b) Date of Next Meeting

It was announced by the Chair that the next meeting of Senate would be on Monday, December 1, 1969.

In response to a question on a Senate meeting to consider calendar changes, the Chairman mentioned that the date would be decided after consultation with the Deans on when appropriate material would be available, with a meeting anticipated in early January.

c) Other Items

Paper S.255 - Ellis Report, Retroactivity

M. Campbell explained that there had been preliminary discussions on Paper S.255 and S.255a, and that last Friday two minor revisions had been made by Senator Lachlan and himself. In addition, the Implementation Committee has prepared an excellent paper which had been distributed earlier in the meeting, and that he wished to withdraw his paper in favor of that now distributed.

Moved by M. Campbell, seconded by L. Srivastava,

"that the revisions recommended by the Vice-President's Implementation Committee of the Ellis Report contained in Paper S.255b be approved."

It was moved by K. Burstein, and seconded by J. Hutchinson "that there be no retroactivity of the Ellis recommendation." The Chairman ruled the motion out of order on the grounds that a previous motion was on the floor.

Discussion followed on procedures for examining the proposals, with it being emphasized by M. Campbell that a discussion on the principle of retroactivity was not the issue before Senate as Senate previously rejected a motion that there be no retroactivity, and that discussion should centre on the specific recommendations of the paper because they dealt with ways of making workable a policy of applying credit. He added that the Paper was in harmony with past policies of Senate and referred specifically to the Senate minutes of January 6, 1969, page 7 and to Senate Paper S.188. M. Campbell continued and stated that the job of processing applications for credit is basically clerical and noted that if all students who had ever attended this university since 1965 applied for credit, there would be only about 4,000 involved.

K. Burstein expressed concern that if the proposals in this Paper were passed, students who have already been required to withdraw will receive sufficient credit to obtain a degree. He added that most universities do not expect changes to apply retroactively. Other Senators supported this last statement.

Considerable debate followed on the various committees most suited to handle student appeals, with K. Burstein and J. Munro challenging the ruling of the Chair that paragraph 2 of page 2 was relevant to retroactivity. The ruling of the Chair was upheld with 13 in favour and 3 opposed to supporting the ruling.

Amendment to paragraph 6, p. 12 - S.M. 10/11/69

The revision reads,

"L. Srivastava enquired as to what body would now be concerned with transferability of courses and what body had performed this task before the Ellis Report. H. Evans indicated that there were two aspects. Prior to the Ellis Report it had been the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings and, more recently, the Acting Academic Vice-President's Implementation Committee. Temporarily it would be the Vice-President's Implementation Committee, and on a long term basis the Academic Board, which would advise on university level transferable courses. The Academic Vice-president stated that some time in the future the Admissions Board or some other agency would have to carry out the work of identifying transfer credit."

At this point J. Kenward asked H. Evans if the proposals were viable administratively and L. Srivastava if they were viable academically. H. Evans, with hesitation, answered in the affirmative. L. Srivastava responded similarly, but noted considerable work was involved, and that there would be some inequities.

Amendment was moved by J. Munro, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that paragraph 2 on page 2, which reads
'All applications for credit for any courses not shown in the list will be handled by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings' be deleted."

J. Munro stated that it was an unnecessary addition. He claimed that presumably eligible courses will be drawn up by departments after discussions have taken place within departments and after consultation has occurred with the various discipline sub-committees of the Academic Board.

Question arose again with regard to the appropriate body or committee sanctioned to examine courses for transfer credit. K. Burstein claimed that it was advisable to have the Academic Board assess all courses for possible transfer credit, and therefore this paragraph stating that applications for courses not shown in the forthcoming list be handled by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings should be deleted.

Question was called on the amendment to delete paragraph 2, page 2, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

10 in favor
9 opposed

It was questioned what body would now handle applications for credit. H. Evans replied that temporarily it would be the Vice-President's Implementation Committee, and on a long term basis the Academic Board. The Chairman stated that sometime in the future an Admissions Board would have to be established to take care of transfer credit.

*See Amendment
Sm. 1/12/69*

Discussion centred once again on retroactivity with arguments made both for and against retroactivity. Eventually K. Burstein moved that Motion B be deleted so that no application would be necessary for retroactivity. As there was no seconder the motion was lost.

It was noted finally that with passage of this motion there would be no retroactive degrees awarded.

S.M. 10/11/69

Question was called on the amended motion to adopt the proposals contained in Paper S.255b (the Vice-President's Implementation Committee Report) and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED.

13 in favour
6 opposed

K. Burstein asked that his negative vote be recorded.

d) Confidential Matters

The Open Session adjourned at 12:40 a.m. to move into Closed Session.

H. M. Evans
Secretary