MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD MONDAY, MAY 11, 1970, EAST CONCOURSE CAFETERIA, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

Strand, K. T.
Baird, D. A.
Barlow, J. S.
Bradley, R. D.
Brown, R. C.
Burstein, K. R.
Campbell, M. J.
Carlson, R. L.
Claridge, R. W.
Freiman, Mrs. L.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Lachlan, A. H.
Lebowitz, M. A.
Rieckhoff, K. E.
Rogow, R.
Stratton, S. T.
Sullivan, D. H.
Turnbull, A. L.
Vidaver, W. E.
Walkley, J.
Wassermann, Mrs. S.

Evans, H. M.
Secretary
Kelsey, I. B.
iNorsworthy, Mrs. R. Recording Secretary

Basham, G. D.
Caple, K. P.
Cole, R. E.
Drache, Mrs. S.
Hamilton, W. M.
Hean, A.F.C.
Kenward, J. K.
Kirchner, G.
McDougall, A. H.
IncLean, C. H.
Perry, G.N.
Sayre, J.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as distributed.
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Open Session of April 6, 1970 were declared approved as circulated.
3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.
4. REPORT OF CHAIRYAN

Papers S.361, S.361a, S.362 - Naming of Persons to Carry out Certain Functions Previously under the Acting Academic Vice-President Graduate Studies, Graduate Admissions, Undergraduate Admissions.

The Chairman spoke briefly with regard to these papers. He pointed out that he had asked Dr. Webster to assume the Chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Graduate Admissions and at this point was asking Senate for its approval. He was also asking that Dr. Webster be granted speaking privileges at Senate while he is serving in the various capacities as outlined in these papers.

Moved by R. Brown, seconded by R. Bradley,
"That whilst J. Webster is assuming the duties as outlined in Papers S. 361 and S.361a related to Graduate Studies, he assume Chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Graduate Admissions."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED
Moved by R. Brown, seconded by' R. Bradley,
"That whilst J. Webster is undertaking the duties as outlined in Papers S .361 and S.36la related to Graduate Studies, he be granted speaking privileges at Senate."

Question was called, and a vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED

Paper S. 362 was provided to Senate for information on actions and suggestions pertaining to Undergraduate Admissions.

## 5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Paper S. 358 - Senate Committee on the Method of Appointment, Tenure, and Functions of Deans and Heads of Departments.

Senator Rogow, as Chairman of this Committee, introduced the paper and asked Senate to accept two corrections of minor typographical errors committed by the Committee. He identified these errors and asked that the following corrections be made: first, on page 5, B. 1. a. - f., that these sections end in semicolons rather than periods, and second, on page 2 insert the following statement at the top of the page between I and A, "The guiding principles to be followed are:." As there were no objections, the corrections were accepted.

Senator Rogow pointed out that the Committee had examined a number of statements and points of view on the selection of Deans, and after examination of these came to the conclusion that the selection of Deans as outlined in Paper S .358 would meet the needs for the selection of Deans of Faculties at Simon Fraser University. The paper did not deal with other than these.

Moved by R. Rogow, seconded by R. Brown,
"That the report of the Committee as presented
in Paper $S .358$ be adopted by Senate."
At this point the Chairman said that Senators could now ask questions of the Chairman of the Committee and Committee members or make brief statements related to the paper, and that the Chairman and Committee members could then respond to these questions and statements.

Dean Sullivan, Faculty of Arts, placed a paper (attached now as Paper S.358a) before Senate indicating a referendum of the Arts Faculty which had provided for a number of alternatives in selecting a Dean for that Faculty, but on which results were very scattered. There was some slight preference for election rather than selection, but without clarity on method.
M. Lebowitz enquired of $R$. Rogow why the Committee had chosen a selective rather than an elective method. R. Rogow indicated the Committee had considered particularly the dual role envisaged for a Dean, the problems of election, of considering external candidates, the position of the Dean centred between the faculty and administration, and the belief that a responsible deanship position was emerging. M. Lebowitz referred to the dual role of a Department Chairman, noted that a procedure had been devised for electing/selecting with election to be used if the Department was working well and expressed the opinion this method could apply to a deanship if a Eaculty was working well. R. Bradley, a member of the reporting Committee, emphasized the difficulties of conducting elections adequately if external candidates were considered, as consideration of credentials was highly important and a careful, thorough screening essential.

He was of the opinion that an election method did not adequately provide for this.
K. Rieckhoff considered the report generally good with some items requiring change. In particular he believed there should be more faculty members on the Search Committee, and that whether an internal or external candidate was being selected it would be essential to have ratification of the faculty. He believed this would strengthen the Dean's position and that the Dean would want this.
K. Burstein favored the report generally but wished to see extension of time beyond nine months for the Search Committee and desired a strengthening of the requirements for a faculty member to serve on the Search Committee. He disagreed with K. Rieckhoff on the proposal for ratification by faculty of an external candidate as he felt members could not be wellinformed, but that ratification of an internal candidate could be undertaken.
J. Hutchinson agreed with the two previous speakers desiring increased membership numbers and requirements of faculty members on the Search Committee, and noted that he would support faculty ratification if an internal candidate, but not external. He expressed opposition to the provision for one student on the Search Committee as "tokenism," and preferred none, or more than one if "none" proved non-acceptable.
R. Bradley noted that the faculty members for the Search Committee would be elected by the faculty and thought it would be unusual to have junior members. R. Rogow noted the provisions for recall of a Dean and believed that item would take care of a number of points raised. R. Bradley commented on the suggestions for more faculty members on the Committee but felt size was very important, He indicated that the provision for one student was a compromise and that there had been much discussion on this item in preparing the report.

After general discussion on these items had taken place in the form of questions and statements, the Chairman then stated that Senate could begin to make formal amendments.

Amendment was moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by J. Hutchinson,
"That Section III. A. 2. c. be amended by substituting the word 'Six' for 'Three' in the phrase 'Three faculty members.'"

Concern was expressed by several Senators over whether or not faculty would be adequately represented with only three of its members available for meetings. It was pointed out that with a larger number of faculty members there would always be sufficient for faculty to have a strong voice at the meetingsof this Committee even should some faculty members
necessarily be absent. There was also opposition as the size of the Committee would be large.

Question was called, and a•vote taken.
AMENDMENT FAILED
9 in favor
9 opposed
Amendment was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by J. Hutchinson,
"That Section III. A. 2. c. be amended to substitute the word 'Five' for 'Three' in the phrase 'Three faculty members.'"

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT CARRIED

10 in favor
9 opposed
Amendment was moved by $K$. Burstein, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,
"That in Section III, A. 2. c. the word 'tenure' be inserted between the words 'Five' and 'faculty.'"
R. Rogow indicated the Committee had considered constraints but believed it better to omit them. R. Bradley noted that there are wellexperienced senior people not yet tenured who would be eliminated. K. Rieckhoff considered the constraints required, and K. Burstein noted that in some instances persons were elected by acclamation as few candidates came forward. R. Rogow noted the cumulative nature of constraints, with difficulties on a small Faculty and S. Stratton observed that the Faculty of Education was not pressing for. such constraints.

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT FAILED
3 in favor
Amendment was moved by $R$. Brown, seconded by M. Lebowitz,
"That Section III, A. 2. d. be amended by striking the words 'One student' and substituting the words 'Three students.'"
R. Brown and $M$. Lebowitz argued for greater student representation as they had an important role. Some Senators questioned whether students
could be of use, particularly in the area of assessment of credentials.
Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT FAILED
7 in favor
10 opposed
Amendment was moved by R. Brown, seconded by J. Hutchinson,
"That Section III. A. 2. d. be deleted."
Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT FAILED
6 in favor
13 opposed
Amendment was moved by R. Bradley, seconded by J. Walkley,
"That Section III. A. 2. d. be amended by striking the words 'One student' and substituting the words 'Two students.'"

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT CARRIED

11 in favor
8 opposed
Amendment was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,
"That Section III, A. 2. c. be amended by deleting 'Instructor or above' and substituting 'Associate or Full Professor.'"
J. Hutchinson expressed opposition unless a provision for ratification were to be added. R. Brown expressed opposition. K. Rieckhoff indicated support and that he would later ask for a provision to ratify internal candidates. D. Sullivan opposed the amendment as he believed it would increase tensions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT FAILED

Amendment was moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,
"That Section III. A. 2. c. be amended by deleting
'at the rank of Instructor of above' and substituting
'at least two of whom shall be at the rank of Associate Professor or above.'"
R. Rogow thought the principle reasonable but expressed opposition to the constraints as he wished faculty to have the right of choice at this point, noting that he had argued for selection procedures and that the present wording gave faculty necessary rights. K. Rieckhoff and $K$. Burstein supported, with $K$. Burstein noting the potential unfortunate effect should there be no senior member of faculty on the Committee.

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT CARRIED
9 in favor
8 opposed
K. Burstein asked that his vote in favor be recorded.

Amendment was moved by R. Bradley, seconded by D. Sullivan,
"That-in Item 8 on page 4, after the word 'Dean' the following words be added 'or his designate.'"

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT CARRIED
7 in favor
4 opposed
Amendment was moved by $K$. Burstein, seconded by R. Carlson,
"That in Section III, A. 1. delete the word 'nine' and substitute the word 'twelve' in the first sentence."

It was claimed that nine months was insufficient time in which to make a search for a Dean in any Faculty. It was urged that a search should begin at least one year prior to the expiration of a Dean's term of office.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

Amendment was moved by M. Lebowitz, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,
"That in Section III. B. 1. a. strike the word 'deciding' and substitute the phrase 'soliciting the decision of the faculty.'"

It was pointed out by M. Lebowitz that it was the faculty's view, as contained in the Report of the Interim Council on Joint Faculty, that the selection of a Dean should be made by faculty, that is, the decision on the appropriateness of a Dean rests ultimately with the faculty rather than a Committee. It was pointed out also that there must be more provision for faculty involvement than that presented in the report and that this amendment provided for a way of getting this involvement. Questions followed on at what point in the search the faculty should become directly involved. It was felt by several Senators that this question needed to be examined very carefully. Points of view were expressed also that faculty involvement should vary depending upon whether or not a candidate was to be chosen from within or without the Faculty concerned. It was also argued that faculty chose members for the Committee and the Committee was charged with soliciting opinions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

5 in favor
13 opposed
Senators K. Burstein and K. Rieckhoff asked that their votes in the affirmative be recorded.

Amendment was moved by R. Bradley, seconded by R. Rogow,
"That at the end of Section III. B. 2 another sentence be added to read 'In such an event the Dean's Search Committee shall undertake once more the responsibilities outlined in B. 1. above.""

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT CARRIED
11 in favor
4 opposed
Amendment was moved by J. Barlow, seconded by A. Turnbu11,
"That in Section III. C. 2. an amendment be made by striking the words 'During his term of office a Dean shall serve on a three-semester-a-year basis with one month annual vacation' and substituting 'During his term of office a Dean shall be entitled to a research semester as are other faculty members.'"
R. Rogow was opposed, arguing that a deanship was a highly responsible position, not suitable for part-time or broken service, which would continue current problems of lack of clarity and continuity. A. Turnbull submitted that there was requirement for a man of stature and reputation, expected to teach, do research, and be a Dean, with necessity of keeping up-to-date in his discipline. K. Rieckhoff stressed the necessity of continuity, as did D. Sullivan. J. Barlow considered the arguments made for Deans pertained equally to Chairmen who are given the research semester.

Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT FAILED
2 in favor
Amendment was moved by J. Hutchinson, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,
"That in Section III. B. 1. the present clause g. be renumbered as $h$. and a new $g$. be inserted to read 'obtaining, by majority vote of the faculty involved, ratification of the candidate to be recommended to the President.'"

It was claimed by some members that faculty ratification was appropriate where a candidate from within the Faculty was being considered because faculty members would be familiar with the individuals; but that it was not practical where a candidate was being considered from outside the Faculty because faculty members would have only a limited knowledge of him, and that confined primarily to information supplied by the Search Committee. Some argued for ratification of any candidate.

Amendment to the amendment was moved by K . Burstein, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,
"That for this new section $g$. the following words be added 'obtaining, in the case of a candidate from within the Faculty, ratification by majority vote of the Faculty involved, of the candidate to be recommended to the President.'"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

Question was called on the amended amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDED AMENDMENT CARRIED

9 in favor
8 opposed
Amendment was moved by R. Bradley, seconded by D. Sullivan,
"That Section III. C. 3. be amended to read 'Upon completion of his term of office a Dean shall be entitled to a commensurate period of research leave.'"

With the concurrence of the mover and seconder it was recommended that the word "appropriate" be substituted for the word "commensurate."

There was discussion on a number of items, but R. Rogow pointed out that the paper was silent on a number of items and that these were best left for negotiation with a candidate.

Question was called on the amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

3 in favor
Amendment was moved by R. Bradley, seconded by J. Walkley,
-"That the words 'at least' be inserted before the last two words in Section III. C. 3."


Question was called, and a vote taken.
AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment was moved by R. Bradley, seconded by D. Sullivan,
"That in Section III, D. 1., second sentence, delete the following words: 'To the extent permitted by the full-time nature of his position.'"

As there was no objection to this amendment it was declared CARRIED by the Chairman.

It was moved by $K$. Burstein, "that no Department be given as a faculty member someone who is not supported by that Department." As there was no seconder, the motion was not placed on the floor.

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by R. Bradley,
"That Paper S. 358 - Report of the Senate Committee on the Method of Appointment, Tenure and Functions of Deans and Heads of Departments as amended be adopted."

Question was called, and a vote taken on the document as amended.

MOTION CARRIED

14 in favor

## 6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

a) Faculty of Arts

Paper S. 359 - Elective Credit for PF 451
Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by S. Stratton,
"That B.A. degree credit be allowed as an elective for PF 451."
D. Sullivan indicated that the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee had held many discussions and had called upon members of the Faculty of Education for information. For the Fall 69-3 credit had been granted under special circumstances upon transfer to the course for a number of persons affected by the PSA strike. Following further discussions the Committee recommended elective credit and on a recent referendum, in a very close vote, the Faculty had approved credit for this course.
K. Burstein expressed strong opposition, noted the varying nature of content and that the course was a professional teacher-training course. He referred to the motion of Senate of June 2, 1969 which permitted the using of courses undertaken in Education 404 (in and after Fall 68-3) normally used for an Arts degree, for credit toward such degree, and argued that it prohibited credit for courses such as PF 451. Submission was made that Senate would have to rescind that motion to permit credit for PF 451.

The Chairman indicated that in future he would expect the Deans of Faculties concerned to discuss thoroughly problems of this type to seek resolution before the items are brought before Senate. Recess for five minutes was declared to clarify the situation.

Senate reconvened after a brief recess and the Chairman ruled that there was no need to rescind any previous action taken by Senate with regard to the item being discussed. The ruling of the Chair was challenged by $K$. Burstein, but as there was no seconder a vote was not taken to sustain or reject the ruling of the Chair.

The Chairman ruled that the motion made by D. Sullivan, seconded by S. Stratton on this item was now on the floor and debatable. It was pointed out that as there were students who have taken PF 451 who were to be considered later for graduation, this question needed to be resolved prior to considering their graduation.

At this point a paper from Dr. C. Crawford, of the Psychology Department, was circulated to Senators (subsequently numbered S.359a), and several Senators spoke in harmony with some of the points brought out in this paper, with particular reference to the points he made that the areas being examined in PF 451 were related basically to teacher training and had virtually no relationship to an Arts program. This argument was rejected by other Senators who pointed out that Senate needs to examine what experience it considers appropriate in the education of a student, and that it needs to look at the question of having all Faculties accept all courses approved by the University, regardless of the type of courses or the Faculty offering them.

Questions arose also with regard to elective credit being awarded for other courses such as PF 452. The Registrar indicated that prior to the motion of June 2, 1969 with effect from September 1968, courses undertaken in Education 404 could be credit only for that purpose, but that the motion permitted the using of Arts courses so taken toward the Arts degree. The motion was silent on professional courses, but before that time the professional courses were not credited. The statement under Group D requirements did not indicate whether such courses would, or would not, be considered for elective credit, hence the matter was before Senate but only with reference to PF 451 at this time. Up to this point elective credit had not been given for such professional courses. It was queried why credit should not be given for, such other courses if it is to be given for PF 451.

After considerable debate on these issues, question was called on the main motion to approve the granting of elective credit to PF 451 within the Faculty of Arts, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED
7 in favor
7 opposed
b) Faculty of Science

Moved by J. Barlow, seconded by A. Lachlan,
"That the Faculty of Science submissions for the Chemistry Department dealing with new courses, replacement courses, prerequisite changes, a title change, and content changes, as outlined in Paper S. 360 a-i be approved."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

Moved by J. Barlow, seconded by A. Lachlan,
"That the Faculty of Science submissions relating to the continuation of Science 010, as outlined in Paper S. 360 k be approved."

Question was called, and a vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED
Moved by J. Barlow, seconded by A. Lachlan,
"That the Faculty of Science submissions relating to Mathematics changes as outlined in Paper S. 360 l-p be approved."

Question was called, and a vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED
7. OTHER BUSINESS
a) Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
b) Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of Senate would be held on Monday, June 1, 1970 at 7:30 p.m.
c) Other Items

There were no other items.
d) Confidential Matters

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 a.m. to move into Closed Session.
H. M. Evans

Secretary

