

MINUTES OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD IN THE BOARD AND SENATE ROOM
ON MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1966, AT 1:30 PM

Admission Grading

PRESENT: P. D. McTaggart-Cowan Chairman
R. J. Baker
M. Bawtree
T. B. Bottomore
A. E. Branca
T. H. Brose
G. L. Bursill-Hall
A. B. Cunningham
J. L. Dampier
A. J. Ellis
J. F. Ellis
W. M. Hamilton
A. F. C. Hean
G. Kirchner
E. S. Lett
A. R. MacKinnon
J. Mills
C. D. Nelson
K. E. Rieckhoff
E. M. Shoemaker
G. M. Shrum
D. H. Sullivan
W. H. Whiteley
D. P. Robertson Secretary

ABSENT: C. J. Frederickson
I. Koerner
C. H. McLean
G. N. Perry
A. M. Unrau
W. Vidaver

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On page 1 the minutes of August 1st were corrected by deletion of the name of D. H. Sullivan from the names of those present.
On page 2. the motion under section (C) should read:

"that Biology 408-3, Biophysics, and Chemistry 201-3, Bonding, Structure and Stereochemistry, be given provisional approval and brought back to Senate at a later meeting"

A correction of the section under "Time Limit" at the top of page 3 was distributed at the meeting by the Secretary.

The minutes were approved with the foregoing corrections.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Nil

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Grading System

The Chairman referred to the papers on the Grading System distributed prior to the previous meeting and to the transcripts and covering notes

distributed at this meeting and requested the Registrar to report on the procedure for recording student records. The Registrar briefly explained the record form and how it was prepared. He then mentioned the various changes in the grading system and requested the approval of Senate on the page attached to the sample transcripts which had been distributed at the meeting, as it was intended that this note be sent out with the official records.

The Chancellor requested that the exact enrolment figure be quoted in the first paragraph of the covering note. G. Kirchner recommended that the cumulative grade point be recorded on the transcript. The Chairman ruled that this latter point be considered after the grading had been discussed.

In opening the discussion on the grading system the Chairman stated that there appeared to be no objection to the use of the four point system for external presentation of examination results, as shown on the final column of the permanent record. He therefore recommended that Senate first reach a decision on this question and then proceed with the debate on the question of the finer grading system for internal use.

Moved by J. F. Ellis, seconded by G. Bursill-Hall.

"that Senate endorse the four point grade system for external use"

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

There followed a debate on the relative merits of fine and course grading. K. E. Rieckhoff recommended that since no grading system had yet been given a fair trial, the University should use the system which had previously been approved by Senate for a proper trial period and if any real problems develop, refer the matter again to Senate at a later date. He pointed out that the system which Senate had approved was a compromise scheme and if it were dropped and a finer scheme adopted, those who wanted a four point scale would withdraw their endorsement of the compromise system and want a full hearing on the four point system.

C. D. Nelson reported that the Science Faculty had supported the compromise system, in spite of the fact that there was strong preference for the four point system, but if there was any question of a finer system the Science Faculty would wish a full discussion on the four point system.

T. H. Brose stated that the majority of the Arts Faculty wanted C+ in the grading system as a means of overcoming the problem of reconciling the letter system with numerical system. T. B. Bottomore stated that if the four point system were used the Scholarship Committee would ask for percentage marks. The Chairman stated that the Scholarship Committee would not be required to judge scholarships on the external grading system.

Moved by J. F. Ellis, seconded by A. R. MacKinnon,

"that the grading system as passed by Senate be approved"

T. H. Brose opposed the motion. He proposed that Science mark on the broad structure and Arts on the fine structure and stated that this system should not be imposed on those who had sent it back to Senate.

R. J. Baker stated that it was necessary for all faculty to learn to use a standard system for a trial period and that it was important that all be

properly briefed on its use. He further stated that the percentage in the Arts Faculty opposed to the system passed by Senate was not as great as stated; since those who were prepared to work with the system had not been present at the meeting which requested that Senate reconsider its decision.

The Chairman referred to the motion

"that the grading system as passed by Senate be approved"

CARRIED (15 to 4)

D. H. Sullivan and T. H. Brose requested their negative votes be recorded.

Preliminary Report on Summer Semester 1966 Grades (Undergraduate)

The Registrar reported on his Paper 4 A, which had been distributed at the meeting, and requested that Senate approve that the question of those students to be placed on probation be left to the discretion of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions. T. B. Bottomore asked the Registrar to explain what probation consisted of. The Registrar then reported that when a student was placed on probation he was informed that unless special permission was granted he must register in a full academic program of not less than twelve semester hours and not more than fifteen semester hours; must secure a C. average or better; must complete on time, and to the satisfaction of his instructors, all term work required; and that failure to fulfill these conditions might result in his being asked to withdraw from the University.

The Chairman stated that approval of the Registrar's request could be given at this time without prejudice to on-coming students and the matter referred back to another meeting.

Moved by G. Bursill-Hall, seconded by K. E. Rieckhoff

"that the question of those students placed on probation be left to the discretion of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate admissions with the assurance that this question would be discussed at a later meeting of Senate"

CARRIED

Moved by K. E. Rieckhoff, seconded by the Chancellor

"that the Registrar, in consultation with the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Committee, prepare a report on the question of academic standings for discussion at the next meeting of Senate"

CARRIED

The question of reporting the cumulative grade point average was discussed. The Chairman pointed out that the cumulative grade point average was the grade point average for all semesters taken at the University and that at an early joint faculty discussion that set up the President's Committee on Grading the cumulative average was not endorsed.

Admission's
grading
Student Records

Moved by T. H. Brose, Seconded by K. E. Rieckhoff

"that the cumulative grade point average be recorded on student records"

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by C. D. Nelson

"that this matter be tabled and that the Registrar present relevant material to the members for discussion at a later meeting"

MOTION TABLED

Note to go with Transcript

The Registrar requested the endorsement of Senate of the note to go with transcripts. In making his request the Registrar explained that the reason the note was necessary was primarily for students transferring whose transcripts might have marks (such as C+) which were not shown in the calendar.

The question of the note was discussed and it was agreed that such a note should be issued with the transcripts, but that the opening paragraph should state the exact enrolment figure and the wording be changed to state simply that the grading system in the first two semesters was slightly different from the present scale.

In the discussion of what to show on the transcripts it was pointed out that the Senate had approved the grading system to be shown. The Chancellor asked if two sets of records would be maintained, since averages on the finer scale would be required for scholarship purposes. The Registrar explained that the data was processed by the 1401 Computer so that if transcript marks were required the broad scale was printed and if scholarship marks were required the internal use scale would be recorded automatically.

The question of percentage distribution of grades was discussed. R. J. Baker stated that publication of such information could be useful to students and to other universities. The Registrar stated that such information could be made available, but that until the University had more experience he felt it would be unwise to publish such information for other Universities. The Chancellor expressed the opinion that faculty should be told what the guide lines are. Concern was expressed about setting up percentages which were expected and it was generally agreed that this was very undesirable. R. J. Baker stated that he had not proposed that this information be made available immediately to outside universities and withdrew the suggestion. He stated that one reason for making the suggestion was that students sometimes had no understanding of what the marks meant and might fail to apply for scholarships to which they were entitled because they had no understanding of the distribution of marks. He recommended that this question be considered at some future meeting.

3B Student Representation on Senate

R. J. Baker commented on his paper, stating that ultimately he would agree with the suggestion presented in the paper submitted by T. H. Brose, but felt this should evolve slowly: and that student

representation should commence by having the students elect a non-student.

G. Bursill-Hall stated that he was in favor of the proposal outlined in the paper by R. J. Baker, but would not at this time support any motion that resulted in a student becoming a member of Senate.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by C. D. Nelson

"that the proposal by R. J. Baker on Student Representation on Senate be adopted as the first step towards student representation"

T. H. Brose stated that he felt the idea of a student representative was good, but did not share the hesitancy of other members to allow the students to participate in their university. He then proposed an amendment to the motion made by R. J. Baker,

"that Senate authorize the seat and designate it as the seat of the representative of the students and permit the students to elect someone in October as their representative on Senate"

The Chairman ruled that this would be an alternative to the first motion, since the motion included not only the position of a Rector now, but moved to broaden the concept later.

R. J. Baker then amended his motion to state

"that Senate add a member elected by the students"

This would leave the title for the decision of the students. He stated he would not agree to a student representative.

T. H. Bottomore stated that the proposal that Senate should elect a non-student seemed difficult. He pointed out that the appointment would be for three years and that this was a long time to delay student representation by the students. He recommended that the matter be deferred until there was a more complete student body and the representation could be open.

G. Bursill-Hall requested clarification on the motion: whether it was on the position of a Rector who was a non-student or a Rector who might be a student representative.

The Chairman stated that the motion was in three parts:

1. The proposal as set out in the paper presented by R. J. Baker,
2. amended to read instead of "Rector", "the representative member of Senate elected by the students", and
3. in due course when a full spectrum of students is in attendance at the University, the whole question of limitations will be examined.

D. H. Sullivan stated that by the terms of the Act the term of appointment was three years. This would mean that a freshman or sophomore

SM 29/9/66

Student Representative

would be the only student eligible. Therefore he was against the motion. He also objected to the fact that members of faculty were excluded, stating that what the students would want would probably be a representative from the faculty.

E. S. Lett asked why it was urgent to consider this question at this time and asked if there would be any loss in deferring the discussion until there was a full complement of students.

R. J. Baker stated that he considered this would be a desirable step now as there is a great deal of concern about various groups being represented.

C. D. Nelson stated that he did not consider three years too long to deny representation by students on Senate. He reported that one of the members of the student government intends to take only a small number of courses, so that he can devote himself to student government. He stated that this was a criticism on the number of things that have to be done and considered it would take three years to sort them out and come to some sort of pattern for the trimester system. He considered that a representative elected by students to Senate was a good way to start and that such representation would give the students a great deal of help.

T. H. Brose stated that there appeared to be some feeling that a non-student should be the representative the students choose and stated that they should be trusted to elect a non-student.

Moved by D. H. Sullivan, seconded by T. H. Brose

"to delete the words "or a member of faculty" from the motion proposed by R. J. Baker"

AMENDMENT LOST

The Chairman then asked for a vote on the motion by R. J. Baker,

"that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Student Representative. This Student Representative would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students registered in courses at the time of the election, and for a term of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia"

CARRIED

G. L. Bursill-Hall abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded in the minutes.

The questions of which students would be eligible to vote and the best time for holding the election of the student representative to Senate were discussed and it was agreed that students registered for twelve semester hours or more were eligible to vote and that the election be held in the spring semester(1967): The elected representative to take his seat at the February Senate meeting.

The Chancellor referred back to Dean Nelson's report that one of the members of the Student Council had cut down on his courses in order to devote time to Student Council work and recommended that a committee be set up to look into this question. R. J. Baker recommended that the whole matter of student participation should be referred to Faculty Council. The Chancellor requested that it be recorded in the minutes that this matter will be referred to Faculty Council.

3C. Regulation regarding Simon Fraser University Student Residences

It was recommended by A. E. Branca that the words "who, without lawful excuse," be inserted after the word "student" in the regulation proposed by the Faculty Council.

Moved by K. E. Rieckhoff, seconded by A. B. Cunningham,

"that the regulation, as amended by A. E. Branca, be adopted"

Moved by M. Bawtree, seconded by D. H. Sullivan,

"that the word "student" in the regulation be changed to "member of the University"

CARRIED

The Chairman requested the members to vote on the following amended motion:

"Any member of the University who, without lawful excuse, is found in, or attempting to enter any of the non-public areas of a University residence other than his or her own residence, will be subject to immediate suspension from the University."

CARRIED (13 for, 7 opposed)

The Chancellor recommended that a statement be printed in the calendar to protect the University from legal suits and stated that at UBC students sign that they will obey the rules of the University. He recommended that such a procedure be instituted at Simon Fraser, possibly by printing such a statement on the application forms for the students' signatures. It was agreed that this question be referred to Faculty Council and then referred back to Senate.

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings

Moved by D. H. Sullivan, seconded by T. H. Brose

"that meetings of Senate be open to any member of the University community who provides sufficient reason: the President to decide upon which such requests should be granted"

MOTION LOST

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by W. M. Hamilton

SM 29/8/66 *Acad. Proc.*
10/10/66

"that the Information Officer be invited to attend Senate meetings at the discretion of the Chairman"

CARRIED

During the discussion it was pointed out that copies of Senate minutes were available for perusal by faculty in the Library and in the office of the Registrar.

Moved by T. H. Brose, seconded by R. J. Baker

"that copies of Senate minutes be made available in faculty department offices."

CARRIED

3E. Expiry Dates for Terms of Senators

The Registrar reported briefly on the reasons for his recommendation on the paper he had submitted on this question.

Moved by the Chancellor, seconded by J. F. Ellis

"that the recommendation submitted by the Registrar on the expiry dates for terms of Senators be accepted"

CARRIED

3F. Service for Admission to Colleges & Universities (S.A.C.U.)

At the request of the Chairman, R. J. Baker outlined the background leading up to the formation of the S.A.C.U.

In the ensuing discussion it was pointed out that there were two important reasons for supporting the recommendation of the Registrar: the University would have some influence on the policy of the service; and since other provinces will discontinue provincial examinations, this University will be forced to rely on the examinations set by the service.

Moved by the Chancellor, seconded by C. D. Nelson

"that the recommendation of the Registrar for membership in the S.A.C.U., as outlined in his Paper 3 F, be approved"

CARRIED

The Chairman announced that the next meeting of Senate would be held on Monday, October 3rd, at 1:30 PM.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

D. P. Robertson
Secretary