

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1969 IN THE FACULTY LOUNGE AT 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present:

Strand, K. T.

Chairman

Barlow, J. S.
Brown, R. C.
Burststein, K. R.
Campbell, M. J.
Carlson, R. L.
Claridge, R. W.
Cole, R. E.
D'Aoust, B. R.
Freiman, L.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Kenward, J. K.
Korbin, D.
Lachlan, A. H.
Lebowitz, M. A.
McDougall, A. H.
Rieckhoff, K. E.
Sayre, J.
Srivastava, L. M.
Stone, A. L.
Stratton, S. T.
Sullivan, D. H.
Tuck, D. G.
Turnbull, A. L.
Walkley, J.
Wassermann, S.

Ellis, J. F.
Evans, H. M.
Kelsey, I. B.
Meakin, D.
Mackie, M.
Day, J.A.P.
Barboza, J.)
Wright, L.)

Secretary

Recording Secretaries

Absent:

Baird, D. A.
Caple, K. P.
Collins, M.
Drache, S.
Funt, B. L.
Hamilton, W. M.
Hean, A.F.C.
MacKinnon, A. R.
McLean, C. H.
Perry, G. N.

The Chairman called the meeting to order and outlined the business before Senate, to consider proposed revisions, additions and alternative wordings to the Ellis Report on Admissions and Standings. He informed Senate that the special committee appointed to study certain parts of the Ellis Report had recommended that their suggestions be taken in a certain order, as listed on the Agenda, and that Senate would comply with this.

K. Burstein suggested that Paper S.240-12 be dealt with first, so that Senate decisions could be implemented before fall enrolment. D. Sullivan said that implementation was the last factor to be considered and spoke against the motion.

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by A. Lachlan,

"That Paper S.240-12 be dealt with first."

MOTION FAILED

1. PAPER S.240-2 - Motion H or Motion H.1

J. Ellis introduced Motion H. He said there had been a great deal of discussion on this motion in committee and he was prepared to withdraw his proposal in favor of Motion H.1. Senators heard arguments that H.1 was biased against transfer students and gave students already in Simon Fraser an advantage, as they would have less adjustment to make and their grades would likely be better at first. Another argument said that in practice the warning system brought little overall advantage.

Moved by D. Korbin, seconded by J. Kenward,

"That Motion H be adopted."

MOTION FAILED

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by D. Sullivan,

"That Motion H.1 be adopted."

MOTION CARRIED

Motion H.1 represents a rewording of page 36 of the Ellis Report - "Statement on Continuance, Withdrawal and Re-admission" as follows:-

"All students who enter the University are expected to maintain acceptable standards of scholarship. Specifically, they are expected to maintain a 2.0 cumulative grade point average. A student who does not maintain the 2.0 cumulative average will be considered to be performing less than satisfactorily in his studies and will be asked to withdraw from the University, if after a probationary period he is unable to raise his cumulative grade point average to or above the minimal requirement in accordance with the following:

1. A student whose cumulative grade point average (on courses

taken at Simon Fraser University) falls below 2.00 will be placed on academic probation for the next semester. If, at the end of the probation semester, the student has not raised his cumulative grade point average to the minimum 2.00, he will be required to withdraw. However, if a student on academic probation obtains a semester grade point average of 2.50 or higher, he shall be permitted to continue on academic probation even if his cumulative grade point average has not reached 2.00.

2. A student who enters the University in the first or second year of studies (or who has less than 45 hours of transfer credit) toward a degree and who does not in his first term of study at this University receive a 2.00 average or better will be placed on academic warning. In his second or subsequent semesters at this University, he will be treated as in paragraph 1.
3. A student with a cumulative grade point average of 1.00 or less for two consecutive semesters will be required to withdraw permanently.
4. A student on either academic warning or academic probation must carry a minimum semester course load of 12 semester hours and may not repeat courses in which he has received a grade of C minus or better.
5. A student who is required to withdraw will be re-admitted on academic probation after twelve months have elapsed. Transfer credit for work undertaken during the twelve month period will be allowed only if the student has received the express prior approval of the Admissions Board for work he intends to undertake.
6. A student who is required to withdraw for a second time will be required to withdraw permanently. No case of permanent withdrawal will be reconsidered for a period of five years.
7. Under exceptional circumstances, the Admissions Board may waive these conditions for individual cases."

2. PAPER S.240-4 - Motion B

J. Ellis introduced Motion B and said that this motion would clarify the situation with regard to maximum transferable credit.

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Motion B be adopted."

MOTION CARRIED

S.M. 9/6/69

Under Motion B it is stipulated, "That Senate agree that the maximum credit allowable to a student on transfer is 60 semester hours." This results in changes on page 25 of the report with deletion of sentences 2 and 3 - "In exceptional cases a student may have undertaken upper level studies at another institution that are within, and appropriate to the major field he chooses at this university. If the department in which the student proposes to major so wishes, it may request the Dean of the faculty to petition the Admissions Board to consider granting up to 30 additional transfer hours of credit for courses taken elsewhere that replace specific courses on the student's major program."

It results in a further change on page 34, item 3.4, line 4, such that 3.4 reads as follows:

"An applicant from a foreign country who seeks admission with 60 or more semester hours or its equivalent in subjects acceptable for transfer credit may be considered for admission and transfer credit with the following provisions: Maximum transfer credit allowed will be 60 semester hours; studies must have been undertaken at a fully accredited institution of higher learning; the studies presented for transfer credit must be acceptable to a leading university in his home area toward a program similar to the one to which he seeks admission; and his cumulative GPA must be 2.0 (C) or higher on transferable courses."

3. PAPER S.240-5 - Motion C or Motion C.1

Introducing Motion C, J. Ellis said that the motion was aimed at avoiding anomalies in grade averages that can arise from disallowing D marks as credits. He said Motion C endeavoured to have transfer students' D grades viewed in the same way as D grades of Simon Fraser students are viewed.

Discussion on the floor made the points that disallowing D grades from transfer students sets up double standards and transfer students would be at a disadvantage against Simon Fraser students. Another argument, opposing the motion, said that overall quality should not be a criterion of granting credit as it is not the criterion by which course grades are awarded. Another point made was that students are unlikely to pursue courses in which they have received low grades. The Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee opposes granting credit for D's; the Faculty of Science supports it.

Moved by L. Srivastava, and seconded,

"That Motion C be adopted."

MOTION CARRIED
15 in favor
6 opposed
3 abstained

S.M. 9/6/69

Under Motion C it is stipulated, "That Senate agree that students whose averages or cumulative grade points are sufficiently high to gain them admission to the university should receive transfer credit for all transferable courses that they have passed with the understanding that a department may require a student to repeat without credit a course in which a student obtained a D and which is prerequisite to another course in the same discipline which the student wishes to undertake."

4. PAPER S.240-9 - Motion G or G.1 or G.2

According to J. Ellis, Motion G was an attempt to make the note under 1.2 on page 25 of the original report more explicit.

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Motion G be approved, i.e. That Senate approve the revised wording of Section 1.2, page 25, Admission with Transfer Credit Note as set forth in Supplementary Paper G."

Substitute motion was made by D. Sullivan, with unidentified seconder,

"That Motion G.1 be adopted."

D. Sullivan said such adoption would be in line with the policy of many North American universities and was necessary in view of the "patently absurd" financing situation of B.C. universities. He said the answer may be to impose a quota on out-of-province students and regretted that there were no exact figures available on the present situation. There followed lengthy discussion. Senators considered what exactly constitutes residence in British Columbia. This would have to be defined by the University, they were told. Arguments stated that discrimination towards out-of-province applicants had already been passed by Senate.

A. Stone said that there should be a deletion from G.1 of the portion reading, "and to students who are not residents of the Province of British Columbia." Arguments against this motion stated that the passage was necessary in view of the financial pressure on Simon Fraser University.

Amendment was moved by A. Stone, seconded by M. Campbell,

"That Motion G.1 be amended by deletion of the final clause of the motion, 'and to students who are not residents of the Province of British Columbia.'"

AMENDMENT TO MOTION
G.1 FAILED

Discussion followed on the main motion that G.1 be adopted.

Senators regretted that there was not more information on the subject, so they could judge how various categories of students made up the student population. Several Senators wished to have more time for thought on the subject of restricting enrolment.

Question was called on Motion G.1 and a vote taken.

MOTION G.1 FAILED
11 in favor
12 opposed
2 abstained

It was then moved by K. Burstein, with unidentified seconder,

"That Motion G.2 be adopted."

K. Burstein said he was in favor of adoption of SACU tests so the tests could be used as one of several criteria in assessing candidates. He said this would be of particular advantage to mature students and that the number of SACU testing stations overseas would provide a service for foreign applicants.

Some Senators expressed distrust of using results of such tests in assessments. J. Ellis was asked for further information and said at present the tests were being used for information only and data is being correlated and amassed so that universities may compare the tests with students' performance. One Senator's comment was that there may be a danger of bias, perhaps on the basis of class, in the test, also that the philosophy of Simon Fraser University was that there should not be standardized criteria. The question of whether the student would be required to pay the fee for taking the test was also raised. K. Burstein said the test must become mandatory to be eventually useful.

Question was called on the motion to adopt Motion G.2, and a vote taken.

MOTION G.2 FAILED
5 in favor
16 opposed
3 abstained

On Motion G, J. Ellis said that the basic decision had already been passed and the rewording of the note was aimed at making it more explicit. The aim was to have transfer students treated the same way as Simon Fraser students.

K. Burstein suggested deletion of the sentence, "Although usually this calculation will be correct for a student who remains within his field of study, it will probably not be true for a student who changes his field." He said this passage was misleading to students.

S.M. 9/6/69

Amendment was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That the sentence in Motion G commencing,
'Although usually this calculation will be
correct' be deleted."

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

AMENDMENT FAILED
5 in favor
14 opposed

Vote was then taken on Motion G.

MOTION G. CARRIED

The passage of Motion G causes rewording of the Ellis Report,
page 25, item 1.2 - Admission with Transfer Credit, as follows:

"1.2 Admission with Transfer Credit

Note: The maximum transfer credit that will be allowed is 60 semester hours. An applicant seeking admission with transfer credit is advised that the courses he transfers, together with those he subsequently takes at the university, must meet the general and specific requirements of the faculty and the department in which he chooses to major or honor. The applicant should not assume that he will complete his degree with a number of semester hours equal to the difference between total hours required for the degree and transferred hours. Although usually this calculation will be correct for a student who remains within his field of study, it will probably not be true for a student who changes his field. Individual departments may require students to repeat prerequisite courses in which they have received transfer credit for a D. The repeated course will show in the student's record but will not carry credit.

Details of faculty and departmental requirements can be found in the calendar and further information can be obtained from the academic department in question."

5. PAPER S.240-3 - Motion A or A.1 or A.2

Moved by K. Burstein, with unidentified seconder,

"That Motion A.2 be approved."

K. Burstein spoke in support of Motion A.2, stressing the importance of criteria to identify mature students. Another Senator stated that

S.M. 9/6/69

criteria as outlined by K. Burstein would not be helpful to mature students. K. Rieckhoff supported the proposal in A.2 because, he claimed, there had to be some means of evaluating mature students.

K. Strand interjected that there would be two votes taken on Paper A.2, the first dealing with Special Admissions, the second dealing with Mature Student Entry.

Question was called on A.2 (1.3) Special Admissions, and a vote taken.

MOTION A.2 (1.3) FAILED

Question was called on A.2 (1.33) Mature Student Entry, and a vote taken.

MOTION A.2 (1.33)
FAILED

D. Sullivan then spoke in support of A.1 and said that the only way of assessing a mature student is by interview and discussion so that the board may decide how his aims relate to his achievements. Discussion showed that Senators felt it was unfair to ask a mature student applicant for a statement of overall aims, as regular students were not called upon to decide on enrolment what their final study program would be. Another view stated was that the mature student was part of the category where it was accepted that an applicant would not have had adequate preparation for study.

Moved by D. Sullivan, and seconded,

"That A.1 be adopted."

MOTION A.1 FAILED

Moved by L. Srivastava, with unidentified seconder,

"That Senate approve the rewording of 1.3, pages 29-31, under Recommendation 12, Part E as given in the paper entitled 'Supplementary Paper A' (Revised)."

MOTION A CARRIED

This motion results in the rewording of the Ellis Report, pages 29-31, Section 1.3, Special Admissions, as follows:

"1.3 Special Admissions

The university is interested in extending university level learning opportunities to citizens of this province who may not qualify under the normal categories of admission providing always that the number of such persons admitted is

subject to limitation in accordance with the availability of university resources. At present the university offers three types of special entry - Early Admission, Early Entry and Mature Entry.

1.31 Early Admission is designed for students on the Academic-Technical Program who are recommended by their schools following their Grade 12 Easter examinations.

1.311 An applicant must have demonstrated his ability by exceptional academic records (average of 80% or better) and have shown mature intellectual development to such an extent that he would profit from admission to the university without first securing Grade 12 standing.

1.312 Admission under this category is at the discretion of the Admissions Board. Inquiries regarding admission under this category should be directed to the Registrar.

1.32 Early Entry is designed for students who have completed Grade 11 on the Academic-Technical Program. Sections 1.311 and 1.312 also apply to this category of admission.

1.33 Mature Student Entry

1.331 A person who is twenty-five years of age or more or would reach that age during his first semester in attendance if he were admitted to the university, and who is not eligible for admission under another category may apply for admission.

1.332 Admission under this category is at the discretion of the Admissions Board. The Admissions Board must be satisfied that the applicant has sufficiently clear objectives in mind that he is likely to profit from university studies. The Admissions Board may, at its discretion require applicants to take appropriate tests. Inquiries regarding admission under this category should be directed to the Registrar.

6. PAPER S.240-6 - Motion D or D.1

Introducing Motion D, J. Ellis said some definition had been necessary because of the unevenness in the educational system of Canada.

Discussion ensued on D.1. Several Senators voiced concern over varying standards of acceptance of non-university courses as first-year university work. Examples concerned physics, where Ontario Grade XIII was judged to be equivalent to B.C. Grade XII, and British GCE "A" Levels, which were said to be good equivalents of first year university work. Replying to a question on how leading universities in other provinces act, H. Evans said that leading universities had stiffer requirements than those of newer institutions. Leading universities in B.C. accepted Grade XIII from B.C. high schools and colleges for transfer credit. Leading Ontario universities had varying policies regarding Ontario Grade XIII students.

It was pointed out to Senate that within B.C., standards of Grade XIII work varied, and blanket acceptance of B.C. Grade XIII by the University would remove incentive to upgrade the courses in that grade. J. Ellis said the centralized Department of Education examinations gave a measure of control.

It was moved and seconded,

"That Motion D.1 (2.1) be adopted."

MOTION D.1 (2.1)
FAILED

In discussion on D.1 (3.1), Senator Sayre commented that some countries at present under the GCE system were trying to get away from it and asked permission to make an amendment to the original report. On a point of order, K. Burstein said this action would not be consistent with the rules laid down for the meeting. J. Sayre withdrew his request.

It was moved and seconded,

"That D.1 (3.1) be adopted."

MOTION D.1 (3.1)
FAILED

On D.1 (3.3), H. Evans stressed that this was a guideline only and that the term "senior matriculation" was a very broad term.

It was moved and seconded,

"That Motion D be adopted, i.e., 'That Senate agree that transfer credit be awarded for transferable courses taken in Grade 13 or equivalent. Grade 13 or equivalent will be taken to mean Grade 13 in B.C., Regional and Community Colleges in B.C., Grade 13 in Ontario, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, first year of Junior Colleges in the United States, Advanced levels or equivalent.'"

MOTION D. CARRIED

7. PAPER S.240-7 - Motion E

Presenting Motion E, J. Ellis said the intention was to draw Senate's attention to the transfer students who can be treated in the same way as students already at Simon Fraser University. The aim was to lay down ground rules on grade points for various categories of students.

Moved by D. Sullivan, and seconded,

"That Motion E be adopted, i.e. 'That Senate agree with the intent of points 1 - 5 inclusive in Supplementary Paper E, bearing in mind the intent of the last sentence of Operating Guide-line 4, page 8.'"

MOTION E CARRIED

It was noted that the following principles were involved (Supplementary Paper E):

"The Statement on Admissions and Transfer (P24-34) attempts to treat similar categories of applicants in similar ways. Remarks made during Senate proceedings and in at least one circulated paper suggest that the attempts to create a parallel structure were not fully appreciated. One minor source of confusion results from attempts to equate grade point averages and percentages (2.0 = C = 60%; 2.4 = 65%; 3.2 = 75%).

If Senate can agree that certain groups of applicants should be treated in similar ways, the precise grades for admission and levels for admission can be determined later. The following statements express the parallels embodied in the report (relevant cross references are provided).

- 1. B.C. Students from Senior Matriculation should be admitted and awarded transfer credit on a similar basis to students from B.C. Regional and Community Colleges. 1.211, 1.212
1.221, 1.222
1.23
1.241, 1.242
- 2. B.C. students from Senior Matriculation and Colleges who met university requirements for admission after Grade 12 should be treated differently from S.M. and College students who did not meet university admission requirements after completing Grade 12. 1.211, 1,221
1,241 should be different from 1.212, 1,222, 1,242
- 3. Minimum educational level and entering average for non B.C. applicants should be similar. 2.1, 3.2
- 4. Requirements for non B.C. applicants who do not meet the minimum educational level should be similar. 2.4, 3.5

5. Requirements for applicants from other universities should be similar 1.24, 2.3
3.4"

8. PAPER S.240-8 - Motion F or F.1

J. Ellis said the adoption of Motion F would reflect existing policy. This was a difficult area and involved awkward judgments. The intention had been simply to provide a structure which could be modified to meet conditions.

Speaking to F.1, D. Sullivan said this alternative raised the percentages in each category by 5%. He said other B.C. universities were using 65% as a standard and lowering this percentage to 60% if they had the capacity. He said he felt it was important that Simon Fraser University standards should not be below those of other B.C. universities. British Columbia, he said, had not faced its educational responsibilities, with the result that higher education is not available to those who wish to have it.

Lengthy debate followed. Senate heard views expressed that the adoption of Motion F would reinforce the public impression that Simon Fraser was a "second-rate university" and that taking the lower standard would make it more difficult to attract good students. Several Senators expressed a wish that this subject could be dealt with at a future date, when more information was available on the University's resource position. Senate was informed by K. Strand that deferring the issue would hinder assessment of applications already being received. He was asked to rule F.1 out of order on the grounds that there was insufficient information available. The Chairman did not accept this.

It was argued that it did not follow that raising the percentage would result in admitting better students. The point was made that there is an escape clause in F.1 and that F.1 met the present pressure on the University. A Senator voiced the opinion that adoption of F would devalue the Simon Fraser degrees.

D. Korbin, who asked to have his comments noted in the minutes, said Senate should be talking in educational terms and not in terms of financial pressure confronting the University. He asked if the University could show more effectively that it was facing a financial-political problem by adopting a quota system instead of raising standards, which would give the impression that the problem was educational.

He said adoption of higher standards would give the University a class bias, as it would penalize students from less well financed schools and give an advantage to students from the richer Coast schools. He said the higher standards would mean that students from the United States would have to be brilliant, which would indicate that "the only good draft dodger is a brilliant draft dodger."

S.M. 9/6/76

A. Stone suggested that Paper F showed a balance, whereas F.1 was not balanced, and requested that D. Sullivan, who had prepared F.1, accept the same kind of note as was provided on Item 1, - with appropriate percentage adjustment as applying also to Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,7. D. Sullivan concurred and the change was incorporated.

Argument was made that F.1 put the emphasis on the standard of the student at admission; rather than at graduation. Imagination could be used to more effectively employ the University's finances - the tutorial system could be dropped to release more money and the space problems could be solved by using existing accommodation outside present University hours.

Speaking for F.1, the opinion was given that students who had higher rates of success elsewhere would be more likely to be successful at Simon Fraser and would therefore improve the quality of the University's output.

It was moved and seconded,

"That Motion F be adopted."

MOTION F FAILED
11 in favor
14 opposed

On Motion F.1, with adjustments, the points were raised that if different faculties adopted different standards of admission, the implicit philosophy of the University would be changed. It was suggested that F.1 be tabled for further thought, and a supporting argument was that adopting it at the meeting would be arbitrary.

Moved by M. Lebowitz, seconded by D. Korbin,

"That F.1 be postponed until such time as Senate has sufficient information on which to act on limiting enrolment."

MOTION TO POSTPONE
F.1 FAILED
8 in favor
12 opposed

On Motion F.1 the view was voiced that this motion's intent was to limit enrolment and it preempted the right of the Board of Governors to make that decision.

Moved by D. Sullivan, and seconded,

"That Motion F.1 be adopted, with appropriate changes, i.e. with the note of Item 1 incorporated in Items 2 - 7 inclusive."

MOTION F.1 AS CHANGED
CARRIED
13 in favor
10 opposed

Voters requesting their votes be recorded as opposed to this motion were Senators Campbell, Claridge, D'Aoust, Freiman, Kenward, Korbin, Lachlan, Lebowitz and McDougall.

Under this motion Senate adopted grade points or averages needed for admission, with changes in the Ellis Report as required. (Part E, pages 23 - 34 inclusive are affected.) The intent raises the averages set forth in the Ellis Report by five percent, on the understanding that if staff and facilities permit, the average five percent lower may be applied.

F.1 as changed reads as follows:

1. Applicants from B.C. High Schools 65%
(Note: The University may admit applicants whose standing ranges from 60% to 65%, if staff and facilities permit.)
2. Applicants from B.C. Senior Matriculation and B.C. Regional and Community Colleges 65% or 2.4 GPA
(Note: The University may admit applicants whose standing ranges from 60% to 65%, if staff and facilities permit.)
3. Applicants from other Canadian provinces with Senior Matriculation Standing 70% or 2.8 GPA
(Note: The University may admit applicants whose standing ranges from 65% to 70%, if staff and facilities permit.)
4. Applicants from the United States with the equivalent of Senior Matriculation 70% or 2.8 GPA
(Note: The University may admit applicants whose standing ranges from 65% to 70%, if staff and facilities permit.)
5. Applicants from other Canadian provinces with less than Senior Matriculation standing. 80%
(Note: The University may admit applicants whose standing ranges from 75% to 80%, if staff and facilities permit.)
6. Applicants from the United States with less than Senior Matriculation standing. 3.5 GPA
(Note: The University may admit applicants whose standing ranges from 75% to 80%, if staff and facilities permit.)
7. Applicants from other universities (B.C.) 65% or 2.4 GPA
(Note: The University may admit applicants whose standing ranges from 60% to 65%, if staff and facilities permit.)

8. PAPER S.240-11 - Motion I or I.1 or I.2

Introducing Motion I, J. Ellis said this was an attempt to have a list of courses in regional and community colleges compiled, so that the Registrar's Office may process applications for such courses to be credited in a more routine fashion.

On Addendum I.1, D. Sullivan said this intended to encompass courses taught in regional and community colleges but not at Simon Fraser University.

Responding to a question, J. Ellis said the final responsibility for making decisions regarding courses on such a list would be Senate's.

H. Evans said the subject was giving rise to many problems at present, as departments sometimes had trouble making decisions and would reconsider their rulings several times.

Arguments against the proposed system were that the trouble in making decisions was at departmental levels and the proposed changes in I did not solve this.

K. Burstein said I.2 would avoid vacillation.

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by D. Sullivan,

"That Motion I.2 be adopted."

MOTION I.2 CARRIED
14 in favor
5 opposed
6 abstained

This motion deleted the items proposed in Supplementary Papers I and I.1, which were not approved.

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by M. Lebowitz,

"That the meeting adjourn."

MOTION CARRIED
18 in favor
6 opposed

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 a.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary