

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1969 IN THE FACULTY LOUNGE AT 7:30 P.M.

Present:

Strand, K. T.

Chairman

Baird, D. A.
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.
Drache, S.
Freiman, L.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Kenward, J. K.
Korbin, D.
Lachlan, A.
Lebowitz, M. A.
Rieckhoff, K. E.
Sayre, J.
Srivastava, L. M.
Stone, A. L.
Sullivan, D. H.
Walkley, J.

Evans, H. M.

Secretary

Kelsey, I. B.

Mackie, M.

Meakin, D.

Barboza, J.)

Wright, L. E.)

Recording Secretaries

Absent:

Caple, K. P.

Collins, M.

Funt, B. L.

Hamilton, W. M.

Hean, A.F.C.

MacKinnon, A. R.

McDougall, A. H.

McLean, C. H.

Perry, G. N.

Stratton, S. T.

Tuck, D. G.

Turnbull, A. L.

Wassermann, S.

S.M. 16/6/69

The Chairman called the meeting to order. Copies of Motion J-2 and Amendment to J-1 were distributed. The Chairman said motions would be taken in the following order: Paper J; if J failed, Paper J-2; if J-2 failed, Paper J-1 and the amendment to J-1 brought forward from the floor.

Dr. Strand introduced Mrs. Drache to Senate. He noted that although Dr. Stone had been present at the previous meeting, he had not been introduced, and the Chair wished to introduce Dr. Stone.

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

"That Senator Stone be seated."

MOTION CARRIED

PAPER S.240-12 - Referring to Recommendation 20 of the Ellis Report

Motion J

Introducing Motion J, K. Burstein said his concern was that Senate could be in the position of passing policies and delegating implementation with the result that the policies could be radically changed by the implementing body. This matter required a great deal of discussion and immediate implementation would be unfair to students.

The Chairman stopped discussion here to discover which Senators wished to speak for or against the motion. At this point, A. Lachlan asked how the Registrar, H. Evans, felt about approval of J-1.

H. Evans said that his personal view was approval or rejection of J-1 would give rise to problems. Generally, implementation of the Ellis Report - given understanding that it could not be expected to work perfectly in every case - would give rise to a lesser set of problems than those encountered without implementation.

Opposing the motion not to implement the Report by the Fall of 1969, a Senator made the point that "fine print" on detailed aspects could not be made in advance and that it would have to be evolved on the basis of practical experience. He said that the Academic Board would provide recommendations, not instructions. Departments were merely being asked to provide more detailed views on what courses they choose to accept.

Miss Mackie was asked for views on the feasibility of implementation of the Ellis recommendations for the September semester. She said she felt it was not possible to implement the entire Ellis Report for the fall semester.

The argument was put forward that a cornerstone of the Ellis Report was that the Academic Board should be the crediting agency on extra-University courses and it was not possible for that body to commence this function in time for the fall semester, 1969.

S.M. 16/6/69

On the subject of how fall semester applications should be handled without approval of the Ellis Report recommendations being implemented for that time, the suggestion was made that departments could provide the accreditation lists and where the departments lack competence in a subject, UBC could be approached for advice. The further point was made that if this system worked as an interim measure, then there was no reason why it should not be used as the permanent system, obviating the need to obtain the services of the Academic Board.

A Senator, speaking in favor of Motion J-1, said it was imperative that students at present entering colleges should know which of the courses they were contemplating would be acceptable for transfer credit. The interim procedures of J-1 could guide admissions for the fall semester.

K. Burstein interposed that Motion J was not intended to preclude communication between colleges and the University with regard to transfer credit. Senator Burstein closed debate on Motion J by asking how Senate proposed to implement the Report if Motion J failed.

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Motion J be adopted."

MOTION FAILED
3 in favor
17 opposed

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Motion J-2 be adopted."

MOTION FAILED
8 in favor
18 opposed

Speaking for Motion J-1, L. Srivastava said the main merit of this motion was that it set up criteria to be used as a framework until the Academic Board commenced its proposed function. It was not the intention of the Ellis Report that there should be any hastiness about implementation of its recommendations.

L. Srivastava said that he would accept the amendment to J-1 submitted from the floor. The amendment was accepted also by the seconder to the main motion, J. Walkley. These amendments were incorporated in J-1 for discussion.

A request by J. Hutchinson for permission to place another amendment before Senate was refused by the Chair.

Replying to a question, L. Srivastava said the University would only be required to give credit for courses submitted by applicants

if that course had been designated acceptable by the Academic Board or the interim body carrying out the intended function of the Board.

In subsequent discussion, J-1 was criticized on the grounds that it had been indicated that departments had not always cooperated over accreditation with the Registrar's office and this motion did not put pressure on them to do so in future. This problem could be solved if departments were made responsible for their decisions to Senate.

J. Hutchinson proposed an amendment to J-1.

Moved by J. Hutchinson, seconded by J. Sayre,

"That J-1, Part 1, be amended to read: 'that until such time as the Academic Board performs its function (as delineated in Part B and covered in Recommendations 2, 3, 4), to prepare on advice of the liaison committees in the disciplines where appropriate a list of courses offered by Junior and Regional Colleges in British Columbia and to decide which of them are University level courses.'"

A Senator expressed the wish that if the accreditation system could be achieved without the Academic Board's involvement, this should be done.

L. Srivastava asked for this amendment to be changed to read, "to prepare a list of courses in consultation with the liaison committees," rather than "on the advice of the liaison committees." J. Hutchinson rejected this alteration on the grounds that he did not have faith in the strength of the word "consultation."

Questioners asked J. Hutchinson how binding the advice of the liaison committees was intended to be under his amendment. He answered that his intent was that decisions would be made at liaison committee levels, and therefore the advice would be binding.

The principle of putting such power in the hands of the liaison committees was criticized on the grounds that decisions would be made by majority vote. Agreeing with this, a Senator made the point that the Senate representation on the liaison committees is a minor factor.

On a point of information, J. Hutchinson stated that the liaison committees consisted of representatives from the universities and the junior colleges. He did not feel that voting would be influenced by institutional politics.

The argument was heard that Simon Fraser University may have difficulty getting information from the liaison committees during summer, due to its trimester system.

Speaking against adoption of the amendment, a Senator argued that it could delay implementation of critical policies by not giving criteria to students entering the University in the coming fall semester.

Discussion ensued on the possibility of advice, by definition, being binding and J. Hutchinson said that he used the word in the sense of "advise and consent."

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

"That the amendment moved by J. Hutchinson be amended by adding the word 'binding' in front of the word 'advice.'"

A Senator said the proposed amendments depended on the existence of liaison committees for each discipline.

J. Hutchinson said rejection of his amendment would amount to rejection of much of the Ellis Report. He also made the point that the Academic Board on any specific day may not contain a representative from the discipline affected.

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

AMENDMENT TO THE
AMENDMENT FAILED
8 in favor
13 opposed

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED
15 in favor
8 opposed
1 abstained

The Chairman said that the main motion J-1, with the earlier incorporated changes and with the amendment just approved, would be considered. Replying to a question from the Chair, M. Lebowitz said the intent of the motion was that if difficulties arise in the proposed system, then the matter will be brought before Senate.

Discussion followed on the term "unassigned credit." Senate agreed generally that this was a misleading term.

Moved by J. Sayre, seconded by K. Burstein,

"That J-1 amendment, 2(b), be amended by deletion of the words 'and unassigned credit.'"

J. Sayre said he was asking that a list be received that clearly states where unassigned credit is not given. The students should know this.

H. Evans said that when a student submits documentation it is not necessarily clear what area he will eventually be studying in. At present different faculties treat outside courses in different ways and it seemed unfair that a student should lose credit by changing departments.

K. Burstein asked if the movers of the motion to delete "unassigned credit" would consent to the word "electives" in the place of "unassigned credit." J. Sayre consented, but the Chairman refused permission for the substitution.

A suggestion from the floor was that the problem could be solved by a "final degree check" between three and six months before graduation, when the major objective of the student was clear. The Registrar would implement this by sending the student a form, setting out the remaining requirements for the degree.

Opinions were expressed that the amendment failed to accomplish anything.

Asked to summarize and clarify the intent of the amendment, J. Sayre said the motion was to delete the words "unassigned credit" and replace these words with "and electives."

Moved by J. Sayre, seconded by K. Burstein,

"That J-1 amendment be amended to read '2(b) To obtain from academic departments and faculties an indication of those University level courses they do not consider acceptable for course equivalent, unassigned credit in a subject area, and electives."

Asked whether the original motion, J-1, referred to unassigned credit in a subject area or unassigned credit, the Chairman explained that the original motion applied to the latter.

B. D'Aoust addressed the chair on a point of order. He said that an amendment of wording and intent had been accepted by the Chairman. He added that Senate was unprepared for such a thing and it should not have been accepted. J. Walkley asked that the amendment be tabled.

The Chairman said it was perhaps true that he should have ruled the amendment out of order, but he would not do so.

B. D'Aoust challenged the ruling. J. Campbell seconded the challenge.

Question was called to support the ruling of the Chair, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED
AMENDMENT OUT OF
ORDER

J. Sayre gave notice that he intended to bring the amendment before Senate at the following meeting.

K. Burstein moved that Section 1 of J-1, as amended by Senate, should be further amended to end "from the discipline and departments involved."

J. Hutchinson requested the Chair to rule K. Burstein's motion out of order on the grounds that the departments were already represented in the disciplines. The Chairman granted the request and K. Burstein's motion was ruled out of order.

S. Drache suggested another amendment to J-1 on the grounds that Senate was doing the work of the Academic Vice-President.

Moved by S. Drache, seconded by K. Burstein,

"That J-1 be amended to read, 'That Senate charge the Academic Vice-President or a committee(s) nominated by him with implementation of the Ellis Report as speedily as possible. Until such time as a particular section is ready for implementation, Senate instruct the Registrar to process applications for admission under the present regulations, provided in so doing there is no obvious conflict with the intent and principles of the Ellis Report.'"

M. Lebowitz asked for this motion to be ruled out of order on the grounds that it contradicted the unamended motion and support of the amendment could be indicated by voting against the motion. The Chairman agreed and S. Drache's motion was ruled out of order.

On a point of information, K. Burstein asked that the procedures would be to determine transfer credit. Replying, L. Srivastava said that there would be consultation with the disciplinary committees and faculty.

A. Stone asked to amend J-1 so that the last paragraph would read, "Until such time as a particular section is ready for implementation, Senate instruct the Registrar to process applications for admission under the present regulations." He said his suggestion was conditional on the meeting not being adjourned until the matter was handled.

The Chairman ruled A. Stone's suggestion out of order.

Moved by L. Freiman, seconded by J. Sayre,

"That the previous question be put."

MOTION CARRIED
15 in favor
6 opposed
1 abstained

Question was called on Motion J-1 as amended, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED
18 in favor
3 opposed
1 abstained

K. Burstein asked that his opposing vote be recorded.

These motions resulted in the following as related to Recommendation 20 of the Report:-

"That Senate charge the Academic Vice-President or a committee(s) nominated by him with implementation of the Ellis Report as speedily as possible. In so doing, the Academic Vice-President or the committee(s) be asked:

1. that until such time as the academic Board performs its function (as delineated in Part B and covered in Recommendations 2, 3, 4), to prepare on the advice of the liaison committees in the disciplines where appropriate a list of courses offered by Junior and Regional Colleges in B.C. and to decide which of them are University level courses;
- 2.a) to obtain from academic departments and faculties an indication of those University level courses which they consider SFU course equivalent, unassigned credit in a subject area, and unassigned credit;
- b) to obtain from academic departments and faculties an indication of those University level courses which they do not consider acceptable for course equivalent, unassigned credit in a subject area, and unassigned credit.
- c) to obtain an explanation from academic departments and faculties for their decisions in respect to those University level courses considered not acceptable.
- d) to make all information received in accordance with items 2(a) - 2(c) available to Senate.
3. to ensure that all necessary fine print is written for each section or subsection in Part E (Admissions and Transfer);
4. To implement the Report in stages if necessary, as each part becomes complete under #3 and adequate personnel is available in the Registrar's Office to ensure its implementation.

Until such time as a particular section is ready for implementation, Senate instruct the Registrar to process applications

for admission under the present regulations, provided in so doing there is no obvious conflict with the intent and principles of the Ellis Report."

RECOMMENDATION 23

Senate then passed to Recommendation 23 of the Ellis Report, "That Senate make a speedy decision on the question of retroactivity." The Chairman said a motion of "no retroactivity" should be debated and if this failed Senate could pass to discussion of what degree of retroactivity was favored.

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

"That there be no retroactivity and that the implementation of any section of the motion just passed apply only at the time of introduction with no retroactivity whatsoever."

B. D'Aoust suggested that Senate go into committee of the whole and all members state their views, the discussion to end with the Chairman.

After considerable discussion about a point of order on this matter, it was moved by B. D'Aoust, seconded by J. Kenward,

"That Senate go into committee of the whole, debate this issue and end the debate with the Chairman's remarks."

D. Sullivan asked the Chair to rule this motion out of order as there was already a motion on the floor. The Chair ruled that the D'Aoust motion was in order.

Question was called on the D'Aoust motion, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED
7 in favor
10 opposed

It was then stated by the Chairman that discussion would follow on the main motion of no retroactivity and that Senators wishing to speak for or against should so indicate.

D. Korbin asked that Senate hear the Registrar's opinion on the recommendation first. The Chairman agreed to this.

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

"That each speaker on the motion observe a time limit of two minutes."

MOTION CARRIED

H. Evans said the intent of the motion (that new policies should not be applied retroactively) was that there would be no retroactivity where a student had already been admitted. However, if an application was processed before the effective date of implementation but the student had not yet entered the University, such cases would be considered. Implementation would be effective from the intake date, not the application date. Replying to questions, H. Evans said the motion under debate was the implementation of a) on Page 45 of the Ellis Report and that, as he understood it, the motion was that implementation should run from a particular term and cover all the intake for that term.

Agreeing with the motion, a Senator said that retroactivity would not be feasible and would create more problems than it would rectify.

In reply to a Senator who asked if adoption of c) on Page 45 of the Ellis Report ("New policies should be applied retroactively to all students who petition for review and who can demonstrate that a review, if successful, could shorten their degree program") would be an administrative problem, H. Evans said that the recommendation in c) would be desirable if machinery could be set up for implementing it. It was a most difficult problem, as a student who intended to apply for admission to Simon Fraser University could have been advised to take a particular course under the pre-Ellis system and could find on admission that the advice had been incorrect under the Ellis Report recommendations.

A Senator made the point that the situation could arise where a student was dismissed from the University, while the recommendation d) in the Ellis Report did not put a student in jeopardy.

M. Campbell gave notice that he intended to move adoption of c) after the debate on D. Sullivan's "no retroactivity" motion.

Several Senators voiced views that adoption of retroactivity was dangerous; one said it may set a precedent that would result in departments giving credit in one instance and not in another.

Disagreeing, another Senator said that just because retroactivity would be difficult to implement, that did not mean that it should not be attempted.

Senate heard the argument that if retroactivity were applied to credits, it could also apply to degrees.

Speaking against the motion, a Senator said that if it could be argued that students already admitted to the University knew where they stood, there could have been no point in undertaking the Ellis Report. Recommendation c) of the Ellis Report did not hurt any students and would help many. Agreeing with this viewpoint, another Senator said it was a principle in law that where a law was changed, the new terms were applied to those who would benefit from them but not those penalized by them.

One Senator said that the question should be examined in the light of how it will directly affect the University - adoption of any policy could result in another sit-in. The problem should be presented to the students to gain their opinions.

Question was called on the "no retroactivity" motion, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED
11 in favor
11 opposed
0 abstained

J. Sayre asked to move that Senate consider c) on Page 45 of the Ellis Report. The Chairman said that the question of retroactivity turned on implementation and it would be premature to act on implementation at the meeting. He allowed J. Sayre's motion, however.

On a point of order, R. Brown said that M. Campbell had already given notice of motion. M. Campbell then moved that the meeting adjourn.

Moved by M. Campbell, seconded by J. Walkley,

"That the meeting adjourn."

D. Korbin said the Chair had erred by not recognizing the notice of motion given earlier by M. Campbell and which had now been reduced to a move to adjourn. The Chair agreed with this view and disallowed M. Campbell's motion to adjourn.

Moved by M. Campbell, seconded by J. Kenward,

"That c) on Page 45 of the Ellis Report: 'New policies should be applied retroactively to all students who petition for review and who can demonstrate that a review, if successful, could shorten their degree program' be adopted."

On a point of order, D. Sullivan asked to make a procedural motion, but the Chair refused to recognize this.

Moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by K. Burstein,

"That the meeting now adjourn."

MOTION TO ADJOURN
CARRIED
12 in favor
7 opposed

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary