

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER
UNIVERSITY HELD MONDAY, JULY 14, 1969, FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Strand, K.T. Chairman

Baird, D.A.
Barlow, J.S.
Burststein, K.R.
Campbell, M.J.
Caple, K.P.
Cole, R.E.
D'Aoust, B.R.
Drache, Mrs.S.
Freiman, Mrs.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.
Stratton, S.
Sullivan, D.H.
Turnbull, A.L.
Wassermann, Mrs.S.

Evans, H.M. Secretary
Meakin, D. Recording Secretary
Wright, Mrs.L.

ABSENT: Brown, R.C.
Carlson, R.L.
Claridge, R.W.
Collins, M.
Hamilton, W.M.
Hean, A.F.C.
McLean, C.H.
Perry, G.N.
Stone, A.L.
Tuck, D.G.
Walkley, J.

B.L.Funt and A.R.MacKinnon were represented respectively by J.S.Barlow and S.Stratton.

N.Lincoln, Head of the Department of Modern Languages, was in attendance for part of the meeting dealing with Calendar changes in the Department of Modern Languages.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by L.Srivastava, seconded by D.Sullivan,

"that Senate approve the Agenda."

MOTION CARRIED

2. SELECTED UNFINISHED BUSINESS FROM THE MEETING OF JULY 7, 1969A. Senate Committee on Graduate Studies - Reorganization of Graduate Studies - Paper S.245 and S.245a - For action

Moved by L.Srivastava, seconded by D.Baird,

"that Senate adopt Paper S.245 as policy."

L.Srivastava indicated that opportunity had been provided for major discussion of these papers, particularly following discussion of the Harper Report at a meeting of the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies held in October. M.Lebowitz enquired as to whether or not the final report now coming before Senate had indeed gone back to Faculties, and L.Srivastava indicated that discussion had been made available at two levels, mainly through the Deans of Faculties and the representatives on the Committee of Graduate Studies through the Heads of each department or the departments delegates, but that final referral back to Faculties had not been made.

Senator Lebowitz made reference to a paper which he had distributed at the commencement of the meeting to all members of Senate, with the paper attached to these Minutes as Appendix A. L.Srivastava indicated that it had not been considered desirable that graduate students sit on Departmental Graduate Studies Committees as they could then be in a position where they had to review the work of other students at that level and that this was not considered desirable. M.Lebowitz and others disagreed with this point of view in that graduate students could contribute substantively to discussions at that level but, nevertheless, be restricted from consideration of the work of individual graduate students.

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

"that Senate postpone discussion until such time as discussion of the paper has been held in the Faculty of Arts."

Discussion was then undertaken on the propriety of postponement with individuals speaking for and against the motion.

Vote on the motion to postpone was undertaken.

MOTION TO POSTPONE FAILED

5 in favour

12 opposed

2 abstained

K.Burstein enquired as to why there was difference between the total numbers of senators in attendance at the meeting, and the total number of votes arrived at through addition of those in favour, those opposed and those who had abstained. The Chairman indicated that it was not necessary that an individual indicate by show of hands any one of the three votes called by the Chair, but that in order to overcome this difficulty in future in general he would require only those voting in favour and those voting in opposition.

Further discussion followed with individuals supporting and opposing the motion, and with technical questions being raised by M.Campbell as to whether or not the Dean of Graduate Studies could indeed be elected by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies. The Chairman indicated that such an election would constitute a recommendation to Senate and, if approved by Senate, would then constitute a recommendation to the Board of Governors.

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

"that adoption of Item 3b of Paper EGS-1 be postponed until qualifications for the Dean of Graduate Studies be forwarded to Senate by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies."

MOTION TO POSTPONE FAILED
7 in favour
13 opposed

K.Burstein requested that his vote in favour of the motion be recorded.

Further debate ensued on the question of participation of graduate students with a number of individuals speaking in favour of graduate students on the committee and a number of individuals opposed.

Moved by A.Lachlan, seconded by M.Campbell,

"that Paper S.245, Item 1d, be amended to read 'At least two-thirds of the members of the Departmental Graduate Studies Committee must be persons who have demonstrated high scholastic ability with experience in supervising graduate work and must not be candidates for higher degrees'."

Considerable debate followed.

J.F.Hutchinson gave notice of motion to the effect that members of the committee who were themselves candidates for degrees should not participate in the decisions judging others directly who are candidates for degrees.

Further discussion followed. K.Burstein expressed the view that the amendment violated the intention of the motion and requested that the Chair rule the motion out of order. K.Strand ruled that the motion was in order and challenge of the ruling was made by K.Burstein, seconded by K.Rieckhoff. Vote was undertaken on the challenge, with 14 supporting the ruling of the Chair, 4 opposed to the ruling, and the ruling of the Chair was upheld.

Grad Studies

Following further discussion, vote on the amendment by A.Lachlan, J. Hutchinson was then undertaken.

AMENDMENT FAILED
9 in favour
12 opposed

M. Campbell again referred to item 3b, with particular reference to "election" of a Dean by the Committee and following discussion, the Academic Vice-President accepted change in Item 3b, line 1 with the word "elected" to be replaced by the word "recommended". *He referred also to Section 3a and noted that if a Dean was not appointed there would be no Chairman for the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies and noted also that he would like a ruling from the Chair on whether or not Senate had the power to appoint the Dean of Graduate Studies. The Chairman then pointed out that the Dean of Graduate Studies shall be nominated by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies and recommended through the Academic Vice-President, in turn to the President, to the Board.* Amendment to Item 1 was made by K.Burstein, seconded by S.Stratton,

"that Item 1e be added as follows 'Departments may at their discretion and in a manner to be designated by them allow graduate students to participate in the decisions of the Departmental Graduate Studies Committee, with the proviso that such graduate students may not participate in deliberations with respect to individual graduate students.'

The Chairman ruled the motion out of order on argument that it contravened the intent of the original document. The ruling of the Chair was challenged by D.Korbin, seconded by M.Lebowitz, and vote was undertaken with 12 in favour of the Chair, 6 opposed to the ruling of the Chair, and the ruling of the Chair was upheld.

Debate continued and M.Lebowitz enquired as to whether Item 1d would require that faculty members working on degrees would have to stop supervising graduate students, to which the Acting Academic Vice-President responded "No".

Discussion continued and amendment was made to Page 3, Item 1, by M.Lebowitz, seconded by L.Srivastava,

"that the word 'oversee' be replaced by the word 'execute'."

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by J.Hutchinson, seconded by K.Rieckhoff,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS QUESTION PASSED
12 in favour
4 opposed

Vote was then undertaken on Paper S.245 as amended

MOTION CARRIED
13 in favour
8 opposed

*Grad Studies
Lee - Ganges*

(Paper S.245 as amended is attached).

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

"that the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies bring forward to Senate recommendations on the desirable qualifications for a Dean of Graduate Studies."

MOTION CARRIED

B. Department of Modern Languages - Calendar Changes - Paper S.247

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

"that Paper S.247 be adopted."

D.Sullivan requested that N.Lincoln be seated with him in order to provide information as needed by Senate, and the request was granted. D.Sullivan then outlined the history of the paper and stressed that there had been much revision to ensure that the paper agreed with the views of the Faculty. He indicated that the submission involved no commitment for Faculty and resources beyond those presently held.

Attention was drawn to Page 2, Paragraph 2, second sentence, and it was agreed that the sentence would be reworded to read "Students who received their secondary education in a French, German, Russian or Spanish-speaking country will not normally be admitted to a language course in their native tongue between 100 and 300 inclusive".

Discussion on the paper continued and it was noted that registrations in French were up, but that registrations in Spanish, German and Russian were down, and it was hoped that a change could be made in this trend. N.Lincoln indicated that in a number of courses three semester hours credit had been given for as much as 8 hours of work but that in some courses it was now proposed that four semester hours credit be given for 4 or 5 hours of work. A number of questions were raised on minor technical features and it was indicated these would be clarified in the final form of the paper.

Vote was then undertaken on the motion, with minor changes noted.

MOTION CARRIED

C. Graduate Courses in Chemistry - Paper S.249

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

"that Senate approve Paper S.249 covering graduate courses in Chemistry."

MOTION CARRIED

D. Unassigned Credit - Paper S.250, J.Sayre

J.Sayre indicated that the paper was an attempt to clarify the meaning of "Unassigned Credit" as used in the Ellis Report. He indicated further that he wished to withdraw Item 4 on Page 2, and renumber Item 5 as 4, and Item 6 as 5, with reference in Item 6 then being to points 2 and 3.

Moved by J.Sayre, seconded by D.Sullivan,

"that Senate adopt Paper S.250 as modified."

It was suggested that Section 2 be altered so that courses will be accepted as general elective credits in the three Faculties, and M.Campbell proposed amendment to delete the last two lines in Section 1, all of Section 2 and the other parts of the paper where reference is made to Section 2, but these changes were not adopted.

Vote on the main motion was undertaken.

MOTION CARRIED

E. Academic Planning - Paper S.215, S.215a, S.215b, S.215c

Moved by K.Rieckhoff, seconded by S.Wassermann,

"that Senate adopt Paper S.215 in principle."

D.Sullivan enquired as to how the paper could be adopted in principle as apart from practice and made reference to the Paper S.215b which had been submitted from the Faculty of Arts as a preliminary paper. He indicated that the Faculty of Arts was of the opinion that more data was needed and review required.

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

"that Senate adjourn."

MOTION FAILED

4 in favour

8 opposed

K.Rieckhoff indicated that when the paper was first presented to Senate it had been argued that it should be placed before the Faculties, and that if the Faculty of Arts had not had sufficient discussion on the paper this was deplorable. He was of the opinion that departments or Faculty want final say on interdisciplinary problems and that this would not resolve the problems, but that Senate could attempt to do this by hearing proposals and agreeing to institution of programs.

M.Lebowitz requested that discussion on the paper be ruled out of order as the original conditions that comments be received from the Faculties had not been met, and noted the preliminary report of the Faculty of Arts.* The

* Verbatim comments appear in Appendix A, which is attached to these Minutes.

Chairman ruled the discussion in order, as views of the Faculties had been received. The ruling of the Chair was challenged by M. Lebowitz, seconded by D. Korbin; vote was undertaken and the ruling of the Chair was upheld with 8 supporting the Chair and 3 opposed.

D. Sullivan stated that the paper was before the Faculty of Arts Planning Committee and when that committee had completed its deliberations, the paper would go to the Faculty of Arts for consideration.

K. Strand indicated that he would leave the Chair in order that he could speak to his paper, and L. Srivastava, Acting Academic Vice-President, undertook the Chair.

K. Strand stated that the paper had been presented to Senate in March so that ideas could be heard and drew attention to the covering memorandum which indicated that debate and analysis had been requested, but that Senate had referred the paper to Faculties without significant debate and that, regrettably, he had not commented on the paper at that meeting. He drew attention to three main principles to which reference was made in the paper, namely that in the matter of growth there need be distinction between on-going programs and new programs, that a system of priority academic planning was envisaged rather than implemental growth on all levels, and that there is a need for a channel to Senate for ideas of an interdisciplinary nature.

Discussion continued and M. Campbell supported the paper but enquired as to the nature of conflicts. K. Strand indicated that if the principle of priority planning was adopted, approval of a program would not constitute its implementation nor necessarily its priority at that time. Support for the paper was expressed by J. Sayre who hoped that a mechanism for priorities would be established at a "University" level or if not at that level, then at the Faculty level, but not at the Departmental level. He also believed that there should be opportunity for representation as broadly as possible across the University. K. Burstein indicated that for a number of months he had emphasized the necessity for a procedure for having items of a University-wide nature reviewed and moved forward, but that at present there were no adequate procedures. He suggested that the fact that Senate had certain powers should not necessarily mean that Senate would use the power, but that consultation and reason were important, with clear indication needed of the role of individual members of Faculty, Departments, Faculty and Senate, with known channels for communication and inter-movement of items. He requested that the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures give consideration to this matter.

S. Drache suggested that the University needed to be set as a top priority and that she considered it desirable that the matter be extensively discussed in Committee of the Whole.

K. Strand indicated that if the paper were approved in principle, the three major principles to which he had made reference would be those which were being adopted.

Vote on the motion was undertaken.

MOTION CARRIED

F. Faculty of Science - Program Priorities, Paper S.229; Computing Science - Paper S.229a; Biochemistry - Paper S.229b

J.Barlow reviewed relevant features of the papers and pointed out that they gave an outline of what is involved in program priorities in principle.

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

"that Paper S.229, 229a, 229b, be received by Senate as informational papers, subject to discussion which may be helpful to the Faculty of Science and to be sent to the Faculty."

K.Rieckhoff indicated that as the papers had been submitted to Senate some time ago, there should be no further delay and that there had been opportunity for feedback earlier. The Chairman indicated that he believed the Faculty of Science should be commended for its promptness in submitting the papers and noted the need for a planning cycle. He emphasized that the order in which programs may be approved by Senate would have no bearing in terms of their placement on academic priority listing for implementation purposes. One member argued that there was no procedure for dealing with a paper passed in principle. K.Rieckhoff submitted that if there were passage in principle, this would indicate that Senate accepted the program as academically sound, but that the decision as to when or how the program might be introduced need not necessarily be known and that the development of such procedures could follow later. There was evidence of some support and some opposition to this point of view.

Summarizing the debate, the Chairman said that approval in principle would be a viable action for Senate to take. Unfortunately, such action had been abused historically within the University as it often had been equated with authorization for implementation. The opponents to this view state that approval in principle indicates acceptance that a program is academically sound but that this is not an indication of authority for implementation nor of the priority level at which such program might be placed.

Debate continued and suggestion was made that the paper go to the University's new Academic Planner but the Chairman stated this was not in order.

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

"that Senate postpone discussion on Paper S.229 until such time as the procedures related to Paper S.215 are developed and approved and that this item then receive early attention."

A discussion followed with indication by one member that it would not be appropriate to keep the Faculty of Science in a vacuum not knowing where it stood, and another member recommending that the paper be accepted in principle as the first new program to be implemented when the procedure for so doing was set up.

Moved by J.Barlow, seconded by D.Sullivan,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION CARRIED

S.M.14/7/69
Acad Planning
Withdrawing some
Rules & Proc.

Vote was then undertaken on the motion to postpone.

MOTION TO POSTPONE CARRIED.

G. Gradings for Withdrawing Students - Paper S.230, S.230a, K.Burstein

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

"that Paper S.230a be approved."

The Chairman indicated there had been some discussion by the Senate Agenda Committee about the lack of support papers but that it had been decided to include the item. K.Burstein stated that it had been his intention to close a loophole whereby students who felt they were going to fail a course could withdraw from that course without their performance being indicated. D.Korbin indicated that the motion should be tabled but support was not obtained for this view. A member supported the motion as it would have the effect of relaxing rules on Withdrawal as students could withdraw very shortly before examinations, but the procedure would be fair as the student's performance to date of withdrawal would be indicated. J.Hutchinson indicated strong opposition to the motion and recommended substitute wording to the effect that students should not be permitted to withdraw from a course after the first six weeks except on medical grounds.

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

"that the paper be referred back to Senator Burstein for further documentation."

M.Campbell, who requested his comments be noted in the Minutes, stated that Senate had no knowledge of how adoption of the paper would affect students and that it should be presented in a more refined form with further information on its anticipated effects. *M. Campbell stated that in his opinion Senate would be grossly irresponsible if it passed Paper S. 230a (Gradings for withdrawing students) because Senate has no knowledge of how adoption of the paper would affect the students.*

MOTION TO REFER FAILED
7 in favour
10 opposed

Moved by J.Barlow, seconded by D.Sullivan,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Vote was then undertaken on the main motion.

MAIN MOTION FAILED

H. Starting Time of Senate Meetings - Paper S:230, S.230b, K.Burstein

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

"that Senate approve Paper S.230b."

Kenneth

Moved by K.Rieckhoff, seconded by M.Campbell,

"that this matter be referred to the Rules Committee for consideration and recommendation."

Amendment to the motion to refer was made by D.Sullivan, seconded by L.Freiman,

"that there be added at the end of the motion the following words 'and that they report back at the next meeting'."

AMENDMENT FAILED

Vote was then undertaken on the motion to refer.

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

Moved by K.Rieckhoff, seconded by M.Campbell,

"that Senate now adjourn."

MOTION TO ADJOURN FAILED

Vote was then undertaken on the main motion,

"that Senate approve Paper S.230b."

MAIN MOTION FAILED

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 a.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary

Read Planning

VERBATIM COMMENTS AS TRANSCRIBED FROM THE
TAPE RECORDING OF THE SENATE MEETING OF JULY 14, 1969

COMMENTS RELATED TO LAST PARAGRAPH, PAGE 6 OF THE MINUTES OF JULY 14, 1969

Lebowitz: I would like to ask the Chair to rule discussion on this motion out of order on the grounds that the original conditions that Senate established April 8 that comments should be received from the faculties have not been fulfilled and in the absence of a rescinding motion discussion is out of order.

Strand: The language as I see it here is for the three Faculties for comments and comments were received from these three Faculties.

Lebowitz: If that will be the way in which the Chair interprets it then I believe that the Chair will be establishing a precedent by which faculty committees can, that the view of faculty committees can be substituted at any time for the view of faculties when faculty views are requested and if the Chair wishes to make that ruling that is fine and I think that should be indicated in the Senate minutes because I believe that will introduce an interesting legal precedent.

Strand: I will respond. I don't know that the interpretation in perpetuity need be placed upon the comments on the word for comment and I would rule it out of order. I wouldn't place that interpretation on the language. Senator Lebowitz - I assume that you wish to challenge.

Lebowitz: I wish to challenge your ruling. (Seconded by Korbin)

Sullivan: I would ask that the previous speaker's remarks be struck from the minutes as being inaccurate and begging an assumption of fact which was not established and I would like to speak on this.

Strand: Why don't you just speak to the point without being struck.

Sullivan: All right, I would like to comment very pointed then. Professor Lebowitz unfortunately doesn't always read or listen very carefully. I said that this was a preliminary report because if he will read what has been said in the submission from the Faculty of Arts, this matter is before the Faculty of Arts planning committee. All matters in the Faculty of Arts that either, under his terms or anyone else's, wind up being discussed and voted on by referendum or wherever in general go to the relevant committees first. When the academic planning committee of the Faculty of Arts finishes its deliberations on this paper, though it may not be by the time limits that this Senate appreciates, than it will go to the faculty in general. Until that time this is a preliminary report and I wish Professor Lebowitz would read more carefully before he makes erroneous assumptions.