

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
HELD MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1969, FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT: Strand, K. T. Chairman

Eaird, D. A.  
Brown, R. C.  
Burstein, K.R.  
Campbell, M. J.  
Caple, K. P.  
Carlson, R. L.  
Claridge, R. W.  
Cole, R. E.  
Freiman, Mrs. L.  
Funt, B. L.  
Hamilton, W. M.  
Hean, A.F.C.  
Hutchinson, J. F.  
Kenward, J. K.  
Kirchner, G.  
Korbin, D.  
Lachlan, A. H.  
Lebowitz, M. A.  
MacKinnon, A. R.  
McDougall, A. H.  
Rogow, R.  
Sayre, J.  
Srivastava, L. M.  
Stratton, S.  
Sullivan, D. H.  
Tuck, D. G.  
Turnbull, A. L.  
Vidaver, W.  
Walkley, J.  
Wassermann, Mrs. S.

Evans, H. M. Secretary  
Kelsey, I. B.  
Meakin, D.  
Barboza, Miss J. Recording Secretary  
Norsworthy, Mrs. R. Recording Secretary

ABSENT: Collins, M.  
Drache, Mrs. S.  
McLean, C. H.  
Perry, G. N.

PSA

Mr. Caple, the Chancellor, said that it was his privilege before the Senate meeting started to welcome Dr. Strand on his first day as President of the University. The Chancellor added that he wished Dr. Strand well and stated that Dr. Strand had a warm group of supporters.

1. SEATING OF SENATORS

Senate moved that Dr. R. Rogow and Dr. G. Kirchner be seated on Senate after being informed by the Chairman that R. Rogow had been elected to Senate by Joint Faculty to replace temporarily L. M. Srivastava while he is serving as Acting Academic Vice-President, and that G. Kirchner had been elected by the Faculty of Education to replace temporarily B. R. D'Aoust from September 1, 1969 to August 31, 1970.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Senator Carlson asked that Item 3(i) dealing with Paper S.258 be ruled out of order on the basis that Senate had already taken action on a previous motion dealing with the offering of PSA 474. The Chairman ruled this request out of order because notice of motion had been submitted to the Secretary of Senate well in advance of the Senate meeting, and therefore this matter could be considered.

M. Campbell requested that two items be added to the agenda and be dealt with in the Closed Session under Business Arising from the Minutes. The Chairman ruled that the items referred to could be taken up later.

Moved by Mrs. L. Freiman, seconded by L. Srivastava,

"that the Agenda as recommended by the Senate Agenda Committee be approved."

MOTION CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OPEN SESSION OF AUGUST 4, 1969

L. Srivastava noted that lines 2 and 3 of Item 3 appearing on Page 3 should read "he and the Deans" rather than "he and the Acting President."

M. Campbell asked if the Board had received Senate Paper S.251, dealing with qualifications for a Dean of Graduate Studies. It was pointed out that the paper had been received by the Board and approved.

M. Lebowitz noted that the minutes of August 4, with regard to receipt of Paper S.215 from the Faculty of Arts, did not reflect exactly what had transpired. It was agreed that he would submit to the Secretary a revised statement for inclusion in the minutes. M. Lebowitz also noted that in Appendix A, Political Science, Sociology, and Anthropology should be shown as one department rather than three as implied in the circulated listing.

*PSA  
Curric Com*

A McDougall stated that on Page 9, Paragraph 2 should read that R. Carlson moved that PSA 474 be referred back to the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee and that as there was no seconder the motion failed.

A. McDougall stated also that on Page 9, Paragraph 3 it should read that Dean Sullivan would bring to Senate "within the next two meetings" a paper on criteria for documentation on curriculum changes.

As there were no further amendments the minutes were approved as amended.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Paper S.258 -- PSA 474

R. Carlson asked that this Item be ruled out of order on the basis that the Senate cannot rescind an action already taken as a result of a motion made at the previous meeting to take that action. In this case Senate had voted to refer the matter back to the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee, an action which Senate now cannot undo.

D. Sullivan stated that he had come to the meeting prepared to give a report on the action recommended by the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee on PSA 474.

The Chairman stated that Senate could undo what it had voted to do at the previous meeting if it so wished. He ruled that Senate could undo the referral back to the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee, and that a motion to rescind would not be out of order.

On a motion by D. Sullivan, seconded by K. Burstein the ruling of the Chair was challenged with a vote of 12 in favour and 13 opposed to sustaining the Chair.

D. Sullivan then reported on the deliberations of the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee which both R. Carlson and Professor Hickerson, who was to teach PSA 474, attended. The Curriculum Committee recommended that PSA 474 be offered in the 69-3 semester.

It was moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by J. Walkley, "that the report from the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee be received," but after reference to the Rules it was pointed out that the Senate had received the report by hearing it. This was accepted by the Chairman and he so ruled.

Moved by A. McDougall, seconded by D. Sullivan,

"that Senate accept PSA 474 as a new course as outlined in Senate Paper S.253, Page III."

*PSA  
Archaeology*

R. Carlson stated that he would serve notice of motion with regard to restricting enrolment in the course to include only students who have taken Archaeology 272, if Senate passed the motion on the floor. He added that at an earlier Senate meeting Senate had voted to separate Archaeology Studies from PSA and he could not see the logic or justice of giving back part of Archaeology to PSA by approving a PSA course which overlaps with a course in Archaeology.

Considerable discussion followed on the difference between R. Carlson's statement on course overlap and the recommendation by the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee that the course should be accepted. Reference was made to A. McDougall's rebuttal of R. Carlson's claim of course overlap as presented on Paper S.258.

Moved by Mrs. L Freiman, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that the previous question be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS QUESTION  
CARRIED

21 in favour  
8 opposed

Question was called on the main motion that Senate accept PSA 474 as a new course, and a vote was taken.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

21 in favour  
5 opposed

It was moved by R. Carlson, seconded by R. Brown, "that only students who have taken and passed Archaeology 272 be permitted to register for PSA 474." The Chairman ruled the motion out of order on the basis that a notice of motion presented from the floor, as this one was, could not be considered at the meeting in which notice of motion is given. The ruling of the Chair was challenged and a vote taken to sustain the ruling. The ruling was sustained, with 16 in favour and 8 opposed.

Moved by A. McDougall, seconded by J. Sayre,

"that Senate suspend its rule, in the case of PSA 474, arising out of a motion passed at the September, 1967 Senate Meeting (Page 8 of minutes of that meeting) to the effect that no new course may be scheduled for a given semester unless it has been approved by Senate at least one month before the beginning of that semester."

*PSA*

Debate followed on whether or not this motion would be considered after the motion is passed that "Senate instruct the Registrar to schedule and accept the registrations in PSA 474 for the 69-3 semester." It was ruled by the Chairman that suspension of the rule would be considered first.

The Registrar indicated that no students had been formally registered in PSA 474 for this semester and the course did not appear in the time table but that the Department had carried out a preregistration on the understanding that registration could take place only after the Senate meeting on September 8, 1969, if Senate passed PSA 474 at that meeting. He stated also that students registering for this course were asked to indicate alternative courses in registration in case PSA 474 was not to be offered.

Question was called on the motion to suspend the rules in the case of PSA 474 and a vote was taken.

MOTION CARRIED

14 in favour  
12 opposed

Moved by A. McDougall, seconded by D. Korbin,

"that Senate instruct the Registrar to schedule and accept the registrations in PSA 474 for the 69-3 semester."

Debate centered on whether or not the course was needed immediately for graduation, how many students required it, and if there was someone qualified to teach it.

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by G. Kirchner,

"that the previous question be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS QUESTION  
CARRIED

20 in favour  
6 opposed

Question was called on the main motion to schedule and accept PSA 474 for the 69-3 semester and a vote taken.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

19 in favour  
9 opposed

*Handwritten notes:*  
L.H.  
D.H. 10/10/69

It was moved by M. Lebowitz, seconded by A. McDougall, "that Senate apologize to the students and staff of PSA for any inconvenience resulting from previous action taken at the Senate meeting of August 4, 1969," but the Chairman ruled the motion out of order.

5. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

The Chairman had no report to make other than to draw Senate's attention to the address he had made earlier in the day (attached as Appendix A). Many of the points made in the address will be brought before Senate in the future.

6. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Paper S.259 - Senate Committee on Graduate Studies

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by R. Cole,

"that Senate agree that for a student to receive a graduate degree from the University he must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or higher over all courses taken for the degree."

Considerable discussion followed on whether or not courses had to be taken at Simon Fraser University, if the intent was to mean all courses taken or all courses required, and how cumulative grade point average was determined.

Amendment was moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by Mrs. L. Freiman,

"that the word 'required' be substituted for the word 'taken.'"

A further amendment was moved by K. Burstein that the words "at SFU" be added after the word "degree." The Chairman ruled that this amendment to the amendment was out of order.

Moved by M. Lebowitz, seconded by J. Hutchinson,

"that this Item be referred back to the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies asking the Committee to report back on merits of the original proposal and the amendment."

Several requests were made to have the entire paper sent back to the Committee rather than just Item 1.

Amendment to the motion for referral was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by J. Walkley,

"that the motion of referral be amended to read 'that the entire document, Paper S.259, be referred back to the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies for reconsideration.'"

S.M. 8/9/69

AMENDMENT TO REFER CARRIED

21 in favour  
3 opposed

Question was then called on the amended motion to refer and a vote taken.

AMENDED MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

None opposed

It was then moved by J. Sayre that this Paper be returned to Senate by the November meeting of Senate.

7. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

No reports.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

A) Notices of Motion

i) Paper S.255, Revised - Ellis Report, Retroactivity

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

"that Basic Assumption No. 1 of Paper S.255 be accepted, that no motions are necessary concerning retroactive application of admissions criteria since students who have been denied admission in the past can re-apply."

MOTION CARRIED

None opposed

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

"that Basic Assumption No. 2 of Paper S.255 be accepted, that by January 1970 the Academic Board or the Academic Vice-President should have ready a list of courses offered by junior and regional colleges in British Columbia together with general elective credit, unassigned credit in a subject area or SFU equivalent credit that will be allowed for these courses. The amount (and nature) of general elective credit which each faculty will credit towards its degree will be included in this list."

S.M. 8/9/69

*Ellis Report  
Implementation  
Appendix*

Questions were raised with regard to the lists which are being compiled, and to be compiled, with enquiry as to how they are compiled, by whom and where they are at present.

On the request of K. Burstein a paper prepared by C. Crawford of the Department of Psychology was distributed by the Secretariat involving a complaint on the procedures used by the Implementation Committee (paper attached as Appendix A to Paper S.257a). Lengthy discussion with argument followed. L. Srivastava, Chairman of the Implementation Committee, D. Meakin and H. Evans responded and explained that lists of courses have been compiled through the Implementation Committee covering the majority of courses currently offered in B.C. regional colleges, that discussions or communications have been held with the heads or delegated persons within the various university departments, that the lists reflect courses for which course equivalent credit has been indicated, that they reflect cases of subject area but non-equivalent course credits and that they show areas where only general elective transfer credit could be considered. It was noted that decision on the utilization of courses in the general elective transfer credit area for credit towards degrees within any given faculty still required decision by the individual faculties, that the lists had not yet been distributed to faculties for these indications, and that this information would be expected before the lists are printed. It was pointed out that some courses still required review and decision, particularly where new calendars or other changes were being made within a college.

The Chairman indicated that it was his understanding that if the lists were not prepared by January 1970, the process suggested in the motion would not go into effect and M. Campbell accepted this interpretation.

H. Evans pointed out that it would not be possible to generate lists for all institutions of the province by January 1970 and that it was understood that Paper S.255 and its basic assumptions pertain at this time only to the regional colleges of the province, and M. Campbell concurred that this was the intent.

With this understanding, Basic Assumption No. 3 was briefly discussed and accepted without opposition.

Discussion continued on Basic Assumption No. 4 and questions arose with regard to retroactivity and appeals. K. Burstein stated that Item 4 was out of order because it had nothing to do with retroactivity and that it dealt with appeals only. M. Campbell offered to reword Item 4 to read: "Students who are admitted under the provisions of the Ellis Report requesting transfer credit will not be allowed to apply for credit following these procedures but will have to direct any or all appeals to the Senate Appeals Committee." The Secretary



*Appeals.  
Implementation  
Ellis Report*

noted that the procedure suggested could require major activity on the part of the Appeals Committee and the students but that by appropriate wording of statements, as the Implementation Committee implements sections of the Ellis Report, much of this difficulty could be overcome, provided the mover agreed, and M. Campbell concurred with this approach.

Discussion continued and after hearing additional arguments for deleting Item 4, with the concurrence of the mover Item 4 was deleted.

Discussion then centered on Item 5 of Paper S.255 Revised.

Amendment was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by R. Cole,

"that the last sentence of Item 5, Paper S.255 Revised, be deleted."

Question was called on the amendment to delete the last sentence of Item 5 and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

15 in favour  
4 opposed

Moved by M. Campbell, seconded by L. Srivastava,

"that Senate adopt Basic Assumptions as stated in Items 1, 2, 3 and 5 as amended of Paper S.255, Revised."

After further discussion, it was

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

"that Paper S.255, Revised be referred back to M. Campbell's committee for further thought and consideration."

Amendment to the referred motion was made by M. Lebowitz, seconded by J. Sayre, "that the motion be amended by adding 'and that K. Burstein be requested to write out his comments on Paper S.255, Revised, and revisions proposed,'" but it was doubted if Senate could rightfully demand a Senator to do this, and the amendment was dropped.

Discussion followed on the advisability of referral with emphasis placed on the careful and detailed working out in the implementation of retroactivity by the Registrar's office and the Implementation Committee.

*Ellis Report  
S. 257*

Question was called on the motion to refer and a vote was taken.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

15 in favour  
4 opposed

ii) Papers S.257, S.257a - Implementation of Ellis Report

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by R. Brown,

"that the requirements of Sections 2.3 and 3.4 of the Ellis Report be changed from an average of 2.0 (60%) to an average of 2.4 (65%)."

It was explained by L. Srivastava that the Report contained in Paper S.257 had been prepared on August 4 showing what had been done to that time with regard to implementing the Ellis Report, and that little had been added since. He added that only about four or five courses had not been accepted by the departments to date and that one major point needed to be cleared by Senate. This point referred to the motion submitted and if passed would clear up the discrepancy between admission requirements for those seeking transfer credit from institutions outside the province, particularly from the United States.

K. Burstein voiced concern over some of the procedures followed by the Implementation Committee in that his department's objections to course equivalents had been ignored by the Committee and he referred to complaints about this matter submitted in the paper by Dr. Crawford. L. Srivastava reported that departments do have the privilege of helping to determine course equivalents and that if there is any department which does not accept the courses listed for its department these matters will be brought before Senate to resolve. L. Srivastava added also that course equivalent lists will not be published until they have been sent to all departments and to Senate.

M. Lebowitz stated that he was concerned about the program for mature students and said that he hoped it will be made known how mature students have done at Simon Fraser before much is done about changing admission procedures for them.

L. Srivastava stated that the Implementation Committee would provide information on this point when the Committee gets it.

*Ellis Report  
Lamp  
Whitaker*

Question was raised by K. Burstein pertaining to general elective credit and the recording of credit on transcripts. The Registrar noted that under the terms of the Ellis Report all transfer credit was to be designated under three headings which involve Simon Fraser course equivalents, unassigned credit in a subject area and unassigned credit with later change to the utilization of the term "general elective credit" to replace "unassigned credit," and that one of the basic principles was that where a course is accepted as being a university level course, that the student on transfer would receive the same amount of credit as he would have received for such course taken at the institution. It was further noted that there had been considerable debate as to the nature of how general elective credit would operate, with discussion on a number of occasions at Senate and also by the Implementation Committee.

In keeping with the Report, permits to register did carry notations as to the type of transfer credit applicable to any course, but the missing area at the present time in terms of general elective credit is the value of the particular course towards a degree in either Arts or Education or Science as this is still to be determined and reported upon by the individual faculties.

K. Burstein asked that J. Sayre's motion with regard to unassigned credit and general elective credit be read and stated that there was obviously some discrepancy between that motion and what was being done in the Registrar's Office.

The Chairman asked K. Burstein to write out his allegations and send them to him and he will look into the allegations himself.

Question was called on the motion to change Sections 2.3 and 3.4 of the Ellis Report and a vote was taken.

MOTION CARRIED

24 in favour  
1 opposed

iii) Paper S.260 - Procedures and Responsibilities to Senate of Senate Committees.

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

"that Paper S.260 be dealt with in the Closed Session."

*Proceedings  
Board of the  
Univ. Calendar*

It was felt that this item should be handled in Closed Session if any personal names were to be brought out in discussion. M. Lebowitz said that no names need be brought out and that the Paper could readily be dealt with in Open Session.

Question was called on the motion and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

10 in favour  
6 opposed

Senators L. Freiman and M. Lebowitz asked that their negative votes be recorded.

iv) Paper S.261 - Recommendation to the Board of Governors

M. Lebowitz reported that he had intended to make a motion, but had decided to withdraw the motion at this time because he did not have the documents he had hoped to have to support the motion.

As there was no objection the motion was withdrawn.

v) Paper S.262 - Production Schedule - Graduate and Undergraduate Calendars 1970-71

It was indicated that Item 1 would be considered ad seriatim.

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

"that Motion (1) of Paper S.262 be adopted to the effect that November 3, 1969 be the last date for submission by Departments to the Registrar of all copy materials for both the Undergraduate and the Graduate Calendars for 1970-71."

Discussion centered on several points. It was pointed out that 60 days is insufficient time for departments and faculties to make the necessary changes, that decisions relating to calendar changes are basically educational and philosophical rather than technical, and that improvements in production will have to be worked out by the Registrar's Office to accommodate the needs of departments and faculties.

The Secretary explained that under present conditions a tight schedule had to be kept to publish a calendar which would be out in ample time for use in B.C. secondary schools. Otherwise the result would be similar to this past year where the Calendar was published at such a late date it was useless for counselors and students in the secondary schools.

Amendment was moved by Mrs. L. Freiman, seconded by D. Tuck,

"that the last date for submission by Departments to the Registrar of all copy of materials for both the Undergraduate and the Graduate Calendars for 1970-71 be extended one month from November 3, 1969 to December 3, 1969."

MOTION CARRIED

On Motion (2) of Paper S.262 which reads,

"that December 8, 1969 be established as the date for the Special Meeting of Senate to approve calendar items for 1970-71,"

it was moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by A. MacKinnon,

"that this item be referred back to the Registrar's Office for further consideration."

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

It was questioned why Senate needed a Special Meeting to approve calendar items at that time. It was suggested that Senate meet further on in the process when the material is closer to final form. It was recommended also that consideration be given to forming a Calendar Committee to handle calendar publications.

On Motion (3) of Paper S.262 which reads,

"That other than in the most exceptional circumstances, for which Senate would suspend its normal rules, the offering of courses in a given semester would be restricted to those courses already approved by Senate appearing within the calendar for the semester concerned,"

it was moved by M. Lebowitz, seconded by D. Sullivan,

"that this item be referred back to the Registrar's Office for further consideration."

The view was expressed that a small bulletin could be printed each semester listing courses offered that semester. It was pointed out that the University needs to move rapidly towards indicating to prospective students exactly what courses will be offered several semesters in advance.

Question on referral was called and a vote taken.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

14 in favour

4 opposed

B) Other Items

M. Lebowitz gave notice of motion that he would move in Closed Session that proceedings from Paper S.260 be published in the minutes of the Open Session.

C) Date of Next Meeting

The Chairman announced that the next Senate meeting would be on Monday, October 6, 1969 at 7:30 p.m.

D) Confidential Matters

Open Session adjourned at 1:05 a.m. to move into Closed Session.

H. M. Evans  
Secretary