

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
HELD MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1969, FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT:

Strand, K. T. Chairman

Baird, D. A.  
Burststein, K. R.  
Campbell, M. J.  
Caple, K. P.  
Carlson, R. L.  
Claridge, R. W.  
Funt, B. L.  
Hamilton, W. M.  
Hean, A.F.C.  
Hutchinson, J. F.  
Kenward, J. K.  
Kirchner, G.  
Korbin, D.  
Lachlan, A. H.  
MacKinnon, A. R.  
Munro, J. M.  
Rogow, R.  
Sayre, J.  
Srivastava, L. M.  
Stratton, S. T.  
Sullivan, D. H.  
Tuck, D. G.  
Turnbull, A. L.  
Vidaver, W. E.  
Walkley, J.  
Wassermann, Mrs. S.  
Webster, J. M.

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

ABSENT:

Cole, R. E.  
Collins, M.  
Drache, Mrs. S.  
Freiman, Mrs. L.  
Lebowitz, M. A.  
McDougall, A. H.  
McLean, C. H.  
Perry, G. N.

Norman Wickstrom, President of the Student Society, was in attendance from 7:30 p.m. until 7:45 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

"that Paper S.260 - Procedures and Responsibilities to Senate of Senate Committees - be placed on the agenda."

The Chairman stated that the Senate Agenda Committee had deferred consideration of the item because the person who had originated the paper was not going to be present at the Senate meeting of December 1, 1969.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED.

8 in favor  
9 opposed

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by W. Vidaver,

"that the agenda be approved."

MOTION CARRIED.

At this point Norman Wickstrom, President of the Student Society, was called upon to speak to the membership. He gave an outline of the activities of the Society, expressed concern on two recent negative actions of Senate pertaining to abeyance on academic probation and suspension, and on the seating of the Student Society President on Senate, and suggested possible revision of the Universities Act to allow the seating on Senate of the President of the Student Society.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OPEN SESSION OF NOVEMBER 10, 1969

L. Srivastava, referring to paragraph 6 on page 12 of the minutes, stated that the body that handles applications for credit should read "Admissions Board" and not "Academic Board." K. Burstein argued that as the terms of reference approved by Senate in the Ellis Report did not provide for assessment of this kind of credit by the Admissions Board the recording of the minutes was accurate.

The Chairman declared the minutes approved as distributed subject to change when the transcript is checked. The transcript on this particular point was checked and a revision was made to clarify the situation on transferability of courses. The revision now reads,

"L. Srivastava enquired as to what body would now be concerned with transferability of courses and what body had performed this task before the Ellis Report. H. Evans indicated that there were two aspects. Prior to the Ellis Report it had been the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings and, more recently, the Acting Academic Vice-President's Implementation Committee. Temporarily it would be the Vice-President's Implementation Committee, and on a long term basis the Academic Board, which would advise on university level transferable courses. The Academic Vice-President stated that some time in the future the Admissions Board or some other agency would have to carry out the work of identifying transfer credit."

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Chairman stated that his paper outlining the use of a Point of Personal Privilege as outlined in Robert's Rules of Order had been circulated to Senators as promised.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

The Chairman noted that a Financial Report on the University (Paper S.292) had been distributed to Senators for information. The Chairman also had circulated to Senators a paper on statistical data in connection with undergraduate registrations and courses which developed as a by-product of the resolutions passed by Senate as a result of the strike within the PSA Department. This paper has been attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

Paper S.302 - Departmental Review

L. Srivastava introduced this paper and stated that inasmuch as the procedures for departmental reviews had not been specified in the original document of the same title, Paper S.224, criteria had been devised by the Deans of the Faculties and three separate proposals were presented for Senate consideration. The Chairman noted that the Board of Governors would have to be the final authority on the criteria submitted to Senate and accepted by it, whether these criteria were standardized or diversified from Faculty to Faculty.

Considerable discussion evolved in connection with Section IV, paragraph 2 of Paper S.224, which reads:

"At the appropriate time the President shall request Senate to establish an ad hoc Senate committee, referred to hereafter

S.M. 1/12/69

as a Review Committee, under the chairmanship of the Dean of the Faculty involved. This committee shall consist of the Dean, the Academic Vice-President, and two members of the Faculty concerned, nominated by the Faculty and approved by Senate. The latter two members of Faculty should not be from the Department under review."

It was noted that on a motion by K. Burstein, seconded by S. Drache, during the meeting of Senate of August 4, 1969, "that no action be taken with respect to Section IV, paragraph 2 of Paper S.224 until Senate had had an opportunity to discuss the procedures to be followed by the Review Committee referred to in this Section."

Now moved by K. Burstein, seconded by D. Sullivan,

"that paragraph 2, Section IV of Paper S.224, and paragraphs 3 and 4 (i.e. all items), dealing with the Departmental Review Committee be rescinded."

D. Tuck objected to this action as the paper had been passed by Senate in virtually its entirety and no new evidence has been revealed since the original submission. He felt that the departments should be free to select their own chairmen. D. Sullivan warned Senate that the Departments in the Faculty of Arts were prepared to resist review as proposed in S.224, and he felt that the whole question of review should be reopened for clearer details and acceptable criteria.

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

"that the question now be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS  
QUESTION CARRIED.

Question was called on the motion to rescind paragraph 2, Section IV of Paper S.224 and related items, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO RESCIND  
FAILED

3 in favor

Debate continued on the required criteria and structure of Review Committees, and it was finally agreed that consideration should be based on either standardization or diversity of proposals as a point of principle.

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by G. Kirchner,

"that Senate accept in principle diversity of proposals with regard to the papers submitted by the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Science on approaches to review of Departments."

Debate followed, the question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

13 in favor  
10 opposed

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

"that Senate consider separately each of the Faculty proposals on the matter of Departmental Review, as outlined in Paper S.302, on a 'Yes-No' basis."

It was pointed out that a suspension of Robert's Rules of Order was involved here, and therefore a 2/3 majority vote would be required.

Question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

16 in favor  
5 opposed

In an interpretation of the last sentence of paragraph 2, Section IV, of Paper S.224, which deals with the composition of Departmental Review Committees, the Chairman ruled that "should not" in this case means that it is recommended that the two faculty members on the Review Committee not be from the Department under review, but that they could be. His ruling was challenged by A. Turnbull, seconded by K. Burstein. A vote was taken and the ruling was not sustained, with 6 in favor of the ruling and 18 opposed. The effect of the vote meant that the two faculty members on a Departmental Review Committee shall not be members of the Department under review.

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

"that the Faculty of Arts paper as contained in Paper S.302 dealing with a review of Departments within the Faculty of Arts be accepted."

S.M. 1/12/69

Considerable debate followed on the review procedures to be followed within the Faculty of Arts with W. Hamilton and D. Sullivan taking differing views on who should be influencing and deciding policy in these matters of review, who was competent to judge the soundness of various departments and faculty and how this judgment was to be made, with D. Sullivan arguing that the words "well-regarded" were unclear.

Question was called on the Faculty of Arts submission and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

4 in favor  
16 opposed

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

"that the Acting Academic Vice-President, without further consultation with the Deans, bring forward to Senate a paper on Departmental Review Committees, consolidated on the basis of the papers before it, and the debate tonight."

It was agreed that the paper could show some diversity, but that there were also common points. Question was called on the motion to refer this matter to the Acting Academic Vice-President, and a vote was taken.

MOTION TO REFER  
CARRIED

12 in favor  
10 opposed

Paper S.303 - Calendar Preparation

L. Srivastava introduced this paper and pointed out that at this time the rationale for calendar preparation does not pertain to the Graduate Calendar. The preparation of the calendar can be delegated to the Registrar's Office, but will involve constant participation by the various departments. The following change was added by L. Srivastava to page 2, following item 2 (ii, b) before the last paragraph of Item 2:

"It is recognized that as a result of approval of new courses the entries for a particular semester's offering may vary from one Course Guide to the next. For instance, entries for 70-3 published in the Summer 1970 Course Guide may show additions to but not deletions from the entries published in the Spring 1970 Course Guide."

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by W. Vidaver,

"that Senate accept the method for calendar preparation as outlined in Paper S.303 and agree that courses approved by Senate shall not be offered for at least two complete semesters following such approval by Senate."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Paper S.304 - Pre-Registration

L. Srivastava outlined a number of administrative and operational problems that would be involved in instituting a system of pre-registration, stated that there would be a minimum lag period of approximately eight months before a computerized system could be incorporated, and stated that a system would not be introduced until these problems could be adequately overcome.

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by S. Wassermann,

"that Senate agree with the principle of pre-registration."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"that courses approved by Senate shall not be offered for at least two complete semesters following such approval by Senate. Note:- Since this policy is a major departure from existing policies, courses and programs approved between now and the May 1970 meeting of Senate will not be subject to the restriction in item 2 above provided at least one semester has elapsed between the time of approval by Senate and the actual offerings of the courses and/or programs."

L. Srivastava said that it is hoped that the computerized system of pre-registration can be implemented by

S.M. 1/12/69

summer of 1970 but noted that this might not be possible. He added a clause to page 4, item IX, "1970, or failing that Fall 1970." J. Sayre read a motion passed by the Student Society to the effect that the Society endorses the principle of computerized pre-registration.

Question was called on the motion to change the present policy on when courses and programs may be offered, and a vote was taken.

MOTION CARRIED

It was pointed out that at least three to four weeks are required for printing of a Course Guide, but that material approved prior to January 31 would be published in the guide for Summer 1970. S. Stratton, supported by A. Lachlan, requested that it be recorded in the minutes that pre-registration does not apply to graduate students.

Following a good deal of discussion on the problems facing departments in attempting to meet the January 31 deadline for producing data for the publication of the Course Guide, it was moved by A. Lachlan, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that there be no attempt to pre-register any students for the Summer Semester 1970."

Considerable discussion followed. K. Burstein asked a series of questions of the Registrar who indicated that there was considerable doubt that a system of pre-registration could be introduced for the Summer 70-2, and emphasized the necessity of completing current data processing program development. He noted that a number of policy items likely would require Senate attention. L. Srivastava made it clear that pre-registration would not take place until problems were overcome, albeit after Fall 70-3, although efforts would be made for Summer 70-2.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

6 in favor  
16 opposed

Paper S.305 - Ellis Implementation Committee Report

i) College Transfer List - Paper S.305a

This list was circulated for the information of Senators, and no objections were raised. It was noted that data on General Elective Credit had been awaited for some time from the Faculty of Arts and was still lacking.

ii) Proposed Constitutions and Procedures for Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and Senate Appeals Board -

Proposal for the Establishment of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and the Senate Appeals Board - Paper S.305b, Report of Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings - Paper S.293 (Paper S.305 as explanation).

L. Srivastava stated that these papers had been drawn up in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Ellis Report with the exception of the recommendation contained in Section 2.3 of that Report.

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by S. Stratton,

"that Section 2.3, found on page 20 of the Ellis Report, be deleted."

The Chairman explained that policy is to be established only by Senate and the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and that administration of policy as so defined is the responsibility of the Registrar. In individual cases policy will be made on the individual basis by the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and all decisions will be final. The Senate Appeals Board, for an individual, decides if the policy has been correctly interpreted by the Registrar's Office. The Appeals Board is not a policy making body, and therefore does not determine whether a policy is right, but only if the policy was applied.

Question was called for deletion of Section 2.3 of the Ellis Report, and a vote was taken.

MOTION TO DELETE CARRIED

13 in favor  
5 opposed

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

"that Senate approve the section of Paper S.305b pertaining to the establishment of a Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board, considering only the procedures and operation, deferring membership at the moment."

J. Sayre objected to examining the proposal in parts and said that he would like to deal with the matter as a whole. D. Sullivan argued in favor of division.

Question on examining the proposal in divisions was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

9 in favor  
5 opposed

S.M. 1/12/69

D. Korbin suggested that general discussion and comments on the total paper were in order, but the Chairman ruled that by voting to examine the proposal in sections this was precluded. J. Sayre seconded the challenge of D. Korbin on the ruling of the Chair, and a vote was taken. The ruling of the Chair was upheld with 11 in favor of the ruling and 3 opposed.

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

"that the sentence 'Decisions by the SUAB shall be final' be deleted from the first paragraph on p. 2 of Paper S.305b."

On a privileged motion it was moved by L. Funt, seconded by D. Sullivan,

"that Senate adjourn and reconvene in a week's time."

After assurance by the Registrar that there were no items on the closed agenda of high priority, the question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO ADJOURN CARRIED

13 in favor  
4 opposed

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 a.m.

H. M. Evans  
Secretary