

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER
UNIVERSITY HELD MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1970,
FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT: Strand, K. T. Chairman

Burstein, K. R.
Carlson, R. L.
Cole, R. E.
Funt, B. L.
Hamilton, W. M.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Kenward, J. K.
Kirchner, G.
Korbin, D. G.
Lachlan, A. H.
Lebowitz, M. A.
Rogow, R.
Sayre, J.
Srivastava, L. M.
Stratton, S. T.
Sullivan, D. H.
Turnbull, A. L.
Vidaver, W. E.
Walkley, J.
Wassermann, Mrs. S.
Webster, J. M.

Evans, H. M. Secretary
Barboza, Miss J. Recording Secretary
Kooman, Miss S. Recording Secretary

ABSENT: Baird, D. A.
Brown, R. C.
Campbell, M. J.
Caple, K. P.
Claridge, R. W.
Collins, M.
Drache, Mrs. S.
Freiman, Mrs. L.
Hean, A. F. C. *Al MacKinnon*
McDougall, A. H.
McLean, C. R.
Perry, G. N.

The meeting was called to continue with the Agenda for the Open Session of Senate following the meeting of January 12, 1970, at which Items 1, 2 and 3 of the Open Agenda had been completed.

Sub
S.M. 26/1/70
SubB

1. UNFINISHED BUSINESS FROM AGENDA OF DECEMBER 1, 1969, CONTINUING THROUGH DECEMBER 8, 1969, JANUARY 12, 1970, AND JANUARY 26, 1970

- a) Proposed Constitutions and Procedures for Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and Senate Appeals Board (including 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; Report of the Acting Academic Vice-President - Paper S.308)

The Secretary was requested to indicate the actions which had been taken up to the present time in the present situation. He drew attention to Paper S.305b (Sayre), to Paper S.293 (Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings) and to Paper S.308 (Acting Academic Vice-President). At earlier meetings there had been discussion on division of the paper into four parts with general consensus that this be done. Senate had voted upon the two major parts of Paper S.305b, with changes, pertaining to (i) The procedures and operation of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and (ii) The membership of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board. He noted that major change had been made in the membership as originally set forth in Paper S.305b with substitution of the membership as suggested in Paper S.293 but drew attention to Page 16 of the Minutes of December 8 noting that the final question on which vote had been taken related only to the numbers and types of members but not to the other items of S.293 on membership. Paper S.308 suggested a change and there still remained the matter of the Senate Appeals Board.

Discussion was undertaken on the membership of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board.

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

"that the constitution of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board as outlined in Paper S.308 be adopted by Senate, and replace that previously approved on December 8."

Considerable discussion followed and vote was undertaken.

MOTION CARRIED
12 in favour
5 opposed

The Acting Academic Vice-President indicated that procedures and operation and membership pertaining to the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board had now been approved but that the "Purpose" on Paper S.305b had not been approved.

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

"that Page 1 of Paper S.305b outlining the purpose of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board be approved."

SAB
S.M. 26/1/70
Pub B
Grad Studies

It was suggested that in Line 4, Paragraph 1, under "Purpose" the word 'elaborate' be deleted and as there was no objection this was accepted.

Vote was then undertaken on the motion covering "Purpose."

MOTION CARRIED

Attention was then turned to the section of Paper S.305b pertaining to the Senate Appeals Board, and following some discussion it was agreed that the body would proceed ad seriatim with review.

K.Burstein argued that by decisions made earlier there was no need for the Senate Appeals Board and that such body would be in conflict with earlier decisions of Senate and that discussion should be ruled out of order, but the argument was not accepted by the Chair.

It was then moved by A.Turnbull, seconded by B.Funt, that Page 3 of Paper S.305b pertaining to 'Purpose' of the Senate Appeals Board be approved - but K.Burstein indicated he wished to challenge the ruling of the Chair on his argument. The Chairman reviewed for Senate the nature of the argument which claimed that discussion of the Senate Appeals Board was irrelevant because of earlier decisions of Senate and amendments made in the earlier portions of Paper S.305b. He called for a vote on the challenge. Vote was undertaken with 9 in favour of the Chair and 7 opposed.

Discussion followed and difficulties arose.

Moved by B.Funt, seconded by D.Sullivan,

"that Paper S.305b be tabled until a report is received from the Registrar outlining the mechanisms and sub-mechanisms which are contained in Paper S.305b."

MOTION CARRIED
12 in favour
5 opposed

b) Reports of Committees

i) Senate Committee on Graduate Studies - Reorganization of Graduate Studies - Paper S.294

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

"that Item 1d of Paper S.245, earlier approved by Senate be rescinded."

MOTION CARRIED

L.Srivastava spoke to Paper S.294 and the motion which had been made as outlined in that paper by Hamilton/Koepke to which he

Grad Studies

wished to make changes before presenting the formal motion to Senate. Specifically the first paragraph of the motion would be changed to read "Members of Departmental Graduate Studies Committees must be members of Faculty who have demonstrated high scholastic ability with experience in supervising graduate work and must not be candidates for higher degrees...."

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

"that with the changes noted the motion of Paper S.294 be approved and be inserted to replace the former Item 1d of Paper S.245."

Discussion was undertaken and it was agreed that when consideration was being given the four prime items outlined in Paper S.294, the Departmental Graduate Studies Committee would consist only of qualified faculty members as defined in the preliminary statement and that this meant that others would not be present, and could neither vote nor participate in discussions on such items.

Debate continued.

Moved by J.Hutchinson, seconded by J.Walkley,

"that this Paper S.294 be referred back to the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies for rewording."

MOTION FAILED

Amendment was then proposed by M.Lebowitz through substitute motion as follows:

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

"that the original motion of Paper S.294 be approved by Senate and substituted for the former Item 1d of Paper S.245."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"that in the last paragraph the words 'as defined in the preliminary statement' be deleted and replaced with the words 'who have demonstrated high scholastic ability with experience in supervising graduate work and must not be candidates for higher degrees.'"

AMENDMENT CARRIED

NOTE

The motion as finally passed, to replace the former Item 1d of Paper S.245 reads as follows:

"At least 50% of the members of Departmental Graduate Studies Committees must be persons who have demonstrated high scholastic ability with experience in supervising graduate work and must not be candidates for higher degrees.

The Departmental Graduate Studies Committee is charged specifically with:

- i) Admission of graduate students.
- ii) Appointment of supervisory committees.
- iii) Evaluation of the progress of individual graduate students.
- iv) Provision of information on the above matters to appropriate persons in accordance with general administrative procedures developed by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies.

The composition of the Departmental Graduate Studies Committee on the above matters will consist only of faculty members who have demonstrated high scholastic ability with experience in supervising graduate work and must not be candidates for higher degrees. On other matters the committee may include graduate students and other faculty members up to a maximum of 50% of the committee."

J.Walkley requested that copies of the paper as finally passed be sent out to all members and it was agreed that this be done.

- ii) Senate Committee on Graduate Studies - Requirements to Continue in Graduate Studies - Papers S.295, S.295a

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

"that Paper S.295 be approved."

Considerable debate was undertaken. S.Stratton wished to know the implementation date and how far back the effect would go. J.Walkley was not satisfied that a demand of 3.0 on outside courses was appropriate. L.Srivastava pointed out that it was somewhat more stringent to fulfill qualifications to remain in graduate studies than to fulfill the requirements for the degree but that there was a parallelism with the undergraduate requirements.

Amendment was moved by A.Lachlan, seconded by K.Burstein,

"that in Item 2(i) all words following the first two sentences, beginning with 'This information ---' be deleted."

A.Lachlan felt that the process was too complicated and wished

Grad Studies
Sept 1970

simplification. L.Srivastava opposed and indicated that the purpose was to ensure that there was knowledge as to what students were doing and that the appropriate responsibilities to students were carried out. A number of individuals spoke for and against the amendment.

Vote on the amendment was undertaken.

AMENDMENT FAILED
5 in favour
10 opposed

S.Stratton again indicated his concern with the implementation date and L.Srivastava, the Acting Academic Vice-President, indicated that the matter of the date for implementation would be referred back to the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies for report for the next meeting of Senate.

Vote on the main motion was undertaken (non-inclusive of a date of implementation).

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Senate Committee on Graduate Studies - Extension of Calendar Dates - Paper S.296

This paper was withdrawn.

2. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN - DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW - PAPER S.309

L.Srivastava suggested that there be informal discussion following which the paper would be withdrawn if there were major disagreements, but otherwise would be left for a Yes/No vote, but D.Sullivan objected.

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

"that Paper S.309, related to Departmental Review, be adopted."

D.Sullivan indicated that he had raised objections before, that he was pleased to see a number of improvements, but that there were certain specific aspects about which he was concerned. It was hoped that there would be an administrative review only. He noted that under Senate ruling, members of the Review Committee could not be from the department under review, but that the Dean was required to include evidence of competence of two faculty members in the subject area of the department under review and that this could present difficulties in certain fields. He stated that the Chairman of departments in Arts were not opposed to an academic review but were opposed to a review tied to the choice of a Chairman and were also concerned with the kind of review. He drew attention to the nature of review proposed for graduate studies. He considered that the proposals would represent in large measure a ritual only and would not do a good job and that the item should be rejected until the job could be done well.

W.Hamilton drew attention to the comments of D.Sullivan, indicated that a number of decisions had been made earlier by Senate and that the debate should

be short in view of those decisions. K. Burstein disagreed that a number of decisions had been made earlier, submitted that the procedures which were being followed resulted from decisions made at a much earlier time under different circumstances and that administrative officers should carry out a number of these functions.

K. Strand summarized the situation for Senate expressing the view that Paper S.224, which had been earlier approved, attempts to achieve two goals with one mechanism and that this presents difficulties. However, Senate should either accept the current proposal through Paper S.309 or re-look at the total matter.

D. Sullivan thought it would be better to re-examine the whole matter as some of the conditions under which Paper S.224 had been generated and approved were no longer germane. He did not believe that review needed to be tied to the chairmanship selection. M. Lebowitz outlined a number of alternatives available to Senate. B. Funt thought that S.309 was workable and could be of assistance in conjunction with S.224 although S.224 was not entirely satisfactory.

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

"that Item IV, Page 3 of Paper S.309 be deleted."

K. Burstein spoke and requested that his comments be recorded in the Minutes. He requested that the D'Aoust motion, made in conjunction with paper S.224, be read and this was done by the Chairman.

"Moved by B. D'Aoust, seconded by K. Burstein, that

- 'because
- 1) goodwill for a policy or a department is not easily come by but can easily be lost, and
 - 2) the greater probability of objectivity and competence should help to avoid the nurturing of bad will,

moved, in principle,

that where a department's academic soundness is seriously questioned, and whenever feasible, that outside authorities within the department's general field of competence be called in to assess its soundness.'

MOTION CARRIED"

K. Burstein stated that, in view of the D'Aoust motion, if the current motions were passed and the Review Committee finds reason to doubt the functioning of a department that at that point the normal procedure will be to call in an outside committee. He enquired of the Chairman if this was correct and K. Strand responded in the affirmative.

Dept Review
From Cde
S.M. 26/1/70
Appeals
elections

Discussion was undertaken on the meaning and intent of Item IV of Page 3. J. Hutchinson wished to know whether or not Item IV provided an avenue for external review of a department if it was ascertained that this was required or whether or not it presented a block to such review. L. Srivastava expressed the opinion that if the Review Committee considered external review required, that it should draw this to the attention of Senate.

J. Sayre indicated that he wished to withdraw his motion, but the seconder was opposed.

Moved by J. Kenward, seconded by B. Funt,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS
QUESTION CARRIED
11 in favour
2 opposed

Vote was then undertaken on the Sayre/Burstein amendment.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Moved by J. Kenward, seconded by B. Funt,

"that the previous question on the main motion now be put."

MOTION CARRIED
13 in favour
3 opposed

Vote was then undertaken on the main motion to adopt Paper S.309.

MOTION CARRIED
11 in favour
6 opposed

3. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

- a) Senate Nominating Committee - Election to Senate Committee - Paper S.310

It was noted that in the election to be conducted by Senate for an alternate member (to replace A. L. Turnbull) on the Senate Committee on Appeals the name of J. M. Webster had been submitted by the Senate Nominating Committee and as no other nomination had been received, J. M. Webster was declared elected by acclamation.

A. L. Turnbull replaces J. L. Walkley as a regular member with J. M. Webster as an alternate.

*Grad Studies
Ma Ed*

Curriculum

b) Senate Committee on Graduate Studies

i) Graduate Programs in Psychology - Paper S.311

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

"that Paper S.311 - Revised Psychology Program M.A. and Ph.D. - be approved."

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Master of Arts (Education) Program B - Paper S.312

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

"that Senate adopt Paper S.312 - Master of Arts (Education) Program B."

R. Rogow enquired as to whether Paper S.314 should be discussed before S.312 receives consideration, and L. Srivastava noted that Paper S. 314 was being presented to Senate for information. R. Rogow indicated that he thought the paper normally would have come forward for discussion.

K. Burstein enquired as to the intent of the ten hours of transfer credit as outlined on Page 2 of the submission and considerable discussion followed. In substance it was agreed that there was no intention to grant credit for courses already used for credit towards a degree but rather to provide for the recognition of appropriate credit for advanced work in courses which may not have been used for degree but possibly for raising certification.

R. Rogow indicated that he wished assurance that resources were available, and noted that whereas there were some 12 students now working at the graduate level it was anticipated that 75 might be added and wished to know whether or not this would have impact on the undergraduate operations and offerings. He was also concerned about operating expenses and wished to know whether or not there could be problems generated at the undergraduate level because of some shift in emphasis. He noted further that there would be staffing through the visiting professors and assumed this to be for summer. He wished to know whether or not there would be a diversion, in terms of the funds noted, from other areas or offerings or whether new monies would be required.

S. Stratton directed enquiry to the Chairman concerning the matter of budget versus the matter of principle of acceptance of the academic programme. K. Strand indicated that if the paper were passed it would indicate acceptance as an academic programme but that its offering would be subject to financial review before implementation could be undertaken.

S. Stratton indicated that it was not intended to overload faculty or unnecessarily to divert funds but that if funded it was proposed that the programme be advanced with all possible speed.

K. Burstein enquired as to whether or not consideration at this time would be placing the programme ahead of certain other programmes which had come forward for consideration but which had been held in abeyance pending certain developments in academic planning. K. Strand expressed concern as it was a new programme and that if it proceeded then questions of equity would have to be considered.

D. Sullivan was of the opinion that the matter should be treated in the same way as the earlier programmes in Science, pertaining to Computing Science and Biochemistry, had been considered.

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

"that this matter be tabled until action has been undertaken by Senate on the question of implementation of new programmes, i.e. until such time as the mechanisms for dealing with such new submissions have been defined, and that the matter be placed in the 'hopper' with other such new submissions."

D. Sullivan indicated that there likely would be four new programmes coming before Senate at very early stages and that the matter of the Science programmes was still in abeyance. S. Stratton indicated that he wished further discussion in view of the desires of the Faculty of Education. K. Strand referred to the earlier debate on Science when it had been decided by Senate that debate would not be undertaken as approval in principle frequently had tended to be accepted as approval for implementation. S. Wassermann protested deferment of the programme as there had been intensive work and lengthy discussions and noted that the programme would be self-sustaining. B. Funt emphasized that the Faculty of Science had placed top priority on Computing Science, that the submissions had been well documented, that there was intensive student demand, that the material had been submitted approximately a year ago and that it would not be equitable to deal with a much later submission.

S. Stratton enquired as to whether tabling would necessitate the submission of the programme through the procedures outlined in Paper S.314 for consideration by Senate. K. Strand indicated that he could not give assurance that it would not go back to the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies for reconsideration.

K. Strand noted that the motion which had been made to table was in effect a motion to postpone. Vote on the motion to postpone was undertaken.

S.M. 26/1/70

Kinesiology
Curric Changes
Course Changes
Undergrad Ad. Bd.
Academic Board
MOTION TO TABLE

CARRIED *Academic Planning*
12 in favour
4 opposed

iii) Master's Program in Kinesiology - Paper S.313

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by B. Funt,

"that Paper S.313, to change the degree title to Master of Science (Kinesiology) from Master of Science (Education), be approved."

MOTION CARRIED

iv) Procedures for Introduction of New Graduate Programs and Reassessment of Existing Graduate Programs - Paper S.314 (For Information)

It was noted that this paper had been provided for information.

c) Senate Committee on the Interdisciplinary Program in Kinesiology

i) Curriculum Change - Kinesiology 043-3 - Paper S.315

Moved by B. Funt, seconded by G. Kirchner,

"that Senate approve Paper S.315 authorizing a new course Kinesiology 043-3."

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Course Requirement Change - Paper S.316

Moved by B. Funt, seconded by J. Webster,

"that Paper S.316, dealing with a minor change in a course in Biology, be approved."

MOTION CARRIED

d) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings

i) Early Processing of Admissions - Paper S.317

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

"that Senate approve Paper S.317 related to the early processing of admissions."

D. Sullivan reported as a member of the Academic Board, noted that letters will be coming from the Board to the University shortly, and described some of the overall problems in the development of Regional Colleges and other matters. He was concerned about the matter of admissions to the University and its resources, and wished to know what steps were being contemplated to provide priority for British Columbia students. L. Srivastava indicated that the Academic Planner and the Registrar were working in these areas. H. Evans indicated that the proposals of the paper would not restrict further appropriate developments but that action on these proposals at this time was necessary in order that the first appropriate steps could be undertaken.

MOTION CARRIED

K. Strand indicated that he would hold discussions with D. Sullivan and J. Hutchinson who were the representatives of Simon Fraser University on the Academic Board to identify appropriate procedures whereby information could be brought before Senate.

ii) Date for Dropping Courses - Paper S.318

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

"that Paper S.318, changing the date for dropping courses, be approved."

Considerable debate followed. M. Lebowitz questioned the philosophy, noted that at the earlier date proposed mid-term results were not known, disagreed with a number of the comments and felt that the arguments were not well made.

J. Hutchinson believed that an earlier date could be appropriate, particularly at the Upper Division level where seminar approaches were being used. Question was raised by J. Kenward as to whether or not there had been discussion with students and members of faculty and it was identified that there had not been such discussion.

L. Srivastava enquired as to how the date had been established and D. Sullivan gave background information.

Moved by A. Lachlan, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that Paper S.318 be referred to the Faculties and Student Council for comments."

MOTION TO REFER
FAILED
8 in favour
8 opposed

*Undergrad Passes
General Changes
S.M. 26/1/70*

Further debate was undertaken.

Moved by A. Lachlan, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that the motion to refer be reconsidered."

MOTION TO RECONSIDER
FAILED
7 in favour
8 opposed

The Secretary was asked to give information and it was noted that under the present schedule of refunds, individuals who withdrew after the seventh week were not entitled to a refund of fee, that the schedule of refunds down to the seventh week was on a graded basis dependent upon time, and that individuals who withdrew in the eighth and ninth week did so without academic penalty but without fee refund. A change of dates therefore would necessitate some adjustment in the refund schedule and there could be a costing factor to the University.

Debate continued with individuals speaking for and against the motion.

Vote on the motion was undertaken.

MOTION FAILED

4. REPORTS OF FACULTIES - SCIENCE - RETROACTIVITY OF RENUMBERING OF TWO COURSES IN MATHEMATICS - PAPER S.319

Moved by B. Funt, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that Paper S.319, retroactivity of renumbering two courses in Mathematics, be approved."

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary