

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1971, EAST CONCOURSE CAFETERIA, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT:

Strand, K. T.

Chairman

Aronoff, S.
Baird, D. A.
Basham, G. D.
Birch, D. R.
Bradley, R. D.
Brown, R. C.
Campbell, M. J.
Carlson, R. L.
Donetz, G.
Drache, Mrs. S.
Freiman, Mrs. L.
Gilbert, K. L.
Harper, R.J.C.
Jennings, R. E.
Lachlan, A. H.
Mallinson, T. J.
Mugridge, I.
Nair, K. K.
Rieckhoff, K. E.
Sullivan, D. H.
Turnbull, A. L.
Wagner, P. L.
Wheatley, J.
Williams, W. E.
Wilson, B. G.

Evans, H. M.
Norsworthy, R.

Secretary
Recording Secretary

ABSENT:

Caple, K. P.
Claridge, R. W.
Hamilton, W. M.
Hodge, F. D.
McDougall, A. H.
O'Connell, M. S.
Reid, W. D.
Salter, J. H.
Srivastava, L. M.
Sutherland, G. A.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Chase, J.
Meakin, D.

1. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE RELATING TO THE REORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION, THE ROLE OF FINE ARTS COURSES WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY, AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE PLACEMENT OF KINESIOLOGY, PAPER S. 71-120.

The Chairman outlined the manner in which he proposed to approach discussion of the paper and motions pertaining thereto. He indicated that there would be informal discussion for a period of one hour with the constraint that no one individual would be allowed to speak twice if anyone who had not spoken once wished to speak. He indicated further that the motions would be grouped in the following manner:

1. Motions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
2. Motions 7, 8
3. Motions 9, 10, 11, 12
4. Motions 15, 16, 17, 18
5. Motion 6
6. Motion 14
7. Motion 22
8. Motions 23, 24
9. Motion 27
10. Motion 28

He stated further that if anyone wished division with groupings that this could be considered, also if it appeared desirable there could be informal discussion on the group for periods which he would define as necessary.

Dr. Wilson, as Chairman of the Academic Planning Committee, was asked to speak to the paper. He indicated that over a period of some five months the Committee had held consultations, received briefs, had interviews and interactions with other persons and groups. He suggested that Senators note the various recommendations and the groupings suggested, but that they should also keep in mind the whole paper although Senate would not be concerned directly with some of the recommendations. He reminded the assembly that it had been necessary to consider proposals knowing that a number of members of faculty had already been appointed and that there was not total freedom as though one were beginning without constraints. He identified that a number of the groups within the Faculty of Education had had difficulty in resolving some of the problems in view of the Senate charges to them made some nineteen months ago. He expressed the opinion that the proposals in the paper presented an integrated approach.

K. Rieckhoff complimented the Academic Planning Committee on its presentation although he had disagreement on some points. His two primary concerns were (a) that de facto the paper dismantles the Faculty of Education, leaving a group only of such size that it might well be considered a department. He recognized that there were some political problems in terms of retention as a Faculty, but in particular did not feel that it should have the same number of representatives on various bodies as had the other Faculties - referring particularly to Senate, Senate Committees, and others. He wished to receive assurance

that there would be controls to prevent reversion back to something like the former system if and when there was growth of the Faculty. (b) He was concerned about the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies and felt that this represented a turn-around from the concept of the Division of General Studies which had been earlier approved. In the earlier concepts no persons would hold permanent appointments within the Division, there would be no departments but Program Committees, and there would be no departmental structure. The current proposal now established departments and program committees and he wished to know the overall intent.

B. Wilson responded noting that the Faculty of Education has a large number of individuals as Associates and that from this standpoint it was a large group. In addition, in terms of student registrations there was a large group that could be compared with the Faculty of Science registrations. He indicated that all necessary efforts would be made to try to ensure appropriate equity in representation on bodies as suggested by K. Rieckhoff. He felt that it would be necessary for some group to carefully go through the composition of various Committees and groups to establish the desirable representations and composition. He did not agree that there had been a complete turn-around in the proposal for the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, but that there would indeed be some departments as well as the Program Committees.

D. Sullivan wished further clarification as to the body which would study representation and composition of Committees. K. Strand indicated that he could give interim reactions only as the matter had not been studied intensively, but that an ad hoc Committee of Senate might consider the Senate Committees, that insofar as Senate itself is concerned Faculties jointly might be involved in view of the way representatives get on to Senate, that he could review the Academic Planning Committee, and that the University Tenure Committee could come under appropriate procedures.

R. Jennings felt that there could be considerable difficulties in representation for the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies by the nature of its structure and that care would have to be undertaken to ensure there is not double representation. He was not satisfied that it should indeed be a Faculty and said that the departments placed there were there on the assumption they could not be placed elsewhere. He presented extended explanation of his viewpoint.

K. Strand noted that half of the time for informal discussion had now expired and all the discussion was on the first five motions. The assembly might wish to consider some of the other aspects in the remaining time.

R. Carlson referred to Kinesiology, to Fine Arts, and to Social Relations, and indicated he had some difficulty in envisaging the

degree which might be awarded. He felt that this problem was important as programs had not been identified and it was difficult to see ahead. B. Wilson felt that this was a point that could be well discussed when programs were developed and considered by Senate, although the matter might be discussed now. R. Carlson felt that if discussion was to include formation of a Faculty then there should also be discussion on the degrees, but that without programs such discussion would be premature.

R. Bradley said that Senator Carlson's comments would assume that a given degree is associated with a given program, but that this would not necessarily be true. He envisaged that the groups concerned would recommend to Senate the degree to be given to a student and that this cannot be identified.

M. Campbell felt that there was avoidance of a number of items of concern, indicated that he disliked the paper and felt that it was poorly thought out. He was of the opinion that many persons now dealing with these matters had not been at the University at the beginning when there was development of the Faculty of Education in its original concept, that it had succeeded, and was recognized as having quite good programs, and that the paper was now dismantling it. In earlier times it was a principle that the University would not compete in areas educationally given elsewhere and that Fine Arts, therefore, would not be a part of the programs but that concentration would be in Arts, in Education, and in Science. Under the reorganization proposed the Faculty of Education would be only a teacher training group and he did not consider this desirable.

R. Brown commented that the reason for the reorganization was because the original models did not work. The fact that certain groups had not been able to integrate well in one area did not indicate they could not perform well in some other area.

A. Lachlan was concerned with the status of the new departments in the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, and wished to know if the comments made by R. Bradley were correct as, if they were, they would give advantage to departments in the new Faculty in terms of the recommendations for degrees, and he did not consider that desirable. He was not certain that it was desirable to create new departments and that no data had been given showing that this was the most suitable approach. He felt that if new departments were to be established then there should be broader consideration of priorities to be applied in such establishment.

D. Sullivan referred back to Senator Carlson's question on degrees and felt that this area had not been well developed. He was not satisfied that if a group were to be moved into the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies it could then opt to grant a Bachelor of Arts degree, an Education degree, or a Science degree. He was of the opinion that if this were done great conflict would be created. He suggested the example of Social Relations developing a program potentially using a large number of courses from the Faculty of Arts and wanting to give a Bachelor of Arts degree but

with differing regulations, and that if this were to develop there could be considerable conflict. He emphasized that it could not be merely accepted that the degree question had been resolved but that considerable work in this area was required. It would be highly undesirable to reach a situation where it would be possible to get a Bachelor of Arts degree through easier requirements in one Faculty than it would be to get a Bachelor of Arts degree in another Faculty. He referred to some current difficulties in the development of Major and Minor requirements and noted similarities to problems which could be envisaged if the degree programs followed some of the suggestions hinted at. He noted that the degree which had been developed for the Division of General Studies was quite different from the degrees in other Faculties and therefore did not present the same nature of difficulties, but that the new ideas could present serious problems.

B. Wilson felt that it would be fruitless to recommend the nature of degrees in Fine Arts and Social Relations until programs have been identified. At that time one could look at the kind of degree to be considered. He did not think that the Faculty of Arts can determine who gets a Bachelor of Arts degree in programs which it does not control. Senate would have responsibility in that matter.

D. Sullivan felt that if departments in the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies wish to develop programs to meet the Faculty of Arts requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree that this would be appropriate, but that they had not been so instructed and meanwhile Social Relations was developing programs.

G. Basham indicated that he had expressed some concern when the Bachelor of General Studies degree was set up and had some feeling that there was a proliferation of administration. The proposal for the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies seemed to augment such administrative proliferation. He suggested that Kinesiology might well be a department in Science, that Computer Science might well be a department in Science, that Fine Arts might well be placed in the Faculty of Arts, and others in the Arts Faculty.

W. Williams felt that it was an administrative decision which was being undertaken, and referred to statements on page 7 as compared with statements on page 6 to identify his concern.

D. Birch stated that the Faculty of Education had started with seven departments, it now had five departments, and if the proposal passed the Faculty of Education would be a single unit and there would be three departments in the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, making four. He did not believe that this showed proliferation of administration. Insofar as the degree question was concerned, he noted that Kinesiology already had a degree, that it would be some time before Fine Arts could consider having a Major program, and that the only unit then remaining was Social Relations which had not yet suggested its program.

K. Strand indicated that the period for informal consideration was now completed and that he would be prepared to accept motions in the method established at the beginning of the meeting.

MOTIONS
1,2,3,4,5

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by R. Brown,

1. "That a Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies be established with the administrative reporting and program routing structure as set out in Charts 1 and 2."
2. "That the present Division of General Studies be dissolved and that its function and administrative responsibilities be assimilated by the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies."
3. "That the position of Dean of the Division of General Studies be abolished and that a new position, Dean of the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, be established."
4. "That departments in the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies have the same status as Departments elsewhere in the University."
5. "That departments in the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies be administered as follows:
 - a) each department shall have a chairman reporting to the Dean of the Faculty;
 - b) the chairman of each department shall be chairman of a curriculum committee charged with making recommendations as to the curriculum of the department;
 - c) membership of each curriculum committee shall normally consist of:
 - the chairman of the department;
 - 2 faculty members elected by and from the department;
 - 3 faculty members, one each from the Faculties of Arts, Science and Education, appointed by the Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies on the recommendation of the Dean of the appropriate faculty; and
 - 3 students appointed by the Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies on the recommendation of the Student Society."

A. Lachlan enquired as to why the Academic Planning Committee had, in Motion 5, laid down a structure that was not there before.

B. Wilson indicated that it was desirable to have input and contact, and the Curriculum Committee was formerly the Steering Committee. He suggested, however, that Motion 4 might be redundant. D. Birch said that the Senate Committee on the Interdisciplinary Program in Kinesiology had in part served as a guideline base, but K. Rieckhoff indicated that it was hardly a good model, and gave background as to how that Committee had come to be.

J. Wheatley expressed the view that Motion 4 was not redundant as it referred to status which would include such things as having a Department Tenure Committee and establish conditions under which it would follow in a number of general regulations of the University, but that Motion 5 refers to the organization as an interdisciplinary group, hopefully with emphasis on the interdisciplinary idea. An amendment was suggested by A. Lachlan for Motion 4, but as there was no seconder it was not included. L. Freiman suggested that Motion 5 might be deleted, but K. Strand identified some of the problems which would arise were this done.

G. Basham indicated he was worried about the rationale for the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, that there was no clear rationale given and no definition of what is meant by having a Faculty. He still felt that rather than establishing a new Faculty the components could be dealt with in existing structure.

K. Strand read to the assembly Sections 63, 64 and 65 from the Universities Act pertaining to Faculties. He noted that to establish a Faculty action was required by Senate and by the Board of Governors.

J. Wheatley expressed his personal point of view as to why it was desirable to have a new Faculty. K. Rieckhoff indicated some sympathy with the ideas expressed but disagreed with a number of the comments. D. Sullivan indicated that he had spoken strongly at the Academic Planning Committee for inclusion of Fine Arts in the Faculty of Arts, but he was prepared to try the proposals as they would come under review at later stages. He again expressed his concern about the problem of degrees and hoped that this matter would be thoroughly looked at.

G. Basham again indicated his disagreement with the establishment of a Faculty and wished to see programs proposed before accepting that the Faculty structure was appropriate.

R. Bradley spoke to G. Basham's questions on the rationale for a new Faculty, referred to Chart 2 and the papers, and said that in effect the new Faculty was an expanded and renamed Division of General Studies now including program committees as well as departments.

R. Carlson suggested that the Division of General Studies might be retained, but R. Brown referred to the constraints that had been placed on the Division of General Studies which included no permanent faculty and that there would not be departments.

R. Jennings indicated disagreement with the principle of a Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies and described his reasons, suggesting it might better be named a Faculty of Extradisciplinary Studies.

An amendment was moved by R. Jennings, seconded by L. Freiman,

"That 'Interdisciplinary' be changed to 'Extradisciplinary' throughout the document, with appropriate editorial changes, and that the first asterisk on the lead page be removed."

Following further comments, moved by L. Freiman, seconded by K. Gilbert,

"That the previous question now be put."

MOTION ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Vote was then undertaken on the amendment.

AMENDMENT FAILED

B. Wilson noted that M. Campbell had previously raised a number of questions and possibly the papers before Senate had not given as much information as they might. He noted that the Joint Board of Teacher Education had endorsed the general principles of reorganization.

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

"That the previous question now be put."

MOTION ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

17 in favor
3 opposed

Vote was then undertaken on Motions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

MOTIONS 1 - 5 CARRIED

15 in favor
10 opposed

MOTIONS
7,8

Moved by I. Mugridge, seconded by R. Brown,

7. "That the Physical Development Centre be reconstituted as the Department of Kinesiology in the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies."

- 8. "That the Senate Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies (Kinesiology) be dissolved upon the establishment of a curriculum committee for the Department of Kinesiology."

K. Rieckhoff indicated that some considerable time ago the Faculty of Science had indicated its willingness to incorporate the Kinesiology program into its Faculty and that this was recorded in Faculty minutes. A. Turnbull indicated that as members of the Academic Planning Committee, he and Dean Funt had held discussions with many persons in the Faculty of Science and that a number of reservations had been expressed in terms of movement to that Faculty.

MOTION CARRIED

16 in favor
6 opposed

MOTIONS
9, 10, 11,
12

Moved by R. Brown, seconded by T. Mallinson,

- 9. "That within the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies there be established an interim Department of Social Relations comprising those faculty members from within the present Faculty of Education who wish to transfer to such a Department."
- 10. "That the faculty members transferred to the Department of Social Relations continue, for the present, to offer those courses which are currently offered by Behavioural Science Foundations and Communications Studies."
- 11. "That the Academic Planning Committee establish an Ad Hoc Steering Committee as an interim curriculum committee for the Department of Social Relations and that this committee be responsible for submitting to the Academic Planning Committee (no later than January 31, 1972), through the Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies, a proposal for a coherent program in Social Relations which would both have a content distinct from that of courses offered elsewhere in the University and be well suited to the qualifications and research interest of faculty members in the department."
- 12. "That within 30 days of receiving such a program proposal the Academic Planning Committee recommend its acceptance or otherwise to Senate."

K. Gilbert noted that in the context of the paper reference was made to the Department of Social Relations, whereas the chart shows Human Relations. B. Wilson indicated that the chart should show

Social Relations and appropriate change will be made.

MOTION CARRIED

20 in favor

MOTIONS
15, 16,
17, 18

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by I. Mugridge,

15. "That, within the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, a Department of Fine and Performing Arts be established."
16. "That the Academic Planning Committee establish an Ad Hoc Steering Committee for the Department of Fine and Performing Arts and that this Committee be responsible, through the Dean of the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, for submitting to the Academic Planning Committee a proposal for a program in Fine and Performing Arts which:
 - a) would include a number of those credit-worthy but non-credit-carrying courses and workshops currently offered by the Centre for Communications and the Arts; and,
 - b) would also include a range of new academic credit courses in the Fine and Performing Arts."
17. "That consideration of minor or major programs in the Fine and Performing Arts be deferred until these credit courses are established and the nature of student demand is fully assessed."
18. "That appointments to the Department of Fine and Performing Arts be made in accordance with the normal university procedures, e.g., procedures for regular appointments at the assistant, associate and full professorial levels, and visiting appointments."

T. Mallinson noted that the Kinesiology Department would not be engaged in non credit courses, but it appeared that the Fine and Performing Arts Department would be involved in both credit and non credit courses, and asked for clarification. Discussion followed.

After it was noted that Motion 16. a) was intended to refer to some of the credit-worthy but currently non-credit courses and workshops becoming credit carrying, amendment was moved by D. Birch, seconded by T. Mallinson,

"To insert at the end of Motion 16.

'That the Ad Hoc Steering Committee consider the desirability of offering

non-credit courses within the Department of Fine and Performing Arts or elsewhere and make a recommendation to the Academic Planning Committee."

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Vote was undertaken on Motions 15, 16 as amended, 17 and 18.

MOTIONS CARRIED

19 in favor
2 opposed

MOTION 6 Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by I. Mugridge,

"That the programs of the Department of Fine and Performing Arts and the Department of Social Relations, if approved, be subject to review by the Academic Planning Committee no later than three years after the inception of each program, and that the Academic Planning Committee at that time make recommendations regarding the continuation or discontinuation of each program with due provision for the welfare of students involved."

MOTION CARRIED

22 in favor
2 opposed

MOTION 14 Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by R. Brown,

"That the units known as 'Educational Foundations Centre,' 'Behavioural Science Foundations,' and 'Communications Studies' be dissolved."

MOTION CARRIED

19 in favor

MOTION 22 Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by R. Brown,

"That the Faculty of Education be newly constituted so as to comprise the faculty members currently in the Professional Development Centre and members currently in Social and Philosophical Foundations, as designated by the Academic Vice-President."

B. Wilson advised the assembly that a number of the persons in the Social and Philosophical Foundations Centre were not happy with this recommendation. K. Rieckhoff referred to page 10 of the paper and to paragraph 2 on page 11, and expressed the feeling that one group was being moved with the remaining group then being left to develop foundations and he was not satisfied with the reasoning. D. Birch said that the recommendations which had come forward were not because of personality differences or clashes, but differences in view of the nature of the Faculty of Education, with the view presented following that of not wanting a large group of departments but with the Faculty of Education able to draw on the University as a whole. D. Sullivan felt that there was relationships between Motions 22 and 27.

MOTION CARRIED

20 in favor
3 opposed

Request was made to now consider Motion 27 rather than Motions 23 and 24 as proposed at the beginning of the meeting. As there was no objection the Chairman acceded to the request.

MOTION 27 Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by R. Brown,

"That the faculty members transferred from Social and Philosophical Foundations into the newly constituted Faculty of Education or the Philosophy Department continue for the present to offer the courses for which they have hitherto been responsible subject to review by the curriculum committees of the Faculty of Education and the Department of Philosophy respectively."

K. Rieckhoff enquired as to whether the wishes of members were being taken into consideration in terms of where they would be placed. B. Wilson indicated that those involved had been asked to comment in terms of an enquiry on order of preference and insofar as is possible, considering also the interests of the groups, those preferences would be met, but that to date there had been exploration only of possibilities.

K. Rieckhoff noted that in Motion 27 review would be by the Curriculum Committees of the Faculty of Education for those in that Faculty, but by the Department of Philosophy for those in Arts, and felt that the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty of Arts should also be involved.

With the agreement of the assembly amendment was incorporated, adding the words "and Faculty of Arts" in the last line of the motion between "Philosophy" ... "respectively."

The motion reads,

"That the faculty members transferred from Social and Philosophical Foundations into the newly constituted Faculty of Education or the Philosophy Department continue for the present to offer the courses for which they have hitherto been responsible subject to review by the curriculum committees of the Faculty of Education, and the Department of Philosophy and the Faculty of Arts respectively."

MOTION CARRIED

21 in favor
2 opposed

MOTIONS It was noted by S. Aronoff that the date, January 1, 1971, 23, 24 should read 'January 1, 1972' and this editorial change was incorporated.

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by R. Bradley,

23. "That the Faculty of Education, as newly constituted, be charged to submit (by January 31, 1972) a report to Senate through the Academic Planning Committee, covering the following points:
- a) detailed recommendations for undergraduate and graduate program modification and development;
 - b) detailed recommendations regarding staffing patterns and priorities; and
 - c) steps to be taken relating to the organizational structure of the Faculty - specifically its Faculty Coordinating Council, Graduate Studies Committee, and Undergraduate Studies Committee."
24. "That the recommendations made regarding programs within the Faculty of Education satisfy the following constraints:
- a) courses should bear the designation 'Education';
 - b) responsibility for Education courses currently numbered 201 and 202 should be retained by the newly constituted Faculty of Education; and

- c) additional work in the foundation areas of education should be integrated as far as is possible into the programs of the Faculty of Education without provision for majors in the foundational areas themselves at the undergraduate level."

MOTION CARRIED

23 in favor
1 opposed

MOTION 28 Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by R. Bradley,

28. "That with the acceptance of the above recommendations, the units known as 'The Professional Development Centre' and 'Social and Philosophical Foundations' be dissolved."

MOTION CARRIED

22 in favor
2 opposed

2. DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY TO SCUS, PAPER S. 71-121

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate's responsibility for review and approval of changes in prerequisites and other regulations for admission to courses be delegated to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, with such delegation to apply to changes for entry to courses for the forthcoming Spring Semester 72-1 only."

J. Wheatley suggested amendment to add at the end of the statement "with such changes to be reported to Senate as soon as possible thereafter." With the concurrence of the assembly the amendment was included.

B. Wilson indicated that there had been some confusion in the paper which he had distributed to Deans and Chairmen of Departments but it was intended that copies of the Pre-registration form of individual students would be sent to the Department of the student's Major, where declared, to the Department of the student's intended Major, where indicated, and where the Major is not identified to the Office of the Dean of the Faculty concerned. He noted further that Departments can check the forms and advise students, particularly in those instances where their proposed offerings would lead them into difficulties, but that the Department would not have the right to prevent the Pre-registration request unless the student indicated change, whilst Pre-

registration was in process. It was hoped that Departments would give as much data as possible to help students adequately plan their programs.

Vote was then taken on the motion with the incorporated amendment.

"That Senate's responsibility for review and approval of changes in prerequisites and other regulations for admission to courses be delegated to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, with such delegation to apply to changes for entry to courses for the forthcoming Spring Semester 72-1 only, with such changes to be reported to Senate as soon as possible thereafter."

MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary