

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1973, 3172 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present:

Strand, K.

Chairman

Aronoff, S.
Beirne, B. P.
Birch, D. R.
Bradley, R. D.
Brown, R. C.
Caple, K. P.
Copes, P.
Dawson, A. J.
Doherty, P. M.
Ellis, J. F.
Emmott, A. H.
Gilbert, K. L.
Hollibaugh, A. L.
Kissner, R. F.
Lardner, R. W.
MacPherson, A.
Munro, J. M.
Nair, K. K.
O'Connell, M. S.
Okuda, K.
Reid, W. D.
Rieckhoff, K. E.
Salter, J. H.
Seager, J. W.
Sullivan, D. H.
Weinberg, H.
Wheatley, J.
Williams, W. E.
Wilson, B. G.

Evans, H. M.
Norsworthy, R.

Secretary
Recording Secretary

Absent:

Baird, D. A.
Coté, P. T.
Eliot Hurst, M. E.
Jamieson, D. H.
Sutherland, G. A.
Swangard, E. M.

As requested by the Chairman, the Secretary of Senate announced the result of a recent election to Senate, wherein K. Okuda had been elected by the Faculty of Arts to temporarily replace P. L. Wagner from date of election to April 30, 1973.

It was moved and seconded that K. Okuda be seated on Senate.

MOTION CARRIED

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Open Session of January 8, 1973 were approved as circulated.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

There was no report from the Chairman.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Academic Planning Committee

1. Paper S.73-24 - Continuing Education

The Chairman of the Academic Planning Committee, R. Bradley, introduced the paper on Continuing Education and requested that Motions 2 and 3 on the order paper be considered prior to Motion 1 - with renumbering to 1 of 2, 2 of 3, and 3 of 1 - as it would be inappropriate to refer to actions required of a Committee before such a Committee is established.

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

"That Senate approve, in principle, the recommendations of the Academic Planning Committee, as set forth in S.73-24, that there be established a Senate Committee on Continuing Education (standing). This Committee shall be empowered and required to approve or not to approve (subject only to subsequent ratification by Senate) all those courses of study, instruction or education which are proposed to be offered, but not for credit, under the auspices of Simon Fraser University or any of its Faculties or Departments, including Departments other than academic ones."

R. Bradley commented that at the present time there is no provision for academic scrutiny of non credit carrying courses, proposed to be offered by the Division of Continuing Education. It was the considered opinion of the Academic Planning Committee that Senate was obligated to exercise the duty and power it held under Section 54 (b) of the Universities Act to provide for the government, management, and carrying out of curriculum, instruction and education offered by the University. Any courses whatsoever offered by the University, whether for credit or not, should have Senate approval. The proposal was to delegate review of non credit courses to the proposed new Senate Committee on Continuing Education (standing).

J. Ellis indicated that he was concerned with the proposal and that it would be difficult to speak to the motion without involving some of the aspects of Motions 2 and 3 which had not yet been put. His concern was on the lack of clear definition of terms, particularly "all those courses of study, instruction or education," but with reference later in Motion 3 to inclusion of workshops. It was not clear, for example, whether approval of the Committee would be needed for a department to conduct a colloquium. He wished assurance that the motion is not intended to throttle departmental or faculty initiative. R. Bradley responded that he could give assurance that there was no intention to affect departments in that way, but he was unable to provide a definition. The Academic Planning Committee did expressly consider the question of colloquia and the like and they were not included in the intent. He suggested that it might be useful for the Academic Planning Committee to provide to Senate an express statement of the exclusions from the motion. J. Ellis felt that it was dangerous to approve something in principle without having clear definitions and that this paper should be taken back in order that there could be assurance, definitions and exclusions clearly set forth in the document.

D. Sullivan supported the position of J. Ellis. He believed that it might be appropriate for the standing committee to concern itself with non credit courses proposed to be offered through the Division of Continuing Education but not other things. As described, the paper did not restrict itself to non credit courses offered through Continuing Education, but to any non credit courses. A. MacPherson expressed concern.

Moved by A. MacPherson, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That Paper S.73-24 be referred back to the Academic Planning Committee."

K. Rieckhoff spoke against referral, on the basis that the document would lead to an improved situation and that the intent was generally clear. He believed there would be increased difficulties

S.M. 5/2/73

if there were attempts to be overly legalistic but the proposal would make it clear that there is to be review of non credit courses, and if there is abuse there is opportunity for correction. He felt that some control in Continuing Education was necessary.

B. Wilson felt that the merits of the proposal should be debated in Senate as it involved the authority to approve or disapprove courses whether offered for credit or not, and that it should not be referred back to the Academic Planning Committee which is not a Committee of Senate. W. Williams spoke in favor of referral indicating clarification was desirable. D. Birch spoke against referral on the premise that a mechanism was being established to carry out a legitimate responsibility of Senate and that there should not be delay.

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

8 in favor
21 opposed

D. Sullivan felt that the phrase extracted from the Universities Act as put forth in the paper essentially defined rigidly two classes or two types of instruction that take place at the University, firstly, academic for credit instruction and, secondly, all things that do not fall in the first and places them under extension. This would include non credit offerings of academic departments and placing them under Continuing Education. He envisaged from the paper as received credit carrying items would go through SCUS to Senate for approval and non credit items would go through the proposed new Committee as though Continuing Education. He did not consider this a wise approach. K. Okuda supported the position of D. Sullivan.

Amendment was moved by K. Okuda, seconded by A. MacPherson,

"That on page 2, paragraph 1, the words 'under the auspices of Simon Fraser University or any of its Faculties or Departments, including Departments other than academic ones' be deleted, and the words 'under the auspices of the Division of Continuing Education' be substituted therefor."

K. Okuda stated that the intent of the amendment was to remove ambiguity as to the matters which would be within the purview of the proposed Committee. He believed that the whole paper dealt with the Division of Continuing Education and its necessary supervision. The paper as worded went beyond that aspect. Certain non credit courses from academic departments now come forward through SCUS directly to Senate. He believed it possible that other mechanisms might later be necessary to take care of new situations.

In response to a question, the Chairman noted that if the amendment were to carry, then it was obvious that appropriate amendments in other sections of the paper would be required.

In response to a question, the Chairman indicated that under a very strict interpretation of the Universities Act it was his belief that the academic departments or any other departments have no legal right to put on any course of instruction unless it has been authorized by the Senate, and therefore under that interpretation it should not be done and probably could not be done whether for credit or not for credit.

P. Copes spoke in favor of the amendment noting that he still preferred to have certain non credit courses developed in academic departments come forward as at present through SCUS to Senate for approval.

R. Bradley explained that it had not been the intention of the Academic Planning Committee to restrict the purview of courses which the Senate Committee on Continuing Education would be charged to review to only those for which the Division of Continuing Education would be responsible. It was the intention of the Academic Planning Committee that some Committee of Senate, rather than Senate itself, should be charged with responsibility for scrutinizing very carefully any courses of instruction which in the normal course of events come before Senate. On this basis a retitling of the proposed Senate Committee might make the matter clearer, and he suggested it might be called Senate Committee on Non Credit Instruction. The Universities Act envisaged a Senate responsibility in all courses of instruction whether for credit or not.

K. Rieckhoff indicated that he found the recent comments confusing. He noted that the paper was titled "Continuing Education," that the terminology throughout referred to the Division of Continuing Education, and that the title of the proposed Committee included Continuing Education. It was his understanding that the paper was related to Continuing Education, and he had spoken against referral. The recent comments suggested that the paper embraced more than Continuing Education. He wished clarification of the intent of the proposals.

Moved by J. Seager, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That Paper S.73-24 be referred back to the Academic Planning Committee."

J. Seager stated that there had been no real progress through the continuing debate but only confusion, and that referral was appropriate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

18 in favor
9 opposed

Paper S.73-24a - Report on Continuing Education, S.72-125 updated

B. Wilson noted that this paper had been provided for the information of Senate. Question was raised from the floor as to when the paper might be discussed. It was suggested that it could be discussed on return of the paper which had just been referred back to the Academic Planning Committee, but on appropriate motion could be discussed now.

Moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by A. MacPherson,

"That Senate undertake discussion of Paper S.73-24a."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

12 in favor
9 opposed

D. Birch was of the opinion that it would have been a courtesy to have the Director of Continuing Education in attendance to respond to questions on the report. The Chairman stated that the report had been prepared for the Academic Vice-President and the Academic Planning Committee. On the basis of the report the Academic Planning Committee had made recommendations to Senate through the paper just considered. It would not necessarily follow that the Director of Continuing Education should be in attendance to speak to the recommendations of the Academic Planning Committee. S. Aronoff enquired whether it would be necessary for Senate to accept the report, and the Chairman indicated that this would not be necessary as it was not a report to it.

A. Emmott expressed interest in the reasons for lack of inclination to transfer the administrative jurisdiction of the Reading and Study Centre to Continuing Education; asked why there was no reference on page 62 to Capilano College; and no contact with Selkirk College. B. Wilson responded that there had been no decision yet on the placement of the Reading and Study Centre, although there had been some consideration of three possible placements. He felt that this was not a responsibility of Senate although Senate was entitled to be apprised of developments. With reference to the two regional Colleges, he was not aware of any reasons for not working cooperatively with them, but added that the three Universities have a joint committee with respect to continuing education and, in addition, there is a much broader provincially based group involved with coordination and rationalization of continuing education throughout the province.

K. Rieckhoff wished to know if the only link between the Division of Continuing Education and Senate was through the Academic Vice-President's office. B. Wilson indicated that that was a direct link, but, since the

mair responsibility of Continuing Education is to coordinate, initiate and help develop academic programs for credit, and if this rested within Faculties, there were representatives of the Faculties on Senate, particularly through the Deans. Further questions were raised on the areas of responsibility for both credit and non credit offerings of the Division of Continuing Education and scrutinizing mechanisms.

D. Sullivan expressed some concerns about the staffing for Continuing Education programs, and felt that procedures were such that the scrutiny of some appointments did not follow the same set of procedures as those followed for other courses of instruction. E. Wilson indicated that the appointment procedures for instructors who staff Continuing Education courses, whether for credit or not, is that where the course falls under the reasonable purview of the Department, the appointment form is signed by the Department Chairman, the Dean of the Faculty, the Vice-President, Academic, and the President, and is presented to the Board of Governors. The procedure is analogous to that for the appointment of visiting faculty for short periods. By the nature of the Division of Continuing Education, however, recommendations for appointment in some cases follow the commencement of the course, but that there is desire to bring this under better control.

K. Rieckhoff enquired whether, under the Universities Act, the Division of Continuing Education is in fact required to get approval of Senate prior to offering its courses, whether credit or non credit. E. Wilson expressed the view that the offerings of that Division are in the same situation as all non credit offerings offered within the University by Departments of Faculties or Departments other than academic ones, and that the answer would be Yes. R. Brown noted that the Division did not offer any credit courses which have not already been approved by Senate. D. Sullivan indicated that he wished further clarification of the response made by E. Wilson. He wished to know whether Deans and others were to continue as in the past until such time as formal change is made, or whether all non credit courses of instruction, study, etc. - under the interpretations voiced tonight - had now to be brought before Senate. Discussion continued with some confusion on definitions and intent. The Chairman indicated that he did not have a legal opinion, but that in his own opinion it would be correct to have them brought before Senate.

Question was raised concerning delegation of powers, and the Chairman indicated that the matter of delegation had been discussed with the attorneys with indication that Senate can delegate certain powers provided that it subsequently ratifies the acts.

B. Wilson indicated that he would invite the Director of the Division of Continuing Education to be in attendance when Continuing Education is discussed.

2. Paper S.73-25 - Bachelor of General Studies

R. Bradley drew attention to a substitute motion for that set out in the original paper S.73-25.

Moved by R. Bradley, seconded by R. Wilson,

"That Senate approve the recommendation that, in addition to the sixty hours of transfer and/or course challenge credit which students may currently count towards the Bachelor of General Studies Degree, a further thirty hours of transfer credit for work taken in the last sixty hours may be credited towards that degree provided:

1. that such transfer credits are obtained from either (or both) the University of British Columbia or the University of Victoria;
2. that the forty-five upper division credit hours required for the degree are taken at one or more of Simon Fraser University, the University of British Columbia or the University of Victoria; and
3. that at least thirty hours of the last sixty used for the degree are undertaken at Simon Fraser University."

Attention was drawn to the "Explanatory Note and Intent for B.G.S. purposes" as shown on S.73-25, as follows:

1. The B.G.S. degree requires completion of 120 semester hours of credit. It must include 45 hours of upper division courses, i.e. our courses numbered 300 and/or 400, but without stipulation as to the level in which these are taken.
2. Transfer credit courses and course challenges are not normally included in the calculation of averages. For the above purposes, however, with the possibility of ninety hours of transfer work the University must be satisfied that the principle of an average of at least 2.0 is clearly fulfilled, and transfer grades will be reviewed to ensure this.
3. The general regulation limiting the amount of transfer credit permitted after first registration here to 30 semester hours would not apply to work taken at U.B.C. or U-Vic.
4. The requirement of grades of C or higher for recognition of transfer work taken after first registration here would not directly apply to work taken at U.B.C. or U-Vic.

5. "Appropriate" courses refers to courses which could normally be credited in Arts and Sciences. It would exclude, for example, courses considered generally equivalent to Education 401/402 or others covering basic teacher education, or other professional areas.
6. Requirements for admission to this University remain unchanged.
7. A student undertaking work elsewhere for transfer here, whose overall record does not fulfil the normal principles for continuance may be placed on warning, or probation, or required to withdraw status.
8. The University reserves the right to deny transfer credit or to require completion of further courses beyond the minimum hours for the degree, where it is adjudged that there is significant content overlap in courses taken.

R. Bradley remarked that there was very little to add to the rationale as set forth in the paper except to emphasize that if the motion were to be approved it would provide the first step in a broad liberalization of degree offerings by the three Universities and not Simon Fraser alone. B. Wilson added that the proposal was the result of interactions between the three public Universities, but consideration could be given to extending to Notre Dame University the privileges afforded if on investigation and evaluation this seemed appropriate.

Some objection to the proposal was expressed on the basis of possible lowering of the status of the General Studies Degree.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

24 in favor
2 opposed

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES AND DIVISIONS

There were no reports from Faculties or Divisions.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Notice of Motion

There were no notices of motion.

2. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of Senate is scheduled for Monday, March 5, 1973 at 7:30 p.m.

3. Other Items

R. Kissner enquired if it would be possible to provide copies of the Senate agenda and motion papers to visitors. S. Aronoff suggested publication of the agenda in advance of the meeting, and D. Sullivan noted that the agenda was already conspicuously posted on bulletin boards. The Chairman stated that he would consider the matter with a view to a trial basis.

4. Confidential Matters

The meeting recessed briefly at 9:13 p.m. prior to moving into Closed Session.

H. M. Evans
Secretary