

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD  
MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1974, 3172 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present:

Strand, K.

Chairman

Aronoff, S.  
Baird, D. A.  
Beirne, B. P.  
Birch, D. R.  
Brown, R. C.  
Burkle, E.  
Copes, P.  
Coté, P. T.  
Daem, J. P.  
D'Auria, J. M.  
Dawson, A. J.  
DeVoretz, D. J.  
Doherty, P. M.  
Eastwood, G. R.  
Eliot Hurst, M. E.  
Ellis, J. F.  
Hollibaugh, A. L.  
Jamieson, D. H.  
Kissner, R. F.  
Kitchen, J. M.  
Munro, J. M.  
Nair, K. K.  
Rheumer, G. A.  
Rieckhoff, K. E.  
Sadleir, R.M.F.S.  
Seager, J. W.  
Smith, W.A.S.  
Sterling, T. D.  
Swangard, E. M.  
Wheatley, J.  
Wilson, B. G.

Evans, H. M.  
Nagel, H. D.  
Norsworthy, R.

Secretary

Recording Secretary

Absent:

Banister, E. W.  
Caple, K. P.  
Emmott, A. H.  
MacPherson, A.  
Reid, W. D.  
Salter, J. H.  
Sutherland, G. A.

In attendance:

Meakin, D.  
Mugridge, I.  
Okuda, K.

SEATING OF SENATOR

The Secretary announced the result of a recent election by and from the Faculty of Arts wherein G. A. Rheumer, having received the majority of votes, had been elected to replace P. L. Wagner on Senate for balance term of office to May 31, 1974.

It was moved, seconded, and carried that Dr. Rheumer be seated on Senate.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

J. D'Auria pointed out a typographical error on page 32 of the minutes of December 3, 1973 in respect of Paper S.73-151 wherein the prerequisite change for CHEM 351-3 should be from CHEM 252-3, 261-3 to CHEM 252-3. With that correction, the minutes of the Open Session of December 3, 1973 were declared approved as distributed.

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. Senate Graduate Studies Committee

1. Paper S.74-1 - Graduate Studies - Course Numbers for Special Arrangements

Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-1, the following two new course proposals:

Special Arrangements 898 - Master's Thesis  
Special Arrangements 899 - Doctoral Thesis

These courses will not be listed in the calendar and are for the exclusive use of students working under Special Arrangements between two or more departments."

An amendment was then moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That the last five words of the motion be deleted."

J. Wheatley stated that S. Aronoff had drawn attention to the fact that special arrangements involved programs and, as there was no objection, the Chairman declared the words withdrawn. The last sentence of the motion then read:

"These courses will not be listed in the calendar and are for the exclusive use of students working under Special Arrangements."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

2. Paper S.74-2 - Graduate Studies - Archaeology Changes

Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-2, the following changes:

- a) That the Archaeology graduate program be disconnected from the Department of Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology.
- b) That the paragraph, 'The following graduate courses are offered. These courses may be taken by students from other departments as electives and may be used to satisfy departmental requirements in the PSA degree program' be deleted from the Calendar.
- c) That the paragraph, 'Students who wish to write the graduate thesis (898 or 899) in Archaeology may do so with the concurrence of both the PSA Department and the Department of Archaeology unit in which case the supervising committee will be partly comprised of Archaeologists' be deleted from the Calendar.
- d) That the following courses be instituted:  
ARC. 898 - M.A. Thesis  
ARC. 899 - Ph.D. Thesis."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

3. Paper S.74-3 - Graduate Studies - Department of Economics and Commerce Calendar Changes

Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

a) "That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-3, that the following paragraph on Page 63 of the Graduate Calendar be deleted:

'2. Written qualifying examinations in three fields, one field in economic theory covering both micro and macro aspects and two other fields or two fields in economic theory covering both micro and macro to an advanced level and one other field. The other fields will be selected from the following: monetary economics, quantitative methods, international economics, economic history, development economics, regional economics, resource economics and labor economics. Adequate preparation for the qualifying exam in economic theory will be successful completion of the Microeconomic Theory sequence (800-5 and 801-5) and of the Macroeconomic Theory sequence (805-5 and 806-5). Students who have successfully completed work equivalent to 800 and 805 may omit course work in those parts of the sequences. Students are encouraged to complete the above sequences early in order to have the appropriate prerequisites for other likely courses in their programs.'

b) That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-3, that the following paragraph be added to Page 63 of the Graduate Calendar:

'2. Written qualifying examination in three fields. These fields will consist either of separate micro and macro economic theory fields and one other field, or a combined micro and macro economic theory field and two other fields. These other fields may be selected from the following: monetary economics, quantitative methods, mathematical economics, international economics, public finance, economic history, development economics, regional economics, resource

economics, and labour economics. Adequate course preparation for the qualifying exam in the combined micro and macro economic theory field will be successful completion of Economics 800-5 and Economics 805-5. The courses required for the microeconomic theory field are Economics 800-5 and Economics 801-5, and for the macroeconomic field Economics 805-5 and Economics 806-5. Students are encouraged to complete their theory courses early in order to have the appropriate prerequisites for other likely courses in their programs.'

- c) That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-3, that the following paragraph on Page 64 of the Graduate Calendar be deleted:

'3. Qualification in a supporting subject.

A student must qualify in a supporting subject in addition to the 60 credit requirement under 1 above. A student may select as a supporting subject a language other than English. To qualify a student must demonstrate a thorough reading knowledge in the language concerned, as well as familiarity with the economics literature in that language.

A student may select mathematics as a supporting subject. To qualify he must demonstrate competence in aspects of mathematics (including differential and integral calculus and linear algebra) adequate to support the most advanced course work in quantitative methods.

With the approval of the Department, a student may select as a supporting subject a social science other than economics. To qualify in such an area he must demonstrate, by examination, a basic knowledge in the discipline concerned at the level of an honors graduate.'

- d) That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-3, that the following paragraph be added to Page 64 of the Graduate Calendar:

'3. Qualification in a supporting subject.

In addition to the 60 credit requirement under 1 above a student may be required to qualify in a

supporting subject. The supporting subject may, for example, be a language other than English, Mathematics, Computer Science, or a Social Science other than economics, depending upon the requirements of the student's proposed thesis. The student's Supervisory Committee, in consultation with the student, shall make a recommendation on the requirements, if any, for qualification in a supporting subject for final approval by the Graduate Program Committee.'"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

4. Paper S.74-4 - Graduate Studies - Department of Modern Languages Calendar Changes

Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-4, that LING 700-5 be graded on a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U) basis."

J. Wheatley commented that, if the motion passed, LING 700-5 would be the first course subjected to S/U grading.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

5. Paper S.74-5 - Graduate Studies - PSA Calendar Changes

Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-5, the following change in degree requirements for the PSA Department:

Delete: 'A graduate student's main concentration will be on a thesis and not on formal course work. For the M.A. degree, minimum requirements are four one semester courses and a thesis. For the Ph.D. degree, requirements are one course and a thesis, excluding seminars. This course may extend beyond one semester's duration and is designed particularly to equip the candidate for his research and thesis.'

Add: 'A graduate student's concentration will be both on a thesis and formal course work. For the M.A. degree, minimum requirements are five one semester courses

and a thesis. The requirements for the Ph.D. degree for students with a Master's degree are three courses and a thesis."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

2. Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

1. Paper S.74-6 - Faculty of Arts - Department of Economics and Commerce - COMM 337-3 - Change in Prerequisite

Moved by S. Smith, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-6, for Commerce 337-3 - Data Processing in Business, a change in prerequisite

From: MATH 106-3 or CMPT 100-3 or 102-2

To: Any accredited computing science course including MATH 106-3."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

2. Paper S.74-7 - Faculty of Arts - Department of Psychology - Change in Requirements and New Course Proposal - Psychology 499-10 - Honors Thesis

Moved by S. Smith, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

Motion 1: "That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-7, the new course proposal for Psychology 499-10 - Honors Thesis."

Motion 2: "That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-7, change in requirements for Honors in Psychology

From: '.... To qualify for the Honors degree in Psychology the student must have completed 50 credits in upper division Psychology or approved related courses during the last four levels.'

To: '.... To qualify for the Honors degree in Psychology the student must have completed 50 credits in upper division Psychology or approved related courses during the upper levels. No more than eight of these credit hours may be directed studies courses in Psychology.'"

Motion 3: "That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-7, the addition of a section in Directed Studies as follows: 'Students taking the Majors or Honors in Psychology may count no more than 8 credit hours of Directed Studies towards the required number of upper division Psychology credits.'"

(Note: If Senate does not approve Psychology 499-10, for the above substitute the following:

"Students majoring in Psychology may count no more than 8 credit hours of Directed Studies towards upper division required credits in Psychology. Students taking Honors in Psychology may count no more than 11 credit hours of Directed Studies towards upper division required credits in Psychology.")

In response to a question from R. Kissner, I. Mugridge responded that his instructions were to provide the substance of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies debate on this subject, but not the actual vote. S. Smith added that the concerns of Senate had been spoken to in the Department and he considered that the communication process on referral had been appropriate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

(In the motion as approved, the "Note" above was not included.)

### 3. Library Penalties Appeal Committee

#### 1. Paper S.74-8 - Changes in Procedures - Library Penalties

Moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That Senate approve changes in the procedures of the Library Penalties Appeal Committee as follows:

Delete: 'Penalties imposed will not be suspended while an appeal is waiting to be heard by the Committee, but fines which have been paid and which are subsequently deemed unfair by the Committee will be refunded.'

Add: 'Penalties imposed will be suspended while an appeal is waiting to be heard by the Committee, and fines which have been paid and which are subsequently deemed unfair by the Committee will be refunded.'"



D. Baird believed that the motion should not have been presented to Senate without prior submission to the Senate Library Committee, and noted that under the terms of reference of the Committee it was a standing committee reporting to the Senate Library Committee. The Chairman considered the question, noting that it was an unusual situation in that it was a Senate Committee which was called upon to report to the Senate Library Committee but that it had only one term of reference for which it makes a final decision. He considered the terms of reference awkward but that the motion was in order.

J. P. Daem was of the opinion that the conditions currently in effect while awaiting decisions on appeals were discriminatory as they assumed unproven guilt. K. Rieckhoff objected to the change proposed in the current policy as he believed that this could lead to abuses and a significant increase in unsupported appeal requests. The mover of the motion noted that for the procedures to be applied the appeal must be in writing.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

4. Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board

1. Paper S.74-9 - Transfer Credit for Work at the British Columbia Institute of Technology

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by D. Birch,

"That Senate authorize, as set forth in S.74-9, the Director of Admissions to grant transfer credit for work completed at the British Columbia Institute of Technology."

J. Munro raised questions concerning the desirability of awarding transfer credit as is done for the colleges and sought clarification. The Chairman asked the Director of Admissions to describe the process for transfer credit, and D. Meakin responded the standard process would be that he would collect detailed course descriptions and the most closely allied department would examine the content and determine what content would fit within the general guidelines of being of a University level. Recommendations in terms of transfer credit would be considered by the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That this new policy be retroactive for any students since the institution of BCIT."

K. Rieckhoff spoke against the motion stating that there had been too many changes in the past offerings and a blanket change was inappropriate. S. Aronoff pointed out that credit would be granted only if it is applicable.

Moved by R. Kissner, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That the motion be referred to the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board for its consideration."

T. Sterling was of the opinion that the University should extend itself to accommodate the few students who might be eligible for transfer credit on a retroactive basis. K. Rieckhoff countered that there was no data to substantiate the claim and if there were only a few students no harm would be caused by delay. S. Aronoff directed attention to the rationale which indicated the motion was an enabling process to permit the Committee to evaluate courses as presented. K. Rieckhoff then stated the motion on retroactivity was out of order, but the Chairman ruled that the rationale statement could apply equally as well in the present as in the past and that the motion was in order. D. Meakin explained that the intent was that transfer credit would be given to students who are admitted to the University in the Fall 1974 and thereafter and retroactivity could apply for work taken prior to passage of the paper.

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

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

15 in favor

11 opposed

5. Academic Planning Committee

1. Paper S.74-10 - Report on the Senate Referral Motion of July 9, 1973 Concerning Department of Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology

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

"That Senate approve, and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the following recommendations of the Academic Planning Committee, as set forth in S.74-10:

1. The existing Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology Department be divided into separate departments of Political Science, and Sociology/Anthropology, and that this action be effective upon acceptance by the Board of Governors;
2. The separate departments bring forward statements of objectives, final program proposals, and detailed curricula for proposed implementation by September 1, 1974."

B. Wilson recapitulated events which led to this presentation following July 1973 when the matter was referred back to the Academic Planning Committee. He advised that a sub-committee had been established by the APC to evaluate the proposal. The sub-committee met with faculty and students and written submissions had been invited from all undergraduate and graduate students majoring in the disciplines represented in the Department, from all members of the Faculty of Arts, and several outside reviewers. Recommendations were formulated. B. Wilson emphasized that the curricula contained in the report were draft curricula and did not define or limit territories and were not for approval at this time.

J. P. Daem was of the opinion that the document did not answer the charges of July 9, 1973 in the motion to refer. Thus this submission continued to involve an administrative rather than academic separation, and therefore the question now being considered is the same as in July 1973. He gave notice of motion, if the motion on the floor were to be defeated, that the matter be referred to the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies in order that the PSA Department and its curricula could be planned to form a comprehensive interdisciplinary social science program within that particular Faculty.

S. Smith responded that the charges contained in the July referral motion had received careful consideration and the recommendations of the Academic Planning Committee represent a consensus that the separation of the department is the most viable solution. K. Rieckhoff added that the complexity of the problem necessitated first steps toward a complete solution. D. DeVoretz said it was unrealistic to attempt to assess extensive concrete proposals within the time permitted and that detailed analysis should take place in the first instance in the Faculty of Arts. J. Ellis noted that the Committee had been asked to consider a number of items and that he did not believe that a fully exhaustive examination had been called for in the original motion. P. Copes felt the time was strategic for development of social sciences with current faculty members who are desirous of rebuilding the disciplines in which they are competent.

E. Burkle considered that bias had been introduced into the report by the lack of complete documentation. T. Sterling, speaking in favor of the motion, considered that a strong desire exists at the University for the development of a sound interdisciplinary program which has not developed with the operation of PSA. He believed that it would be to the advantage of the University if concentration were now to be placed on the development of such an interdisciplinary program.

Commenting on the statement that bias had been introduced into the report, S. Smith considered that for practical reasons it would be impossible to include all documentation and to summarize all discussions that took place. He was satisfied that balanced documentation had been provided.

Moved by R. Kissner, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That consideration of the motion on the floor be postponed until the third item on the motion sheet of S.74-10 is taken under discussion."

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

MOTION TO POSTPONE FAILED

12 in favor  
15 opposed

Speaking in opposition to the motion, R. Kissner stated that he considered the department's current situation was a result of indecision and that the discussion taking place regarding the proposed separation was not based on academic merits of splitting a department. He believed that separation would result in increased costs to the University, that the solution suggested was not based on sound academic merits, and was the easiest way out of a problem. He considered the option which should be taken would be to engage in development of the PSA Department as it currently exists. He gave notice of motion that, in the event the motion on the floor were defeated, Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors a comprehensive interdisciplinary social science program organized with the PSA Department as a central core be developed for consideration by the Senate and the Board as follows: a) that a Director be sought who will be given the responsibility for development of a detailed program proposal for graduate and undergraduate programs; b) that a steering committee be struck by the Dean of Arts from within the University consisting of one faculty member and one student from each of Psychology, History, Economics and Commerce, Geography and Philosophy, and two faculty members and two students from the PSA Department to work with the program director in the development and implementation of such proposals.

S. Aronoff considered the solution was to develop strong programs for political science and sociology/anthropology and the separation of the PSA Department was an avenue to accomplish this. He noted that no development can go to the limit of a discipline because of limited resources available to all universities.

Moved by R. Kissner, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That Senate suspend its rules and record a roll call vote."

It was noted that the motion was not debatable and requires a two-thirds vote to carry.

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

MOTION FAILED

12 in favor  
16 opposed

14/1/74

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

MOTION CARRIED

23 in favor  
8 opposed

The following Senators requested that their votes be recorded in the minutes:

In opposition: E. Burkle, J. P. Daem, M. Eliot Hurst,  
A. Hollibaugh, R. Kissner.

In favor: J. D'Auria, K. Rieckhoff, S. Smith,  
E. Swangard, T. Sterling.

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by J. Wheatley,

"That immediate planning be undertaken to investigate the establishment of a genuinely interdisciplinary program broadly based in the social sciences."

In response to a suggestion from J. Munro that an amendment was required to provide an operational context, as the vehicle for investigation was not the Board of Governors,

An amendment was moved by B. Wilson, seconded by J. D'Auria,

"That Senate approve that immediate planning be undertaken to investigate the establishment of a genuinely interdisciplinary program broadly based in the social sciences and refer the question to the Academic Planning Committee for action."

Question was called on the amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment was moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by R. Kissner,

"That Senate approve that immediate planning be undertaken to establish a genuinely interdisciplinary program broadly based in the social sciences and the question be referred to the Academic Planning Committee for immediate action."

J. P. Daem suggested that this amendment would accelerate the process to establish a program. A. Dawson objected on the grounds that he considered any interdisciplinary program should be thoroughly investigated before considering implementation.

Question was called on the amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

15 in favor  
14 opposed

Amendment was moved by R. Kissner, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That the following be added to the motion,  
'Further, a) a steering committee be struck  
by the Academic Planning Committee consisting  
of one faculty member and one student from  
each of Psychology, History, Economics and  
Commerce, Geography, Philosophy, Political  
Science, Sociology/Anthropology and such other  
members as the Academic Planning Committee may  
determine necessary to work cooperatively with  
the Academic Planning Committee in developing  
interdisciplinary proposals, and b) that a  
progress report be delivered to Senate at its  
meeting in September 1974.'"

It was questioned whether this amendment was in order. The Chairman ruled that the amendment was in order, and the ruling was challenged. Question was called on the challenge. The ruling of the chair was sustained by a vote of 15 to 7.

R. Kissner considered the establishment of a date for a report to Senate would ensure some progress would be made and the committee suggested would provide greater participation. R. Sadleir spoke in opposition to the committee as he did not consider it Senate's responsibility to tell the Academic Planning Committee its job, although he agreed with the establishment of a date.

Amendment to the amendment was moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. D'Auria,

"That the words of the amendment be deleted  
with the exception of the following: 'Further,  
that a progress report be delivered to Senate  
at its meeting in September 1974.'"

J. Munro said the size of the suggested committee was unworkable and the establishment of a steering committee of this type would tend to preclude the participation of members of already constituted committees in the Faculty of Arts.

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

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT  
CARRIED

24 in favor  
6 opposed

Question was called on the amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

The Secretary read the main motion as amended:

"That Senate approve that immediate planning be undertaken to establish a genuinely inter-disciplinary program broadly based in the social sciences, and the question be referred to the Academic Planning Committee for immediate action. Further, that a progress report be delivered to Senate at its meeting in September 1974."

In reply to a question by J. Ellis, the Chairman stated that a commitment to the establishment of a program would be an approval in principle by Senate and the Board of Governors. There is a commitment by Senate to an early investigation of this question but it would not be a commitment until such time as there is a recommendation and that recommendation is acted on positively by Senate and transmitted to the Board of Governors.

Question was called on the main motion as amended, and a vote taken.

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED  
CARRIED

6. Senate Committee on Working Paper on University Governance in British Columbia

1. Paper S.74-11 - Report to Senate

The Chairman requested that K. Okuda, a member of the Committee on University Governance, report on the present status of the Committee. K. Okuda advised that the Committee has been instructed to proceed with its program and that a public hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, January 16, 1974 with Walter Young as Acting Chairman. He added that the Committee is not precluding further meetings at any of the universities even if material is not presented on the dates established for any of the hearings.

In reply to a question by J. P. Daem as to how Senate was to discuss the paper, the Chairman responded that the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules was for debate and discussion on the alternatives prior to indicating preferences in rank order. The intention was to collate the preferences for presentation to the Committee to indicate the general views of Senate.

Moved by D. Jamieson, seconded by J. P. Daem,

"That a Special Meeting of Senate be called on Monday, January 21, 1974 to consider the question."

J. P. Daem indicated that he did not consider that a preferential vote method was appropriate and that he was opposed to considering the matter in that way. He wished to know, if the Special Meeting were approved, whether items could be distributed in advance, and the Chairman responded in the affirmative. B. Wilson expressed opposition and felt that Senate must make substantive judgment. In discussion it was noted that there were two obvious alternatives, namely that of a single position on each issue or various degrees of positions on all issues. A third alternative would be to have established at this stage various degrees of positions on issues to be followed by a later meeting to attempt to develop the appropriate single position on the issue. J. D'Auria suggested it might be appropriate to invite the members of the Provincial Committee to come and sit in and discuss the topic at and with Senate.

In response to enquiry from S. Aronoff, the Chairman indicated that additional items could be added and items could be deleted in terms of the items as already presented through the Committee report.

A straw vote was taken which indicated 23 members were in favor of calling a Special Meeting.

S. Aronoff suggested that procedure be developed for speaking and discussion, and the Chairman said he would hold hearings on how the question would be dealt with, and interested Senators were at liberty to make appointments with him for this purpose. He indicated that if Senators have views which they wish to express that they could be put together and given to the Secretary for distribution.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

7. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Notice of Motion

1. Paper S.74-12 - Recommended Rules of Senate (Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules)

The Chairman commented that a notice of motion pertaining to Rules of Senate is advertised one month in advance of discussion.

2. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next regular meeting of Senate is scheduled for Monday, February 4, 1974, at 7:30 p.m.

3. Other Items

There were no other items.



4. Confidential Matters

The meeting recessed briefly at 11:00 p.m., prior to moving into Closed Session.

H. M. Evans  
Secretary