

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1974, 3172 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present:

Strand, K.

Chairman

Aronoff, S.  
Baird, D. A.  
Banister, E. W.  
Beirne, B. P.  
Birch, D. R.  
Brown, R. C.  
Burkle, E.  
Copes, P.  
Daem, J. P.  
D'Auria, J. M.  
DeVoretz, D. J.  
Doherty, P. M.  
Ellis, J. F.  
Hollibaugh, A. L.  
Kissner, R. F.  
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.  
Wheatley, J.

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

Secretary

Recording Secretary

Absent:

Caple, K. P.  
Coté, P. T.  
Dawson, A. J.  
Eastwood, G. R.  
Eliot Hurst, M. E.  
Emmott, A. H.  
Jamieson, D. H.  
Kitchen, J. M.  
MacPherson, A.  
Reid, W. D.  
Salter, J. H.  
Sutherland, G. A.  
Swangard, E. M.  
Wilson, B. G.

In attendance:

Mugridge, I.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Open session of January 14, 1974, and the Special meeting of January 21, 1974 were approved as circulated.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

In response to a question posed by J. D'Auria, the Chairman reported that the Board of Governors had postponed consideration of the proposal to separate the PSA Department pending receipt of an indication of the financial implications.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

There was no report from the Chairman.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

1. Paper S.74-28 - Faculty of Science - New Course Proposal -  
Physics 333-4

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

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.74-28,  
the new course proposal, Physics 333-4 -  
Introduction to Instrumentation in the Life  
Sciences."

S. Aronoff noted a correction was required on the proposal form to indicate that this course will be offered annually rather than every second year. He added that the course had been designed as a service course for Kinesiology students, but it was open to all segments of the University. In response to a question as to the appropriateness of this course with an upper level number, K. Rieckhoff stated that the 300 level was appropriate in view of the sophistication required. E. Banister concurred and added that Kinesiology students will take the course towards the end of their upper level studies when the necessary basic background has been acquired. He asked that it be reflected in the minutes that this course was viewed as being primarily for Kinesiology students with relevance to the life sciences and not merely a purely physics course. S. Aronoff commented that it would be appropriate for interested faculty to propose changes, but that the course should be taught as prescribed by Senate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED



OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

S.M. 4/2/74

by K. Rieckhoff,

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
From: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

normal two semester time  
that this course may be  
semester 74-3."

note taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Program in Biological Sciences

by K. Rieckhoff,

set forth in S.74-29,  
Program in Biological

note taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Resolution

man, H. Evans explained that at the  
1974 a motion to suspend the rules  
nominations and election was approved,  
committee had been requested to bring for-  
with the membership of a committee:

academic philosophies and academic  
at University;

provide secretarial service to the  
committee to his need;

That the committee present a report to Senate for its  
consideration at the May meeting;

That the Senate Report to the Committee on University  
Governance be considered a preliminary report and subject  
to reconsideration in the light of this investigation,  
which may modify the processes by which this University  
wishes to be governed and govern.

The call for nominations specified three categories, and the following  
names had been submitted by the Senate Nominating Committee:

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| One Administrator:  | M. McClaren, W.A.S. Smith, J. Wheatley     |
| One Faculty Member: | M. E. Eliot Hurst, J. F. Ellis, J. Walkley |
| One Student:        | R. F. Kissner                              |

*Handwritten notes:*  
2/19/74  
Committee  
4/2/74

The Secretary noted that with suspension of the rules, nominations from the floor would be accepted. He noted also that the Chairman of the Senate Nominating Committee had pointed out that the Committee had encountered difficulty in nominating a student able to meet the demands of membership on the committee.

J. Wheatley and J. Ellis withdrew their names as candidates. There were no additional nominations from the floor. Ballots were distributed, and the following individuals were declared elected:

Administrator:	W.A.S. Smith
Faculty Member:	J. Walkley
Student:	R. F. Kissner

3. Senate Committee on the Working Paper on University Governance in British Columbia, Papers S.74-27, S.74-27A, S.74-27 Addendum

1. Paper S.74-27 Appendix A - Reconsideration of Item IV.1 on Senate Functions of Paper S.74-27 Addendum (J. Munro)

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. D'Auria,

"That Senate reconsider Recommendation IV.1 (c) of Recommendations re Senate functions."

It was noted that at the Special meeting of Senate considering the options presented by the ad hoc Senate committee, Senate had approved the recommendation IV.1 (c), "That a non-Senate presidential committee be established to advise the President on budget formulation, and that this committee include representatives elected by and from Senate." It had ranked the selections IV.1 (c), IV.1 (a), and IV.1 (b) and (d) tied.

J. Munro stated that the operating and reporting structures and duties were not the optimal ones to achieve wider involvement of the University community. He favored the option IV.1(a) which recommended, "That a Senate committee be established to advise the President in priorities for expenditures in academic programs.

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

MOTION TO RECONSIDER  
RECOMMENDATION IV.1  
CARRIED

J. Munro was supported by S. Smith when he spoke against the motion that had been previously approved by Senate. They were of the opinion that an advisory committee on academic priorities should be selected from a wider membership than Senate, but it should be a Senate committee.

The Chairman responded to a request to outline his views on the Working Paper as it related to University budgeting. He was of the opinion that the rationale was contradictory and the context misleading. Error factors included the presumption that budget formulation is a statutory responsibility of the President. He said that his preference was the present process of developing academic priorities through the

S.M. 4/2/74

expertise and responsibilities of the individuals involved in this process compared to a committee consisting of members who may not have the same scope nor be subjected to the same pressures and responsibilities.

J. Munro considered that the present system had not produced clear academic priorities and that the contributions which a Senate committee could make might be valuable. J. D'Auria suggested that the formation of a Senate committee did not prevent the inclusion of such individuals as the Academic Vice-President.

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

"That Paper S.74-27 Appendix A, Items IV.1 (a), (b), (c), (d) be referred to the just established committee on academic philosophies and objectives."

J. Wheatley stated that it was useless to discuss alternatives until a statement of philosophies is ascertained. K. Rieckhoff agreed that preliminary judgment could not be made without knowledge of the intended goals. S. Smith and P. Doherty spoke against referral on the basis that they considered some statement of opinion must be submitted to the Working Committee.

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

6 in favor

Question was called on Alternative (c), "That a non-Senate presidential committee be established to advise the President on budget formulation, and that this committee include representatives elected by and from Senate," and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

3 in favor

17 opposed

In accordance with the straw vote taken at the Special meeting and the procedure approved for that meeting the remaining alternatives were considered in the following order: (a), (b), (d). Consideration of Alternative (a) was undertaken: "That a Senate committee be established to advise the President on priorities for expenditures in academic programs."

J. Munro expressed the opinion that the Universities Act currently gives Senate the right to establish academic responsibilities and he presumed that under a rewritten Act there would be opportunity to establish priorities. He said that there was confusion between the establishment of a principle versus the implementation of an action and that this must be differentiated. He considered the effective way to emphasize the concern is to approve Alternative (a) and establish the principle of a Senate committee to advise the President on academic priorities. J. P. Daem felt the proposal would not satisfy the needs of the University community because emphasis was placed on expenditures without considering revenues. K. Rieckhoff and J. Ellis spoke strongly in opposition to all the alternatives suggested.

S.M. 4/2/74

Question was called on Alternative (a), and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

6 in favor  
14 opposed

Question was called on Alternative (b), "That, as implied in the Working paper, a Senate committee be established to advise the President on all aspects of budget formulation," and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

1 in favor  
16 opposed

Question was called on Alternative (d), "None of the above," and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

11 in favor  
7 opposed

It was noted that the person or persons to be charged to present Senate's views to the Committee on the Working Paper would report that Senate had preference for none of the options proposed.

2. Paper S.74-27, Appendix B - Items Postponed from January 21, 1974  
Special Meeting

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

"That consideration of Paper S.74-27 Appendix B, Items V through VIII, and the selection of a committee to present Senate's views be postponed until the ad hoc committee on philosophies and objectives makes its report."

K. Rieckhoff commented that at the previous meeting, although there was considerable feeling expressed, the assembly was unable to reach a consensus. He suggested hearings would likely produce wider views which would place Senate in a better position to reach a conclusion. J. P. Daem said that Senate had spent considerable time looking at what the Board, the President, and Senate should do, and the issues regarding Faculties and departments should not be avoided at this time.

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

MOTION TO POSTPONE FAILED

4 in favor  
15 opposed.

Consideration of Recommendation V re Faculty Committees was undertaken:

"That a committee of faculty and students be established to survey faculty committees on which student representation is needed, and to recommend accordingly."

A number of comments were made as to the lack of clarity in wording and intent of the motion and to what body recommendations would be made.

Moved by J. Seager, seconded by J. P. Daem,

"That Recommendation V be referred to the ad hoc committee on philosophies and objectives."

R. Brown remarked that the terms of reference of the ad hoc committee did not include the charge noted in the recommendation.

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

3 in favor

An amendment was proposed by A. Hollibaugh to strike the word "accordingly" and add "a ballot on a one person, one vote basis of faculty and students, with results to the President," but it failed for lack of a seconder.

Amendment was moved by R. Sadleir, seconded by B. Beirne,

"That the following words be added to the recommendation, 'to the Faculties involved,'"

R. Kissner gave notice of motion, "That a committee of three faculty and three students survey faculty committees....."

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

6 in favor

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

"That a committee of three faculty members and three students be established by Senate to survey Faculty committees on which student representation is needed and to recommend to the President accordingly."

R. Kissner stated that the revision would introduce an independent person in the President, but K. Rieckhoff countered that the President did not have authority over a Faculty committee. In response to a question by J. Wheatley, the Chairman stated that any recommendations under the conditions proposed would likely be referred to the Faculty

for its information.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

8 in favor  
8 opposed

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Seager,

"That the Recommendation V re Faculty Committees  
be tabled."

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

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED

12 in favor  
5 opposed

The Chairman stated that Recommendation VI re Procedures for Academic Appointments, etc. was the next item for consideration:

"That committees of administrators, faculty and students be established to suggest appropriate procedures and advise the President accordingly."

J. Ellis enquired if the Universities Act gives the President authority to carry recommendations on appointments to the Board of Governors, and the Chairman responded that it was a procedural responsibility of the President which could not be delegated.

D. DeVoretz objected to consideration, and the question of consideration was put to a vote.

OBJECTION TO CONSIDERATION  
SUSTAINED

Attention was next directed to Item VII.1 - Recommendations re Alternative Approaches to University Education:

"That a standing committee of administrators, faculty, and students of the three universities be established to consider this matter and recommend accordingly."

R. Sadleir proposed an amendment to delete the words "this matter" and insert "alternative approaches to University education." As there was no objection, the Chairman declared the recommendation altered accordingly.

Amendment was moved by R. Brown, seconded by J. Seager,

"That the following words be inserted between



S.M. 4/2/74

'recommend' and 'accordingly': 'to the Committee on University Governance in British Columbia.'"

R. Brown stated that the intention was to comply with the purpose of the paper to comment on University governance and direct the comments to the committee. R. Sadleir said if the committee were extant the recommendation would be lost, and gave notice of motion that the recommendation be to the Minister of Education. J. Ellis did not think the amendment clarified the intent of the committee.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

10 in favor  
6 opposed

A substitute motion was moved by J. Ellis, seconded by S. Smith,

"That this Senate suggest to the Committee on University Governance that it create or recommend the creation of a vehicle for the continuing examination of alternative approaches to University education."

Moved by A. Hollibaugh, seconded by D. DeVoretz,

"That Item VII.1, including the substitute proposed motion, be tabled."

Question was called on the motion to table Item VII.1, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO TABLE FAILED  
4 in favor

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

SUBSTITUTE MOTION CARRIED

20 in favor  
0 opposed

J. D'Auria enquired if an alternative approach to University education was intended to include the college system, and S. Smith stated that the recommendation might have been clearer if it had specified alternative approaches to traditional University education.

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

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED  
CARRIED

Discussion ensued on Item VII.2:

"That consideration be given to setting up a degree-granting body modelled in some fashion after the Open University and capable of awarding transferable academic credit."

R. Sadleir proposed an amendment to delete the words "and capable of awarding transferable academic credit," but the amendment failed for lack of a seconder.

Amendment was moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by J. Ellis,

"That following the word 'consideration' there be inserted 'by the vehicle of Item VII.1.'"

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

J. D'Auria commented that the Open University concept would be an expensive project in British Columbia, but S. Smith stated the recommendation was intended to promote investigation of feasibility in a sparse population. J. Wheatley added that the use of materials already developed could make the proposal viable.

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

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED  
CARRIED

18 in favor  
2 opposed

VIII - General Recommendation:

"That in view of the extent to which the content of the Working Paper has been studied by Senates, the Committee on University Government should include henceforth at least one Senator from each of the three Universities."

R. Kissner pointed out that there are four Universities in British Columbia, and, as there was no objection, the Chairman declared that the recommendation would be altered accordingly.

S. Smith noted that if the recommendation were approved it would be directed to the appropriate authorities.

Question was called on Recommendation VIII, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

2 in favor  
14 opposed

The Chairman referred to page 17 of the minutes of the Special meeting of January 21, 1974 wherein it was recorded that J. P. Daem had given notice of motion.

Moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by E. Burkle,

"That faculty, staff and student members of Senate and the Board be given time releases from their respective duties to perform their functions on the Senate and the Board."

J. P. Daem said the intent was to provide a device whereby student members would not be penalized through participation. J. Ellis was sympathetic with the intent but suggested that lay members could face substantial financial sacrifices.

In response to a question from the Chairman, J. P. Daem made it clear that the intent was to provide the motion, if approved, to the Committee on University Governance in British Columbia, and not for immediate implementation here.

Amendment was moved by J. Ellis, seconded by G. Rheumer,

"That the words 'faculty, staff and students' be deleted and that after 'given' there be added 'appropriate compensation' and the words up to and including 'duties' be struck."

The effect of the amendment would alter the wording to read as follows:

"That members of Senate and the Board be given appropriate compensation to perform their duties and their functions on Senate and the Board."

Discussion ensued on the definition of the word "compensation," and a number of opinions were expressed. J. Seager objected to consideration, and the question of consideration was put to a vote.

OBJECTION NOT SUSTAINED

J. D'Auria spoke against the motion and the amendment as self-interest oriented and leading to abuse. T. Sterling thought that the proposal for compensation should exclude faculty members.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

13 in favor  
3 opposed

J. D'Auria requested that his negative vote be recorded.

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

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED  
CARRIED

14 in favor  
3 opposed

J. D'Auria requested that his negative vote be recorded.

The Chairman noted that the remaining item in connection with Paper S.74-27 as originally presented was the motion,

"That Senate select one or more of its number to present its views on the Working Paper to the Committee on University Government."

Moved by J. Ellis, seconded by J. P. Daem,

"That the chairman of the ad hoc committee, assisted by the members of the ad hoc committee be the members to make the presentation to the Committee on University Governance."

R. Kissner declined membership, and the Chairman stated that the motion would then have the effect of limiting the membership to B. P. Beirne, assisted by W.A.S. Smith.

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

MOTION CARRIED

4. Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

1. Paper S.74-31 - Recommended Rules of Senate

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

"That this paper be postponed to the next regular meeting of Senate."

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

MOTION TO POSTPONE  
CARRIED

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

There were no reports of Faculties.

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 4, 1974, at 7:30 p.m.

3. Other Items

There were no other items.

4. Confidential Matters

Senate moved immediately into Closed Session at 11:08 p.m.

H. M. Evans  
Secretary