

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1976, 3172 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 7:00 P.M.

Present: Jewett, P., Chairman

Absent: Arrott, A. S.
Barlow, J. S.
Cunningham, A. B.
Cunningham, F.
Diamond, J.
Doherty, P. M.
Finlayson, T.
Hindle, L.
Martel, A. G.
Sterling, T. D.

Birch, D. R.
Bittle, D. E.
Blaney, J. P.
Brown, R. C.
Buitenhuis, P.
Calvert, T. W.
Carlson, R. L.
Catalano, J. A.
Curzon, A. E.
Davison, A. J.
Debo, R. K.
Dobb, T. C., representing D. A. Baird
Ellis, J. F.
Emery, B. E.
Erickson, D. A.
Fattah, E. A.
Glas, T.
Hindley, M. P.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Ironside, R. A.
Johl, R.
Jones, C.H.W.
Knight, D. E.
Latham, L.
MacDonald, B. L.
Mackauer, J.P.M.
McClaren, M.
McGuire, G. T.
Munro, J. M.
Okuda, K.
Overholt, M. J.
Severy, L.
Thomas, S.
Walker, R. E.
Walkley, J.
Webster, J. M.
Wemyss, I. D.
Wheatley, J.
Wilson, B. G.

A. J. Dawson

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

S.M. 29/11/76

In a recent by-election by and from students of two students to replace N. G. Hall and R. Schiffer for balance terms of office to May 31, 1977, undernoted are the returns:

Ballots Cast	1119
Ballots Spoiled	16
Individual Totals:	
Bittle, Gale	547
Glas, Ted	671
Lloyd, Clifford	293
McGuire, Gerald	583

The Chairman congratulated Senators Glas and McGuire and welcomed them to Senate. Observers were also welcomed to the meeting and these included some members of the Board of Governors, Dr. B. P. Beirne, and individuals from NDU.

1. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE PROVISION OF UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS IN NON-METROPOLITAN AREAS, PAPER S.76-152

The Chairman commented that only one item was on the agenda for the Special Meeting of Senate and that the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules had drawn up a series of procedures to facilitate consideration of the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, which were contained in Paper S.76-152a.

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

"That the recommendations for the procedures, as set forth in Paper S.76-152a, be approved."

Following discussion and clarification of some points, question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

P. Buitenhuis opened informal discussion of the Report, stating that political pressure had led to the Winegard Committee to provide recommendations to improve post-secondary education in non-metropolitan areas of the province, but the Commission's report had been quickly prepared, inadequately researched, and the projections of required funding were grossly underestimated. He referred to Dr. Beirne's review of the Winegard Report and drew attention to a number of the consequences outlined therein with respect to acceptance of a responsible role in the development of higher education in other areas of the province. He favored offering assistance in the establishment of a new independent university and avoiding involvement in its operation, and indicated that from his discussions with persons in the interior he was firmly convinced that this was their desire - Motion D. J. Blaney did not consider the Winegard Report to be a political solution to a political problem but a response to a need for improved post-secondary educational opportunities in the interior. Both Buitenhuis and Blaney offered their comments as members of the Winegard advisory committee.

S.M. 29/11/76

J. Wheatley believed that there was an opportunity for new money and that funds provided via SFU would be more effective than if given to a new independent university which he feared could be fourth rate. He believed this institution has a moral responsibility to help, and that it would do a good job with challenges to be faced but excitement to overcome these.

R. Walker supported Motion D and opposed involvement beyond co-operation in the development of university programs in non-metropolitan areas on the grounds that the desires of the people living in the interior have not been clearly established. Limited involvement would minimize the risk to people in the interior and would force the government to proceed with the establishment of an autonomous university.

M. McClaren rejected Motion D and spoke strongly for B, as did J. Blaney, T. Calvert, J. Walkley, J. Webster, D. Birch and A. Davison. J. Munro argued for C and K. Okuda for D. S. Dawson supported B and noted the experience of the Faculty of Education in its programs in the interior. J. Hutchinson spoke strongly for D. R. Brown expressed his concern that the information presently available to Simon Fraser did not provide an adequate basis on which to determine a final decision. He considered it essential that further discussion take place between this university and the government and that opportunities for additional research be made possible.

B. Wilson rejected the argument that there was an undue gamble. He noted that no speakers had spoken for either A or E. T. Dobb indicated his support for A, with B. MacDonald and R. Ironside speaking for D, R. Carlson for C, and J. Ellis for B.

D. Knight gave notice of motion, "Simon Fraser University is prepared to cooperate in the development of an independent provincial university which would offer programs in non-metropolitan areas and is willing, in principle, to offer such expertise in academic and administrative resources as may be required. But any program implemented by Simon Fraser University would require prior approval by the University's Senate and Board of Governors together with assurance of an appropriate level of funding." He later withdrew this motion.

During the debate the assembly approved extensions to the period established for informal discussion. The informal consideration of the SCAP report terminated at 9:10 p.m. Following a brief recess, Senate entered formal discussion at 9:34 p.m.

Considerable further debate took place on perceived advantages and disadvantages of the various motions and attempts were made to delineate and clarify the options contained in the report from the Senate Committee on Academic Planning.

Motion was made by J. Blaney, seconded by J. Walkley, "That Question A be isolated and that Question 3 become the first question." The effect of this motion would be to change

S.M. 29/11/76

- from: 1. Question: Should there be any formal SFU participation in the projected university development in non-metropolitan areas?
 Motions: Yes (A,B,C,D) No (E)
- 2. Question: Should SFU participation be limited to support of an independent university?
 Motions: Yes (D) No (A,B,C)
- 3. Question: Should SFU commit itself at this time to accept total responsibility?
 Motions: Yes (A) No (B,C)
- 4. Question: Should any decision on implementation be deferred until a detailed planning report be available?
 Motions: Yes (C) No (B)
- to: 1. Question: Should SFU commit itself at this time to accept total responsibility?
 Motions: Yes (A) No (B,C,D,E)
- 2. Question: Should there be any formal SFU participation in the projected university development in non-metropolitan areas?
 Motions: (Yes (B,C,D) No (E)
- 3. Question: Should SFU participation be limited to support of an independent university?
 Motions: Yes (D) No (B,C)
- 4. Question: Should any decision on implementation be deferred until a detailed planning report be available?
 Motions: Yes (C) No (B)

A vote was taken on this motion to reorder and there was approval. (Later actions cancelled this.)

Amendments to the wording of some questions were proposed. B. Wilson noted that changes made to the questions would not change the motions. Subsequently there was general agreement that amendments to the questions would not be permitted.

Motion was made by J. Munro, seconded by R. Walkler, "That Question 4 follow the new question 1, and that the No vote in Question 4 refer to Motions B, D, E. This to be followed by Question 1, which would have Yes B and No E, etc."

Because the full impact of the motion could not be clearly identified, consideration was given to activating the advisory committee which would consist of some of the members of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning and to having a recess to enable the advisory committee to determine all of the changes that would need to be made to the decision tree. The

Secretary noted that to restructure the decision tree to coincide with the motion would necessitate amendments to the wording of some of the questions and it had been decided by Senate that amendments of this type would not be made. He also referred to Paper S.76-152a, Item 2. iv) c), "that changes proposed be handed in writing to the Secretary."

P. Jewett named the members of SCAP who would form the advisory committee and suggested that Senate recess. J. Hutchinson spoke against the propriety of restructuring the original decision tree.

It was moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by T. Calvert, "That Senate revert to the original decision tree, as set forth on page 5 of Paper S.76-152," and on the taking of the vote there was strong support for the decision.

Votes were then taken on each of the questions on page 5 of S.76-152, with results as follow:

Question 1:	Should there be any formal SFU participation in the projected university development in non-metropolitan areas?	
	Yes (A,B,C,D)	36
	No (E)	2
Question 2:	Should SFU participation be limited to support of an independent university?	
	Yes (D)	19
	No (A,B,C)	21
Question 3:	Should SFU commit itself at this time to accept total responsibility?	
	Yes (A)	6
	No (B,C)	29
Question 4:	Should any decision on implementation be deferred until a detailed planning report be available?	
	Yes (C)	9
	No (B)	23
	Abstentions	8

The Chairman confirmed that Alternative B had received Senate's majority approval and the following decision was adopted:

"Simon Fraser University is willing to accept in principle responsibility for offering university programs in non-metropolitan areas and is prepared to appoint a director and appropriate staff to develop specific plans by December 1977,

S.M. 29/11/76

provided that funds for such development will be made available by the government. Any program implementation by Simon Fraser University would require prior approval by the University's Senate and Board of Governors, together with assurance of an appropriate level of funding."

The Special Meeting of Senate was declared adjourned at 10:42 p.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary