

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD  
MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1978, 3172 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 7:00 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present: Jewett, P., Chairman

Arrott, A. S.  
Barlow, J. S.  
Birch, D. R.  
Bittle, D. E.  
Bittle, G.  
Blaney, J. P.  
Buitenhuis, P.  
Calvert, T. W.  
Carlson, R. L.  
Chapman, A. E.  
Cunningham, A. B.  
Cunningham, F.  
Dobb, T. C.  
Hackney, J. W.  
Hobson, R. F.  
Holweg, B.  
Hossack, K.  
Hoyt, G. C.  
Hutchinson, J. F.  
Ivany, J.W.G.  
Kazepides, A.  
Keltner, A. A.  
Kemp, C. L.  
Lal, H.  
Latham, L.  
Mackauer, J.P.M.  
McClaren, M.  
McGuire, G. T.  
Mulholland, E. B.  
Munro, J. M.  
Okuda, K.  
Overholt, M. J.  
Palmer, B.J.F.  
Powell, R. D.  
Resnick, L.  
Rieckhoff, K. E.  
Thomas, S.  
Walkley, J.  
Webb, M. J.  
Webster, J. M.  
Weinberg, H.  
Wells, E. J.  
Wheatley, J.  
Wilson, B. G.

Absent: Croll, J. R.  
Diamond, J.  
Doherty, P. M.  
Hindle L.  
Knight, D. E.  
Wyatt, J. D.

In attendance: Alspach, B. R.  
Bowman, M. L.  
Richards, W. D., Jr.

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

The Chairman welcomed T. C. Dobb, who had assumed the Senate seat of the former University Librarian, D. A. Baird. She noted that Mr. Baird had been a member of Senate since its inception in 1965, and on behalf of the membership extended good wishes to him during his current leave of absence and in the pursuit of his subsequent duties as University Archivist.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Reference was made to page 9 of the minutes of the Open Session of December 12, 1977, and at the request of B. Wilson the last sentence of the last paragraph was deleted from the record. The minutes of the Open Sessions of December 5, and December 12, 1977 were then approved as corrected.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

i) Paper S.78-1 - Presidential Search Committee - Selection of a Candidate and Operation of Search Committee

Moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by L. Resnick,

"That Senate approve the procedures established by the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.78-1, for the recommendation and selection of a candidate and for the operation of the Presidential Search Committee:

1. That the Committee recommend to the Board for its consideration suitable persons, ranked in order, for the Presidency as soon as possible.
2. That the Committee make every effort to present unanimous recommendations to the Board, but, if it cannot do so, that the recommendations have the support of at least two-thirds of the Committee.
3. That the proceedings of the Committee be strictly confidential. However, reports at any stage may be made to the Board of Governors.
4. That the Committee appoint a Secretary to the Committee and such secretarial staff as is necessary.
5. That the Vice-Presidents meet with the Committee to present their views concerning desirable qualifications for a Presidential candidate. The Vice-Presidents will also meet with the candidates on the short list and will present their opinions to the Committee.

S.M. 9/1/78

6. That the Simon Fraser University community be canvassed by the Committee for suitable names.
7. That the Committee, at its first meeting, be authorized to establish such further operational procedures as it may require."

Note: At the Board of Governors meeting held on December 6, 1977, the Board noted Senate's point of clarification to change Clause (a) of Paper S.77-137 to read:

"two members of the Board plus the Chairman, or in place of the Chairman a member of the Board designated by the Chairman, with the Chairman or his designate serving as Chairman of the Committee."

Although the Chairman originally stated that only suggestions for change could be relayed to the Board of Governors, following extended discussion and the difficulties arising from such procedure, she agreed to accept amendments to the motion.

An amendment was moved by J. Munro, seconded by P. Buitenhuis,

"That Clause 1 be altered to read, 'That the Committee recommend to the Board for its consideration a suitable person or persons, ranked in order, for the Presidency as soon as possible.'"

J. Munro stated that the amendment was intended to avoid possible delays which could develop in the event the stated procedures proved to be unworkable or if there obviously were to be a single outstanding candidate with difficulties in agreeing on the lesser alternatives. The Chairman indicated the Board specifically had made changes from previous search, wanting more than one name, and noting also the use of the plural in Clause 2. K. Rieckhoff, A. Arrott, and C. Hoyt opposed the amendment as restricting the Committee's options, while J. Wheatley felt there was desirable facilitating in the proposal.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

An amendment was moved by H. Lal, seconded by L. Latham,

"That Clause 3 be altered to read, 'That the proceedings of the Committee be strictly confidential. However, reports at any stage may be made to the Board of Governors and to the Senate in Closed Session.'"

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

9/1/78

During the discussion of Clause 2 of the motion it was argued by some and opposed by others that two-thirds support of the Committee was desirable both for individual candidates recommended and for the ranking order. Others supported the view that two-thirds related to whatever motion the Committee approved. Following continued discussion J. Wheatley, K. Rieckhoff and the Chairman felt it should be left to the Committee.

An amendment was moved by H. Weinberg, seconded by A. Kazepides,

"That Clause 2 be altered to read, 'That each individual recommended and the ranking have the support of at least two-thirds of the Committee.'"

H. Weinberg was of the opinion that the amendment would eliminate an interpretation that only the ranking or alternatively that only the individual recommended required two-thirds support.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

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

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.78-2 - Search Procedures for University Librarian

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

"That Senate approve the selection procedures and terms of reference established by the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.78-2, for the University Librarian Search Committee:

A. Selection of the University Librarian Search Committee:

1. The University Librarian Search Committee shall consist of the following members:
  - a. The Academic Vice-President, who shall serve as Chairman.
  - b. Two Deans, elected by the Deans.
  - c. Four members of the University Library Professional Librarian and Division Head staff elected by that constituency.
  - d. One faculty member from each Faculty, holding a regular full-time appointment, appointed by the Dean.
  - e. Two students, to be selected by such methods as the Simon Fraser Student Society may determine.
  - f. One member of the continuing non-professional Library staff, to be elected by that constituency.
2. All the above members of the University Librarian Search Committee shall be voting members.

B. Terms of Reference of the University Librarian Search Committee:

1. Responsibilities of the University Librarian Search Committee shall include:
  - a. Deciding whether to include in its search area persons outside the University.
  - b. Engaging in a search for potential candidates and examining their credentials.
  - c. Consulting during the search procedure with all available University Library Division Heads.
  - d. Receiving expressions, as early as possible in the search process, of the opinions and preferences of Library personnel.
  - e. Apprising the President of the name of any candidate for appointment so that in advance of making any final recommendation, agreement may be reached between the President and the said candidate regarding the terms under which he/she might be appointed.
  - f. Obtaining, in the case of a candidate from within the Library, ratification by vote of the constituency defined in A.1.(c) above, of the candidate to be recommended to the President; and
  - g. Bringing to the President of the University within a reasonable period one or more recommendations for appointment to the position.
2. If the President does not find it possible to recommend to the Board of Governors the appointment of a candidate recommended by the Committee she shall so inform the Committee, and shall supply an explanation of her decision. In such an event the University Librarian's Search Committee shall undertake once more the responsibilities outlined in B.1. above.

C. Related Matters

1. Only those persons holding appropriate status within the University Library (as determined by Senate and as recorded in the Registrar's Office) shall be eligible to vote under sections A.1.(c) and B.1.(f).
2. Unless otherwise specified, the applicable election rules and procedures shall be those prevailing in elections to Senate, with the elections to be conducted by the Registrar."

Registrar's Explanatory Note: Unless clearly instructed otherwise by the Board and by the Senate, the constituency of Section A.1.(f) shall be taken to be the usual type of constituency for prime elections at this institution and would constitute those non-faculty equivalent library employees entitled to be candidates and/or to vote in elections to the Board.

S.M. 9/1/78

L. Resnick enquired in A.1.(d) why faculty members were to be appointed by Deans rather than elected by faculty in the usual fashion. B. Wilson referred to parallelism with a Dean's Search Committee, but there was not agreement by the enquirer on parallelism.

An amendment was moved by A. Arrott, seconded by J. Hutchinson,

"That Clause A.1.(d) be altered to read, 'One faculty member from each Faculty, holding a regular full-time appointment, elected by and from each Faculty.'"

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED  
22 in favor  
9 opposed

There was considerable discussion of A.1.(e) concerning direct provision for a graduate student. The Chairman noted this had been discussed by the Board with no special provision to be made, but the graduate students were not precluded.

An amendment was moved by H. Lal, seconded by J. Hackney,

"That Clause A.1.(e) be altered to read, 'Three students, to be selected by such methods as the Simon Fraser Student Society may determine; at least one of whom shall be a graduate student.'"

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED  
22 in favor  
4 opposed

A number of questions were raised in connection with the terms of reference as outlined in Section B of the motion, and B. Wilson stated that the parallel was with the terms of reference of the Dean's Search Committee.

An amendment was moved by A. Arrott, seconded by A. Cunningham,

"That B.1.(a) read, 'Fully advertising the position.' and that the following sections be relettered."

B. Wilson was of the opinion that if the amendment were to be approved it would be necessary to delete B.1.(a) as it is currently set forth in Paper S.78-2. Others felt a precedent should not be established which would dictate search areas to the Committee. It was agreed by the assembly that if change were approved it would replace the current B.1.(a) as a substitute without further relettering.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

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

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED  
CARRIED

iii) Paper S.78-3 - Extension Credit Courses - For Information

*received clarification*

K. Rieckhoff clarified that the statistics provided in the paper referred to credit courses and for students enrolled for credit, and the material was accepted for information.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

i) Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Senate Graduate Studies Committee

Paper S.78-4 - New Graduate Program Proposal - Applied/Clinical Psychology

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

"That Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.78-4 (formerly S.77-168), the proposal for a graduate program in Applied/Clinical Psychology, including:

- i) The requirements for degrees
  - (a) M.A. (b) Ph.D. (pages 8,9)
- ii) New courses (or changes)
  - PSYC 802-3 - Seminar in Assessment (page 11 and see S.77-167)
  - PSYC 803-3 - Seminar in Intervention (page 11)
  - PSYC 804-3 - Seminar in Evaluation (page 11 and see S.77-167)
  - PSYC 806-3 - Advanced Topics in Assessment
  - PSYC 807-3 - Advanced Topics in Intervention
  - PSYC 808-3 - Advanced Topics in Evaluation
  - PSYC 809-3 - Advanced Topics in Applied Psychology
  - PSYC 880-5 - Internship I
  - PSYC 886-5 - Internship II
  - PSYC 881-3 - Practicum I
  - PSYC 882-3 - Practicum II
  - PSYC 883-3 - Practicum III
  - PSYC 884-3 - Practicum IV."

The Chairman drew attention to the memorandum attached to the documentation which provided information on the deliberations of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning. K. Okuda added that the question of stipends and gratuities for adjunct staff was under review by the Vice-President's office.

M. Bowman joined the assembly and provided information in connection with varying arrangements involving remuneration or not of graduate students engaged in practica. It was ascertained that no capital costs were anticipated in mounting the program.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

a) Paper S.78-5 - Discontinuation of Course Challenge for EDUC 405

Moved by D. Birch, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Education 405 course challenge be removed from the calendar entry of the Professional Development Program and that this procedure cease, effective September 1, 1977."

Note: Education 405 is a one-semester professional internship taken under supervision and it is the position of the Faculty of Education that all students in the Professional Development Program can profit from it. Course challenge was approved in order to accept, in rare instances, those students who had extensive prior professional experience and who could demonstrate outstanding competence. Application for course challenge commits the Faculty to a very expensive procedure with dubious benefits. For this reason the Faculty has proposed its discontinuance.

M. McClaren supported the concept of people with special talents taking alternative steps, but in his opinion course challenge for EDUC 405 was not the right mechanism to shorten the professional program. R. Powell noted that the paper provided a good deal of analysis but lacked constructive suggestions to resolve the problem. Considerable debate ensued with strong reservations by some about removing the alternate route without indication of more suitable processes for special cases.

Moved by B. Holweg, seconded by G. McGuire,

"That Paper S.78-5 be referred through SCUS to the Faculty of Education for a proposal of better alternative procedures."

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

The Secretary confirmed that, in view of the original approval by Senate and the nature of the present debate, if the present motion were defeated then the normal university regulations for course challenge could not be applied to EDUC 405 without authoritative confirmation by Senate.

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

MAIN MOTION FAILED

b) Paper S.78-6 - New Course Proposal - CMNS 445 - Communication and International Development

Moved by D. Birch, seconded by T. Calvert,

"That the proposed new course CMNS 445-5 (Communication and International Development), as set forth in S.78-6, be approved and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval."

Note: The Political Science Department was represented by Dr. Audrey Doerr who indicated that her department had noted overlap but had not specifically opposed approval of CMNS 445-5. Instead she was asking that guidelines be developed to indicate the circumstances under which overlap should be considered undesirable. Professor Melody stated that Professor Anderson of Communication Studies had met with the instructor for POL. 448-3 (Selected Topics in International Relations I) and that they had identified a fairly specific overlap involving the content of 3 1/2 of 13 weeks' instruction. Furthermore the instructors involved recognize that each had a distinctive emphasis and approach appropriate to his department and each will provide guest appearances in the other's course.

Members of SCUS agreed that each of several social science and applied social science departments appropriately deal with issues relating to international development and that a department of communication could appropriately deal with the issues raised in CMNS 445-5. It was noted that POL. 448-3 is a selected topics course and, therefore, its content might well change from time to time and, although overlap is currently significant, it is not excessive nor undesirable.

K. Okuda was of the opinion that the course related to communication involving Canada and developing countries, and as a number of other courses in different departments deal with the problem of <sup>international</sup> development it was imperative that a title to accurately distinguish the CMNS proposal should be sought. W. Richards, who was in attendance to respond to questions, found the suggestion acceptable, and it was agreed that if the content of the course were to be approved the Chairman of SCUS, the Registrar, the Chairman of the Department, and K. Okuda would attempt to reach a consensus on an appropriate course title.

Question was called on the motion (including the proviso), and a vote taken. (Note: Change was made by adding to the title "The Role of Canadian Institutions.")

MOTION (WITH THE  
PROVISO) CARRIED

c) Paper S.78-7 - Mathematics New Course Proposals and Discontinuance of MATH 450-8

Moved by D. Birch, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

Motion 1 "That Senate approve, and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the proposed new courses:  
MATH 336-0 - Job Practicum I  
MATH 337-0 - Job Practicum II  
MATH 436-0 - Job Practicum III  
MATH 437-0 - Job Practicum IV,  
as set forth in S.78-7. These courses are to be graded on a P/W basis with the implications as stated on page 71 of the 1977-78 calendar."

Note: Although Senate has not yet been asked to approve a general university model for Co-operative Education, a number of departments including Mathematics have developed opportunities for students to undertake in a systematic way alternate semesters of study and related work experience. The proposals for Co-operative Education programs have included four work semesters and the Mathematics Department has proposed four job practicum courses without credit to accommodate students wishing to undertake that many work semesters in approved placements.

The scale of fees appropriate for job practicum courses has not yet been determined and it is a question which must be addressed by the Board of Governors before these courses are finally approved and listed for offering. Those universities which currently offer Co-operative Education programs either charge fees for the work semester or charge larger fees in the study semester for those students enrolled in the Co-op program. No doubt these practices reflect costs to the university in obtaining approved positions and arranging for placement of students.

B. Alspach was invited to respond to queries.

Noting that the proposal was intended to be graded on a Pass/Withdrawal basis, R. Powell enquired how the withdrawal would be initiated and if there was any recourse for the student. D. Birch stated that the work term must be completed in a manner satisfactory to the employer and if the employer wished the student to be withdrawn the university would not interfere with the job but likely would withdraw credit for the course. A minimum criteria needed to be met for a P to be awarded, as in any practica course. B. Alspach added that the student activities would be monitored and brief reports from both the student and the employer would be required.

T. Calvert supported the proposal but pointed out that the general principle of zero credit practica required further study and the Mathematics submission should not be seen as establishing a precedent. B. Alspach stated that the principal argument for zero credit was the non-academic component where students were paid for full time regular employment.

Question was called on Motion 1, and a vote taken.

MOTION 1 CARRIED

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

Motion 2 "That Senate approve, and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the discontinuance of MATH 450-8 (Job Practicum), as set forth in S.78-7."

Question was called on Motion 2, and a vote taken.

MOTION 2 CARRIED

d) Paper S.78-8 - Proposed New Course - BISC 105-3

Moved by D. Birch, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That BISC 105-3 (Biology and the Human Species), as set forth in S.78-8, be approved and recommended to the Board for approval, as there is not (in the judgment of SCUS) undesirable overlap."

Note: The SCUS meeting at which this matter was considered took place some three weeks after referral by Senate - referral based on a concern expressed by the Chairman of the Archaeology Department about substantial overlap between the proposed BISC 105-3 (Biology and the Human Species) and the existing ARC. 131-3 (Human Origins). In the intervening period of time each department had given some consideration to the question but there had been limited discussion between the two departments. At the SCUS meeting the Archaeology Department was represented by its Chairman, Professor Carlson, and the course instructor, Professor Skinner. The Biological Sciences Department was represented by its Chairman, Professor Mackauer, and the Chairman of its Curriculum Committee, Professor Kemp. Professor Carlson stated that human biology is physical anthropology, that the Archaeology Department already offers a first-year course in physical anthropology (i.e., human biology), that the proposed BISC 105 overlaps up to 80% with that course, that the Department of Biological Sciences has proposed the course primarily for students from the Faculty of Arts and that it should not, therefore, be approved. He requested (and still requests) that the matter be referred to the Departments concerned for consultation and resolution.

The position of the Biological Sciences Department is that physical anthropology and human biology are not identical, the BISC 105 is not a course in human biology anyway, that it is a course in general biology designed to teach concepts, principles and functions identical with those introduced in BISC 101 and 102. It is designed not solely for students from the Faculty of Arts but rather to relieve pressure on first year biology labs and it is utilizing "key problems" related to the human species as a pedagogical device to assist students in learning the concepts of general biology.

Following protracted discussion SCUS rejected the proposal that the matter be referred to the departments, determined that (in its judgment) the overlap between the courses was not as extensive as suggested by the Chairman of the Department of Archaeology, that the courses had differing purposes and perspectives, and that the degree of overlap was not undesirable.

S.M. 9/1/78

Following the SCUS meeting, the secretary received a request from the Chairman of the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee that Senate refer this matter to the departments concerned. In order to ascertain whether there might be additional information not presented to SCUS, the Chairman of SCUS convened a meeting (December 22) attended by the Dean of Arts, the Dean of Science, the Registrar and representatives of the Department of Archaeology and the Department of Biological Sciences. At that meeting the Department of Biological Sciences presented a re-statement of the course outline unchanged in comment but revised to eliminate ambiguities which might have contributed to a judgment of course overlap. Also distributed at the meeting was the course outline of ARC. 131-3 (Spring, 1975) which had been presented to Senate at the time the course was originally approved in May 1974. It appeared from the documents that there was relatively little overlap (if any) between the course description for BISC 105 and the original course outline of ARC. 131-3, somewhat more potential overlap with the 1977-3 outline of ARC. 131 and more again with the 1978-3 outline of ARC. 131 and suggested that, in his judgment, there was not more than 20% to 25% overlap. Professor Carlson continued to be concerned that the course should be entitled general biology and should not make reference to the human species if it was intended to be a general biology course.

In my judgment, as Chairman of SCUS, referral of this matter to the Department of Archaeology and Biological Sciences is unlikely to change positions or to achieve a different resolution.

R. Carlson spoke against the motion stating that the proposal was a service already offered in the university for Arts students, though not exclusively, and it duplicates "human origins." He felt there was no academic justification for the expense of duplication at the 100 division. The Biology representatives had responded that BISC 105 was not a course in human biology and that it would parallel the offerings in BISC 101 and BISC 102, and he felt that should be indicated in the title and course description. He also noted that a student can take BISC 101, BISC 102 and BISC 105 without any restriction from taking one, two or all three of the courses. He felt the proposal had been ill-conceived.

J. Munro noted that a memorandum exists which represents the current view of the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee that there is considerable overlap between BISC 105 and ARC. 131. (Note: That memo now forms part of the support papers.)

M. Mackauer confirmed that students can take 101, 102 and 105; that major students must take 101 and 102; a student may take 105 as an elective and then decide to major, needing 101 and 102, in which case he might challenge 102. He stated that BISC 105 is introductory and open to all students and intended to present the relationship of biology to the environment of modern society. A. Kazepides suggested the new course proposal might take the number of the current BISC 101, and that the current BISC 101 be renumbered BISC 105. R. Carlson added that BISC 105 should be presented as an alternative or a prerequisite to the existing introductory courses.

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

MOTION CARRIED

e) Paper S.78-9 - Transfer Credit Toward Requirements for a Minor - Faculty of Arts

Moved by D. Birch, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate approve, and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the regulation that only six hours of upper division credit transfer from other institutions can count as part of the fifteen (15) required upper division hours for a Minor in the Faculty of Arts."

Note: There is currently no limitation on the amount of transfer credit which may be credited toward a Minor. The regulation is proposed in order to guarantee that a majority of the credits counted toward a Minor be earned at Simon Fraser University.

Discussion ensued on the impact such a regulation would have on minors for students undertaking a BGS degree, possibly some effect on B.Ed. students taking minors in the Faculty of Arts, and possible implications regarding Interior Programming. J. Munro noted the intent was to require some minimal amount of work at SFU in the minor area before attaching the minor label in Arts.

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

"That Paper S.78-9 be referred back to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for comments from all Faculties."

B. Wilson said the general principle should be established before Senate addresses the matter. J. Munro did not object to referral but pointed out that different faculties have different degree requirements and he did not think it was desirable to enforce a common pattern for degrees.

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

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

f) Paper S.78-10 - Delegation of Authority to SCUS

Moved by D. Birch, seconded by T. Calvert,

"That Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board:

1. That the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies be authorized to conclude all matters dealing with proposed revision of an existing course unless such revision is undertaken in the context of a major program revision or entails the need for the allocation of additional resources;

2. That such actions be reported in a summary form (at least once each semester) to Senate and the Board for ratification;
3. Notwithstanding the authority granted to it, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies retains the right to forward for consideration by Senate and the Board any matter which, in the judgment of the Committee or its Chairman, requires such consideration."

Note: It is proposed that this motion be implemented January 1, 1978 or as soon thereafter as it is approved by Senate and the Board.

Rationale: The intent is to lessen by one the number of University-level considerations given to minor curriculum revisions, specifically to the revision of an existing course. This is a minimal delegation of authority but even so it should save paper and reserve the time of Senators for consideration of weightier matters.

D. Birch observed that had the motion been in effect in advance of recent meetings of Senate some twenty-five thousand sheets of paper would have been saved, that there are eight considerations of each curricula change, and that SCUS is by design of Senate a representative body capable of assuming the decision making. K. Rieckhoff questioned that SCUS could identify problems which might occur in submissions from the faculties, and suggested that the University Review Committee would likely have some concern with the administration of the committee structure and the flow of materials. B. Wilson noted that a special task force had been charged to review the bureaucratic processes, including those of Senate and its committees. He expected there would be drastic suggestions made with regard to the flow of materials.

R. Powell was in support of the motion to streamline the procedures and was of the opinion that adoption of the principle would place more responsibility on the faculty curriculum committees and the departmental chairmen.

Noting that the deadline for duration of the meeting had expired, it was

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

"That the meeting be adjourned."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

Moved by T. Calvert, seconded by M. Overholt,

"That the meeting be extended for fifteen minutes."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

L. Resnick spoke in favor of the motion, stating that it would be to the advantage of the university community generally.

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

"That the motion be tabled pending receipt of the report of the University Review Committee."

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

MOTION TO TABLE FAILED

C. Hoyt enquired what the voting rules of SCUS were, and D. Birch responded that a simple majority was required for approval. He added that there had been some hesitation in referring submissions back to the curriculum committees when it was apparent that calendar revisions could be delayed for a year.

An amendment was moved by A. Arrott, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That section 2 be altered to read, 'That such actions be reported in a summary form to Senate at its next meeting and the Board for ratification.'"

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

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

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

i) Faculty of Science

a) Paper S.78-11 - For Information - Use of Special Topics Courses - 77-2

Senate received for information the report from the Faculty of Science in connection with the use of Special Topics courses during the 77-2 semester.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION

i) Paper S.78-12 - Proposed Change to Rules of Senate (Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules) - Not for Discussion

A notice of motion relating to proposed adjustment of the Rules of Senate was presented for review of Senators in advance of discussion at the next meeting of Senate.

9. INFORMATION

It was noted that the next regular meeting of Senate is scheduled for Monday, February 6, 1978.

The assembly moved immediately into Closed Session at 10:13 p.m.

H. M. Evans  
Secretary