

SM 7/18/67

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
HELD IN THE BOARD AND SENATE ROOM  
MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 1967 AT 7 P.M.

Present: P.D. McTaggart-Cowan Chairman  
R.J. Baker  
J. Behrens  
D. Berg  
J.L. Dampier  
A.J. Ellis  
J.S. Foulds  
C.J. Frederickson  
G.H. Geen  
E.M. Gibson  
W.M. Hamilton  
R.J.C. Harper  
G. Kirchner  
I. Koerner  
M.A. Lebowitz  
E.S. Lett  
S.K. Lower  
A.R. MacKinnon  
J.W. Matthews  
G.N. Perry  
K.E. Rieckhoff  
G. Sperling  
D.H. Sullivan  
D.G. Tuck  
J. Walkley  
S. Wasserman  
W. Williams  
S. Wong  
S. Yandle  
D.P. Robertson Secretary  
M. Dawson Recording Secretary

In attendance: D. Roberts, Information Officer

Absent: D. Baird  
A.E. Branca  
F. Candelaria  
A.F.C. Hean  
C.H. McLean  
G.M. Shrum

## 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Page 2, Item 2, insert: "M. A. Lebowitz complained that, as a new Senator he did not have the materials available to him to perform properly his functions as a Senator. He asked that he be given a copy of previous Senate minutes, a description of the working rules of Senate and a list of all Senate Committees, their responsibilities and their composition. The Registrar informed him that it would be too costly to provide previous minutes for new Senators, but that copies of previous Senate minutes were available in Departmental offices. R.J. Baker suggested that retiring Senate members could pass their minutes on to new Senate members as a general rule."

B. Page 3, Item 3A, Special Education Project, amend last paragraph:

".....involved in the project. The Centre would make no more demands on University funds than would be made by normal enrolment in the Faculty of Education, although it was possible that the existence of the off-campus program would lead to increased enrolment in Special Education. Moved by....."

C. Page 4, Item 3C, Interdisciplinary Program in Kinesiology, amend first paragraph: "...laboratory in BioScience. R.J. Baker questioned the advisability of having a program administered by a Committee rather than by a Faculty, suggesting it might be at odds with the Act; D.H. Sullivan questioned the very strict nature of the first two years of the program which required students to take a list of courses with no more than four elective hours within the first sixty hours."

D. Page 5, Item 4B, Appeal to Senate by Five Graduate Students amend first paragraph: "...Committee on University Regulations."

S. Yandle served notice of motion "that Senate consider the appeals of graduate students involved in the Templeton School incident who are appealing the decision of Faculty Council"....."

The Minutes of the meeting of July 10, 1967, were approved with these amendments.

/.....

SM 7/8/67

*Faculty Council*

-3-

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by G.H. Geen

"that the order of the Agenda be re-ordered to allow items E,F,G,H,J,K,M,N,O and P to come in that order at the beginning of the Agenda"

An amendment was moved by D.H. Sullivan, seconded by G. Sperling

"that Business Arising should be given precedence"

AMENDMENT CARRIED  
MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

## 2. BUSINESS ARISING

### A. Proposal for a Special Education Project - S-15

In response to questions enquiring as to the Board of Governors decision regarding the Senate's recommendation on Special Education, the President replied that the Board of Governors had approved the program for one year and had approved the appointment of the co-ordinator for one year with the provision that not later than the end of that year and as early as possible the Faculty of Education should come back with a report on the progress and success of the program and request an extension. This was to give the Faculty of Education opportunity to show that this program could be funded in the manner which the Faculty had in mind and which had been stipulated in the Senate Minutes of its last meeting.

B. The reason for the omission of an item on the Agenda which had been submitted to the Secretary by the student representatives was asked for.

The Registrar explained that the material presented to him did not appear on the meeting's Agenda as the Chairman of Senate had ruled that the material pertained to a matter which had not been defined as Senate business, namely the procedures of Faculty Council.

Some discussion took place on whether or not the papers referred to which now formed part of the Notice of Motion of D.Berg were in fact relating to an appeal against procedures or against decisions. It was decided that all the matters relating to the five graduate students and the relationship of Senate to Faculty Council could be discussed in relation to Item 3A on the Agenda.

It was suggested that these items could be discussed as Business Arising.

Moved M.A. Lebowitz, seconded E.M. Gibson

"that consideration of this item be deferred no later than 8.30 p.m."

MOTION LOST

It was then agreed to move on to the items in the Agenda which had been agreed upon.

3/....

## 3. NEW BUSINESS

## E. Transfer of Students from Recognized Regional Colleges - S-22.

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by E.S. Lett

"that Senate approve the interim operating procedures for transfer students from Regional Colleges as follows:

- a. Normally, students who were eligible for admission prior to attending the College will be admitted with full credit for all approved courses in which they received a "C" or better.
- b. Normally, students who were not eligible for admission prior to attending the College may be admitted upon successful completion of at least four courses in one semester at the College. On admission such students will be granted full credit for all approved courses in which they received a "C" or better.
- c. Normally, students whose record at the College is such that had they been at the University their academic status would be "on probation", will not be admitted until this condition is removed."

The meaning of "approved courses" was questioned. The Registrar explained that references to approved courses meant courses which had been agreed upon between the University and the Colleges as having transfer status. This agreement was arrived at after consultation between the University Departments and their counterparts at the College in most cases.

MOTION CARRIED.

## F. Re-admission of Students Required to Withdraw from the University - S-23

Moved by A.R. MacKinnon, seconded by K.E. Rieckhoff

"that recommendation a. be approved as follows:

- a. Normally, a student who has been required to withdraw from Simon Fraser for the first time, will be re-admitted after a period of one calendar year."

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by R.J. Baker, seconded by W. Williams

"that recommendation b. be approved as follows:

- b. Normally, no credit will be granted to a student on re-admission for academic work completed during the required period of absence. Students required to withdraw will be so informed. The Senate Committee will keep a record of the actual application of this policy and report back to Senate in August, 1968."

3m 7/8/67

Revisions  
Accepted

-5-

Amendment moved by D. Berg, seconded by D.H. Sullivan

"that the second line be altered to read '...completed during the required year of absence.'"

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment moved by G. Sperling, seconded by R.J.C. Harper

"that the wording of the paragraph be amended to read:  
'Normally, no credit will be granted to a student on re-admission for academic work completed during the year of absence except for that credit that the University usually accepts on transfer'"

The Chairman ruled that this Motion was out of order on the grounds that it was contrary to the main Motion.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED  
AS AMENDED

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by A.R. MacKinnon

"that recommendation c. be accepted as follows:

c. Normally, students required to withdraw will be placed on academic probation on re-admission"

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by G.H. Geen

"that recommendation d. be approved as follows:

d. Normally, a student required to withdraw from the University on two occasions will not be re-admitted"

MOTION CARRIED

G. Proposals for revision of the Chemistry Curriculum - S-24

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by J. Walkley

"that the Chemistry program contained in paper S-24 be accepted by Senate"

/A....

SM 7/8/67

It was noted by some members that the new major program went contrary to the previous expression of opinion by the Senate. *Carried.*

-6-

A lengthy discussion took place on the number of electives and the degree of liberalisation in this program. Reference was made to previous decisions of Senate namely,

October 3, 1966. - "that Senate direct the faculties of Arts, Science and Education to examine the general question of the liberalism of their degree programs and report back to Senate"

January 9, 1967 - "that Senate express its deep concern to the Science Faculty with the fact that there appears to be no limitation on the requirements which a department in the Faculty of Science can impose on a student in the first four levels and requests the Faculty of Science to reconsider its program with a view to liberalizing it" and

January 9, 1967 - "that the Science Faculty and in particular the Departments of Physics and Chemistry be asked by Senate to examine the course levels and see what positive action they can take to secure greater freedom of choice for the students in Science".

Mention was also made of the Committee on General Education which had been asked to look into the matter of liberalising programs within the University.

MOTION CARRIED

H. Bio-chemistry Honors and Major Program - S-25

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by G.H. Geen

"that this Bio-Chemistry program be approved by Senate"

MOTION CARRIED

J. Hindi 101-3 - S-27

Moved by J.W. Matthews, seconded by D.H. Sullivan

"that Hindi 101-3 be approved as follows:

101-3 Introductory Hindi. Continuation of the work of Hindi 100-3; it should be taken, wherever possible, in the semester immediately following Hindi 100-3"

MOTION CARRIED

/K....

SM 7/8/67

Carroll

K. Deletions, changes and additions to History courses. - S-28

Moved by J.W. Matthews, seconded by D.H. Sullivan

"that the proposals as follows be approved:

Pages 92, 93 and 96 of Undergraduate Calendar.  
To be deleted:

241-3 North America Before 1800.

To be amended (to read):

- 141-3 Historical Development of the Americas to 1763
- 242-3 Canada 1763-1873
- 243-3 United States 1763-1890
- 447-5 Latin America and the External World
- 448-5 Economic aspects of Latin America
- 449-5 Social aspects of Latin America

To be added:

200-3 China since 1839

Chinese political, socio-economic and intellectual history from the First Anglo Chinese War to the end of the First Five-year Plan of the Chinese Peoples' Republic in 1957. (2-1-0)"

MOTION CARRIED

M. Changes to Geography Graduate Program - S-30.

Moved by J.W. Matthews, seconded by G. Sperling

"that the proposal as follows be approved:

A. M.A. Requirements

The section following "Minimum requirements" at the bottom of page 42 should be deleted and the following substituted:

Candidates for the degree of M.A. must complete 30 semester hours of work at the graduate level, with B average or better. All graduate students will be required to take part in the graduate seminar, Geography 806, which does not carry credit. Two types of programmes are offered:

a) With Thesis.

Geography 801-2

Geography 802-3 or 803-3 or 805-3.

15 semester hours to be selected in consultation with the candidate's advisers; of these up to ten semester hours may be taken in a department or departments other than Geography.

M.A. Thesis: this carries ten semester hours credit.

/(b)...

*Calendar.  
Elections*

## b) Without Thesis.

Geography 801-2

Geography 802-3 or 803-3 or 805-3.

25 semester hours to be selected in consultation with the candidate's advisers; of these up to ten semester hours may be taken in a department or departments other than Geography.

At least three extended essays on topics to be approved by the candidate's advisory committee. These essays will not be counted as part of the total semester hours completed for the M.A. degree. The essays may be based on assignments carried out as part of the work in the graduate courses.

## B. The department also wishes to add the following item to the list of graduate courses:

891-2 )	Directed	Not more than five semester hours credit in readings courses may be counted towards the requirements for the M.A. degree.
892-3 )	Readings	
893-5 )		

## MOTION CARRIED

On a point of order the matter of Graduate Courses in Geography was reopened and it was decided that the Motion should be altered to make the final approval of Senate conditional upon the acceptance of these changes to the Geography graduate program by the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies.

## N. PSA 172-3 - S-31.

Moved by G. Sperling, seconded by D.H. Sullivan

"that the course Anthropological Concepts be listed in the Calendar as PSA.172-3"

## MOTION CARRIED

## O. Question of replacements for Joint Faculty representatives during Research Semesters and other temporary absences.

It was decided that the Registrar should conduct a regular ballot procedure to provide nominations to Senate for the necessary replacements for W.Williams and D.G. Tuck, Joint Faculty representatives to Senate.

It was also decided that the candidate receiving the highest number of votes would be named as the replacement for W.Williams for eight months and the second highest would be named as the replacement for D.G. Tuck for four months.

/In....



SM 7/18/67

-9-

*Elections  
Nominating Com.  
Faculty Council  
Appeals  
Student Discipline*

In view of the fact that a number of Faculty will be off the campus for the next few weeks it was agreed that the election should be held in September even though it will mean that the Senate will be short two Joint Faculty representatives for that one meeting.

P. Nominating Committee - S-32

Moved by D.H. Sullivan, seconded by K.E. Riekchoff

"that a Nominating Committee be established to make recommendations regarding the membership of Senate Committees and that the Committee be composed of the three Academic Deans and the Registrar, and that the three Deans be assisted by a member of each Faculty"

*The Committee was instructed to make a slate of its own nominations and volunteers from the Faculty.*

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10.10 p.m. and reconvened at 10.20 p.m.

3. A. The Chairman reminded members that they had agreed to discuss in this item D. Berg's Notice of Motion, S. Yandle's Notice of Motion that had been inserted in the Minutes of the last meeting at the beginning of this meeting, and in addition the opinion of the University solicitor regarding the relationship between Faculty Council and Senate and he suggested that members might also wish to refer to Paper S-34 - Procedures followed in the Templeton School Incident.

The Chairman asked in which order members wished to proceed with the consideration of these matters.

It was proposed that the items be taken in the order in which they were presented at the last meeting, namely: 1. Student appeal; 2. D. Berg's Notice of Motion, and following that the letter from the solicitor and the report from Faculty Council. S. Yandle presented the appeal on behalf of five graduate students, John Edmond, Geoffrey Mercer, Martin Loney, Phil Stanworth and Christopher Huxley. She pointed out that the students wished to appeal to Senate and asked for general discussion in Senate as to whether Faculty Council had usurped the authority of others in its actions regarding the Templeton School incident.

There was some discussion whether or not an appeal could be made against Faculty Council as stipulated in Section 62. of the Universities Act, inasmuch as Faculty Council had decided to take no action. The statement was made that a decision to take no action is in itself action.

/....

SM 7/8/67

Faculty Council  
Appeals:  
Student Discipline

-10-

A.R. MacKinnon suggested that it was best for Senate to discuss how best to proceed after admitting that there had been mistakes made.

He suggested that the first two years of the University's existence was necessarily exploratory, and that relationships between the Faculty and students were still being worked out. He pointed out that Senate had already received a response from Faculty Council which suggests steps are being taken to clarify certain matters relating to student discipline, namely the setting up of a Faculty Council/Student Advisory Committee.

A.R. MacKinnon also pointed out that it should be remembered we are dealing with human lives inasmuch as the kinds of things that happened as a result of the Templeton School incident can affect the lives of graduate students or other students or Faculty members for many, many years. He thought the graduate students should be informed by a personal letter from the Chairman exactly what took place at Faculty Council, why it took place, and they should also be informed that the investigations conducted by the Faculty Council were in no way a reflection on their scholarship or on their right to continue their studies at this University. It should also be pointed out to them that no part of the deliberations of Faculty Council or any matters relating to those deliberations would form a part of their permanent records. He suggested that if discussion could take place on these items, it should be possible to formulate a series of Motions to satisfy the students, the Senate and the Faculty Council and the University community.

D. Berg thought that the discussion so far had implied that there were two main points to be considered: 1. the redress to the five graduate students involved and 2. the need for Senate to concern itself with the operation of Faculty Council. R.J. Baker stated as his view the thought that an apology was in order to the students for the publication of the confidential memorandum to Faculty Council from the Chairman, but that since the University is an academic body it was most important that academic performance be taken into account in assessing the action taken in discipline cases. He went on to say that it should be a practice of Faculty Council or any other adjudication committee to deal with the infractions of regulations or codes of conduct without any consideration of academic performance, but that after it had arrived at a decision to take some action, that action should only be taken in light of a review of the student's academic performance.

S. Yandle suggested that the most important point in the discussion to her was the consideration of who in the University was competent to make academic evaluations of students, and for what reason such academic evaluations should be made. She suggested that this was in large part the nature of the students' appeal, namely that they felt they had been subjected to an academic evaluation by persons who were not competent to make such evaluations. Considerable discussion resulted in the view that a letter should be written to the graduate students and that it should contain an apology for the release of the confidential memorandum.

*H.E. Reckhoff wished to be recorded as being opposed to sending any letter to the five graduate students.*

1....

SM 7/8/67

Faculty Council  
Appeals  
Student Discipline

-11-

Discussion then hinged on the exact wording of the letter, and on whether or not the apology should be on behalf of the University or on behalf of the Senate or on behalf of the Faculty Council. A number of wordings were suggested for the letter and it was decided that the exact wording would be submitted by the Chairman for ratification at the next meeting of Senate.

Moved by W. Williams, seconded by A.R. MacKinnon

"that this course of action be followed"

MOTION CARRIED.

Questions were then asked regarding the dispensation of the student appeals. The mover of the last Motion stated that his Motion was intended to close the Templeton School incident insofar as these particular students were concerned. The Chairman gave his view that the letter was in response to the student appeal, and that it dealt with the question of redress. However, he did not view the Motion as a termination of the debate on the Senate's concern with the procedures of Faculty Council. On a show of hands the Senate agreed with the President's interpretation that the Motion had given an expression of the desires of Senate with relation to the five graduate students and that he was now enjoined to express this in letter form, a draft of which will appear as a supplement to the Minutes presented at the next meeting of Senate.

Moved by J.W. Matthews, seconded by

"that Senate deplores the errors in the past proceedings of Faculty Council, in particular in receiving academic evaluations of students submitted to Faculty Council by its Chairman, and recommends to Faculty Council a careful study and definition of its powers and duties, for the better ordering of its procedures in the future"

Discussion of this Motion was terminated very shortly by a Motion to adjourn, which was carried. The meeting adjourned at 12.10 a.m.

D.P. Robertson  
Secretary