

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD ON THURSDAY,
OCTOBER 10, 1968, IN THE FACULTY LOUNGE AT 7:30 P.M.

SPECIAL MEETING - OPEN SESSION

Present:

Strand, Dr. K.T.
Baker, R.J.
Baird, D.A.
Collins, M.
Dampier, J.L.
D'Aoust, B.
Foulds, J.S.
Funt, B.L.
Gibson, E.M.
Hamilton, W.M.
Harper, R.J.C.
Hutchinson, J.
Koerner, Mrs. Otto
Korbin, D.
Lett, Mrs. Sherwood
Okuda, K.
Riechkhoff, K.E.
Sperling, G.B.
Stratton, S.
Sullivan, D.
Vidaver, W.
Wong, S.

Chairman

Evans, H.M.
Meyers, D.A.
Roberts, D.
Smedley, J.

Secretary

Recording Secretary

Absent:

Boland, L.A.
Burstein, K.R.
Ellis, A.J.
Hean, Arnold F.C.
MacKinnon, A.R.
McLean, Cyrus H.
Perry, G.N.
Shrum, Dr. G.M.
Smith, Mrs. L.
Tuck, D.G.
Walkley, J.
Williams, W.E.

The Chairman opened the meeting and drew attention to the fact that this was a special meeting to consider the Report of the Committee to study the constitution and functions of governing bodies of the University under the Chairmanship of R.J. Baker.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by M. Collins, seconded by D. Baird

"that the Agenda be approved"

MOTION CARRIED

2. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE CONSTITUTION AND FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING BODIES OF THE UNIVERSITY - Chairman - R.J. Baker

R. Baker outlined briefly the background leading to the establishment of the Committee, its membership and the recent request of Senate that the Committee work extensively on the Report to bring it forward for consideration for possible submission to the Perry Committee. He noted that D. Baird prepared the bibliography and later resigned, being replaced by R.J. Baker who acted as Chairman. Other members on the Committee were B.L. Funt, R.J. Harper, J. Sperling, S. Wong, and S. Wasserman who was later replaced by K. Okuda.

He indicated that the Committee had felt it was not an appropriate time to suggest only minor adjustments in the Universities Act but that study should be given to the whole system and structure. The Committee had seen the Report of the Interim Council of Joint Faculty and the proposals of this Committee did not overlap those of Interim Council. He expressed appreciation to the various members of the Committee who had worked under a great deal of pressure to produce the final report in the short space of two weeks. It was noted that the report was deficient in some items, particularly in the matter of extensive research. Attention was drawn primarily to the report as such and its recommendations, with indication that much of the other material had been included at the request of certain individuals.

Moved by R. Baker, seconded by D. Sullivan

"that the Report be accepted"

G. Sperling indicated that he had a paper for the members of Senate and the paper was distributed.

The Chairman of the Committee continued explanation, indicating that the Report was the unanimous recommendation of the Committee although each of the members would have certain reservations on certain items.

- 3 -

Attention was drawn to the unanimous recommendation of the Committee at the bottom of Page 3 of the Report. Brief reference was made to the California System, the New York Board of Regents System, and others with indication that the Committee did not like the term "Regents". It was emphasized that the Committee was suggesting an Integrated System. Attention was drawn to the section on "Pro's and Con's of possible systems" with further explanation of the advantages and disadvantages outlined. He commented on the advantages of the simplicity of structure proposed in the Integrated System.

The Chairman of Senate suggested that informal discussion of the Report would be appropriate and this was commenced.

In response to a question the Chairman of Senate indicated the substance of discussions which had been held with Dr. Perry, Chairman of the Committee studying Inter University Affairs. It was noted that submissions should be made by mid-October.

A number of members commented most favorably on the work of the Committee and the Report which had been submitted for consideration although some had reservations on some of the recommendations.

Question was raised as to whether adoption of the Report by Senate might lead to greater government control with loss of autonomy to the Universities, and response was given that the Committee believed that governments at large are seeking appropriate methods to provide some protection to governments in view of the significant costing demands of education. Reference was made to Dr. Hare's suggestions and to the possibility of a "buffer" body such as the commission proposed in the Report.

D. Korbin questioned the propriety of Senate or the Board of Governors making recommendations to the Perry Committee or Government until such time as the Student Implementation Committee's Report is considered and that he proposed to move "that we postpone discussion of this Report until the Student Society has considered the Student Implementation Report and the Report is available".

Comment was made to the effect that most of the arguments in support of the proposals seemed to concern financial advantages and that clarification of the academic benefits would be helpful. The Chairman of the Committee commented on the matter of inter-relationship between financial and academic benefits and indicated that in his view many of the benefits which might appear superficially to have financial implications only would indeed have direct academic benefits.

*Free University, Ottawa
SM 10/10/68 University Reg'n
Acad. Plan*

- 4 -

M. Collins expressed the belief that if the system proposed had indeed been in existence in recent years Simon Fraser University might not have benefited as greatly as had indeed been the case. Emphasis was made on the desirability of having a relatively large number of bodies bringing persuasion upon government to provide adequate funds and that the establishment of a single body might reduce impact. Further reference was made to the helpfulness which lay members on Senate could provide through community and other contacts and the opportunities for providing information directly in the community. There was some disagreement with the points of view expressed.

G. Sperling indicated his reasons for endorsing the recommendations of the Committee and expressed the view that the Integrated System would be but a small step in the appropriate direction. He made reference to the paper he had provided and explained the nature of the commission as he saw it, with request that representation thereon be broadly based with strong representation from the academic community.

Question was raised concerning the minimum information and suggestions made in regard to Senate in the proposals of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee indicated that his Committee did not wish to overlap recommendations of Joint Faculty which might suggest a greater combination within Senate of the current roles of Senate and Board, and felt that less specificity in the Universities Act might be desirable.

Question was raised concerning the role of Chancellor under the present Act and the Chairman of the Committee noted that under the current Act the Chancellor has a prime function - the giving out of degrees - but that there is nothing in the Act which suggests or requires that the Chancellor be the Chairman of the Board of Governors.

Comment was made on the paper referring to a grant commission, which the committee had not adopted as its prime recommendation but emphasis was given to the desirability of multi-year budgeting so necessary to better planning.

G. Sperling expanded on his explanation of the Secretariat and membership suggested in his paper. L. Funt indicated that the committee at large had not accepted this particular point of view and provided explanation as to the nature of the commission suggested in the main committee report, noting recommendations with the advantages and disadvantages envisaged. Further discussion followed on the question of formula financing, grant commission, methods of establishing equitable budgets across Universities and related items. Attention was drawn to the fact that the Chairman

/.....

*Simon Fraser University
SM 10/10/68 University Org. &
Acad. Plan*

- 5 -

of the Advisory Board, who is also Chairman of the Academic Board, is a member of the Perry Committee and from that stand point the Committee preparing the current report had not felt it necessary to make specific recommendations in a number of areas as useful data would be available directly to the Perry Committee.

Discussion continued with further points being raised on the question of budgeting, equitable distribution of funds, relationships of costings in various faculties, decisions in respect of establishing new offerings or faculties, and with strong indication on the part of some members of potential loss of autonomy if an Integrated System were established. Question was raised as to whether or not there were available Canadian studies on various systems which might prove useful to Senate in making its decision in respect of the suggestions currently proposed. Some further discussion arose on various systems in the United States.

Some opposition was made to the suggestion that Simon Fraser University might suffer financially through the proposed new structure and argument was given to the effect that each University must be in a position to clearly define and defend its needs in terms of the provincial system as a whole. Comment was made that comparison with a number of the systems of the United States would not be appropriate and that consideration should be given to development of a system most appropriate for the province of British Columbia. Attention was drawn to the weaknesses of the present system which relied upon the Advisory Board.

Discussion continued with repetition and enlargement of explanations of a number of points made in earlier discussion.

Further comments were made on the possible loss of autonomy but there was disagreement that such would necessarily arise, with indication by some that the University did indeed have considerable autonomy and that it likely could anticipate retention of autonomy to a significantly high level.

Suggestion was made that the Report of the Committee be submitted in its entirety, along with its supplements, as a submission on Formula Financing to the Perry Committee on Higher Education in British Columbia. This suggestion received some considerable support and consideration was given to most appropriate methods for making such submission.

Alternative suggestions were made and the Chairman was asked to make further comment about the Perry Committee.

/....

Inter University Relations
SM 10/10/68
University of Oregon
Acad. Sen.

- 6 -

The Chairman indicated that he believed it most desirable to have a submission presented to the Perry Committee by October 15 and that it was his understanding the Committee did not propose to hold hearings but that he expected to have an opportunity to make oral argument. He noted that in his view there would be nothing to prevent individual Senators from submitting such comments as they might wish to make pertaining to recommendations.

Following further discussion suggestion was made that Senate could vote on the motion before the members and either pass or defeat the motion, with further consideration to be given alternatives in the event the motion be defeated. In the event the motion be passed it would be on the understanding that the Report with the supporting papers would be forwarded to the Perry Committee with covering letter, with indication of the vote, and on the understanding that individual Senators could submit in writing further comments to the Perry Committee should they so desire.

Vote was taken on the motion by R. Baker, seconded by D. Sullivan

"that the Report be accepted"

MOTION CARRIED
11 in favor
7 opposed

D. Korbin requested that his negative vote be recorded.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

H.M. Evans
Secretary