

SM 11/9/67

*Student Report on Senate
Openness of Senate*

Paper S-19

July 24, 1967

TO: Members of Senate

FROM: Sharon Yandle, Senate Student Representative

The inclusion of student representatives on Senate in June of this year poses a problem regarding the closed nature of Senate meetings.

Student senate members, like their faculty counterparts, have been elected to represent a certain constituency. Unlike their faculty counterparts, however, student senators do not represent constituents numbering in the dozens; our constituents in September will number 5000 to 6000 or possibly more. Because of this obvious disproportionate representation, student senators cannot discuss Senate proceedings or issues as can faculty in, for example, departmental or faculty meetings. Our only recourse to informing students of Senate activities, therefore, is through the student newspaper, The Peak, or through a student Senate newsletter.

This problem has been further compounded by a unanimous vote by the Student Society Executive Council "that student senators be requested to report to Council after each Senate meeting". (Minutes, Student Society Executive Council, June 26, 1967). Since Student Council meetings are open to both press and public, such reports will immediately be reproduced in the Peak. The first such report has in fact been made, a Peak excerpt of which is enclosed.

Because reports by any given individuals are almost inevitably to cause some unintended distortion of Senate proceedings, it would appear to be in the interests of all concerned that Senate meetings be declared open as soon as possible. (Open Senate meetings, of course, would not restrict Senate from moving in camera if the nature of particular proceedings should justify such a move.)

No doubt it will be recognized that these problems were not extant during the discussion of this issue by Senate last semester. In view of the changes since that time, therefore, and in the hope of some free discussion of this question and the possibility arising therein of some viable alternative, we urge the acceptance of the following motion:

THAT SINCE THE INCLUSION OF STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES ON SENATE APPEARS TO CREATE A PROBLEM HITHERTO NON-EXISTENT, THE QUESTION OF THE CLOSED NATURE OF SENATE MEETINGS BE RECONSIDERED.

SM 11/9/67

*Kinesiology
Calendar*

In a report to Students' Council Senator Simon Foulds stated that "... there were objections (in Senate) as to whether the Kinesiology curriculum was less strenuous than the requirements of a normal BSc. and whether the value of the BSc. would be lowered.

He reported that two members of the Faculty of Science had objected to the Kinesiology program as an "... insult to the university. It would not represent the kind of degree normally acquired by Science students.

"It was argued that the course requirements in Kinesiology did not include a sufficient number of upper level courses to constitute anything like the rigorous requirements for a normal BSc. degree in one of the natural sciences," said Foulds.

"Questions were asked as to whether one could study the economics, historical, and sociological aspect of human movement in any meaningful manner."

The program was passed with Sharon Yandje abstaining and Simon Foulds opposed.