

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1969, FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present: / Strand, K.T. Chairman

/ Baird, D.A.
/ Boland, L.A.
/ Burstein, K.R.
/ Dampier, J.L.
/ D'Aoust, B.
/ Ellis, A.J.
/ Funt, B.L.
/ Haering, R.R.
/ Harper, R.J.C.
/ Hutchinson, J.F.
/ Lett, Mrs. Sherwood
/ Korbin, D.
/ MacKinnon, A.R.
/ Okuda, K.
/ Prock, Mrs. L.
/ Rieckhoff, K.E.
/ Sperling, G.B.
/ Shrum, G.M.
/ Stratton, S.
/ Sullivan, D.
/ Vidaver, W.
/ Walkley, J.
/ Wong, S.
/ Williams, W.E.

/ Evans, H.M. Secretary
/ Barboza, J.)
/ Smedley, J.) Recording Secretaries

Absent: / Baker, R.J. (On leave)
/ Branca, A.E.
/ Collins, M.
/ Gibson, E.M.
/ Hamilton, W.
/ Hean, A.F.C.
/ Koerner, Mrs. Otto
/ McLean, C.H.
/ Perry, G.N.
/ Tuck, D.G.

Expressions of regret at inability to attend were received from Senators Collins, Hamilton, Hean, Koerner, Perry, Tuck.

*Senate meeting tip
5/27/69 referred to
notice of motion*

The Chairman expressed regret that microphones were not yet installed but that these were under way.

He notified Senate that Senator S. Wong had submitted his resignation to be effective June 1, 1969, and that the early submission of Notice of Resignation had been made by S. Wong in order that the by-election to fill the vacancy could be held at the same time as the regular triennial election for replacement of a student Senator.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by K. Okuda, the Agenda was approved.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - OPEN SESSION - JANUARY 6, 1969

K. Okuda indicated that he had been in attendance and that his name should be added to those attending and deleted from those absent.

S. Wong noted that amendment was required on page 11, item 3, paragraph 2, adding at the end of the sentence and paragraph the words, "and that the University is not involved".

K. Burstein noted correction was necessary on page 5, paragraph 3, line 18, after the word "publish" of insertion of the words, "before the next deadline for submission of Agenda items".

With the above corrections the minutes were ruled approved.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(A) Report on Deferred Grades - Paper S-194

It was noted that this paper was a response to questions which had been raised by B. D'Aoust and was received as such.

B. D'Aoust gave Notice of Motion as follows:

"Whereas there is no direction by Senate to the Registrar regarding the handling of 'N' and 'DEF' grades for purposes of calculating either cumulative or semester grade point averages, and

Whereas the present practice (1) may penalize the student - he may not get a bursary or scholarship for which he is qualified by his other marks - and
(2) since the computing of an average which includes an 'N' or 'DEF' grade carrying a zero value in fact results in an erroneous reflection of a student's achievement and
(3) since the trouble involved in re-programming the computer to calculate averages accurately is easily offset

SM 3/2/69 *Deferred Grade
Notice*

by the reliability of the information printed out, U

Moved, (1) that where grades of 'N' and 'DEF' are awarded by an instructor, these be left intact on the student's record unless changed according to present University policy, and

(2) that in calculating grade point averages, computation be based only on passing or failing grades awarded by instructors.

Comment - Motion No. 1 intends to record academic evaluation of a student's performance more accurately, Motion No. 2 is intended to arrive at averages on the basis of academic rather than administrative judgments."

B. D'Aoust indicated that this was Notice of Motion for the next meeting and it was agreed that in distribution of the Notice of Motion to Senators the Registrar should add any comments he feels appropriate.

W. Williams gave Notice of Motion as follows:

"that the time for conversion of grades be extended until the last day to drop courses in the semester following the awarding of the grade".

This Notice of Motion would also be included in the distribution of the D'Aoust Notice of Motion and the comments of the Registrar.

SM 3/2/69

Calendar Times
Agenda C.C.
Academic Board
Admission

3. (B) Report on Calendar Times - Paper S-195

Moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by J. Hutchinson,

"that Paper S-195 be received and that the recommendations on page 3, item (c) be approved".

MOTION CARRIED

(C) Other Items

K. Burstein noted that the Senate Agenda Committee had not clarified the criteria on the basis of which papers and items would be accepted for the Agenda and that before the date for submission of papers for the next meeting such clarification should be provided to members of Senate.

K. Burstein noted that the statement had been issued indicating approval in principle by the Board of Governors of Chairmanships rather than Headships of Departments and inquired as to the nature of the decision and the issue of the statement without review by other bodies. The Chairman commented.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

- (A) K. Strand noted that the report of the Perry Committee was in draft form with expectation that it would be presented to the Minister of Education as soon as in final form.
- (B) Chairman made reference to institutional research at the University, stated that recruitment for the senior position was under way and that progress was being made.
- (C) The Chairman indicated that the Academic Board was giving consideration to a system of province-wide forecasting of enrolments which should give much more accurate and useful data than currently available and requested that R. Haering, Acting Academic Vice-President, who is a member of the Board, comment further. R. Haering noted that Simon Fraser University is but part of the total system and with growth in post-secondary education in the province close liaison would be necessary. The Academic Board was attempting to find a sounder basis for forecasting enrolments and that consideration was being given the development of a mathematical model on the basis of which certain decisions undertaken at an institution or decisions proposed could be reviewed with reasonable accuracy to ascertain the likely total impact on the various institutions.

*Archaeology Student
EM 3/2/69 Rules & Procedures
Student Group*

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

(A) Report of Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures - Paper S-196

Review of the paper was undertaken and it was agreed that on document R.P.1 under "Membership" the word "faculty" be replaced by the word "the".

Moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by A. MacKinnon, that with the change noted

"that Senate ratify the terms of reference for the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures".

MOTION CARRIED

(B) Report of Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Representation of Student Groups on Senate - Paper S-197

Discussion on the paper was undertaken.

Moved by W. Williams, seconded by J. Walkley,

"that the last paragraph of page one, lines 3, 4, and 5, be amended to read, "Senate should adopt in principle that students who are not Senators should be permitted to serve upon Senate Committees where Senate calls for student representation ---".

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion was held as to whether or not page 2 be approved. The suggestion was opposed by some and supported by others. The Chairman ruled that as the Ad Hoc Committee had submitted its report the Committee be dissolved and this ruling was accepted.

Moved by J. Walkley, seconded by K. Okuda,

"that the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Representation upon Senate, with change as noted, be received".

MOTION CARRIED

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

(A) Faculty of Arts

(i) Administrative Separation of Archaeology from P.S.A. - Paper S-198

As the microphones had not yet arrived it was moved by D. Korbin, seconded by S. Wong,

"that Senate recess for fifteen minutes".

MOTION DEFEATED
4 in favour
12 opposed
4 abstained

SM 3/1/69 Archaeology Senate

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by J. Walkley,

"that the two motions of Paper S-198 be approved".

Discussion was undertaken. D. Sullivan, Dean of Arts, commented on the reasons why submission had been made in the particular fashion and emphasized that the results of the proposals must be both timely and equitable.

(The microphones were installed.)

S. Wong suggested that discussion of the paper in two parts would be more equitable and it was moved by S. Wong, seconded by R. Haering,

"that the question be dealt with in two parts".

MOTION CARRIED
12 in favour
4 opposed
6 abstained

Discussion was then undertaken on Part I on the motion,

"that Senate accept in principle an administrative separation of Archaeology Studies from the Department of Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, and authorize that Archaeology Studies become an administrative responsibility under the Office of the Dean of Arts".

S. Wong inquired as to whether or not the parties had been invited to the Senate meeting and the Dean of Arts responded in the negative. It was noted that Messrs. Briemberg, Carlson, and Hobler were in the audience.

S. Wong inquired of the Chairman as to whether the parties would be allowed to speak and join in the debate and the Chairman ruled that this would be permitted.

S. Wong referred to documents provided with Paper S-198 with particular reference to the Abstract prepared by R. Carlson and T. Hobler. He also referred to another paper which had been distributed within the Faculty and claimed that down to page 6 there was agreement but that on page 6 and thereafter, commencing with "the present facilities" there was not agreement and that there was indication that new appointees would be considered. D. Sullivan responded drawing attention to Paper R.B.3 with particular reference to paragraph 5 and the section which states, "carries with it no obligation by the Faculty of Arts for any increase in support, budgetary or otherwise, beyond those resources now committed to Archaeology".

SM 3/2/69
Archaeology Department

Debate continued with argument that there was not evidence of long-term planning and disagreement on a number of points.

Question was put by S. Wong to R. Carlson as to whether there was intention to ask for establishment of an Archaeology Department within the next year. Points of Order were raised to the effect that questions should be directed to the Dean of Arts, and that questions should be on facts, not intentions. The Chairman ruled that the Dean would speak for the Faculty but that if he did not know he could then seek the information. Comment was made on precedent, i.e., the nature of discussions when the M.B.A. Program had been under review, and there were disagreements.

The chairman ruled that Messrs. Briemberg, Carlson and Hobler join the Senate table for purposes of discussion.

In response to the question pertaining to possible establishment of an Archaeology Department within the next year, R. Carlson responded that he did not know as there were too many variables involved.

Comment was made that the proposal and method was unusual, with inquiry as to whether any two people could ask for separation from departments and that if this be done the academic implications would not be known. Further questions were raised in terms of financial and budgetary implications and D. Sullivan indicated that the papers presented were designed to show the academic considerations and that budgetary considerations directly as such had not been involved as that was not directly a Senate matter.

- (S. Wong argued that the debate should be on the establishment of a new
- (department and not on administrative separation and that the supporting
- * (papers were inadequate. Dean Sullivan replied that Senator Wong was
- (misleading Senate since the approval of the motion in no way obligates the
- (creation of a new department in the creation of a new department in the
- (near future or at any time.

Question was raised as to the meaning of "intense conflict" and R. Carlson stated he had no comment but the documentation thereon rested with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts.

Further debate followed with comment by S. Wong that a paper of October 1, 1968, from the Archaeology Department to the P.S.A. Curriculum Committee requested 17 new courses. D. Sullivan again made reference to Paper R.B.3 noting that request was not being made for a new department, and that the October 1st document was not relevant in view of the later developments and the comments on R.B. 3 dated December 11, 1968.

Debate continued.

* This paragraph was inserted at the request of S. Wong and D. Sullivan. It is a substitute for the following paragraph, which was included in the original draft minutes:-

"Argument was made that the debate should be on the establishment of a new department and not on administrative separation and that the supporting papers were inadequate."

SM 3/2/69
Archaeology

Moved by S. Wong, seconded by D. Korbin,

"that paper S-198 be referred back to the Faculty of Arts".

The Chairman ruled that the ensuing debate would be limited to the propriety of referral back to the Faculty of Arts. Debate ensued with argument that there had been improper submission in that papers went forward to the Faculty of Arts without going through the appropriate department. The Chairman noted that attempts had been made to bring the matter before Senate without success, that the Senate Agenda Committee had offered three different advices, that when again presented to Senate, Senate had declined to discuss the matter and had adjourned, and that Senate had declined to treat the matter in the abstract.

Various members spoke for and against referral back to the Faculty of Arts and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts outlined the procedures he had followed.

Moved by R. Harper, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that the previous question now be put".

MOTION CARRIED

Vote was then undertaken on the motion

"that paper S-198 be referred back to the Faculty of Arts".

MOTION FAILED
6 in favour
17 opposed

S. Wong requested that his vote in favour of referral be recorded.

Amendment to the main motion was moved by G. Sperling, seconded by S. Wong,

"that in line 2 the word "administrative separation" be replaced by the words "academic department".

The Amendment was ruled out of order by the Chair and was challenged by L. Boland, with reference to page 144 of Robert's Rules of Order. Vote was taken on the challenge and the ruling of the Chair was upheld.

Debate on the main motion continued.

SM 3/2/69
Archaeology

G. Sperling referred to written comment by the Acting Academic Vice-President to the effect that he believed the separation to be academically sound, but that there had not been discussion with department members generally on this matter and basis of decision was requested with indication of the meaning of "academic separation". Further comment was made that the timing of referendum was not appropriate and that the Faculty of Arts did not consider the matter in its entirety.

D. Sullivan stated that three requests had been sent to the department for information for circulation to the Faculty at large at the same time that other documentation was forwarded but that there had been no response from the department.

R. Haering noted that vote had been undertaken in the department and that his decision was based in large measure on the results of the vote.

K. Burstein expressed the view that appropriate procedures had been followed in the Faculty of Arts and inquired of M. Briemberg whether this was correct.

M. Briemberg, Acting Chairman of the Department of Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology, discussed at length a number of issues, referred to matters of differences of opinion and philosophy and provided considerable background for Senate.

R. Harper inquired of M. Briemberg as to the drawbacks to separation as proposed and inquired of R. Carlson as to the drawbacks which would result from non-separation. M. Briemberg expressed the view that the University must decide its long-term goals including the type of Archaeology it wished to offer, that foresight, advance planning and intellectual debate would be required and that he did not consider that the proposal would be good for students. He commented that the proposal differed from the situation which pertained in Reading and Study in that no degree requirements and credits are involved in that area but that these matters did pertain in the case of Archaeology. R. Carlson noted that the Faculty had given consideration to this matter through referenda, that a number of individuals had referred to documents on file in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and that administrative separation seemed to be a viable method for solution of a vexatious problem.

Various members entered the debate speaking for and against the proposal. Reference was made to the vote in the Faculty of Arts and to the proposal as providing an interim step at this time.

SM 3/2/69
Archaeology Studies

Amendment was moved by S. Wong,

"that in line 2 after the word "separation" the words 'i.e., a new department' be added".

The Amendment was ruled out of order by the Chairman. Challenge was made on the ruling. Vote was taken with six supporting the challenge and 15 supporting the Chair. The ruling of the Chair was upheld.

Debate on the main motion continued.

L. Boland requested that the Chairman give reasons for his ruling on the Wong amendment as he believed the ruling was in opposition to Robert's Rules. The Chairman responded that the submission from the Faculty was as stated and that the nature of the amendment changed materially the request.

Debate continued.

Moved by J. Walkley, seconded by R. Harper,

"that the previous question now be put".

MOTION CARRIED
18 in favour
2 opposed
1 abstained

Vote was then undertaken on Part I on the motion,

"that Senate accept in principle an administrative separation of Archaeology Studies from the Department of Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology and authorize that Archaeology Studies become an administrative responsibility under the Office of the Dean of Arts".

MOTION CARRIED
16 in favour
6 opposed
2 abstained

D. Korbin and S. Wong requested that their negative votes be recorded.

L. Boland requested that it be noted in the minutes that of 16 voting in favour of the motion 10 did not contribute in the debate.

Senate undertook consideration of Part II on the motion,

"that Senate form an Ad Hoc Committee comprising the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, the Bursar, the Academic Vice-President, and one other Faculty member on Senate whose responsibility will be to see that an equitable and timely separation of Archaeology Studies from P.S.A. is implemented".

D. Korbin referred to the current motion and to the previous motion, and requested that his remarks be recorded. He stated that in the current motion persons proposed were inappropriate in that reference was made to the Dean of Arts -- an ex-radical, to the Bursar -- an administrator, to the Acting Academic Vice-President -- who was mobile, and to one Senator faculty member. He considered the motion just passed as non-intelligent, and the current motion a blatant one. The motion passed in part one by Senate began the dismemberment of the P.S.A. Department and it was not proposed to have some members from that group which had made a non-intelligent decision complete the separation. He considered the rulings of the Chairman in rejecting the amendments proposed for part one rather disgraceful.

SM 3/2/69 Election
Archaeology Society

Amendment to the motion was moved by S. Wong, seconded by G. Sperling,

"that there be added to the Committee two student Senators and five lay members of Senate".

AMENDMENT FAILED
5 in favour
12 opposed
4 abstained

Vote on the main motion was then undertaken.

MOTION CARRIED
15 in favour
3 opposed
4 abstained

D. Korbin and S. Wong requested that their negative vote be recorded.

Discussion ensued as to the nature of the Committee and D. Sullivan pointed out that it was an Ad Hoc Committee of Senate expected to report back to Senate. He commented further that the purpose of the Committee was to oversee that a timely and appropriate separation was undertaken and that from this standpoint it was an implementation committee which would report its results back to Senate.

S. Wong argued that the motion was out of order, made reference to section 46 (f) of the University Act and indicated that he proposed to write to the Attorney General for a legal ruling.

Further discussion was undertaken.

Moved by K. Okuda, seconded by J. Walkley,

"that Senate suspend its rules concerning nominating and voting".

MOTION CARRIED
12 in favour
4 opposed

Nominations for the committee to elect one member were then called. Nominations were received on behalf of K. Okuda, G. Sperling and L. Boland.

Balloting was undertaken and K. Okuda was declared elected.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

SM 3/2/69

Edmund G. ...

(A) Notices of Motion

No papers received.

(B) Query re status of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Examination Grading and Practices - Papers S-199, S-200

The papers were noted.

Moved by R. Haering, seconded by W. Williams,

"that Senate establish a standing Committee on Examination Grading and Practices and that the membership of the Committee be referred to the Senate Nominating Committee".

Various members spoke for and against the motion. Suggestion was made that introduction of such a Committee could prove dangerous, argument was presented that there is need for a Committee to collect, examine and provide appropriate documentation for consideration by Senate, that the work load for a standing Committee would prove too great and that there should be introduced an Office of Research and Evaluation to collect and provide for information and for experimentation. Reference was made to study conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee and the wide disparity which had then been found. Further arguments, pro and con, were made.

Vote on the motion was undertaken.

MOTION CARRIED
11 in favour
9 opposed

Moved by K. Okuda, seconded by J. Hutchinson,

"that Senate state that for courses at the 100 and 200 level the median grade by a 'C'".

Debate ensued with individuals speaking for and against the proposal.

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by B. D'Aoust,

"that this open session of the meeting adjourn in ten minutes - at 11:40 P.M.".

MOTION CARRIED
12 in favour
2 opposed

SM 3/2/69

Debate returned to the motion of Okuda/Hutchinson.

Moved by L. Boland, seconded by S. Wong,

"that the motion of Okuda/Hutchinson, be tabled".

MOTION CARRIED

15 in favour

3 opposed

2 abstained

(C) Date of Next Meeting

The date of next meeting was established as March 3, 1969.

The meeting of the Open Session adjourned at 11:40 P.M.

H. M. Evans
Secretary