

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER
UNIVERSITY HELD TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1969, FACULTY
LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT: Strand, K.T. Chairman

Baird, D.A.
Branca, A.E.
Boland, L.A.
Burstein, K.R.
Cole, R.E.
Collins, M.
Conway, J.
Dampier, J.L.
D'Aoust, B.
Ellis, A.J.
Funt, B.L.
Haering, R.R.
Hamilton, W.M.
Harper, R.J.C.
Hutchinson, J.
Korbin, D.G.
Lachlan, A.H.
MacKinnon, A.R.
Okuda, K.
Prock, Mrs.L.
Rieckhoff, K.E.
Shrum, G.M.
Sperling, G.B.
Stratton, S.
Sullivan, D.
Tuck, D.G.
Vidaver, W.
Walkley, J.
Wong, S.
Williams, W.E.

Evans, H.M. Secretary
Meyers, D.A.
Barboza, J. Recording Secretary
Collins, E. Recording Secretary

ABSENT: Hean, A.F.C.
Koerner, Mrs.O.
Lett, Mrs.S.
McLean, C.H.
Perry, G.N.

arrangements were made to provide audio coverage from the Senate Room to the Student Cafeteria. In addition, the Chairman of Senate had ruled that closed-circuit T.V. coverage also be provided with six T.V. monitors in the Student Cafeteria and one T.V. camera in the Senate Room. As at recent meetings within the Senate Room provision was made for two moving microphones and one fixed microphone.

Immediately prior to the opening of Senate a large audience occupied the Senate Room but left immediately prior to the opening of Senate, with the Student Ombudsman presenting proposals to the Chairman of Senate with request that these be considered. The paper presented is attached to these Minutes as Appendix A - "Proposal presented to President Strand for Senate Action".

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

"that the Agenda be approved".

Amendment was moved by J.Conway, seconded by D.Korbin,

"that the paper handed to the Chairman immediately before the opening of Senate 'Proposal presented to President Strand for Senate Action' (Appendix A) be added to the Agenda including the items:-

- i. that final votes on the academic planning, admissions and 'open university' motions be made at an open Senate meeting at the beginning of the next semester, thus allowing the student body and faculty to examine the documents, formulate their opinions and attend the meeting without the pressure of exams and essays.
- ii. that Senate indicate its willingness to be bound by a referendum vote on the question of a parity Senate (half students and half faculty, elected according to their own procedures) conducted among students and faculty either singly or jointly; that if such a referendum passed, that Senate would agree to ratify decisions made by an interim parallel Senate set up as an elected parity body before the Universities Act is formally changed."

The Chairman proposed that items i and ii be considered as two questions and each dealt with singly. He also noted that suspension of the rules of Senate would be required.

Debate was commenced and enquiry was made as to why the paper had not been submitted through the Senate Agenda Committee in the normal fashion. J.Conway responded that the items arose from a debate held on the Mall

- 3 -

that day and that they constituted emergency items. K.Burstein expressed the view that the items should first be presented to the Student Body for consideration and disagreed that they constituted emergency items and hoped that they would be ruled out of order as they had not been through the Senate Agenda Committee.

The Chairman indicated that he proposed to request inclusion of Paper S.219, 219a (D.Tuck), dealing with the search for an Academic Vice President and that this paper had not been through the Senate Agenda Committee. He was therefore accepting debate on the question of inclusion of items i and ii above on the Agenda.

Lengthy discussion continued with individuals speaking for and against inclusion on the Agenda. B.D'Aoust stated that bartering was being undertaken and with considerable loss of time.

Moved by B.D'Aoust, seconded by K.Burstein,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION PASSED
21 in favour
1 opposed
3 abstained

Vote was then taken on the question of inclusion of item i on the Agenda.

AMENDMENT FAILED
12 in favour
13 opposed
4 abstained

Debate was then undertaken on inclusion of item ii on the Agenda. J. Conway spoke in favour of inclusion.

K.Burstein raised a point of order stating that the Senate structure was controlled by the Universities Act and requested that the Chairman rule the item out of order.

K.Strand, Chairman, ruled the debate in order as it concerned only a question as to whether or not the item would be placed on the Agenda.

J.Conway continued with expression of the view that the item be included on the Agenda with opposition expressed by D.Sullivan. S. Wong rose to a point of order noting that the debate pertained only to the question as to why, or why not, the item should be included on the Agenda. D.Sullivan argued that the substance of the item deserved debate, but not in the form in which presented as the structure of Senate is set by the Universities Act.

K.Burstein rose on a point of order arguing that the item was outside the power of Senate and, therefore, was not in order.

K.Strand ruled that the debate concerned whether or not the item be included on the Agenda and that such debate was in order. K.Burstein, seconded by D.Tuck, challenged the ruling of the Chair; vote was undertaken with 14 in favour of the Chair, 13 opposed and 2 abstentions. The ruling of the Chair was upheld and debate continued as to whether or not the item would be included on the Agenda. D.Korbin supported inclusion of the item on the Agenda as the current structure of Senate was involved and that it was necessary that disproportionate representation be corrected. K.Rieckhoff opposed inclusion claiming that the question could be put to Senate in appropriate order and time. J.Conway argued the importance of including the item on the Agenda now as many serious matters were being presented to Senate but that Senate was not structured representatively to handle such serious items.

Vote was undertaken on the question of inclusion of item ii on the Agenda.

AMENDMENT FAILED

5 in favour

24 opposed

1 abstained

Representatives of the student press departed from the Senate Room.

Debate on approval of the Agenda continued.

Amendment was moved by K.Burstein, seconded by G.Sperling,

"that item 4a - Academic Planning, Paper S.215, be deleted from the Agenda until it has been through the faculties."

D.Tuck enquired of the Chairman as to why the item was now included on the Agenda, and the Chairman responded that at the last meeting he had indicated he proposed to include such paper and that no objections had been made. The item was included as a part of the Chairman's Report with the concurrence of the Senate Agenda Committee.

G.Sperling submitted that before a presentation to Senate, the item should receive consideration through the faculties and with opportunity of student discussion in advance. R.Harper expressed the view that appropriate steps had been taken. W.Vidaver supported the view that the item be retained on the Agenda. K.Burstein expressed opposition to inclusion as he was not persuaded that Senate should undertake to do something just because it has the power to so do, and argued that the matter should be put through faculties before Senate consideration.

J.Conway requested that the results of votes be announced loudly in order that those watching the proceedings through audio-visual could know the results, and enquired of the Chairman about plain-clothesmen on the doors of the Senate Room. The Chairman indicated that the individuals were University employees.

Vote was undertaken on the amendment proposed by K.Burstein, G.Sperling.

AMENDMENT FAILED

10 in favour

16 opposed

4 abstained

Discussion continued on approval of the Agenda. The Chairman requested inclusion of Paper S.219, 219a (D.Tuck) submitted by the Senate Committee on the Methods of Appointment, Responsibilities and Tenure of Heads and Deans, on the Method of Appointment of an Academic Vice-President. As there were no objections, he ruled inclusion in order as item 5c.

As no further changes were proposed, the Agenda was ruled approved.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OPEN SESSION - MARCH 3, 1969

Page 6 - Paragraph 3: The statement "Ruled by K.Okuda" should read "Moved by K.Okuda".

Page 7 - 4a, Line 1 : The word "a" is to be added at the end of the line.

Page 11 - Item ii: In each case where reference is made to Education 499-15 or Education 498-18, change is to be made to indicate that reference is to the individual study semester 499 or 498 as the case may be, and that in terms of course headings these would be dependent upon the particular department of the Faculty of Education concerned (e.g. B.S.F., S.P.F. etc.).

Page 3 - Paragraph 9: The word "utterly" is to be replaced by the word "upwardly".

With the changes noted above, the Minutes were ruled approved.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

G.Sperling drew attention to Page 7 Item 4b Paragraph 2 concerning the growing malaise of the Centre for the Communications and the Arts and noted that the Chairman had not given data in this connection. The Chairman responded that he did not consider the matter appropriate for Senate at this time, and in response to further questioning indicated that he considered the faculty concerned was looking after the matter.

G.Sperling referred to Page 15, Section iv pertaining to the consideration by U.B.C. of raising standards of admission and his enquiry concerning any consideration being given by Simon Fraser University. The Chairman responded that U.B.C. was considering this matter but that firm decision had not been made. He concurred that if this were done there would be effect upon Simon Fraser University and noted that the Ellis Report has certain recommendations.

B.D'Aoust referred to Page 5 on the section pertaining to the introduction of gradings "W", "WP" and "WF". K.Burstein replied that he did not receive notice of dates for submission of material to the Senate Agenda Committee meeting and that he was still awaiting a paper indicating the criteria to be met in order for papers to be accepted by the Senate Agenda Committee. The Chairman noted that a notice had been issued February 21 indicating the dates for submission of material for consideration by the Senate Agenda Committee and stated that up to this time a paper on criteria to be met for inclusion of papers by the Agenda Committee had not been completed.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN(a) Academic Planning - Paper S.215 (K.Strand)

K.Strand indicated that he would vacate the Chair and requested that the Acting Academic Vice President assume the chairmanship. S.Wong raised a point of order noting that under Senate rules the Chancellor should assume the Chair and that in his absence the Chair would be then taken by the senior Dean. G.Shrum assumed the chairmanship.

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

"that Paper S.215 be referred to the three faculties for comment, and then sent to Senate with comments for the June 2 meeting of Senate."

Debate on the motion was undertaken. W.Vidaver spoke in opposition to the motion. R.Harper expressed the view that the paper should be considered by the faculties. B.D'Aoust concurred that it likely should be referred to the faculties but only after discussion by Senate. B.Funt expressed the view that the principles were well known within faculties and the need for priorities had been established. K.Rieckhoff enquired as to the extent the Deans had been consulted in the preparation of the paper and the Chairman indicated that the Deans had been consulted at length but that only they could indicate how much discussion had been held with faculty members. D.Sullivan indicated that details had not been submitted to general faculty meetings but that some parts need not go to faculties as general knowledge existed but that Senate should discuss those aspects which should be referred to faculties. A.MacKinnon indicated that the principles had been before the Faculty of Education frequently but that the specific paper and procedures outlined had not been presented, and agreed with D.Sullivan that some items should be referred to the faculties.

Amendment was moved by S.Wong, seconded by G.Sperling,

"that Paper S.215 be referred also to the Student Society."

S.Wong spoke to the amendment arguing that the students should have opportunity in the same fashion as the faculty, as the students would be affected by decisions. M.Collins spoke against both the amendment and the main motion and indicated that the Chairman who had prepared the paper should be given opportunity to provide information. G.Sperling spoke in favour of both the amendment and the motion stating that ample opportunity should be given for consideration of the items.

D.Sullivan expressed disturbance that Senate should feel it necessary to go to both the faculty and student body and stated that student senators should speak on behalf of students on the paper and various sections. He stated that most of the paper deals with administration. W.Williams spoke against referral to either the faculty or students, referred to the principles, and expressed the view that much information

was lacking in the paper. K.Burstein referred to an earlier C.A.U.T. report which had noted that faculty had been bypassed in certain earlier decisions, that the faculty had fought to obtain rights but that some individuals were now suggesting that faculty should not have the right of review of such an important document. J.Conway indicated that he felt it necessary that a thorough job be done as many issues were involved and that referral to the students was essential. He further expressed the view that seeds of controversy would exist if implementation was made and that students should be involved on a parity basis with veto if required. W.Vidaver and K.Rieckhoff spoke against the amendment arguing that Senate had both the duty and the power to undertake decisions of this type and that time was important.

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

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION PASSED

21 in favour

5 opposed

1 abstained

Vote was then undertaken on the Wong-Sperling amendment.

AMENDMENT FAILED

9 in favour

14 opposed

4 abstained

Debate was resumed on the main motion. D.Korbin spoke in favour of the main motion noting that the Act does indeed give power to Senate but that the Act requires revision. B.Funt made reference to priorities and stated this concept had been known in faculties for some time with a number of submissions being made. He concurred that some details required further debate and discussions. R.Harper argued that a number of points require debate in faculties and spoke in favour of referral to the faculties. A.Lachlan spoke against the motion stating that planning procedures were required as quickly as possible. K.Burstein supported the motion for referral arguing that the principle of the paper was not at stake but rather the principle of procedure and that faculties had the right to expect opportunity to debate issues and make comments before decision is undertaken by Senate. G.Sperling spoke in favour of the motion arguing that the present procedure was dissemination from the top down and not a two-way discussion as faculties had no chance to discuss the paper. J.Conway noted that referral to students had been defeated but that nevertheless he would support referral to the faculties and felt that Senate was avoiding debate on crucial issues.

Amendment to the main motion was moved by L.Boland, seconded by J.Walkley,

"that the words 'and then sent to Senate with comments for the June 2 meeting of Senate' be replaced with the words 'and

that they report back to Senate at the May 5 meeting".

AMENDMENT FAILED
7 in favour
17 opposed
4 abstained

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

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION PASSED
17 in favour
3 opposed
6 abstained

Vote was then undertaken on the main motion of K.Burstein, R.Harper.

MOTION PASSED
17 in favour
10 opposed
2 abstained

(b) Scholarships, Awards, Bursaries - Paper S.216

As the item constituted part of the report of the Chairman, K.Strand commented.

Moved by K.Okuda, seconded by A.MacKinnon,

"that the four proposals of Paper S.216 be approved."

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

"that the motion be postponed until such time as report is received from the Senate Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries on the whole nature of University Awards and Athletic Awards, to be reported to Senate at its June meeting."

Debate was undertaken on the propriety of postponement. S.Wong spoke in favour of postponement and made reference to a letter from him to K.Strand dated March 10, 1969. He made further reference to a report submitted to the President in connection with Athletic Awards with argument that Senate needs to know the policies of the committees before it can adequately judge if merging would be appropriate. D.Sullivan spoke in favour of the motion and wished to see reports from the existing committees, and to ascertain whether or not the committees support or reject the submission.

Vote on the motion to postpone was undertaken.

MOTION PASSED
24 in favour
2 abstained

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES(a) Senate Agenda Committee Recommendation on Procedures for Considering the Ellis Report - Paper S.217

Discussion was undertaken and K.Burstein referred to Senate rules based on Robert's Rules with reference to speaking twice (Pages 2 and 10) and that the previous President had emphasized this ruling.

G.Sperling suggested that the procedure for the special meeting provide for opportunity to move into Committee of the Whole or informal discussion for a period of an hour.

D.Sullivan requested that the present discussion on Paper S.217 deal with the items ad seriatim and the Chairman so ruled. D.Sullivan noted that wide distribution had been recommended for the Ellis Report and expressed the view that it should be discussed in faculties and by students. He suggested change in the date proposed for the special meeting.

Moved by D.Sullivan, seconded by K.Burstein,

"that faculties have opportunity to discuss the Ellis Report and report their findings for a meeting of Senate to be held in the third week of May."

K.Rieckhoff spoke in opposition to the motion making reference to the provision for the Consultative Committee, the three-month period given for preparation of the report, the opportunity for faculty members to have made their views known, and questioned if Fall semester requirements could be met if delay arose. The Secretary gave information on dates.

D.Sullivan spoke in favour of the motion commenting that the report is a complex document with sweeping recommendations and that if items were rushed difficulties could arise.

Amendment was moved by D.Korbin, seconded by G.Sperling,

"that the report be referred similarly to the Student Society for comment."

D.Korbin spoke in favour of the amendment for referral to the students as they represent the largest group and those most affected by proposed changes.

L.Boland spoke against referral as provision had been made for a Consultative Committee consisting of faculty and student representatives. D. Korbin enquired as to whether the student representatives had been elected and S.Wong gave explanation. J.Conway stated that the students had no mandate and there had been little discussion with no referral back to the Student Body. He therefore spoke in favour of the amendment. A.Lachlan spoke in opposition, expressing the opinion that student views could be indicated by the student senators.

Vote on the Korbin-Sperling amendment was undertaken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

6 in favour

12 opposed

7 abstained

J.Conway requested a roll call vote and Senate was requested to indicate its desire. The request for a roll call vote was defeated with L.Boland, D.Sullivan and S.Wong requesting entry in record that they were in favour of a roll call vote.

Debate on the main motion was resumed. K.Burstein spoke in favour of the motion emphasizing that a good job must be done and that this required extensive debate and discussion. B.D'Aoust spoke in opposition claiming that the document would provide something better than currently exists and that revision and improvement could be made at later stages. A. Lachlan enquired as to whether movement of the date of special meeting to May or June would make it technically feasible for introduction of the regulations to apply for the Fall semester and the Secretary commented.

K.Rieckhoff spoke strongly against the motion to refer the matter to the faculties arguing that individuals had been selected to carry out the study and to act in consultative capacities, and that once such selection is made Senate should give appropriate authority to do the job and that Senate now had a job of decision to make rather than to refer back for further debate.

W.Vidaver argued that Senate should make decision without further referral.

Moved by W.Vidaver, seconded by D.Tuck,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION PASSED

23 in favour

2 opposed

Vote was then undertaken on the main motion by D.Sullivan, K.Burstein.

MOTION FAILED

13 in favour

14 opposed

Further change in the date of special meeting was proposed. Moved by J. Conway, seconded by D.Korbin,

"that the meeting be held the second week in May."

D.Korbin spoke in favour of the change noting that it is difficult for student senators to meet during exams and that the students cannot bring their demands adequately before Senate or adequately observe debate.

MOTION FAILED

8 in favour

15 opposed

1 abstained

Further discussion on Paper S.217 was undertaken and K.Strand explained the rationale underlying the paper.

K.Burstein indicated that he would want opportunity to ask questions on specific items, possibly of the Registrar, the Associate Registrar and the Assistant Registrar - Admissions, and enquired as to whether or not it would be possible to have them in attendance at the special meeting, to which the Chairman responded in the affirmative.

J.Conway suggested that the time limits proposed in Paper S.217 be deleted and any time limits necessary be established during the special meeting.

Moved by G.Sperling, seconded by J.Conway,

"that the time limit of 10 minutes suggested in Section 2 and the time limit of 2 minutes suggested in 3c be deleted."

Moved by B.Funt, seconded by D.Tuck,

"that this meeting adjourn by midnight."

MOTION CARRIED
13 in favour
8 opposed
3 abstained

Discussion resumed on the Sperling-Conway motion. W.Vidaver spoke in opposition referring to the problems of unlimited debate. D.Korbin spoke in favour of the motion with argument that as there had been no approval of referral on many substantive items it would be necessary to go through all necessary debate at the special meeting.

L.Boland pointed out that under the provisions of Paper S.217 for a vote to pass a two-thirds vote would be required as debate would be limited.

Vote on the Sperling-Conway motion was undertaken.

MOTION FAILED
8 in favour
15 opposed
1 abstained

Moved by D.Tuck, seconded by J.Hutchinson,

"that Paper S.217 be accepted in its entirety."

MOTION PASSED
16 in favour
8 opposed

(b) Senate Nominating Committee - Paper S.218

Moved by D.Tuck, seconded by B.D'Aoust,

"that Item 5b, Paper S.218, be tabled."

MOTION PASSED
15 in favour
4 opposed

- (c) Report from the Senate Committee on the Methods of Appointment, Responsibilities and Tenure of Heads and Deans, on the Method of Appointment of an Academic Vice-President - Paper S.219, 219a (D.Tuck)

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

"that Paper S.219a be adopted as university policy."

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

"that this matter be postponed until the next regular meeting of Senate."

MOTION PASSED
9 in favour
8 opposed
5 abstained

In view of the decision to adjourn at midnight consideration of the date of next meeting was undertaken.

6. DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING

The normal date for the next regular meeting of Senate would be May 5, 1969, but in view of the number of records to receive consideration for graduation purposes, time limitations were noted. It was therefore agreed that the next regular meeting of Senate would be scheduled for Monday, May 12, 1969, on the understanding that the faculties would provide to the Registrar not later than Wednesday, May 7, 1969, the appropriate lists of individuals to be considered for the various degrees.

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 a.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary.