DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD MONDAY, JULY 6, 1970, EAST CONCOURSE CAFETERIA, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT:	Strand, K. T.	Chairman
	Barlow, J. S.	
	Basham, G. D.	
	Bradley, R. D.	
	Brown, R. C.	
	Burstein, K. R.	
	Campbell, M. J.	
	Claridge, R. W.	
	Ellis, J. F.	
	Freiman, Mrs. L.	
	Hamilton, W. M.	
	Harper, R.J.C.	
	Hutchinson, J. F.	
	Kenward, J. K.	
	Kirchner, G.	
	Lachlan, A. H.	
	McAninch, J. R.	
	O'Connell, M. S.	
	Rieckhoff, K. E.	
	Rogow, R.	
	Stratton, S. T.	
	Sullivan, D. H.	
	Turnbull, A. L.	
	Vidaver, W. E.	
	Weinberg, H.	
	Williams, W. E.	
	Evans, H. M.	Secretary
	Kelsey, I. B.	
	Norsworthy, Mrs. R.	Recording Secretary
ABSENT:	Baird, D. A.	
	Caple, K. P.	
	Carlson, R. L.	
	Drache, Mrs. S.	
	Hean, A.F.C.	
	McDougall, A. H.	
	McLean, C. H.	
	Perry, G. N.	
IN ATTENDANCE:	Boland, L. A. (to speak to Paper S.382)	
	Webster, J. M.	

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Open Session of June 1, 1970 were approved as distributed.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

a) Paper S.380 - Report on Status of Paper S.358 forwarded by Senate to the Board of Governors - Report of Senate Committee on the Method of Appointment, Tenure and Functions of Deans and Heads of Departments (ad hoc).

The Chairman of Senate stated that Paper S.380, which had been distributed to Senators earlier in June, 1970, indicated that the Board of Governors has considered Paper S.358, dealing with the report of the Senate Committee on the Method of Appointment, Tenure and Functions of Deans and Heads of Departments, and is holding decision on the complete paper pending legal opinion. Paper S.380 showed, however, that the Board had approved, with some change, Sections III. A. (Selection of a Dean's Search Committee) and III. B. (Terms of Reference of the Dean's Search Committee). As there were no questions on Paper S.380 the next item of the agenda was considered.

b) Paper S.381 - Proposal for Establishment of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and the Senate Appeals Board (R. C. Brown).

Moved by R. Brown, seconded by G. Kirchner,

> "That Motions 1, 2 and 3 of Paper S.381, dealing with establishment of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board (SUAB) and the Senate Appeals Board (SAB) be adopted."

At this point the Chairman of Senate stated that Senators could ask questions on the paper of Senator Brown and he in turn could reply to the queries. During the questioning period it was noted that several changes should be made in the paper. The following changes were noted and agreed upon:

1. Page 2 (Motion 1): Where the words "Admissions Board" appear, this should be changed to read "Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board (SUAB)."

2. Page 3 - Operating Model: A line should appear between the statement immediately preceding the Operating Model and the Operating Model itself.

3. Page 3 - Operating Model: The title "Operating Model (SAB)" should be changed to read "Operating Model (SUAB and SAB)."

In response to the question whether any Senator could propose policy changes for the Committee, Senator Brown stated that it was the intent to have either the Registrar's Office, or the Committee, or Senate itself, or any other interested body propose policy changes. In other words, recommendations for the need of policy changes did not necessarily have to come from the Registrar's Office alone.

Question was called on the motion to approve Motions 1, 2 and 3 of Paper S.381, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by R. McAninch, seconded by J. Ellis,

"That Senate reconsider the motion just passed."

It was pointed out that several Senators had thought that Motions 1, 2 and 3 were going to be handled individually.

Question was called on the motion to reconsider, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

1 opposed

Amendment was moved by R. McAninch, seconded by A. Turnbull,

> "That membership of the Senate Appeals Board (SAB) be changed by adding the words 'plus alternate' after the statement 'one faculty member of SUAB'; by substituting the words 'two students' for the words 'one student'; and by adding the word 'faculty' between the words 'one' and 'Senator.'"

The effect of the motion would be to add an alternate faculty member at large of SUAB and one student, and to replace the one Senator with a faculty Senator.

R. McAninch pointed out that from his experience on the former Senate Committee on Appeals (Admissions and Standings) students and faculty had somewhat different perspectives on the cases brought before it, and that it was helpful in making decisions to have such a balance. He thought that the proposed change to two faculty members

and two students would ensure this balance. This view was supported by A. Turnbull, who had also served on the previous Committee. He added that the former Committee had originally been set up on a student-faculty parity basis and that the agreed upon arrangement where a split or tied vote would be considered lost had worked out to the satisfaction of the Committee.

R. Brown spoke against the amendment and stated that in his view the Committee should have an uneven number in order to prevent a tie occurring in voting. Other Senators spoke on the issue with some expressing the view that the Committee should be on either a student-faculty parity basis or that students should have the majority. Others opposed this view claiming that students would then be "running the Committee."

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

"That the previous question be called."

Question was called on the previous question, and a vote taken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Question was called on the amendment to add one alternate faculty member from SUAB and one student and to replace one Senator at large with one faculty Senator, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

19 in favor
2 opposed

Amendment was moved by H. Weinberg, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That the following statement be added under Membership of the Senate Appeals Board (SAB), 'One member at large to be elected by the other Committee members.'"

H. Weinberg stated that this additional member would preclude the possibility of a split vote and offer an opportunity for either a student or a faculty member to be elected by the group.

Question was called on the amendment to add one member at large to the Committee, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

2 in favor

It was noted that in the event of a tied vote on the Committee, the motion would be declared lost.

Moved by G. Basham, seconded by L. Freiman,

> "That the following words be deleted from the section entitled 'Operation' in Motion 2 found on Page 5: 'Meetings shall be closed and proceedings shall remain confidential. Policy statements will be publicized through normal channels.'"

It was claimed that the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board is dealing with policies relating to undergraduate admissions, re-admissions, standing, and credit transfer, not individuals, and that if Senators were to influence policies in these areas, it was important for them to know what was going on with regard to these policies in the meetings to be held by the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board. However, it was claimed by some Senators that there would be numerous times when individual cases would have to be discussed for the formation of new policies and that where this was the case meetings should be closed and proceedings kept confidential. It was felt by some Senators that discretion should be exercised by the Committee on whether or not to keep some of its proceedings confidential, for instance when it is dealing with individual cases. The Chairman of Senate stated that if this amendment passed the Committee is to use its own discretion in deciding upon whether or not meetings are to be closed and proceedings confidential.

Question was called on the amendment to delete the formal statements relating to closed meetings and confidential proceedings, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

3 opposed

Question was called on the main motion to adopt Motions 1, 2 and 3, as amended, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Paper S.382 - Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices - Terms of Reference.

The Chairman of Senate pointed out that the Senate Agenda Committee had asked Dr. L. Boland, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices, to be present at this meeting to speak on the Terms of Reference for this Committee and to answer any questions which Senators may have on these Terms of Reference, or the specific charges placed before the Committee.

Moved by J. Hutchinson, seconded by R. Bradley,

> "That the Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices, as outlined in Paper S.382, be adopted."

Dr. Boland spoke to the note which appeared at the bottom of the page dealing with the Terms of Reference of the Committee, pointing out that the Committee will not attempt to make decisions in the case of individual grades assigned to any student, but that it may consider information derived therefrom in developing appropriate policies for recommendation to Senate to correct major inequities in future. Dr. Boland stated that the Committee did not want to be a "police Committee" for individual grades.

Dr. Boland then offered to answer questions which Senators might have on the Terms of Reference and the specific charges given to the Committee. Several Senators challenged the assumption on which the Terms of Reference had been made, the assumption being that there were wide discrepancies in grades. It was suggested that the Committee examine whether or not there were wide grade discrepancies.

Other Senators questioned why the Committee was establishing its own Terms of Reference rather than carrying out the Terms of Reference Senate supposedly assigns to its Committees. It was pointed out that there were no Terms of Reference given either to the original ad hoc Committee or to the present standing Committee on Examination and Grading Practices, and that the Committee members felt strongly that they needed some guide lines in carrying out the work assigned to the Committee.

It was moved by R. Bradley, seconded by K. Burstein,

> "That in paragraph 2 of the Terms of Reference the following words be deleted 'with a view to reducing wide divergencies in future.'"

It was noted that the powers of the Committee should not be confused with those of Senate. It was pointed out that the effect of this deletion would be to have the Committee gather the facts on grade discrepancies and then let Senate decide on the action to be taken with regard to the information gathered. Several Senators spoke against the amendment stating that they would like to see the Committee come forward with recommendations to Senate on how grade divergencies can be reduced. Other Senators spoke in favor of the amendment claiming that the Committee does not have authority to interfere with the differences in grading throughout the University, because in effect what the Committee is doing is interfering or questioning the competence of the instructors giving the grades.

Moved by M. Campbell, seconded by L. Freiman,

"That consideration of this question be postponed to the August, 1970 meeting of Senate."

M. Campbell stated that it was grossly improper for any Committee to establish its own terms of reference. He pointed out, however, that in this case the Committee was not at fault, but Senate itself, for failing to give to this Committee the Terms of Reference it required to carry out its duties. He stated that postponement of the question would give ample time for Senators to consider Terms of Reference they think should be given to the Committee.

Moved by G. Basham, seconded by J. Kenward,

"That the previous question on postponement be called."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Question was called on the motion to postpone, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO POSTPONE FAILED

2 in favor

Senate returned to consideration of the amendment to delete the words "with a view to reducing wide divergencies in future."

Moved by R. McAninch, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That the previous question on the amendment be called."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Question was called on the amendment to Section 2 of the Terms of Reference, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

14 in favor
7 opposed

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by M. Campbell,

> "That consideration of Paper S.382 - Terms of Reference of the Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices - be tabled."

Question was called on the motion to table, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO TABLE FAILED

3 in favor

Moved by R. McAninch, seconded by G. Basham,

> "That Sections 1, 3 and 4 of the Terms of Reference be deleted and that the following statement be added as Section 1: 'An assessment of the current grading practices of Simon Fraser University, which would include a full consideration of the current premises which underlie the evaluation processes at this University; as well as consideration of matters raised in Senate Papers S.375, S.379 and S.378.'"

R. McAninch stated that Senate should seize the opportunity of the problem which has arisen as a result of the grading within PSA and the resulting effects on the awarding of scholarships, awards and bursaries to examine the whole problem of grading. This Committee should examine the problem of grading throughout the University and recommend to Senate what should be done to solve the problem rather than have the problems such as awarding of scholarships and bursaries sent to the Committee for solution.

Considerable debate followed on the merits of this proposal with a number of Senators indicating that it was too broad a problem to be handled in a relatively short time by this one Senate Committee. It was noted the Committee was concerned with "practices." It was suggested that perhaps a commission should examine the whole problem of grading throughout the University. It was claimed that the Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices would be unable to report back to Senate on this very important matter for at least a year or more under the present wording of this amendment. K. Burstein stated, as he has on several occasions, that this matter of grading is a responsibility of Department Heads and should be left in their hands, rather than in the hands of Senate or one of its Committees.

Moved by R. Brown, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

> "That the previous question be called."

Vote was called on the previous motion.

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Question was called on the amendment to delete Sections 1, 3 and 4 and substitute a new Section 1, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

6 in favor
19 opposed

Amendment moved by W. Vidaver, seconded by G. Basham, "That the statement in Section 1 of the Terms of Reference is not to be construed that the Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices cannot make recommendations in the area of grading philosophy or theory."

W. Vidaver stated that in re-reading the Terms of Reference as they appeared before Senate, he could see nothing that precluded the Committee from making recommendations to Senate on grading and examination practices. He stated that he feared that the preceding debate would leave Committee members with the feeling that the intent of Senate is not to consider any recommendation on grades, that the present system is immutable and therefore must not be discussed or tampered with by the Committee. He reiterated his view that that intent should not be read into these Terms of Reference, and that he would not like the Committee to interpret the Terms of Reference that way, unless Senate explicitly stated that the present grading system is not to be tampered with.

It was agreed that the amendment would be withdrawn with the provision that Senator Vidaver's comments on this particular aspect of the problem be recorded in the minutes.

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

"That the previous question be called."

Question called on the previous question, and a vote taken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION FAILED

15 in favor
10 opposed
(two-thirds required)

At this point R. McAninch wished to make amendments to Sections 1 and 3 of the Terms of Reference. As there was some confusion as to the exact wording, it was felt that a recess at this time to clarify the wording would be most helpful.

Moved by M. Campbell, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate recess for five minutes."

Question was called on the motion to recess, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO RECESS CARRIED

Senate recessed at 9:35 p.m., and reconvened at 9:40 p.m., approximately.

Amendment moved by R. McAninch, seconded by G. Basham,

> "That Section 1 be changed to read 'To make recommendations to Senate as to whether or not it should adopt grading and examination practices which are designed to ensure reasonable equitability in a) assignment of grades within courses and across courses, b) the use of grades, and to ensure the internal and external credibility of grades given at Simon Fraser University'; and that Section 3 be changed to read 'To make recommendations to Senate as to whether or not the University should adopt appropriate methods for equating grades so that summary measures of scholastic standing utilized are equitable for students, for such purposes as awarding scholarships on the basis of academic merit.'"

Considerable discussion followed on the propriety of these changes with several challenges on the Chair's ruling that the amendment was in order. It was claimed that the amendment was in conflict with what Senate had previously examined and defeated.

The Chairman ruled that the amendment was in order on the basis that it was not in conflict with what Senate had previously examined and defeated.

It was moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by J. Kenward, "That the ruling of the Chair be challenged." In the vote taken on the Chairman's ruling that the amendment was in order, the ruling of the Chair was sustained by a vote of 13 to 5.

Dr. Boland left the meeting at 10:05 p.m. after pointing out that the Committee had spent considerable time examining the Terms of Reference before Senate and that if Senate was not pleased with these Terms of Reference then it should devise its own and submit them to the Committee.

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by J. Kenward,

> "That the previous question be called."

Question was called on the previous question, and a vote taken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Question was called on the amendment to Sections 1 and 3 of the Terms of Reference, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

3 in favor

Amendment moved by L. Freiman, seconded by K. Burstein,

> "That in Section 1 of the Terms of Reference the following words be deleted, 'and to ensure the internal and external credibility of grades given at Simon Fraser University.'"

L. Freiman spoke to the amendment and stated that the responsibility for credibility of grades did not belong to any one Committee but that it belonged to Senate and the University as a whole.

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

> "That the previous question be called."

Question was called on the previous question, and a vote taken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

1 opposed

Question was called on the amendment to delete the final part of Section 1 related to credibility of grades, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

3 in favor

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by R. Brown,

> "That the previous question on the main motion as amended be called."

Question was called on the previous question relating to the main motion as amended, and a vote taken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

3 opposed

Question was called on the main motion to adopt Paper S.382 - Terms of Reference of the Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices - as amended, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

6 opposed

M. Campbell and K. Burstein requested that their negative votes be recorded. M. Campbell stated that his negative vote was to be recorded on the grounds that it was grossly improper for a Senate Committee to establish its own Terms of Reference and that Senate itself should have devised the Terms of Reference for the Committee.

It was pointed out by the Chairman of Senate that the note which appeared at the bottom of the page on the Terms of Reference was included in the motion passed.

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

a) Faculty of Arts

There was no report from the Faculty of Arts.

b) Faculty of Education
Paper S.383 - A Proposal to Offer Courses in Either or Both the First and Second Two Month Periods of Each Summer Semester

Moved by S. Stratton, seconded by J. Ellis,

> "That Senate authorize that a Department that so wishes, offer Senate-approved courses for full credit in either or both the first and second two-month periods of each Summer semester commencing 1971, providing that the hours of instruction and other requirements of the courses so offered are equivalent to those in effect in the normal four-month semester."

Dean Sullivan indicated that he wished to make a motion to refer the matter to the Academic Planning Committee as he considered the item a new program and that it should be considered under the Terms of Reference of the Academic Planning Committee by that body. Dean Stratton felt that time was important, that the proposal would have impact on the total University, and that in the event decision was later made to refer the matter to the Academic Planning Committee, it would be most helpful to that body if there had been prior discussion at Senate with pertinent comments transmitted to the reviewing body as an aid in its deliberations.

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

> "That this matter be referred to the Academic Planning Committee, and that the Academic Planning Committee report back to Senate on its deliberations in accordance with previous instructions within 60 days."

D. Sullivan expressed the opinion that the matter fell clearly under the Terms of Reference of the Academic Planning Committee and that it represented a new program. He observed that it called for reorganization of programs, had impact on space usage, and possibly monetary implications. He emphasized that his comments in no way should be considered prejudicial in the discussions as he considered the proposal worthy of full and careful review. He commented that the proposal undoubtedly would involve all three Faculties. The matter had been drawn to the attention of Chairmen of the Departments of the Faculty of Arts with request that they consider it carefully, raise questions and offer comments. Questions had been raised as to the nature of course load and organization which might be involved. He considered that reasonable time was needed for discussion of such an important matter and that clearly the Academic Planning Committee should be considering it.

There was considerable discussion on how Senate would handle the item before it with several Senators expressing the feeling that because of the profound implications for the entire University, the proposal should be referred to the Academic Planning Committee or some other body for a detailed examination, with the full report to be brought back to Senate.

It was pointed out by S. Stratton, J. Ellis and G. Kirchner that it was important to consider the matter as quickly as possible so that the reorganized programs could be offered next Summer semester to many teachers in the field and others in the community. Senate was reminded that changes such as this had to be approved two semesters in advance of the date changes were to be effected. Argument was made that this was not a new program and that it involved primarily reorganization in the areas of space, equipment, cost and faculty utilization. G. Kirchner, a member of the Academic Planning Committee, gave his opinion that it was not a new program.

R. Brown felt that to be effective the proposal would have to involve all Faculties and that there needed to be full discussion within the Faculties on these matters. He expressed strong concern on the possibility of two additional registrations and questioned whether or not this was feasible, and the nature of increased costs. He felt thorough investigation was needed.

Senator Ellis referred specifically to the paper and observed that additional formal registration periods would not necessarily be needed, that it was not the intent for students to take a full semester of study during a two-month session, that it was not abandonment of the trimester system, but that it was an attempt to make the present opportunities for learning more readily available to the community at large. He also commented that the number of individuals in the Summer semester who registered

for less than 10 hours was significant and that these individuals were required to study throughout the full semester, whereas under the proposals made, the same amount of work could be completed in the two-month proposal allowing greater flexibility for students. It was observed that this was not a new type of venture as other institutions in the province had offerings of the types proposed and that these were not costly but rather cost-recovering programs.

K. Rieckhoff indicated support of the amendment and desirability of referral both on necessity of investigating administrative impacts as well as upon academic considerations. He indicated he did not wish to prejudice full discussion of the proposal but noted that already there had been some concern expressed on academic grounds on the short-term periods even of semesters and that the proposal suggested that the terms might be even shorter. He drew attention to the fact that the paper proposed that there could be broadened course offerings without increase of faculty by utilizing part of the faculty members' research semesters for teaching in the shortened terms. He seriously questioned whether any reduction in research opportunity would be academically sound and raised the problem of teaching versus research. He emphasized that proposals which had such broad and long-term implications required thorough and careful consideration before action is undertaken.

A. Lachlan opposed the motion to refer and felt that the original motion could be passed with some constraints placed thereon. R. Rogow supported the motion to refer, noting agreement with a number of points raised by Senator Rieckhoff. He commended the Faculty of Education for bringing the proposal forward but felt that very careful consideration was required. He felt that the proposal had major impact and that its relationship to the trimester system required careful review, including the problems of program, faculty manning, sabbaticals, and research. He desired greater clarification and elaboration and felt that the Academic Planning Committee was the appropriate body to provide this.

K. Burstein was generally in favor of referral and expressed concern on the budgetary implications of operating a Summer School and felt that the report awaited on the operation of the trimester system would have impact on decisions. Consideration by the various Faculties was essential.

Amendment was moved by K. Burstein, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

> "That the following words be added to the present motion, 'with recommendations and priorities based upon consideration of all academic programs currently before the Academic Planning Committee.'"

Considerable debate followed and the Chairman noted that the assignment of priorities was an item that could only be undertaken by the Academic Planning Committee at a much later stage. K. Rieckhoff indicated that in his opinion in order to develop the necessary critique report to come back to Senate from the Academic Planning Committee, that Committee would have to take cognizance of the various other items before it in relationship to the current proposal. K. Strand considered that the original motion would automatically involve that type of consideration, but that the amendment currently being proposed was really calling for a critique report within 60 days of all proposals before the Committee. On the understanding that the original motion implies that the Academic Planning Committee would take cognizance of such other matters before it as have bearing on the current proposal, the motion was withdrawn.

Moved by R. Bradley, seconded by R. Brown,

"That the previous question be called."

Vote on the call for the previous question was undertaken.

PREVIOUS QUESTION FAILED

14 in favor
9 opposed
(two-thirds required)

Amendment moved by J. Ellis, seconded by G. Basham,

"That the words '30 days' be substituted for the words '60 days.'"

Considerable discussion followed as to whether or not 30 days was sufficient for the Academic Planning Committee to examine the proposal and report to Senate, with considerable doubt that the time was sufficient for consideration of such important questions. A number of Senators emphasized the time urgency. Vote was undertaken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

16 in favor
4 opposed

Question was asked if the Committee at the end of 30 days could report back indicating it needed more time, and the Chairman responded that it might bring in a partial report with indication of more time needed, but that it was obvious that it was the desire of Senate to have a full report if possible within 30 days. Debate continued on whether or not it was appropriate for Senate to refer the matter to the Academic Planning Committee with call for a critique report within 30 days. The Chairman noted that there was some question as to whether the proposal was or was not a new program but that by the nature of the motions presented, Senate had the opportunity to decide whether it did or did not wish to have the matter considered at this juncture by the

Academic Planning Committee. Dean Stratton indicated that there was no intention to not have the proposal considered by the Academic Planning Committee, but that he had wished for informal discussion in order that the Committee could have as much information as possible before it following a Senate discussion.

Moved by R. Harper, seconded by R. McAninch,

"That the previous question be called."

PREVIOUS QUESTION CARRIED

Vote was then undertaken on the amended motion to refer to the Academic Planning Committee.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

18 in favor
6 opposed

M. Campbell asked that his negative vote be recorded.

Moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by K. Burstein,

"That Paper S.383 be referred to the Faculties of Arts and Science for comments."

Vote on the motion to refer to the two Faculties was undertaken.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

12 in favor
2 opposed

c) Faculty of Science

There was no report from the Faculty of Science.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.

b) Date of Next Meeting

The Chairman of Senate stated that the date of the next meeting would be Monday, August 3, 1970 at 7:30 p.m.

c) Other Items

There were no other items.

d) Confidential Items

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 p.m. to move into Closed Session.

H. M. Evans
Secretary