

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY  
HELD MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1971, EAST CONCOURSE CAFETERIA, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT:

Strand K. T.

Chairman

Baird, D. A.  
Basham, G. D.  
Birch, D. R.  
Bradley, R. D.  
Brown, R. C.  
Burstein, K. R.  
Donetz, G.  
Drache, Mrs. S.  
Ellis, J. F.  
Freiman, Mrs. L.  
Funt, B. L.  
Hamilton, C. L.  
Harper, R.J.C.  
Hodge, F. D.  
Lachlan, A. H.  
McAninch, J. R.  
Mugridge, I.  
O'Connell, M. S.  
Pate, B. D.  
Reid, W. D.  
Rogow, R.  
Salter, J.  
Stratton, S. T.  
Sullivan, D. H.  
Sutherland, G. A.  
Turnbull, A. L.  
Vidaver, W. E.  
Webster, J. M.  
Weinberg, H.  
Wilson, B. G.

Evans, H. M.  
Kelsey, I. B.  
Norsworthy, Mrs. R.

Secretary

Recording Secretary

ABSENT:

Campbell, M. J.  
Caple, K. P.  
Claridge, R. W.  
Hamilton, W. M.  
McDougall, A. H.  
Rieckhoff, K. E.

IN ATTENDANCE:

D'Aoust, B. R. )  
Hamm, C. M. ) To speak to  
Mallinson, T. J.) Paper S.71-51

Roberts, S.

S.M. 5/4/71

The Chairman drew to Senate's attention the fact that Senator Vidaver, having been a member of Senate since its inception in 1965, had not sought re-election and was now attending his last meeting of Senate. He was thanked by the Chairman for his contributions during his relatively long service on Senate.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Open Session of March 1, 1971 were approved as distributed.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

There was no report by the Chairman.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Senate Nominating Committee

Paper S.71-49 - Election of Senators to Various Committees

The Chairman reported that there had been no additional names submitted by individual Senators to those submitted by the Senate Nominating Committee and that a motion to elect by acclamation the individuals named would be in order.

Moved by J. Ellis, seconded by I. Mugridge,

"That the individuals nominated to the Senate Agenda Committee, the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board (SUAB), the Senate Appeals Board (SAB), the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and The Joint Board of Teacher Education be elected by acclamation."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Results of the elections are as follows:

i) SENATE AGENDA COMMITTEE

One Senator at large to replace W. E. Vidaver. No specified term of office. Term to begin May 1, 1971.

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION:

A. H. LACHLAN

ii) SENATE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS BOARD (SUAB)

One Senator at large to replace W. E. Vidaver for the remainder of his term of office to September 30, 1972. Term to begin May 1, 1971.

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION:

R.J.C. HARPER

iii) SENATE APPEALS BOARD (SAB)

One alternate faculty Senator for I. Mugridge, who is now replacing R. C. Brown as faculty Senator and has agreed to continue as the faculty Senator. No specified term of office. Term to begin upon election.

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION:

M. S. O'CONNELL

iv) SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

Election of two student Senators, with one individual to serve to September 30, 1971 and the second to serve to September 30, 1972.

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION TO SERVE TO  
SEPTEMBER 30, 1971:

G. DONETZ

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION TO SERVE TO  
SEPTEMBER 30, 1972:

J. R. McANINCH

v) THE JOINT BOARD OF TEACHER EDUCATION

One Senator at large to replace W. E. Vidaver. No specified term of office. Term to begin May 1, 1971.

ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION:

A. L. TURNBULL

2. Academic Planning Committee

Paper S.71-50 - Program in Latin American Studies

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by R. Brown,

1. "That Senate approve the establishment of a program in Latin American Studies.
2. That the program initially consist of a minor in Latin American Studies requiring 15 credit hours in courses at the upper division level and 9 credit hours at the lower division level.
3. That responsibility for the program rest in the Division of General Studies with the organization and administration to be as set out in Section 3(a) of Senate paper S.424 revised.
4. That the implementation date of the program be no earlier than September, 1971."

S.M. 5/4/71

R. Brown explained that the program was being set up by a group of faculty members interested in Latin America as a study area through an interdepartmental approach involving the various Departments currently offering Latin American courses. No "joint" courses had yet been proposed by the Steering Committee.

Question was raised as to what in the program was interdisciplinary. Senators Harper and Burstein emphasized that an interdisciplinary program involves people from various disciplines examining a common problem and offering solutions based on training and experience from these various disciplines. They stated that the program as presently constituted only contained courses to be offered by separate Departments, and that in no way could this be considered an interdisciplinary program. It was pointed out that at no time had it been claimed that the program was interdisciplinary. It was acknowledged that, in time, it could possibly evolve to that point.

Several Senators felt also that there was insufficient detail provided in the paper in connection with the administrative and organizational structure of the program and the possible constraints involved.

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

"That Paper S.71-50 - Program in Latin American Studies - be referred back to the Academic Planning Committee for further documentation."

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

7 in favor  
16 opposed

Discussion continued on pre-requisite requirements for courses, and whether these could be waived, with argument that if this were not possible, there would be little difference from that already available. Comments were made on restrictions in utilizing the program for a major field of study, and whether a course could be used by a student both toward a major and a minor, with indication by B. Wilson that this would not seem reasonable. An amendment was moved by R. Brown, "That in Motion 2 the words 'outside his major field of study' be added following the word 'level,'" but the motion failed for lack of a seconder. There was argument that the program was unclear.

B. Wilson stated that although he would like to see the establishment of a program of this nature, it was obvious from the discussion

that there were a number of items that needed clarification, and asked that the paper be withdrawn.

As there was no objection from the members, the paper was withdrawn.

PAPER S.71-50 WITHDRAWN

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

Paper S.71-51 - Reorganization of Educational Foundations Centre and Approval of Courses

S. Stratton asked permission of the Chair to bring in Professors B. R. D'Aoust, C. M. Hamm and T. J. Mallinson for the purpose of speaking to this paper. Permission was granted and the representatives from the Faculty of Education joined the meeting.

Motion 1 of Paper S.71-51 was moved by S. Stratton, seconded by G. Donetz,

"That the Educational Foundations Centre be organized into one administrative unit; that this unit be recognized for University purposes as a Department; and that there be no sub-departments within the Educational Foundations Centre."

S. Stratton outlined the history of events which had occurred during the one year interim period of continued de facto departmental recognition of the B.S.F., S.P.F. and C.S. components of the Educational Foundations Centre, and stated that the organizational structure contained in Paper S.71-51 was based on the program proposal contained in the remainder of the paper. He said that the resource people would be willing to answer any queries put to them by members of Senate. He drew attention to the Faculty vote approving the proposal, the reasons for so many abstentions and to the Faculty minutes which were available to Senators (now labelled S.71-51, Appendix I). He stated that the program proposal had much stronger support within Faculty than shown by the vote on the proposed organizational structure.

S. Drache remarked that inasmuch as Dr. G. Eastwood, of the Social and Philosophical Foundations, had circulated a report which seemed to present a challenge to the motion, it would seem appropriate that he be presented with the opportunity of taking part in the discussion. Dean Stratton pointed out that Professor Hamm would represent Social and Philosophical Foundations. (A paper from Dr. Eastwood had been distributed to Senators - now labelled S.71-51, Appendix II.)

S.M. 5/4/71

C. Hamm said he represented the minority group and that he hoped he would reflect the opinion of that group in stating that there was opposition to amalgamation or elimination of the Departments. He claimed that in the view of himself and several other persons within the Faculty no good reasons had been given for eliminating the three Departments of Behavioural Science Foundations, Social and Philosophical Foundations and Communications Studies. He pointed out the marked differences in specialization of faculty among these three Departments and claimed that it would be extremely difficult for a number of them to work together without Departmental boundaries. He pointed out that the persons involved were anxious to work together with other groups but not within a single structure or unit.

At this point D. Sullivan noted that the program proposal outlined in Paper S.71-51 had been accepted by the Faculty of Education first and with apparently stronger support, and that the organizational structure, which Senate was dealing with now, had been developed on the basis of the program. He stated that Senate should deal first of all with the proposed programs and later with the organizational structure.

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by I. Mugridge,

"That Motion 1 of Paper S.71-51 be postponed until Motions 2, 3 and 4 have been discussed by Senate."

The propriety of postponement was argued at length. On general agreement the meeting moved into Informal Discussion of Paper S.71-51 at 9:10 p.m. It was agreed that informal discussion would continue for thirty minutes.

L. Funt stated that the issues, especially justification for the organizational structure, were not clear and that a statement of principle and rationale should be forthcoming from either the Vice-President or the Dean of Education. He was supported by R. Rogow, and by K. Burstein who felt that the rights of faculty members involved in the reorganization proposal might be infringed upon. R. Bradley was of the opinion that there was no justification shown in the document for the organization proposed. G. Basham and A. Lachlan considered that Senate should act on Motion 1.

S. Stratton suggested that members consider the full documentation and the preamble and argued that the program rationale was based on the co-operation of the group, and that there are financial, academic and personal factors involved in the problems of organization. A number of organizational models had been considered and this selected to provide for individuals operating collectively in a single departmental structure with organization of courses by single committees with respect to undergraduate and graduate programs, with the collective planning of the programs through a single department chairman. B. Wilson supported

S.M. 5/4/71

the organization and expressed serious concern if there were to be proliferation of very small departments as the number of faculty members was such that there would be a good deal of difficulty in securing membership for various important departmental, faculty and Senate committees.

In response to a question on the criteria for Education Minors as part of the requirement for the B.Ed. degree, T. Mallinson replied that this was an attempt to make more coherent groupings of courses in Education as part of the degree. He stated that the specific minors proposed were an important part of the new program proposals and an attempt to integrate the course offerings.

R. Harper spoke on the organizational aspects of the proposal, stating that there were insufficient common interests to warrant the proposed administrative structure. He favored a two department structure for the Educational Foundations Centre consisting of the Behavioural Sciences and Communications Studies, which had common interests and backgrounds, and the Social and Philosophical Foundations. He claimed that the structure under which the Educational Foundations Centre had been operating during the past year, a structure approved by Senate in March of 1970, had not proved workable, as one group was concerned with a formalistic philosophy and the other more with a social philosophy.

D. Sullivan noted that a number of courses proposed could have significant impact in areas of the Faculty of Arts, and referred particularly to areas involving the Fine Arts.

R. Brown favored sending the paper to the Academic Planning Committee and then to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies in order that the whole matter of the program could be sorted out. He said that he was reluctant to make a decision in connection with the organizational structure on behalf of the Educational Foundations Centre when the concerned faculty members had indicated no consensus.

B. Wilson stated it would be inappropriate for Senate to address itself to the motions contained in Paper S.71-51 until there is significant comment from the Professional Development Centre.

The meeting moved out of informal discussion at 9:45 p.m., at which point D. Sullivan requested that his motion be withdrawn. As there was no objection from the seconder or the assembly the Chairman declared the motion to postpone Motion 1 withdrawn.

MOTION TO POSTPONE  
WITHDRAWN

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by I. Mugridge,

"That the four motions contained in Paper S.71-51 be referred to the Academic Planning Committee for comment."

Concern was expressed by several Senators with regard to the structure to be used until Senate approves a new organization for the Educational Foundations Centre. It was pointed out that a motion could be made later indicating precisely what that interim organization should be.

S. Stratton and R. Harper expressed opposition to referral. S. Stratton requested that if the motion on referral passed that Senate give direction to the Faculty of Education on the type of structure to be recognized in order that an immediate settlement of the current problems could be made. B. D'Aoust suggested that if Senate is not going to give an immediate solution the Academic Planning Committee be given specific direction as to what Senate is looking for in the reorganization of the Faculty of Education and specifically of the Educational Foundations Centre. K. Burstein suggested that if the motion were passed the Academic Planning Committee should meet with representatives of the Faculty and ensure that whatever recommendation is brought before Senate will represent a majority view of the faculty involved. R. Rogow felt the Academic Planning Committee should obtain considerably greater clarification of the rationale as in his view it was deficient both as a central theme against which individual courses can be measured for consistency and in justification of structure, and suggested that the Academic Planning Committee might wish to bring in outside experts for consultation.

Moved by S. Stratton, seconded by G. Donetz,

"That the referral of Motion 1 be divided from the referral of Motions 2, 3, and 4."

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

MOTION TO DIVIDE FAILED

6 in favor  
13 opposed

Question was called on the motion to refer Motions 1, 2, 3, and 4 to the Academic Planning Committee, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

16 in favor  
9 opposed



S.M. 5/4/71

J. Webster requested that the Academic Planning Committee do more than consider the matter solely within that body, and that it extend its considerations broadly.

Moved by S. Stratton, seconded by G. Donetz,

"That until the question is finally resolved by the University that Senate recognize the Educational Foundations Centre as a single administrative unit and a single department."

The Chairman pointed out that if the motion were passed by Senate the recommendation would be made to the Board of Governors and, if approved, the structure would exist on an interim basis until such time as the question is resolved within the University, and further approved by the Board. S. Stratton and T. Mallinson indicated that for some months the Centre had been operating as a single department and expressed concern with regard to the difficulties which would arise if this motion were not approved.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

Moved by S. O'Connell, seconded by C. Hamilton,

"That Senate extend for three months, to the July, 1971 meeting of Senate, the continued de facto departmental recognition of B.S.F., S.P.F. and C.S., and continue to recognize for this period the organization of the three divisions into an Educational Foundations Centre under the following constraints:

- i) single undergraduate education committee
- ii) single graduate education committee
- iii) a single spokesman for relations external to the Centre."

S. Stratton asked that it be recorded in the minutes that the interpretation of how the continued interim structure is to operate be the responsibility of the Academic Vice-President. The Chairman pointed out that according to the Universities Act the President, as the Chief Executive Officer of the University, has that responsibility. He may in turn delegate that responsibility, but that is his decision.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

16 in favor  
2 opposed

S.M. 5/4/71

7. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Notices of Motion

Paper S.71-52 - Request for Report from Senate Library Committee  
(B. Wilson)

B. Wilson stated that he understood a paper had been prepared by the Senate Library Committee which would be circulated very shortly and he would therefore not make a motion requesting a statement on loan practices. A. Lachlan, as Chairman of the Senate Library Committee, added that the paper had been drawn up carefully by the Librarian and the Registrar and it should reflect what actually occurred with regard to Library loan policies and practices.

2. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the date of the next meeting of Senate would be Monday, May 10, 1971 at 7:30 p.m.

3. Other Items

There were no other items.

4. Confidential Matters

The meeting recessed briefly at 11:25 p.m. prior to moving into Closed Session.

H. M. Evans  
Secretary