

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD
FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1969 IN THE FACULTY LOUNGE AT 9:55 A.M.

SPECIAL MEETING - THE ELLIS REPORT (CONTINUED)

OPEN SESSION

Present:

Strand, K. T.

Chairman

Baird, D. A.
Boland, L. A.
Burstain, K. R.
Srivastava, L. M.
Haering, R. R.
Okuda, K.
Rieckhoff, K. E.
Stratton, S. T.
Sullivan, D. H.
Walkley, J.
Wassermann, S.
Williams, W. E.
Wong, S.

Evans, H. M.
Barboza, J.
Collins, E.

Secretary
Recording Secretary
Recording Secretary

Absent:

Branca, A. E.
Cole, R. E.
Collins, M.
Conway, J.
Dampier, J. L.
D'Aoust, B.
Ellis, A. J.
Hamilton, W. M.
Harper, R.J.C.
Hean, A.F.C.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Koerner, O.
Korbin, D.
Lachlan, A. H.
Lett, S.
MacKinnon, A. R.
McLean, C. H.
Perry, G. N.
Shrum, G. M.
Sperling, G. B.
Tuck, D. G.
Vidaver, W. E.

CONTINUATION OF CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ELLIS REPORT

8. Recommendation No. 6

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University empower the Undergraduate Admissions Board to seek from academic departments a listing of course equivalencies related to lower division courses and programs offered in the several institutions of higher learning in the province. (Part C)."

J. Ellis indicated that the intent of Recommendation 6 was to set up the necessary conditions for the Registrar's Office to deal with the students' transfer of credit and that the purpose of approving 6 would be to make possible the implementation of Recommendation 8.1. It envisages preparation of a master list which would indicate for the colleges and the university whether a course carries course equivalent credit, subject area credit, or unassigned credit - if credit at all.

W. Williams referred to the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings since, in his view, there was not enough distinction between credit and standing in Recommendation 6. A clarification and expansion of terms and intent is desirable.

D. Sullivan indicated that he agreed with the principle but not with the language and felt that before the item was passed there need be much more explicit terminology, as he was fearful that with the present wording there could be considerable argument at a later date over the intent.

L. Srivastava indicated that he supported the intent of the section but believed that the wording required modification.

Further discussion was undertaken with explanation by J. Ellis and additional questioning.

Vote was then undertaken on Recommendation No. 6.

MOTION FAILED

The Chairman indicated that Section 6 would be set aside for subsequent modification and consideration.

9. Recommendation No. 7

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University empower the Registrar to award transfer credit up to a maximum of 60 semester hours for university level courses

so designated by the Academic Board or analogous agencies. (Part C)."

J. Ellis commented on the intent of No. 7 and its relationship to other sections of the report. He had envisaged that when a student entered university there would be a number of preliminary steps taken that were routine and that these would then move the student towards his major department in terms of making certain that the student had necessary prerequisite study for undertaking majors and the like. As a part of the routine process the departments would have given considerable direction to the Registrar through Recommendation No. 6 but follow-up would be expected. No. 7 would empower the Registrar to award transfer credit that the student carries with him on subjects which have been seen as the equivalent of university level studies, to a maximum of 60 semester hours, but that the awarding of such hours may or may not mean a shortening of the degree, with this then moving into the departmental area of concern.

D. Sullivan commented on his reservations on the process described. He envisaged that the university would get information from the Academic Board, and generate a list of courses by submitting them to the departments for a statement of which courses are equivalent and which ones have acceptable area credit. He was concerned, however, over the matter of the residual credits beyond the specific equivalents and the acceptable area requirements that departments might accept, and that it was up to the Faculty of Arts, or other Faculties, to identify those courses which might be acceptable towards the particular degree beyond those in the specific and area fields. In particular, the Faculties of the university would have to say how much of the unassigned credit is to be applied to each of the degrees. He considered that there should be deferment on Items 6, 7, 8 and 9 until the mechanisms could be spelled out.

L. Boland expressed concern that through the provision of Recommendation No. 4 it was necessary to review Items 8.2 and 8.3 carefully as otherwise the university in effect could be giving a British Columbia degree rather than a Simon Fraser University degree.

R. Haering indicated that he wished to speak in favor of Recommendation No. 7 and against the arguments raised by D. Sullivan as he believed that procedures suggested might be somewhat better but not greatly better than the procedures which have previously existed. He was of the opinion that appropriate use of Recommendation 4 would provide the protection being sought.

L. Srivastava spoke in favor of Item 7 and did not believe it would create the difficulties suggested by D. Sullivan. Further consideration might be necessary under Item 8 and 9.

K. Okuda saw no difficulty with Item 7, but was concerned about the transfer of credit from institutions outside the Province of British Columbia. He did not believe that D. Sullivan's suggestions could be applied in terms of outside transfer courses without encountering significant difficulties.

S.M. 9/5/69

W. Williams indicated general agreement with D. Sullivan, although he concurred with K. Okuda that it would not be appropriate to invoke Faculties and a number of other agencies directly in a number of these decisions. He was convinced that it was necessary to more precisely word the section dealing with unassigned credit.

S. Stratton believed that Section 7 should be approved, particularly in principle, and that if it was necessary to add something further along, that this could be adequately done.

J. Ellis noted that it had been necessary to make recommendations without knowledge as to what an independent Faculty might do in an area of unassigned credit. He drew attention to page 25 and its conjunction with Recommendation 10 on page 17, as follows:

"An applicant seeking admission with transfer credit is advised that the courses he transfers, together with those he subsequently takes at the university, must meet the general and specific requirements of the faculty and the department in which he chooses to major or honor." - "The applicant should not assume that he will complete his degree with a number of semester hours equal to the difference between total hours required for the degree and transferred hours."

He presumed that departments and faculties would be more definitive in the statements that they would make concerning transfer credit.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation No. 7.

MOTION CARRIED
10 in favor
1 opposed
1 abstained

10. Recommendation No. 8

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

"It is recommended to the Senate of Simon Fraser University to request the Registrar to designate all transfer credit under these headings: (Part C)

- 8.1 Simon Fraser University course equivalents.
- 8.2 Unassigned credit in a subject area.
- 8.3 Unassigned credit.

The sum of these three should be equal to total hours granted by the transferring institution for the student's transferable courses."

J. Ellis indicated that Section 8 is assigned to provide a mechanism in which the Registrar would examine the transferable courses and categorize them into three groups. He noted that the

Undergraduate Admissions Board was concerned about the wording of the last sentence in Recommendation 8, that the Advisory Committee had spent an hour trying to word that particular sentence and that none were happy when the item was completed, but that there had been agreement upon the intent. He further noted that it has been accepted by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings which had proposed an amendment on the intent that, for example 37 transferable hours equals 37 Simon Fraser University hours. He considered that the amendment of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee also embodied certain difficulties in wording. Nevertheless, there had been overall agreement on intent.

W. Williams enquired as to whether the reference to the principles of transferable credit pertained only to B.C. institutions or to other agencies. J. Ellis indicated that the intent was also to pertain to other areas and drew attention to the references which had been made to analogous agencies elsewhere. He referred to pages 13 and 14 of the report.

W. Williams commented upon the variations that can arise from area to area, and J. Ellis indicated that problems did exist but that reference to the recognition given by a leading institution in the area could help to overcome some of these difficulties.

L. Boland indicated that the procedures were still not clear and that the Registrar had now been empowered to grant up to 60 semester hours without clarity of procedures.

R. Haering suggested that at this stage commitment was being made only to one specific transferring agency, the Academic Board of British Columbia. He was of the opinion that the other references were perhaps purposely vague so that some control might be maintained. From this standpoint the prime intent, since most students were from British Columbia agencies, was to establish specific recommendations concerning transfers within the province.

K. Okuda was of the opinion that there was re-argument of Recommendations 6 and 9 instead of Recommendation 8, and that he was of the belief that Item 8 presented merely a mechanism.

D. Sullivan disagreed that Item 8 represented a mechanism only and commented that the last sentence of Item 8 represented a principle. He did not consider it possible for the Registrar's Office to write across the world for data and that appropriate mechanisms would be necessary to seek advice within the university on a number of items.

J. Walkley considered that the important words are 'student's transferable courses' and that it was his assumption that if a course is acceptable, the hours carried by the course would be transferable.

S. Wong indicated that in the Advisory Committee there had been considerable discussion on this point and that the intention was to ensure some mechanism of calculating the amount of credits which would be given at Simon Fraser University, basically to ensure that it would neither be given too much nor too little.

K. Burstein believed that these items had to be spelled out in greater detail.

J. Ellis indicated that in view of the items currently passed reference primarily was to the use of the Academic Board within the province as an accrediting agency, but that over a long term he expected use of the principle of reference to a leading university in a given locality to provide data on the basis of which appropriate decisions could be made.

Vote was then undertaken on Recommendation No. 8.

MOTION CARRIED
6 in favor
5 opposed
1 abstained

11. Recommendation No. 9

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University request the Undergraduate Admissions Board to issue guidelines to departments in an effort to ensure that a student's program will not become unnecessarily attenuated either by the requirement of repetitive lower division courses or by the requirement of a number of lower division hours significantly in excess of minimum department requirements. (Part C)."

J. Ellis suggested that there was some confusion in the understanding of the intent of Recommendation 6 and Recommendation 9. It was intended that Recommendation 6 specify certain courses as SFU course equivalents and that in large measure this decision would rest with individual departments. Recommendation 9, however, assumes that certain earlier events have transpired including the admission of a student with a certain number of transfer hours, including perhaps a number of unassigned hours. He was of the opinion that the Admissions Board should issue guidelines within the spirit of page 15 and that the middle paragraph on page 15 represents a direction to departments to examine the unassigned credits in the area that the student has, to determine whether these might offer alternatives of the same kind to particular topics that are seen as necessary lower division prerequisites for the student. In those cases where transfers were difficult No. 10 would become operative and students could be informed of overall difficulties.

K. Okuda was concerned with the suggestion that the Undergraduate Admissions Board issues guidelines and did not consider that these could be beyond the general guidelines contained in the report in the sections already passed. To suggest more specific guidelines could lead to the Undergraduate Admissions Board admonishing individual departments for treating a particular student badly. He considered that Item 9 should be defeated but that Item 10 could be the method

S.M. 9/5/69

whereby Senate would be informed as to areas where major difficulties arise consistently such that further consideration could be given to seek appropriate solution.

W. Williams was of the opinion that it would be illogical and inconsistent to have defeated Recommendation 6 but to then pass Recommendation 9. He did not consider that there was sufficient distinction between credit and standing.

D. Sullivan spoke against Recommendation 9 and rejected the point of view expressed by J. Ellis concerning Item 4 on page 15 of the report, as he considered it the responsibility of the university to set its own programs and not to assume responsibility because of inability of other institutions to offer programs which dovetail.

S. Stratton suggested that Recommendation 9 is one primarily for improving communication through the Admissions Board distributing information and suggesting guidelines.

K. Burstein considered that the issuance of guidelines to departments, especially with respect to program requirements and course structure, could have very serious consequences. Such guidance should come from Senate and should not be delegated to another body. He did not consider that the other body would have competence to carry out the proposal adequately.

J. Walkley believed the proposal appropriate because of the difficulty in obtaining data from departments and felt that Item 10 provided a further appropriate feature.

J. Ellis concurred that there should be no attempt to adjust the university's academic line to the stringencies placed upon regional colleges but believed that guidelines could be well issued under the suggestions made on page 15. He drew attention to the paper circulated earlier by D. Sullivan and believed that it reflected the spirit intended in Recommendation 9. The intent was not to indicate compulsory action but to solicit information to facilitate the overall process. Recommendation 10 would be utilized where necessary to inform a college that the particular kind of work undertaken in certain areas would not represent an acceptable start upon a major program for a student contemplating transfer to Simon Fraser University.

Vote was then undertaken on Recommendation No. 9.

MOTION FAILED
4 in favor
7 opposed
1 abstained

It was noted that this item would be set aside for further consideration and amendments at a later meeting.

12. Recommendation No. 12

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University adopt the proposed Statement on Admissions and Transfer. (Part E)."

J. Ellis noted that Recommendation 12 was a long and complicated recommendation. He considered that the recommendation represented a series of rules growing out of a number of the policies earlier considered, rather than policies within themselves. He noted that the principle of parallelism had been used throughout the section and commented on a number of the elements of parallelism.

He considered that retention of parallel treatment of parallel groups was a particularly important element in the report.

The Chairman indicated that he would undertake a straw vote and that if there was indication the section would not pass, individuals could speak before the actual vote is put. The straw vote suggested the section would not pass.

Discussion was undertaken as to the possibility of considering the sub-sections item by item, but in view of the earlier procedures adopted, it was agreed that this would not be an appropriate time to follow that procedure.

Vote on Recommendation 12 was then undertaken.

MOTION FAILED
1 in favor
9 opposed
2 abstained

It was noted that Recommendation 12 would be set aside for consideration and possible amendments at a later meeting.

13. Recommendation No. 13

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University endorse the Statement on Continuance, Withdrawal and Re-admission. (Part F)."

J. Ellis noted that the committee had a great deal of difficulty with the particular section for a number of technical reasons and that the recommendations put forward represented currently existing policy. He noted further that Recommendation 13 interacts closely with the considerations of Recommendation 12 and suggested that Recommendation 13 be deferred.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 13.

MOTION FAILED
11 opposed
1 abstained

The Recommendation will be considered at a later meeting.

14. Recommendation No. 14

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University request the Admissions Board to continue the practice of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings in reviewing the cases of students with low records of achievement. (Part F)."

J. Ellis indicated that the present Admissions Committee had carried out this particular task with considerable conscientiousness and that a similar review in future was desirable.

S. Wong suggested that the committee might also consider the records of students with high academic standing.

K. Burstein concurred that review of records was necessary but believed that a more efficient procedure was required to remove the current awkwardness.

D. Sullivan enquired as to whether the intent was to have the same process as at present continued and J. Ellis indicated that the intent was that records be examined without stipulating the specific method.

W. Williams considered it necessary to have examination of a number of individual cases and did not believe that a computer could carry out the operation adequately.

K. Rieckhoff believed that the comments made indicated there was lack of clarity and that there should be clarification, or the section defeated.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 14.

MOTION CARRIED
8 in favor
3 opposed
1 abstained

15. Recommendation No. 15

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University encourage the Admissions Board to foster the systematic development of procedures for admitting and ensuring the academic success of Special Entry Students. (Part G)."

S.M. 9/5/69

J. Ellis spoke to the item and indicated that he could concur with the suggestion of the Undergraduate Admissions Board that the sub-division of the three categories of special early admissions, early entry and mature entry is probably preferable to the continuation of the rather awkward expressions which have been used. The intent is to place the responsibility for the very important groups clearly in someone's hands. The recommendation is to examine more clearly what is involved, to develop procedures for admitting groups and making certain that there are procedures available to support groups that may need additional assistance.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 15.

MOTION CARRIED
10 in favor
1 abstained

16. Recommendation No. 16

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University approve in principle a program of course challenge. (Part H)."

J. Ellis indicated that the intent of Recommendation 16 is to recognize a particular fact of social living today and that it is not intended to force the practice suggested upon individual departments but that in some areas of study departments would be prepared to recognize that certain students come with knowledge already available to them.

D. Sullivan supported the principle strongly but noted that it would be necessary that appropriate procedures be developed.

W. Williams supported the principle but wondered if there was implicit a suggestion of retroactivity. J. Ellis indicated that the intent of No. 16 is to gain an approval of the suggestion and that Recommendation 17 will provide for development of procedures. He concurred that it was necessary to draw safeguards and that these should be developed clearly and specifically.

S. Wassermann enquired as to why the course challenge should be limited to 5 courses and J. Ellis indicated that this was simply indicative of what the nature of a system of course challenge might be.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 16.

MOTION CARRIED
13 in favor

The Chairman wished the minutes to show that the vote was unanimous.

17. Recommendation No. 17

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University instruct the Undergraduate Admissions Board to develop with interested departments a program of course challenge and submit the program for Senate approval before the end of 1969. (Part H)."

D. Sullivan enquired as to whether or not the date was realistic. The Chairman suggested that the item could be defeated and the date changed or, alternatively, that the date could be left and that if it is later found impossible to meet the date, report would be made to Senate.

L. Boland was not satisfied that the Undergraduate Admissions Board should be asked to undertake the job but considered that it might be given to another committee.

Enquiry was made as to whether or not the passing of Recommendation 17 would automatically include the specific proposals generated in Part H of the report. The Chairman indicated that he had earlier stated that if the principle was approved, a simple organizational and procedural framework might be developed somewhat as outlined, but that this was indicative and not binding.

K. Burstein concurred with L. Boland that the Admissions Board might not be the appropriate body and believed that Senate itself should give consideration to the item. S. Wong suggested that the Senate Committee might coordinate the study.

W. Williams was of the opinion that the Admissions Board would be an appropriate body to undertake action.

R. Haering expressed the view that it might be appropriate to have a committee undertaking the work.

L. Srivastava suggested that the Admissions Board would be the appropriate body.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 17.

MOTION CARRIED
9 in favor
5 opposed

18. Recommendation No. 18

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University request the Acting President

to make provision, as may be possible, for the academic planning and student advising services that are presently lacking or deficient. (Part I)."

J. Ellis indicated that Recommendations 18 and 19 go together and constitute a request to the President to examine the area of student advising and the additional area of provision of information upon which Senate can do adequate planning.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 18.

MOTION CARRIED
11 in favor
1 abstained

19. Recommendation No. 19

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University request the Acting President to undertake or cause to be undertaken a study designed to bring about a better articulation of the various university services that are related to admissions, standings and credits. (Part I)."

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 19.

MOTION CARRIED
11 in favor
1 abstained

20. Recommendation No. 20

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University agree that students enrolling for the first time at the University in September 1969 be governed by new policies on Admissions, Credits and Standings, providing that agreement is reached on all necessary aspects of the policies by no later than May 15, 1969. It is understood that all existing policies and procedures will remain in force unless specifically amended or revoked until they are superseded by the new policies and procedures. (Part J)."

J. Ellis described the rationale behind the dates suggested but noted that there had been some delay in the matter coming before Senate and that Recommendations 12 and 13 had not yet been approved and that there were other areas now requiring clarification.

The Chairman enquired as to the number of Senators who would be in a position to reconvene after luncheon, but response indicated there would be difficulty in developing a quorum.

K. Rieckhoff considered it almost impossible to follow the suggested timing and believed that implementation for September might be difficult if not impossible.

D. Sullivan considered the statement too broad and did not believe that it could be accomplished by September.

L. Srivastava suggested a change in procedure and that there appeared to be no great difficulties in Recommendations 21 and 22. He suggested that consideration be given to Items 21, 22 and possible 23 and that a small working group composed of Professor Ellis and other interested members of Senate be charged to re-examine the sections which have not passed and to come back with revised versions on such items.

The Chairman indicated agreement with the proposal but noted that Item 23 would not be considered until all other items had passed.

S. Wong believed that every effort should be made to consider implementation for September 1969 and that the date of May 15 might be changed to May 31.

K. Burstein expressed concern similar to those of Professor Rieckhoff and was not satisfied that there was great urgency, particularly if items would be passed too hurriedly.

S. Wong enquired as to whether or not it was the Chairman's intention to reconvene Senate during the current terms of membership of a number of persons, and the Chairman indicated that this was the intent.

Vote was undertaken on Recommendation 20.

MOTION FAILED

6 in favor

6 opposed

21. Recommendation No. 21

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University empower the present Undergraduate Admissions Committee to act for the Admissions Board until the latter is constituted. (Part J)."

MOTION CARRIED

9 in favor

2 abstained

22. Recommendation No. 22

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

"It is recommended that the Senate of Simon Fraser University empower the present Appeals Group to act for the Appeals Board until the latter is constituted. Part J)."

MOTION CARRIED

8 in favor

3 abstained

The Chairman indicated that, within the present rules, it would be necessary for Senate to reconvene at a later stage to consider, in the following order, Items 6, 9, 12, 13, 20 and 23. He referred to the suggestion of L. Srivastava concerning a working group and requested that persons who have specific written amendments, in addition to those that have already been suggested, be sent to him promptly. He asked for an indication as to the persons who would be willing to meet as a Working Committee. He then indicated that he proposed to meet, following the present session, with L. Boland, K. Burstein, S. Stratton, L. Srivastava, D. Sullivan and J. Walkley.

The meeting was recessed at 12:35 p.m. to be reconvened at the call of the Chair.

H. M. Evans
Secretary