

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD IN THE BOARD AND SENATE ROOM
ON MONDAY FEBRUARY 6 1967, AT 1.30 PM

PRESENT:

P.D. McTaggart-Cowan

Chairman

M. Bawtree

D. Berg

T.B. Bottomore

F. Candelaria

J.L. Dampier

A.J. Ellis

W. Hamilton

R.J.C. Harper

A.F. Hean

G. Kirchner

I. Koerner

E.S. Lett

S.K. Lower

C.H. McLean

A.R. MacKinnon

J. Mills

K.E. Rieckhoff

G.M. Shrum

G. Sperling

A.M. Unrau

W. Vidaver

W. Whiteley

W. Williams

D.P. Robertson

Secretary

M. Dawson

Recording Secretary

ABSENT:

R.J. Baker

A.E. Branca

J.F. Ellis

C.J. Frederickson

G.N. Perry

IN ATTENDANCE:

T.H. Brose (for part of Item 3A)

D. Roberts, Information Officer

D.G. Tuck (for Item 3B)

SM 6/2/67

Student Rep. on Senate
Openness & Procedure

2

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of 9 January Meeting were approved with the following amendment:

Item 2, motion by K.E. Rieckhoff, amend to read: "should include one representative appointed by the Dean, and one elected representative, from each of the Faculties of Arts and Science".

2. BUSINESS ARISING

None.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT REPRESENTATION AND OPENESS OF SENATE MEETINGS

K.E. Rieckhoff presented the Committee's report. He said that the Committee's frank discussion on the openess of Senate meetings had brought out points previously not thought through and had changed views previously held by some members. The Committee felt that as there was no clear cut evidence that openess would be detrimental to the work of Senate, the experiment should be tried. If such a trial turned out to be a failure, the meetings could be closed again.

On the question of student representation, the Committee felt that since one of the prime intents of student representation on Senate is that of communication of the ruling body of the University with a vital part of the University community, once this is accepted as a desirable thing, a student representative, or, in the future, more than one, could make a useful contribution to this body. The principle that a student might prove a useful addition to Senate was agreed on; the only point on which the Committee could not reach unanimous agreement was the timing of introducing such representatives. The Committee had recommended introduction of three student representatives singly over the next three years.

The President said that two questions were posed:

- (a) recommendations on the openess of Senate and
- (b) recommendations on student representation.

If either or both of these were approved, he suggested that the same Committee should investigate and recommend ground rules of procedure.

W. Hamilton suggested it was an unwise course and unfair to the students to bring in one student representative at a time. He felt that one student could not truly represent the opinions of the whole student body and this would defeat the object of having student representation on Senate.

/K.E. Rieckhoff...

SM 6/2/67 Student Report Senate
Experience of 1966

3

K.E. Rieckhoff said he thought it should be stated to Senate that the feeling of the Committee members from Senate who made this recommendation was that the climate would be unfavourable in Senate at this stage and that Senate would be more likely to accept a recommendation for one student representative. If however Senate were willing to accept three representatives immediately, the Committee would have no objection.

W. Hamilton stated he was in agreement with the idea of having student representation on Senate and felt there would be some satisfaction in showing the way to other Universities in this. He was, however, strongly opposed to the recommendation on openness of Senate meetings, and said that he felt that to have Senate proceedings with individual viewpoints and interchange between members reported in the Press and open to public discussion could prove to be detrimental to Senate. He also felt that opening Senate meetings to observers was a decision that could only be reversed at very great embarrassment to Senate.

A. Hean said that he was in support of student representation on the Senate and thought it should immediately go to two, possibly three. He would like to see student representatives have two continuous semesters at Simon Fraser before election to Senate. He supported W. Hamilton's view on openness of Senate meetings, but thought that Senate should not be opened immediately but after two years experience with students in Senate decide at that time whether meetings should be opened.

W. Vidaver was strongly in favour of implementing one suggestion at a time, and felt that student representation should come first. J.L. Dampier agreed.

A.F. Hean asked if students were really more interested in openness of meetings than in student representation.

K.E. Rieckhoff said that to some the openness of Senate was the more important issue, but that the recommendations would have to be taken independently.

Regarding student representation, the question of qualifications and experience had been discussed at great length by the Committee, who felt the only qualification they could recommend was that the students should be of provincial voting age.

Regarding openness of Senate meetings, the Committee had recommended opening meetings to those directly affected by Senate decisions, i.e. Faculty, students and staff, the number to be controlled, and also that there should be an identified reporter from "The Peak" personally responsible for accurately reporting the debates. K.E. Rieckhoff went on to say he himself was convinced and he hoped that Senate would be convinced that the idea of open Senate meetings was worth a trial.

/The...

SM 6/2/67 *Student Representation
Opening of Senate*

4

The President pointed out to the meeting that there would be an automatic addition of three Faculty members to Senate, if the motion was passed.

The Chancellor said that he was not strongly opposed to student representation, but thought it should be restricted to one student. As an alternative he suggested a Standing Committee of the Senate on Student Affairs, who would sit down with the students and report their views to Senate. He said that the nine Universities of the State of California who have very much more experience than Simon Fraser were going very slowly in their approach to the matter of admitting students to any administrative body of faculty. He thought it was probably a step to be discussed with the other two Universities in the province with a view to taking joint action.

G. Sperling said that he was sure the Chancellor was aware of some of the problems obtaining in California and wondered if one of the reasons could be that students are not represented on these bodies? The other matter was the question of whether or not the Committee had considered whether each Faculty should be represented by students, as well as the student body at large? Probably what would be involved would be expansion beyond that proposed, perhaps something to the effect of three student members, one from each Faculty, and one at large for the next three years.

K.E. Rieckhoff said that this had been explored by the Committee and found to be not really desirable, necessary or easily implemented. The representatives' function on Senate was to contribute to Senate as individuals rather than as members responsible to the particular constituency which they came from.

The President asked whether it was thought that there should be provision for consultation with UBC and the University of Victoria before a decision was taken. If the desire was to engage in this consultation then the motion should be tabled.

Moved by E.S. Lett, seconded by I. Koerner

"That the motion be tabled pending consultation with the Senates of University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria"

After discussion it was generally agreed that as UBC and the University of Victoria were not bound to conform to the policy at Simon Fraser University in the matter of student representation on Senate, consultation with them was not necessary.

MOTION LOST

/The...

SM 6/2/67

Student Rep. on Senate
Agreement of Senate

5

The Registrar then quoted from a letter forwarded to him by C.J. Frederickson who was unable to attend the meeting:

"The great majority on the senate consists of various levels from the faculty and this is the way it should be as its chief consideration is the curriculum. The students are or should be concerned with the content and structure of the curriculum and should be able to make valuable contributions. I am in favour of student representation on the senate but in a new university where the great majority is still composed of first and second year students I think that some degree of caution must be exercised in the choice of representatives. I realize that maturity is a much abused term and, like beauty, is only evident "in the eye of the beholder". Nevertheless there are certain qualities of judgment that accompany experience so I suggest that the following procedure might be acceptable until the university reaches a reasonable complement of third and fourth year students: (1) That student representatives be third or fourth year students. (2) That they be selected by the student's council but not members of it. (3) Consideration might be given at a later time as to the election at large of such representatives."

R.J.C. Harper then moved, W. Hamilton seconded

"that the election of three students to Senate in conformity with Section 23(i) of the Universities Act be approved"

MOTION CARRIED

It was agreed that the Committee on Student Representation should be asked to report to the next meeting of Senate how this intention of Senate would be accomplished.

The President then called for a motion regarding the openness of Senate meetings.

A.F. Hean moved, J.L. Dampier seconded

"that Senate not be opened for a minimum period of one year at which time Senate reconsider the matter of openness of Senate"

K.E. Rieckhoff opposed the motion. He said that it was brought out in discussion with the students that one of the prime beneficial functions of partial openness would be the improvement of communications within the University. To the student, Senate is a remote body; a body that he knows so little about that he has sometimes the most strange notions about it. He has the feeling that he cannot get a proper idea of what is going on merely by second hand knowledge. The fact that Senate meetings are open would give a sense of security and influence strongly the climate that exists between Faculty and students. He therefore opposed the motion very strongly.

/A.R. MacKinnon...

SM 6/2/67 *Students Report on Senate
Openness of Senate*

6

A.R. MacKinnon said that he too opposed the motion and could find no clear arguments as to why the meetings should not be open. It seemed to him that the conditions for opening Senate had been carefully thought out and had been unanimously approved by the Committee members and on these grounds he opposed the motion.

W. Vidaver thought that Senate and the University as a whole might gain a great deal from opening Senate meetings. Senate might have some apprehension about the irrevocability of such an act but it seemed to be certainly worth trying. He would have Senate open for a trial period with a mandatory break where Senate might assess the effect of openness. If the experiment didn't work and Senate wished to revoke its previous decision then with a break of two or three months between there should not be much difficulty in closing Senate meetings again.

R.J.C. Harper said that the argument was based on the assumption that what happened during the trial period would be representative of what happened after the trial period. He was not one to be apprehensive about the possibilities of abuse. There would be times when Senate would be embarrassed but he didn't think they constituted a body of fragile egos that would crumble at any hostile reporting.

The Registrar said that as a member of the Committee that brought in the report he realised that one of the arguments against openness was fear of people abusing the privilege; but opening meetings would remove what was now a misunderstanding of Senate. It would put a stop to erroneous rumours. Everyone talked about Senate but it would be much easier to put down false statements if students and faculty had the opportunity of attendance and could hear the debates first hand. He was confident that Senate would be doing the right thing to open its meetings.

K.E. Rieckhoff said that students, faculty and staff have a concern to know what Senate is doing; they are members of the University and as such they have a certain responsibility to the University. The students are very much aware of this responsibility. There is nothing that enforces any information to stay within the University community - in fact Senate would have to take a chance and see how responsible they are.

A.F. Hean thought the Committee must have been in error in its recommendation that observers be limited to those mentioned in the report, because surely the responsibility of Senate was to the public and not just to the staff, students and faculty. He suggested that Senate had taken a very great leap forward for the total community and for the University in particular by seating students. He thought however that the matter should be put back for a minimum period of a year.

/J.L.Dampier...

SM 6/2/67 *Student Rep. on Senate
Opening of Meetings*

7

J.L. Dampier said that as seconder of the motion his intention was not to deny openness but just to delay it.

The Registrar read C.J. Frederickson's comments:

"While in favour of open meetings as a matter of principle I cannot find myself agreeing to such in the immediate future.

The senate has been constituted only recently and until the "shaking down" process is completed I doubt the wisdom of opening the meetings to observers."

The Registrar reminded Senate that the first request to open Senate meetings came in November 1965 from Faculty members; if the recommendations were accepted half the observers would probably be Faculty members.

G. Sperling thought that the public should be allowed to attend Senate meetings and that the democratic atmosphere existing in the University should be maintained.

E.S. Lett said that some months ago Senate had made the minutes of its meetings available to the University community. She was very much in favour of delaying the opening of Senate meetings.

W. Williams agreed with W. Hamilton and thought that the prestige of Senate would tend to be diminished if meetings were open.

K.E. Rieckhoff said that he did not feel that just because the Committee's decision was unanimous it should be adopted; but the fact that a number of members, having made a detailed study over a period of time, had come to this conclusion was in itself an argument for the proposed recommendations, and he would urge his colleagues to defeat the motion before them.

D. Berg said that he thought no clear case had been made of the inadvisability of opening Senate, and in fact a number of Faculty would be embarrassed if Senate were not opened as they had been elected on this platform. He opposed the motion.

/W. Hamilton...

SM 6/2/67 Student Rep. ...
Openness of Senate
Meetings

8

W, Hamilton said that D. Berg's observation that he would be embarrassed if Senate meetings were not opened as he had run for election upon this was interesting; it was one of the main considerations that had brought him into opposition to the principle of opening Senate meetings; Senate could develop into a political body that performed so that it didn't embarrass people.

T.H. Brose in response to an invitation from the President said that as a member of the Committee he joined with the Registrar and K.E. Rieckhoff in recommending openness of Senate meetings. He thought that to allow a limited number of observers into meetings on a first come first served basis would have a very healthy effect on the University and, by extension, on the community.

MOTION CARRIED

The Registrar said that the Committee had worked hard on the report and had had a great deal of assistance from the three students who participated, and would appreciate a letter of thanks to them.

Moved by J.L. Dampier, seconded by R.J.C. Harper

"that a letter of thanks on behalf of Senate be sent to the three student members of the Committee on Student Representation"

MOTION CARRIED

B.and C. REPORT OF THE AD HOC INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS COMMITTEE and
ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONTINUING COMMITTEE ON INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

D.G. Tuck presented the Committee's report.

The President said that there were three steps to be taken:
1. that the Committee recognise that the degree program which the departments of BioSciences and Physical Development, probably PSA and perhaps others in Arts would mount, be approved with the actual name of the degree left for further study; 2. that an administrative body be set up to administer this particular program which could be chaired by the Dean of Science rather than create another Dean: this Committee to be chaired by the Dean of Science and have three representatives from Biology, two from Physical Development and one from PSA; 3. that a high level committee be set up to go into the more general problems and to go into the Interdisciplinary problems per se. The Long Range Academic Planning Committee might concern itself with this third step, but this would not delay the kinesiology program. The President questioned whether the recommendations on page 1 of the Committee's report were in the right order of priority.

/D.G.Tuck...

SM 6/2/67 Kinesiology

9

D.G. Tuck said that the order of events was indeed the one the Committee intended. There were two things to be done. Someone had to go through the programs in detail and check them out; although the ad hoc Committee had drawn them up they had chosen not to do this line by line appraisal. He was not sure that a committee headed by the Dean of Science was what the Committee had intended: they were looking for a permanent head to look after this.

G. Kirchner said that there were a number of students already at the University who would wish to start the course in September 1967, and it was a vital matter to come to some decision as to what to name the degree, and to get the program started. There were in the University some 65 students enrolled in the first two years of the program.

The President said that the Committee he had suggested, chaired by the Dean of Science, would get on with the problem of getting this program mounted. The particular problems throughout the University of interdisciplinary programs would be referred to the Long Range Committee on Academic Planning.

K.E. Rieckhoff said that it seemed logical to follow the suggestion of the President to form a high level committee with very specific responsibility and powers to administer this particular program. It also seemed to him that this could be achieved only by some body that had the necessary authority of department head or Dean and it seemed logical to have the Dean of Science responsible; with the Dean of Science, one representative from Education, one from Arts and three from Science, at least one of the Science representatives to be from outside the department of BioScience. This could be done and would have the authority that this program called for and would have the advantage of being established immediately instead of bringing in a new Dean.

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by G.Kirchner

"that an Inter-faculty Committee be formed to administer the interdisciplinary program in Kinesiology, chaired by the Dean of Science with three representatives from the Faculty of Science, one from the Faculty of Education and one from the Faculty of Arts"

W-v

The President said that the setting up of an Inter-faculty interdisciplinary high level body that could handle all interdisciplinary programs would be expensive because another Dean would have to be sought, and the committee would take some time to set up; however, the committee as now proposed would be of the same stature.

/D. Berg...

SM 6/2/67

Kinesiology

10

D. Berg asked if the duties of the present ad hoc Interdisciplinary Programs Committee would be transferred to the new Interdisciplinary Committee when that was set up and the President replied that that was his understanding.

A.R. MacKinnon said he thought there was another function for the proposed Committee to take on - that of finance. He wondered whether the Committee of Deans, already in being, was not the right body to administer the program.

W. Vidaver said that he felt the implications of such a program should be considered at a very high level; one aspect was financial and the only way to handle this kind of problem that he could see was by some kind of University agency that had the power to approve finance, to direct the entire University resources if necessary into implementation of the program.

G.Kirchner said that if the ad hoc Committee's recommendations were accepted it would be possible to organise the program in the Fall.

The Chancellor suggested that there were recommendations in the report of the Committee and that these should be approved, the details being worked out by the President and the Deans concerned.

W. Vidaver pointed out that in its report the Committee had not specified what degree should be offered to a student completing the program and the reason for this was that the Committee could not agree on it. It could be a BA or BSc. He felt however that some high level body could negotiate this. The President said that this was a perennial problem in interdisciplinary programs but that the University had 12 to 18 months in which to work it out.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by E.S. Lett, seconded by G.Kirchner

"that under the direction of the committee just established the degree program in Kinesiology be mounted"

W.Hamilton said that he hoped that the Committee just established would have the authority to achieve the end decision. The President said that there would be at least three departments involved in three different faculties and that the committee would provide overall coordination and authority. The Provision of money would be within the departments and would be coordinated. Guidance of Senate was now sought as to whether this program to study human movement was to be offered at bachelor's degree level.

MOTION CARRIED

/Senate...

SM 6/2/67

*Minicopy
Don't agree
Regalia
Procedure
Student Society*

11

Senate then approved the material as circulated at the last meeting of Senate and now in page proof form, for inclusion in the Calendar.

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff and seconded by A.F. Hean

"that the Tuck Committee be commended for their hard work in the difficult task they had had to do"

D. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES

The Chancellor reported for the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees. A number of names were put forward as candidates for degrees for the May 20th 1967 Congregation. These candidates were discussed and a number of names were approved.

E. REGALIA FOR LAY MEMBERS OF SENATE

The Senate approved the recommendation that the gown for Senate be the same as that for the Board of Governors, namely a black doctoral gown with a gold border.

F. ARRANGEMENTS FOR SENATE MEETINGS

Senate agreed to the suggestion that where Senate meetings were expected to continue beyond 5:30 or 6:00, Senate instead of meeting for lunch would break for dinner.

G. STUDENT SOCIETY CONSTITUTION

The Constitution and By-laws for the Simon Fraser Student Society were approved with the amendments recommended by the Faculty Council.

In answer to a question, the President stated that all amendments to the By-laws and Constitution would be considered by Faculty Council and brought to Senate for approval. He explained that the Provincial Registrar in Victoria had refused to grant registration of the Simon Fraser Student Society until the University had approved the Constitution and By-laws and he expected that the Registrar would refuse to make changes to the Constitution and By-laws unless the University approved as well.

Moved by Chancellor, seconded by J. L. Jampel 14...

*"that the Simon Fraser Student Society Constitution
be approved"*

MOTION CARRIED.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

A. PRE ADMISSION MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

G. Kirchner raised the question of medical examinations for students before admission to the University. He explained that he was most concerned that students would not now be required to have medical examinations before admission to the University and this was going to cause particular difficulties for the Physical Development Centre and the Athletic Program inasmuch as they had over 800 students in the current semester participating in Athletics. It was agreed by Senate that medical examinations would not be imposed upon students prior to their admission to the University but that if the Physical Development Centre felt it necessary to impose medical examinations on students before allowing them to participate in athletic activities, there was no reason why the Centre could not make this regulation.

The Registrar volunteered the assistance of his office to the Physical Development Centre if it required such.

5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of Senate will be at 1:30 PM on Monday, March 6, 1967.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.


D.P. Robertson
Secretary

Moved by G. Kirchner, seconded by K.S. Lott

"that the requirements for medical examination of students prior to admission remain in the Calendar and that the Registrar administers this service."

MOTION LOST "