

Book

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD IN THE BOARD AND SENATE ROOM
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1967 AT 7 P.M.

Present:	P.D. McTaggart-Cowan	Chairman
	R.J. Baker	
	A.E. Branca	
	F. Candelaria	
	J.L. Dampier	
	J.S. Foulds	
	C.J. Frederickson	
	G.H. Geen	
	E.M. Gibson	
	R.J.C. Harper	
	A.F.C. Hean	
	G. Kirchner	
	I. Koerner	
	M.A. Lebowitz	
	E.S. Lett	
	S.K. Lower	
	A.R. MacKinnon	
	J. Matthews	
	K.E. Rieckhoff	
	D.H. Sullivan	
	J. Walkley	
	S. Wasserman	
	W. Williams	
	S. Yandle	
	D.P. Robertson	Secretary
	M. Dawson	Recording Secretary
In attendance:	D. Roberts, Information Officer	
	I. Garland (Item 3C only)	
Absent:	D. Baird	
	J. Behrens	
	D. Berg	
	A.J. Ellis	
	W.M. Hamilton	
	C.H. McLean	
	G.N. Perry	
	G.M. Shrum	
	G. Sperling	
	D.G. Tuck	
	S. Wong	

SM 5/6/67

-2-

*Election
Calendar
Graduate Students*

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SENATE ELECTION RESULTS - S-11

The President opened the meeting by proposing that Item 3A of the Agenda, Announcement of Senate Election Results, be taken first. Senate agreed and the Registrar presented the results of the Senate election:

Three student representatives:

Stan Wong (3 year term)
Simon Foulds (2 year term)
Sharon Yandle (1 year term)

Three Joint Faculty representatives:

R.J. Baker
M. Lebowitz
D.G. Tuck

Three Faculty representatives:

E.M. Gibson (Faculty of Arts)
S. Wasserman (Faculty of Education)
J. Walkley (Faculty of Science)

Moved by R.J.C. Harper, seconded by K.E. Rieckhoff

"that Senate accepts the report of the Registrar"

MOTION CARRIED

The President welcomed the new members of Senate.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of May 1, 1967, were approved.

2. BUSINESS ARISING

A. CALENDAR AMENDMENTS - S-7

The Registrar said that the timetable for production of the next Calendar was not yet available as the printing schedule had not been received from the printers. It was agreed that the Registrar should circulate to Heads of Department a tentative timetable.

B. LIST OF GRADUATING STUDENTS - S-9

The President said that the Select Committee had approved the conferring of degrees on all the candidates reviewed at the May 1 meeting of Senate, with the exception of A.C.H. Lee who had not completed his examinations, and V. Poplavsky who had not completed the requirement of courses outside his major department of study.

/C....

SM 5/6/67

-3-

*Calendar
Admissions
Gen Education*

2. C. AMENDMENT CALENDAR - PSA COURSES - S-10

The Faculty of Arts having concurred in these proposals, Senate accepted the amendments which were noted in the Minutes of the meeting of May 1, 1967.

3. NEW BUSINESS

B. SUMMER ENROLLMENT - S-12

The Registrar presented the Summer enrollment figures. These were 50% higher than the projected figures and it was believed that this was because students felt that with fewer numbers enrolled they had better use of facilities in the Summer semester.

C. REPORT OF UNIVERSITY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION
- S-13

The President suggested that discussion be confined to Senate satisfying itself that the Committee had done what Senate required it to do, and to questioning the Committee members for any necessary clarification.

S. Wasserman said that there were three points which she would like to make clear: a. The programs in Section 2 of the report were sample programs, examples of possibilities; b. the Committee was unanimous in its feeling that there was a need for separate administration of University Network, and that this should not be left to casual administration; and c. that the proposal was the beginning of what a General Education program might be, and the core of the proposal was its possible future expansion.

The following questions were raised regarding the proposal:

1. Would the University be financially capable of undertaking such a program?
2. Would such a program not require a revamping of all departmental course programs as they presently exist?
3. Does the setting up of a hierarchy for the administration of the program not destroy some of the ends to which it is striving?
4. Does the paper not neglect the desirability of liberalising the present major and honors programs within the Faculties?
5. Should there not be more stress on the interdisciplinary nature of any General Education program?
6. Do we not offer the ends to which the program is striving in our present course offerings?

/7....

SM 5/6/67

Gen. Education
Academic Board

-4-

7. Is there not a danger in such a program of institutionalizing what is essentially a form of traditional student activities? If we put General Education as it has been proposed into effect, are we not taking over from extra curricular activities?
8. Does a pass/fail system ~~not inevitably~~ lead to a pass being given for mere attendance?
9. Should the program not be presented on a schematic diagram so that the faculty will be able to see at a glance what the Committee's report entails?
10. Is it possible that a General Education program such as proposed will entail an extra semester tacked on to the present degree programs?

Discussion revolved around the above questions and the Committee gave its assurance that most of these questions had been considered by them in the preparation of the report.

After this discussion it was

Moved by W. Williams, seconded by D.H. Sullivan

"that Senate accept the report and refer it to the Faculties for study and comment through the Committee of Deans; and that the Committee of Deans working with the University Co-ordinating Committee on General Education be enjoined to frame a set of questions that would ensure the necessary uniformity of treatment and comment by the Faculties"

MOTION CARRIED

D. REPORT FROM ACADEMIC BOARD REPRESENTATIVES - S-14

The President asked whether the Academic Board had discussed the matter of transfers from Regional Colleges. R.J. Baker said all University Senates had made a statement which was in effect that these Colleges would be put on probation; the recommendation of the Board had been that the three Universities should accept students from these Colleges in good faith until there was evidence that might lead to a change of policy.

The President said that he had heard that there were different levels of acceptance of these students in the three Universities; R.J. Baker said that it was the intent that the three Universities should maintain the same level, but that there were undoubtedly differences in interpretation of the spirit of the agreement.

/4....

SM 5/6/67

*Scholarships
and Bursaries*

-5-

4. OTHER BUSINESS

A. SCHOLARSHIPS, AWARDS AND BURSARIES

The President asked whether Senate would express its views on the discharge of its responsibilities as outlined in Section 54 (f) of the Universities Act, which states: "54. It is the duty of the Senate and it has power.....to approve the establishment or discontinuance by the Board of any Faculty, department, course of instruction, chair, fellowship, scholarship, exhibition, bursary, or prize....".

Moved by K.E. Rieckhoff, seconded by A.R. MacKinnon

"that the Senate Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries be charged with performing the function of Section 54 (f) of the Universities Act on behalf of Senate, and with bringing to Senate for decision only those cases where it is in doubt."

MOTION CARRIED

B. GRADUATE STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

D.H. Sullivan said that he had been approached by the Graduate Students' Society and asked to inform Senate that they would present a paper to the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies requesting graduate student representation on that Committee.

5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed not to hold a ^{regular} Senate meeting in July.

Moved by J.L. Dampier, seconded by D.H. Sullivan

"that the next meeting of Senate take place on Monday, 7 August, 1967, at 7 p.m."

MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 8.45 p.m.

D.P. Robertson
Secretary