

S.M. 4/3/68 *Senate Procedures*  
*Openness of meetings*

Paper S-113

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE  
TO STUDY THE QUESTION OF OPENING SENATE MEETINGS

The Senate Committee to study the Question of Opening Senate Meetings was established at the Senate meeting of February 5, 1968. This Committee was asked to report back to the Senate meeting of March 4, 1968.

That the question of opening Senate meetings is to be discussed at the March 1968 meeting follows a previous discussion of Senate upon this question (February 6, 1967) when it was agreed "that Senate not be opened for a minimum period of one year at which time Senate reconsider the matter of openness of Senate".

A report from a Senate Committee established at the Senate meeting of November 7, 1966 "to study Student Representation and Openness of Senate Meetings" was received at the Senate meeting of February 6, 1967. From this time the need for the opening of Senate meetings has been discussed at many levels both inside and outside the University community. Some of this forms an Appendix to this Report. It is with due regard to the previous deliberations of Senate, the Senate Committee Report of January 1967, the Reports of various bodies upon University Government, and to the tenor of feeling of the whole University community of Simon Fraser that this Committee reports its recommendations upon looking into the question of opening Senate meetings. As these recommendations are only in part agreement with the Report of January, 1967, we include in this Report some of the deliberations upon which this Committee has made its recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

J. L. Dampier  
M. A. Lebowitz  
A. R. MacKinnon  
John Walkley - Convenor  
Stan Wong.

February, 1968

Recommendations

That Senate proceed no later than the next meeting of Senate to implement the openness of Senate meetings, subject to the following:

- (a) that there is no condition placed upon the word 'open' other than is required by the rules governing visitors or might be imposed by purely physical limitations;
- (b) that a set of conditions covering the general behaviour of these visitors to Senate meetings be drawn up;
- (c) that in the event of a disruption Senate may revoke the privilege of attending Senate meetings as an observer of any or all individuals at any time;
- (d) that Senate when it considers it so necessary, or by prior agreement, can consider items of Agenda in "private session";
- (e) that Senate consult the University Solicitors so as to be advised upon the rights of its members speaking at open session and the applicability of Parliamentary immunity.

Deliberations of the Committee - an attempt at definition and interpretation.

1. The Universities Act. Under Section 54(a) of the Universities Act, Senate has power "to regulate the conduct of its meetings and proceedings....". No other Section of the Act appears to infringe this right so the willingness for Senate to declare itself 'open' is a matter only for Senate itself to decide.
2. Senate Responsibility. The question of "openness" relates directly to the question of the responsibility of Senate. Though the main substance of the deliberations of Senate place its responsibility mainly to the whole University community, we are nonetheless a public institution and have a total public responsibility as well. For Senate to conduct its affairs in public session must lead to a better understanding between Senate and the community. It is obviously important that persons outside Senate should be able to hear how a particular decision made by Senate came to be made.
3. Senate. Whether a Senator regards himself as an individual representing one segment of the University, or as part of an entity called 'Senate' but having knowledge particular to those electing him, he should be publicly accountable. The opening of Senate would allow those electing a Senator to observe him representing their point of view (when requested) and to see that he does, in fact, help Senate to perform its duties and obligations to the community.
4. Openness. That Senate should, if it so wishes, be truly 'open' and that apart from the limitations of its physical location, Senate meetings should be open to all responsible persons. The openness is thus extended to all persons of the University, of the surrounding community and to all others who may wish to attend. It is necessary, however, that certain business of Senate must be carried out in private (closed) sessions.
5. Openness as an "experiment". The move to carry out the duties and obligations of Senate in open session has wide significance. The success of the earlier move by this Senate to have Student Representative Senators is without question. The subsequent adoption of Student Senate Representation by other Senates right across Canada placed Simon Fraser University once again as a prime innovator in the University community. Whilst the desire "to be first" must be of little real motivation for the adoption of "open Senate" we must acknowledge the eventual recognition by all University Senates that their obligation to the community at large requires such openness. Whilst Senate must retain the right to revoke its possible decision to open its meetings, the actual decision to do this must not be taken in the nature of trying an "experiment". If it wishes to become 'open', Senate must do so with total commitment to this ideal and do so boldly and with complete strength in its decision.

S.M. 4/13/68

-4-

6. Executive (Private or Closed) Sessions. It is obvious that certain things to be discussed by Senate, particularly those relating to a private individual, must be discussed in closed session. Such items could be placed in closed session by a successful motion to have them so placed, the motion requiring only a simple majority. Such a motion discussed in public session could be needlessly time-consuming and it is suggested that the motion should be spoken to only by the mover. Consideration of the powers and duties of Senate in the Universities Act suggests that only 54(e) "to provide for and to grant degrees...." and 54(m) "to exercise disciplinary jurisdiction with respect to students...." would normally be items discussed in private session. Often a motion defining the justification to have these placed in closed session might be equally damaging to the reputation of the individual concerned as would the discussion of the item itself. Senate might consider it sensible that all items coming under Section 54(e) and 54(m) should automatically first be discussed in closed session unless these are of a general nature in which case they can be immediately considered the business of an open session. A successful motion could have an item placed back into public session at any point in its discussion. In any case the final decision on all items discussed in private session should later be declared in open session.

7. The Presence of Observers. It is doubtful if the presence of non-participating observers will interfere with the conduct of a responsible Senator. That other people can become aware of the "doings" of Senate may, in fact, enable a Senator to become aware of factors pertinent to a particular issue. It is also possible that "open Senate" may make Senate a more cohesive body.

8. Regulations Concerning Vistors. It is necessary that such regulations must be made. We presume that at an open meeting of Senate we might expect the Press and its attendant technological devices necessary for recording Senate "in action" (tape-recording, video-recording). It would be necessary that the use of such devices should not impede the duties and conduct of the Senate meeting. It is possible that such recording devices could be allowed into Senate meetings only with the prior permission of the Chairman of Senate. The granting of such permission should be communicated to all Senators prior to a Senate meeting. The presence of photographers at open meetings should be strictly forbidden.

General regulations concerning visitors must also be made: "they must remain quiet at all times....", "they must be requested to leave if interfering with the business of Senate....", etc.

We might require visitors to be in the "public gallery" some time (5 minutes) prior to the beginning of the open session.

1....

-5-

8. (continued). Should they be required to stay throughout the entire "open session"? Should the Chairman of Senate, with cognizance of the Agenda, be allowed to "request Senate that visitors might leave" or "request Senate that visitors may enter" at any time during the open session? Should all Senators have this right (perhaps as a motion carried on a simple majority)? Are the general legislative rules for persons observing from the public galleries applicable to Senate?
9. Legal Implication. Opening Senate meetings will undoubtedly create certain forms of personality clash which though quite harmless in closed session could easily be misinterpreted by non-involved visitors. The general misinterpretation and verbal or written misreporting of things spoken by Senators must be accepted as part of doing a public duty - is it necessary that we should all be aware of the legal implications of such misrepresentation? Are we to be protected by "parliamentary immunity" and if so, do we assume this or do we have to invoke this ourselves? A legal interpretation of the implications of "openness" should be sought. It is possibly necessary that all of each meeting of Senate should be adequately tape-recorded. Such a recording could be kept for a minimum period (6 months? 2 years?). It could be a valuable safeguard particularly as a complete transcript of each meeting is an impossibility and the present "minutes" are quite adequate for the conduct of our meetings.
10. Practicality of "open" meetings. It is felt that the Board Room is quite inadequate for open meetings of Senate. The Faculty Formal Dining Room is probably large enough, enabling the seating for visitors to be placed at one end of the room. For meetings at which Agenda items are likely to draw a large number of visitors, a small lecture theatre could be used for the location of the meeting.

For the convenience of our visitors it is sensible that the agenda for a meeting be divided into items "for open meeting" and items "for closed meeting", and that the business of Senate should start with the discussion of the former.

The adequate running of open Senate will require the Agenda for each meeting to be publicly displayed some time before each meeting.

Appendix - Previous Discussions and Reports on the "Openness of Senate"

NOVEMBER 29, 1965 - Senate Minutes

Dr. Ellis advised that there were several members of faculty waiting outside wanting to know if the Senate would permit spectators. A brief discussion followed in which the members generally expressed their reluctance to permit the admission of spectators at this time.

It was moved by Mr. Frederickson and seconded by Dr. Rieckhoff:

That visitors be excluded from Senate at this time and that the matter be reconsidered after Senate has been in existence for some time.

Dr. Maud had been asked by his colleagues to support their visiting the meeting and was therefore opposed to the motion. Mr. Bawtree then requested that a specific date be set for re-opening the issue. Dr. Shrum recommended that the matter should be postponed until Senate is more fully constituted.

An amendment was moved by Dr. Bursill-Hall and seconded by Mr. Bawtree:

That the matter be reviewed when Senate is more fully constituted.

CARRIED

The amended motion then carried.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings:

Moved by D.H. Sullivan, seconded by T.H. Brose

"that meetings of Senate be open to any member of the University community who provides sufficient reason: the President to decide upon which such requests should be granted"

MOTION LOST

1....

S.M. 4/3/68

-2-

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (continued)

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings (continued)

Moved by R.J. Baker, seconded by W.M. Hamilton

"that the Information Officer be invited to attend Senate meetings at the discretion of the Chairman"

CARRIED

During the discussion it was pointed out that copies of Senate minutes were available for perusal by faculty in the Library and in the office of the Registrar.

Moved by T.H. Brose, seconded by R.J. Baker

"that copies of Senate minutes be made available in faculty department offices"

CARRIED

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3A 2. Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society.

Senate considered the request from the President of the Student Society for Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings.

After considerable discussion the Chairman recommended that the Registrar write a report on each meeting of Senate and send the summary report to the President of the Student Society, the Peak, and any other party who was interested. This report could be written so that supporting papers would not be necessary.

It was pointed out that it could be assumed that the Student Representative, who will receive all documentation for Senate, will communicate matters of importance to the students.

A.R. MacKinnon recommended that there should be a place where the minutes with the papers are available.

J. Mills amended his motion to state

"that the request of the Student Society to have Senate minutes provided be met by making the Library copy of the minutes available to students!"

The Chairman then called for a vote in two parts for the motion by J. Mills, seconded by A.R. MacKinnon

"that the Registrar be requested to prepare a summary to be distributed freely in the community"

CARRIED

/....

S.M. 4/3/68

*Senate Proceedings  
Minutes of Record*

-3-

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes (continued)

3A 2 Distribution of Senate Minutes to Student Society (continued)

"that the agenda, supporting papers and minutes be kept in the Library and made available upon request to any member of the University community: the papers for this copy to be subject to the discretion of the Registrar"

T. B. Bottomore stated that he felt this was getting away from the idea of minutes: that they were for the information of those who discuss the business of the meetings and the business of the meetings would be deteriorated by such action. He prefers that the minutes of a meeting of any body be confined to the membership of that body: to go beyond this is to restrict open discussion. He stated he was opposed to circulating the minutes.

T.H. Brose stated that he did not believe candour would restrict the body: that since Senate did not have Proceedings, as did the House of Commons, minutes and papers were the record of Senate and he believed people on campus should have that record available.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the second part of the motion.

CARRIED

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from Student Society rejecting proposal of Representative of Students on Senate

The Registrar reported that because he felt that the letter from the Student Society, which had been distributed to all members, required some clarification, he consulted with Dean Bottomore, acting President at the time, about the advisability of meeting with the students before the letter was discussed in Senate. With the concurrence of Dean Bottomore a meeting was held on Friday November 4th. Present were the Registrar, Professors Baker, Brose, Ellis, Rieckhoff and students John Mynott, Dave York, Mike Campbell and Greg Stacey. As a result of this meeting Mr. Mynott was asked if he and some of his colleagues wished to present the Student Society's case in person at a Senate meeting. He agreed this would be desirable. At the meeting the student newspaper editor, Mr. Mike Campbell, was asked to consider that he was not present at the meeting as a reporter and he agreed, but has since asked to accompany the student delegation to Senate as a reporter.

Moved by A.E. Branca, seconded by K.E. Rieckhoff

"that the student delegation be admitted"

CARRIED

1....

S.M. 4/3/68 (Openness of Senate  
Senate procedures)

-4-

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (continued)

Moved by A.M. Unrau, seconded by J.L. Dampier

"that the request of the reporter to attend the  
meeting for the interview be denied"  
*denied*

CARRIED

John Mynott, the President of the Student Council, was then introduced to the meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Mynott stated that the question of open and public meetings as stated in item 1 of the letter distributed to Senate, was the most important facet of the whole question. He was asked to what extent this was a Student Council decision and to what extent it was publicly discussed issue. He stated that the decision was a decision of the Executive Council in consultation with a number of students on campus and some of the executive and other members of the Canadian Union of Students.

Mr. Mynott left the meeting at 3.10 p.m.

Moved by A.E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills

"that a Senate committee be established to meet with a committee of students to discuss the question of student participation in Senate"

The Chairman stated that from the discussion he would take the terms of reference for the committee to be to investigate the whole question of student participation in Senate and the openness of Senate meetings.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion by A.E. Branca seconded by J. Mills.

CARRIED

It was further agreed that the committee be composed of four members, the membership of the committee to be left to the discretion of the President, with the recommendation that one member be a non-faculty member of Senate and that one member be the Registrar.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT OF JANUARY 1967 ON THE  
MATTER OF THE "OPENNESS OF SENATE"

"That Senate open its meetings to observers subject to the following conditions:

- a) that observers be limited to Simon Fraser University students, faculty and staff only

/....

Recommendations of the Senate Committee Report (continued)

- b) that the number of observers be controlled
- c) that observers be made aware of the necessity for proper demeanour
- d) that one student reporter for the Peak be named by the Editor as the official Senate reporter
- e) that motions to conduct any Senate meeting or part of a meeting "in camera" be carried on a simple majority vote
- f) that the University community be made aware that Senate may revoke the privilege of attending Senate meetings as an observer to any or all individuals."

Arguments

1. Openness

For

- a) Community
  - remove the feeling of secrecy, even stealth, and thereby bring closer the various elements of the academic community.
- b) Communication
  - allow those who are interested in such things freedom to observe and thereby gain firsthand knowledge rather than rumours.
- c) Ideas
  - allow all elements of the University to participate to some extent and thereby widen the net to catch ideas and opinions before decisions are made.

Against

- a) Tradition
  - Senate meetings at Canadian Universities have always been closed.
- b) Inhibition
  - the presence of a gallery would inhibit the present frankness in debate due to the fear of misinterpretation of words and attitude by the casual observer.
- c) Exhibition
  - there might be a tendency to 'play to the gallery' and espouse short-term popular causes at the expense of long-term benefits to the University.

S.M. 4/3/68

*James V. Cawley,  
Chairman of the Senate  
Committee on Education*

-6-

Recommendations of the Senate Committee Report (continued)

d) Confidentiality - items such as some discipline cases should not be decided in public

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate procedure  
Appeals & the Board*

REPORT  
of  
SENATE COMMITTEE  
to study  
STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
and  
OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS.

JANUARY 1967

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.M. 4/3/68

*Senate Proc  
Appendix*

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I	Introduction
II	Recommendations
III	Summary of Arguments
IV	Minutes of Committee Meetings
V	History of Senate Discussion

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate of  
Openness*

Introduction

The Senate Committee to Study Student Representation and the Openness of Senate Meetings was established at the Senate Meeting of November 7, 1966. The members were named by the President a few days later.

At the request of the Secretary of Senate the President of the Student Society named three students to meet with the Committee. The Committee met on a number of occasions, always with the students present, and wishes to go on record expressing deep gratitude to the students: John Mynott, Rob Watts, and Bill Egleson, for their candor, charm, and goodwill throughout the discussions.

The Committee decided to present, as well as its recommendations and arguments, the minutes of its meetings. In spite of two different recording secretaries, cursory editing, and the resultant disjointedness of these minutes, the Committee feels they do give the flavour of the discussion which might be missed if only the bare bones were presented.

Respectfully submitted

A.E. Branca  
T.H. Brose  
K. Reickhoff  
D.P. Robertson - Chairman

RECOMMENDATIONS1. Openess

"that Senate open its meetings to observers subject to the following conditions:

- a) that observers be limited to Simon Fraser University students, faculty and staff only
- b) that the number of observers be controlled
- c) that observers be made aware of the necessity for proper demeanor
- d) that one student reporter for The Peak be named by the Editor as the official "Senate" reporter
- e) that motions to conduct any Senate meeting or part of a meeting "in camera" be carried on a simple majority vote
- f) that the University community be made aware that Senate may revoke the privilege of attending Senate meetings as an observer to any or all individuals."

2. Student Representation

"that Senate establish seats for members elected by and from the student body as follows:

- a) one member to be elected immediately\*
- b) One additional member to be elected one year from now
- c) One further member to be elected a year after the second

subject to the following conditions:

- a) to be eligible for nomination a student must be 19 years of age or more
- b) to be eligible for nomination and to retain his seat the member must be a student in good standing as defined by the Senate.

(\*Note: the Committee draws Senate's attention to the fact that the three students who met with it were unanimously opposed to the staggered introduction of the three student representatives, preferring to elect three immediately. )

S.M. 4/3/68

Grade 3  
Opinion

ARGUMENTS

1. OPENNESS

FOR

- a) Community - remove the feeling of secrecy, even stealth, and thereby bring closer the various elements of the academic community.
- b) Communication - allow those who are interested in such things freedom to observe and thereby gain firsthand knowledge rather than rumours.
- c) Ideas - allow all elements of the University to participate to some extent and thereby widen the net to catch ideas and opinions before decisions are made.

AGAINST

- a) Tradition - Senate meetings at Canadian Universities have always been closed.
- b) Inhibition - the presence of a gallery would inhibit the present frankness in debate due to the fear of misinterpretation of words and attitude by the casual observer.
- c) Exhibition - there might be a tendency to 'play to the gallery' and espouse short-term popular causes at the expense of long-term benefits to the University.
- d) Confidentiality - items such as some discipline cases should not be decided in public.

2. DIRECT STUDENT REPRESENTATION (COMPARED TO A NON-STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE)

FOR

- a) Effectiveness - more likely to result in a representative who knows and understands today's University students. A student representative would usually be on campus and more accessible to other students.

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate Page  
Oppositions*

b) Respect

- remove the suspicion that student "voice" is merely a device to keep the mob quiet rather than a way of enriching Senate by respecting legitimate student concern.

AGAINST

a) Inexperience

- a chance students may elect a green youth who would be completely ineffective

b) Time

- Senate activities take up a lot of time - a student should not be expected to devote this much time to non-studies.

c) Confidentiality

- Students should not be present when other students' affairs are discussed.

SM. 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.

MINUTES OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
ON SENATE AND OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS  
FRIDAY DECEMBER 9 1966

PRESENT:

Senate Committee

D.P. Robertson - Chairman  
A.E. Branca  
T.H. Brose  
K.E. Ricckhoff

Student Committee

J. Mynott  
R. Watt  
W. Engleson

Minutes of previous meeting and history of this topic in Senate Meetings to date were distributed to the members.

It was suggested that the Committee discuss the form of student representation which is where it left off last week. Just before the last meeting ended it was decided to state that anybody is eligible to be elected by the students. Is it wished to put more details in the recommendations, or leave it at that? Does the Committee think there should be any limitations?

It is expected that Senate will want certain guarantees or considerations. It is doubted very much if the Senate would accept a sixteen-year-old kid just out of school for three months as a fit member. Just what form the restrictions could take and still leave it free is a difficult question. In a short discussion after our last meeting with other members of this committee the possibility was discussed of saying that the candidates should be voting age, assuming that if they are considered old enough for voting they will be responsible representatives.

What is the voting age? Nineteen years old.

This would exclude most of the first and second year students.

Some doubt was expressed about setting a definite age. Some preference was expressed for experience gained at Simon Fraser say, in attendance for two years. If an age was set, Senate could get someone who was here for the first time and still be a good Senate member.

Would this not come out in the election?

Another point is, some of the Senate members and Faculty members have not been here that long and yet seem to have made responsible Senate members.

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Please.*

You could have sixteen-year-olds elected. Collective wisdom is not a good guarantee. To trust to the electorate is not always best. There are democratic restrictions about people who can and cannot be elected.

The person who has been exposed has had a better opportunity to develop a mature judgment. If the students want to elect a non-student this is fine. If they want a student this is fine. The lowest possible age is the voting age. Senate should have a person that is an adult.

The standard of debate and thinking in the Senate is a high one. A student who is not nineteen would unlikely qualify in that respect. Even the students would want a limitation of this nature so that they may have the views of the student body presented to the Senate. This would not come from a student who has been here for the first semester, from high school.

Although not in disagreement with nineteen years of age the view was expressed that this person should be in attendance for a certain amount of time. You have to gain a certain knowledge of the university to get involved in the Senate. A two semester limit is quite reasonable.

At least one of the Faculty members elected in the fall has only been here for one semester.

There is quite a difference. Although a Faculty member may only have been here for one semester, at least he has been around universities for a considerable time and has the experience, even though he is a new member of Faculty. He has six or seven years under his belt.

It was suggested that for the candidate's nomination to be valid he should have been here for at least one semester.

Is it decided that the representative must be a student.

Opposition was expressed to a non-member of the University community. If he is a student he should have been in attendance for one semester. If he is a Faculty member no restrictions could be placed. Surely the majority would not want to see anyone from outside the University representing the students.

If the students wanted to elect someone from outside the University, why should anyone step in their way. It seems that there are people already who have been here for more than two semesters who do not know what is going on. People who take interest can learn very quickly and learn as they go along. What guarantee is it giving anybody by placing a residence restriction on the candidate?

There are two points of view here. If you do want to insist on some sort of residence requirement you run into a lot of additional troubles. Is a resident 10, 12 or 15 semester hours? Must he have passed all his courses? Is an age limit required? Some second year students do not know what is going on at the University. What is going to happen when these people start voting for candidates?

SM 4/3/68

Opposite  
page  
21

By talking about restrictions there is an underlying assumption of an irresponsible electorate. If you are going to take a chance on an irresponsible electorate you must make realistic limitations. The age limit is a realistic limitation.

There could be an irresponsible electorate and therefore restrictions are required. Residence could possibly be interpreted to mean 30 semester hours accumulated Simon Fraser credit. The person who has been in attendance at a university for one year.

A lot of graduate students who come here may have a tremendous amount of experience in university affairs and an active interest in university business. A graduate student only needs five or ten semester hours. Perhaps the stipulation we require is that they have been in attendance at some university.

It was suggested that stipulation should be made for nineteen years of age and over. Agreed.

Now what about the question of university experience. If students want to elect someone without university experience they should be allowed to do so. Senate should not stipulate this. Senate should have only one concern - that he is a student when elected and continues to follow his studies. This is assuming that he is a student and would continue to be a student for the three year term. If this committee decides to stipulate that it is a student.

Why has 'Rector' been rejected?

On the basis that it might be a person who was not aware of the problems of students today and might not have been in contact with university life for a good number of years.

Would there be violent objections if representation was limited to students at Simon Fraser University completely? This would be the most acceptable representation for students to have on Senate. You have to have someone from inside the community.

General discussion followed on the effect of student representation in respect to the increase in numbers on the Senate. Section 1 of the Act was cited (for each student representative on the Senate, Faculty would have a representative. Three student representatives would mean three Faculty representatives, increase to Senate would be six).

The Committee should talk about the numbers of representatives? A very useful suggestion. It will be very difficult to get Senate to go beyond one representative at this time. However, pending its experience for one year, Senate might add another member and possibly after another year, another one, and the one representative could grow to three.

Will three students cause more trouble than one? If you try for one you might get it, for three you might have three times the difficulty in getting it.

It would be nicer to have more than one student member. If a student is elected to Senate could he stand up for himself and the students without support? Faculty do not need other Faculty members to prop them up. Why three to hold the argument up? The discussion started with a representative, one, and now all of a sudden it has to be three because one cannot be loud enough.

Three would hardly be a voting block, because Senate will elect an equal number of Faculty. It is realistic to have one person confidently voice the opinions of the whole student body.

Two or three students can give you a more unbiased voice of student representation on Senate.

Why not wait one year for the second and two years for the third? The students may, at certain times, present a voting block but never a power block. It is a sensible experiment to have three people but just one is asking a lot of newly elected student.

What benefit would it be to Senate to have one, two or three? Would it be beneficial to have more than one?

Could it not be put this way? The students are strongly, universally of the opinion that the student representation should be three.

Should it be left up to Senate to decide? Certainly. Senate will decide ultimately anyway.

One student representative for the time being would be sufficient, it is a renovation of the constitution of Senate and if put on that basis it would probably be more likely to succeed. Three would give the students more security, because of having three there, but some members have the suspicion that Senate would not go for three students immediately.

Is the disagreement based on what it is thought Senate will go along with or what would be more beneficial to Senate.

It is experimental for the time being so it cannot be said with certainty that three would be better than one.

There is nothing lost with letting a thing like this evolve gradually.

In Senate the student representative will not be there primarily as a spokesman for students but as a member of Senate.

Senate should be urged to try it with one, then two, then three.

If the students get two or three, Faculty will get the same and Senate will end up with 30 to 35 members. Senate meetings run quite long enough now. The first recommendation regarding openness should not be forgotten: If the Committee recommends a gallery and three students, some members may think things are getting too cluttered.

It is not known if one, two or three will work better. Why should we start with three? We do not have to rush. Senate has run along closed for many years and now we are saying that Senate will need to be open and have three students to be effective!

Could it not be agreed to only having one student representative? The only point is that some feel that three students would be more effective than one and the argument against three is a dislike of increasing the size of the Senate.

Maybe at this stage the Senate would be wise to admit students to committees who were not Senators.

SM 4/3/68

*Oppress  
Proc.*

23

What about the in-between ground? What does the committee think of two? The Committee will accept the suggestion that it leave the number to Senate, but recommend that one would be better than none. Leave the number up to Senate, and go to what kind of student it should be. Would it be a student in good standing who to maintain his place on the Senate must remain a student in good standing. Yes, a student of the age of 19 in good standing at the time of election. Is a student in good standing any student registered at the University? Students may elect a student who is not on the campus at that time. He may be a student on a semester off. Does that mean with the one person, if he took a semester off would the students be without representation? If a Faculty member takes research time off he notifies Senate and they appoint a substitute. If a student was working in the area he could maintain his representation to Senate.

The Committee has done the task it has been charged with. The next meeting of Senate is January 9 and the Senate then goes through the Graduate and Undergraduate Calendars. This item will be on the agenda but it is doubtful if Senate will have time to get to it, because the calendars must get out. This item deserves a special meeting with nothing else being discussed. Senate will probably call a special meeting to discuss these recommendations sometime later in January. Could the students be present at the meeting when the recommendations are discussed? It could be arranged.

The Chairman will attempt to write the history, the arguments pro and con, re-write the minutes and recommendations and send the whole report to Senate. As soon as the Chairman has rewritten this he should get the Committee together again.

Next meeting to be notified.

Mr. Don Murray  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

D.P. Robertson Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.

24

HISTORY OF DISCUSSION IN SENATE

REGARDING

OPENNESS AND STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
prepared by The Registrar

NOVEMBER 29, 1965 - Senate Minutes

" Dr. Ellis advised that there were several members of faculty waiting outside wanting to know if the Senate would permit spectators. A brief discussion followed in which the members generally expressed their reluctance to permit the admission of spectators at this time.

It was moved by Mr. Frederickson and seconded by Dr. Rieckhoff:

That visitors be excluded from Senate at this time and that the matter be reconsidered after Senate has been in existence for some time.

Dr. Maud had been asked by his colleagues to support their visiting the meeting and was therefore opposed to the motion. Mr. Bawtree then requested that a specific date be set for re-opening the issue. Dr. Shrum recommended that the matter should be postponed until Senate is more fully constituted.

An amendment was moved by Dr. Bursill-Hall and seconded by Mr. Bawtree:

That the matter be reviewed when Senate is more fully constituted.

CARRIED

The amended motion then carried.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings:

Moved by D.H. Sullivan, seconded by T.H. Brose

"that meeting of Senate be open to any member of the University community who provides sufficient reason; the President to decide upon which such requests should be granted"

MOTION LOST

SM 4/3/68

*Openers  
Proc.*

25

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3D Observers at Senate Meetings (cont'd)

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by W. M. Hamilton

"that the Information Officer be invited to attend Senate meetings at the discretion of the Chairman"

CARRIED

During the discussion it was pointed out that copies of Senate minutes were available for perusal by faculty in the Library and in the office of the Registrar.

Moved by T. H. Brose, seconded by R. J. Baker

"that copies of Senate minutes be made available in faculty department offices."

CARRIED

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Papers presented by R. Baker and T. Brose (attached)

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3B Student Representation on Senate

R. J. Baker commented on his paper, stating that ultimately he would agree with the suggestion presented in the paper submitted by T. H. Brose, but felt this should evolve slowly: and that student representation should commence by having the students elect a non-student.

G. Bursill-Hall stated that he was in favor of the proposal outlined in the paper by R. J. Baker, but would not at this time support any motion that resulted in a student becoming a member of Senate.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by C. D. Nelson

"that the proposal by R. J. Baker on Student Representation on Senate be adopted as the first step towards student representation"

T. H. Brose stated that he felt the idea of a student representative was good, but did not share the hesitancy of other members to allow the students to participate in their university. He then proposed an amendment to the motion made by R. J. Baker,

SM 4/3/68

Appendix  
Proc. 26

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

"that Senate authorize the seat and designate it as the seat of the representative of the students and permit the students to elect someone in October as their representative on Senate"

The Chairman ruled that this would be an alternative to the first motion, since the motion included not only the position of a Rector now, but moved to broaden the concept later.

R. J. Baker then amended his motion to state

"that Senate add a member elected by the students"

This would leave the title for the decision of the students. He stated he would not agree to a student representative.

T. H. Bottomore stated that the proposal that Senate should elect a non-student seemed difficult. He pointed out that the appointment would be for three years and that this was a long time to delay student representation by the students. He recommended that the matter be deferred until there was a more complete student body and the representation could be open.

G. Bursill-Hall requested clarification on the motion: whether it was on the position of a Rector who was a non-student or a Rector who might be a student representative.

The Chairman stated that the motion was in three parts:

1. The proposal as set out in the paper presented by R.J. Baker,
2. amended to read instead of "Rector", "the representative member of Senate elected by the students", and
3. in due course when a full spectrum of students is in attendance at the University, the whole question of limitations will be examined.

D. H. Sullivan stated that by the terms of the Act the term of appointment was three years. This would mean that a freshman or sophomore would be the only student eligible. Therefore he was against the motion. He also objected to the fact that members of faculty were excluded, stating that what the students would want would probably be a representative from the faculty.

E. S. Lett asked why it was urgent to consider this question at this time and asked if there would be any loss in deferring the discussion until there was a full complement of students.

SM 4/3/68

*Oppenham  
Proc.  
27*

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B. Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

R. J. Baker stated that he considered this would be a desirable step now as there is a great deal of concern about various groups being represented.

C. D. Nelson stated that he did not consider three years too long to deny representation by students on Senate. He reported that one of the members of the student government intends to take only a small number of courses, so that he can devote himself to student government. He stated that this was a criticism on the number of things that have to be done and considered it would take three years to sort them out and come to some sort of pattern for the trimester system. He considered that a representative elected by students to Senate was a good way to start and that such representation would give the students a great deal of help.

T. H. Brose stated that there appeared to be some feeling that a non-student should be the representative the students choose and stated that they should be trusted to elect a non-student.

Moved by D. H. Sullivan, seconded by T. H. Brose

"to delete the words "or a member of faculty" from the motion proposed by R. J. Baker"

AMENDMENT LOST

The Chairman then asked for a vote on the motion by R. J. Baker,

"that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Student Representative. This Student Representative would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students registered in courses at the time of the election, and for a term of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia"

CARRIED

G. L. Bursill-Hall abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded in the minutes.

The questions of which students would be eligible to vote and the best time for holding the election of the student representative to Senate were discussed and it was agreed that students registered for twelve semester hours or more were eligible to vote and that the election be held in the spring semester (1967): The elected representative to take his seat at the February Senate meeting.

SM 4/3/68

Open  
PAC, 20

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

3A Student Representative on Senate

1) Eligibility to vote

The members considered the request of the President of the Student Society that Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more would be the only eligible voters on the election of a Student Representative on Senate

Moved by K. E. Rieckhoff, seconded by C. J. Frederickson

"that the decision of Senate to require a student to be enroled twelve semester hours or more to be eligible to vote be reaffirmed"

CARRIED

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society

Senate considered the request from the President of the Student Society for Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings.

After considerable discussion the Chairman recommended that the Registrar write a report on each meeting of Senate and send the summary report to the President of the Student Society, the Peak, and any other party who was interested. This report could be written so that supporting papers would not be necessary.

It was pointed out that it could be assumed that the Student Representative, who will receive all documentation for Senate, will communicate matters of importance to the students.

A. R. MacKinnon recommended that there should be a place where the minutes with the papers are available.

J. Mills amended his motion to state

"that the request of the Student Society to have Senate minutes provided be met by making the Library copy of the minutes available to students"

The Chairman then called for a vote in two parts for the motion by J. Mills, seconded by A. R. MacKinnon

"that the Registrar be requested to prepare a summary to be distributed freely in the community"

CARRIED

"that the agenda, supporting papers and minutes be kept in the Library and made available upon request to any member of the University community: the papers for this copy to be subject to the discretion of the Registrar"

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3A Student Representative on Senate (cont'd)

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society (cont'd)

T. B. Bottomore stated that he felt this was getting away from the idea of minutes: that they were for the information of those who discuss the business of the meetings and the business of the meetings would be deteriorated by such action. He prefers that the minutes of a meeting of any body be confined to the membership of that body: to go beyond this is to restrict open discussion. He stated he was opposed to circulating the minutes.

T. H. Brose stated that he did not believe candor would restrict the body: that since Senate did not have Proceedings, as did the House of Commons, minutes and papers were the record of Senate and he believed people on campus should have that record available.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the second part of the motion.

CARRIED

Procedures for Election of Student Representative

The Registrar requested a ruling on his suggestion that nomination forms for nomination of a student representative required twenty signatures.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by J. F. Ellis

"that nomination forms for the student representative should require twenty signatures"

CARRIED

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate

The Registrar reported that because he felt that the letter from the Student Society, which had been distributed to all members, required some clarification, he consulted with Dean Bottomore, acting President at the time, about the advisability of meeting with the students before the letter was discussed in Senate. With the concurrence of Dean Bottomore a meeting was held on Friday, November 4th. Present were the Registrar, Professors Baker, Brose,

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Prog.  
30*

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate (cont'd)

Ellis, Rieckhoff and students John Mynott, Dave York, Mike Campbell and Greg Stacey. As a result of this meeting Mr. Mynott was asked if he and some of his colleagues wished to present the Student Society's case in person at a Senate meeting. He agreed this would be desirable. At the meeting the student newspaper editor, Mr. Mike Campbell, was asked to consider that he was not present at the meeting as a reporter and he agreed, but has since asked to accompany the student delegation to Senate as a reporter.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by K. E. Rickhoff

"that the student delegation be admitted"

CARRIED

Moved by A. M. Unrau, seconded by J. L. Dampier

"that the request of the reporter to attend the meeting for the interview be denied"

CARRIED

John Mynott, the President of the Student Council, was then introduced to the meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Mynott stated that the question of open and public meetings, as stated in item 1. of the letter distributed to Senate, was the most important facet of the whole question. He was asked to what extent this was a Student Council decision and to what extent it was a publically discussed issue. He stated that the decision was a decision of the Executive Council in consultation with a number of students on campus and some of the executive and other members of the Canadian Union of Students.

Mr. Mynott left the meeting at 3:10 PM.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills

"that a Senate committee be established to meet with a committee of students to discuss the question of student participation in Senate"

The Chairman stated that from the discussion he would take the terms of reference for the committee to be to investigate the whole question of student participation in Senate and the openness of Senate meetings.

SN 4/3/68

*Openess  
Proc.*

31

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative  
of Students on Senate (cont'd)

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills.

CARRIED

It was further agreed that the committee be composed of four members, the membership of the committee to be left to the discretion of the Provost, with the recommendation that one member be a non-faculty member of Senate and that one member be the Registrar.

SM 4/3/68

*openness  
Br. C.*

-32-

To: President

From: R. J. Baker,  
Head, Department of English

Subject: Rector

July 12, 1966

Student Representation on Senate

I would like to put on the agenda for the next Senate meeting the motion that I gave notice of at the last meeting. I propose that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Rector.

The Rector would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students for a period of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia.

The Rector would not be directly responsible to the student body but he would address them once a year. His particular responsibility in Senate would be the welfare of students.

The position is well established in Scottish Universities, and our name, and links with Lord Lovat, would make it appropriate for us to use the same term. I attach the statement made by President Mackenzie on his retirement; it will be noted that he recommended that the Rector be a member of the Board of Governors. It is not, however, within the power of Senate to make such a proposal.

R. J. Baker.

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

-33-

If the Faculty are to be represented, I suggest that the student body should also be represented. I would arrange this through the creation of a new office - that of Rector - one which is traditional in many universities in the United Kingdom and at Queen's in Canada. The Rector would be elected by the current student population for a period of five or six years. He would be a distinguished citizen resident in British Columbia. His office and title would be largely honorary and his duties would include the giving of a Rectorial address at least once each year and voting membership on the Board of Governors. He would not be responsible to or report back to the student body save in the most general way, but he would in a sense be the friend and advocate of the students in the affairs of the University.

The President's Report (1961-62)

The University of British Columbia.

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Principle*

-34-

To: Members of the Senate

From: Thomas H. Brose

Date: August 1st 1966

STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SENATE

That the Act establishing Simon Fraser University government did not include representation for students is one of the serious omissions in the document.

I think students should be represented on Senate, and I thus support this aspect of Professor Baker's fine suggestion that Senate proceed to create a seat for the students.

However, I think the person chosen should be the students' choice - with no prior restrictions imposed by us. Only the students can best judge who can best represent them. Further, since Simon Fraser University has proclaimed itself in favour of educational innovation, we should encourage this innovation. Rather than reaching across the seas or the border for a precedent, we have the opportunity to join those very few universities who have recognized this generation's students' desire to be involved in their university. The students do not want the paternalism of which much of past university-student relationships consisted. There is no master-servant relationship in a healthy democratic community. Those who wish to continue such a system were born in the wrong age. The university in my opinion, should be a workshop, a microcosm, of the kind of society Canada is striving for - not a haven for tradition at the expense of the realities of the time in which we live.

Therefore I wish to offer the following amendment to the proposal of Professor Baker:

That the Senate authorize a seat under its power in Section 23(i), and that it designate that seat as the seat of the student representative.

Further, that we request the students to nominate a person residing in British Columbia and to elect their representative sometime in October so as to have a representative at the new session of Senate.

Finally, the title of the representative - if we need a title - should be the choice of the students. Let us create our own traditions.

SM 4/3/68

*Answers  
Shre.*

-35-

Simon Fraser University Student Society  
Burnaby 2, British Columbia

September 14 1966

The Senate  
c/o Mr. D. P. Robertson  
Registrar  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2 B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I was gratified to receive the formal notice of the Senate's decision to include a student representative on the Senate. At this time I would like to request that the Senate give consideration to providing a set of Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings for the Student Society's information so that we may be more fully prepared to choose our Senate representative.

With regards to the election procedure and those eligible I would request that the Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more are the only eligible voters. The basis for my request lies in the fact that all students taking four or more semester hours pay Student Society fees and are thus considered members of the University community. I would also like to point out that in many cases students taking less than 12 hours are those who like myself are involved in considerable non-academic activities and in order to do justice to both course load and co-curricular activities have decided to reduce their load to less than 12 hours. I would appreciate the Senate's careful consideration of this point.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott  
President

SM 4/3/68

*Openness*  
*PRC*

-36-

Simon Fraser Student Society  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Office of the President  
October 31, 1966.

The Senate  
c/o Mr. D. P. Robertson  
Secretary to the Senate  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I have been instructed by the Executive Council to inform you that after considerable discussion and careful consideration the Executive Council must regrettably decline acceptance of the Senate offer to place a student elected Rector on the Senate. The Council's decision is contained in a three point resolution as follows:

Whereas, the Senate resolution as communicated to the Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society in a letter dated September 14, 1966, involves students in the responsibility for decision making without allowing sufficient student votes, it resolved that:

1. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects any and all forms of student representation on Senate that are not accompanied by a proposal to carry on the business of Senate in open and public meetings.
2. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects the specific Senate proposal for a student elected Rector on Senate as being guilty by association without sufficient representation.
3. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society proposes as an initial step towards adequate student representation on the Senate that at least two student representatives be elected by the student body to the Senate.

/....

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

-37-

The Senate

October 31, 1966  
Page 2

In reaching its decision the Executive Council took into consideration the possible problem arising from a student serving a three year term as a member of Senate. The consensus reached was that since the main purpose of student representation on the Senate is to present the students' point of view and to present problems encountered by students from time to time, direct student representation is the most efficient means of reaching these goals. Election of an upper class man for a three year Senate term would accomplish two things. First, the student elected would have at least two years experience as a student at the University. Second, even if this student representative were to graduate before the end of his term of office, he would be temporarily close enough to his student experience to give adequate representation to the student body. Such a plan would lend itself to some multiple of three as the number of representatives for the student body. Thus, one-third of the representatives could be elected each year.

The above plan is only one of several possibilities for incorporating direct student representation in the academic Senate of the University. The Executive Council would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to review or discuss other possibilities. We appreciate the Senate's sincere efforts to increase the democratization of university government.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott

on 4/3/68

*Openers  
Prs.*

-37-

The Senate

October 31, 1966  
Page 2

In reaching its decision the Executive Council took into consideration the possible problem arising from a student serving a three year term as a member of Senate. The consensus reached was that since the main purpose of student representation on the Senate is to present the students' point of view and to present problems encountered by students from time to time, direct student representation is the most efficient means of reaching these goals. Election of an upper class man for a three year Senate term would accomplish two things. First, the student elected would have at least two years experience as a student at the University. Second, even if this student representative were to graduate before the end of his term of office, he would be temporarily close enough to his student experience to give adequate representation to the student body. Such a plan would lend itself to some multiple of three as the number of representatives for the student body. Thus, one-third of the representatives could be elected each year.

The above plan is only one of several possibilities for incorporating direct student representation in the academic Senate of the University. The Executive Council would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to review or discuss other possibilities. We appreciate the Senate's sincere efforts to increase the democratization of university government.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Prce.*

-37-

The Senate

October 31, 1966  
Page 2

In reaching its decision the Executive Council took into consideration the possible problem arising from a student serving a three year term as a member of Senate. The consensus reached was that since the main purpose of student representation on the Senate is to present the students' point of view and to present problems encountered by students from time to time, direct student representation is the most efficient means of reaching these goals. Election of an upper class man for a three year Senate term would accomplish two things. First, the student elected would have at least two years experience as a student at the University. Second, even if this student representative were to graduate before the end of his term of office, he would be temporarily close enough to his student experience to give adequate representation to the student body. Such a plan would lend itself to some multiple of three as the number of representatives for the student body. Thus, one-third of the representatives could be elected each year.

The above plan is only one of several possibilities for incorporating direct student representation in the academic Senate of the University. The Executive Council would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to review or discuss other possibilities. We appreciate the Senate's sincere efforts to increase the democratization of university government.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott

SN 4/3/68

*Openness  
Share.*

-37-

The Senate

October 31, 1966  
Page 2

In reaching its decision the Executive Council took into consideration the possible problem arising from a student serving a three year term as a member of Senate. The consensus reached was that since the main purpose of student representation on the Senate is to present the students' point of view and to present problems encountered by students from time to time, direct student representation is the most efficient means of reaching these goals. Election of an upper class man for a three year Senate term would accomplish two things. First, the student elected would have at least two years experience as a student at the University. Second, even if this student representative were to graduate before the end of his term of office, he would be temporarily close enough to his student experience to give adequate representation to the student body. Such a plan would lend itself to some multiple of three as the number of representatives for the student body. Thus, one-third of the representatives could be elected each year.

The above plan is only one of several possibilities for incorporating direct student representation in the academic Senate of the University. The Executive Council would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to review or discuss other possibilities. We appreciate the Senate's sincere efforts to increase the democratization of university government.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

-36-

Simon Fraser Student Society  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Office of the President  
October 31, 1966.

The Senate  
c/o Mr. D. P. Robertson  
Secretary to the Senate  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I have been instructed by the Executive Council to inform you that after considerable discussion and careful consideration the Executive Council must regretfully decline acceptance of the Senate offer to place a student elected Rector on the Senate. The Council's decision is contained in a three point resolution as follows:

Whereas, the Senate resolution as communicated to the Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society in a letter dated September 14, 1966, involves students in the responsibility for decision making without allowing sufficient student votes, it resolved that:

1. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects any and all forms of student representation on Senate that are not accompanied by a proposal to carry on the business of Senate in open and public meetings.
2. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects the specific Senate proposal for a student elected Rector on Senate as being guilty by association without sufficient representation.
3. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society proposes as an initial step towards adequate student representation on the Senate that at least two student representatives be elected by the student body to the Senate.

1....

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

-36-

Simon Fraser Student Society  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Office of the President  
October 31, 1966.

The Senate  
c/o Mr. D. P. Robertson  
Secretary to the Senate  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I have been instructed by the Executive Council to inform you that after considerable discussion and careful consideration the Executive Council must regrettably decline acceptance of the Senate offer to place a student elected Rector on the Senate. The Council's decision is contained in a three point resolution as follows:

Whereas, the Senate resolution as communicated to the Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society in a letter dated September 14, 1966, involves students in the responsibility for decision making without allowing sufficient student votes, it is resolved that:

1. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects any and all forms of student representation on Senate that are not accompanied by a proposal to carry on the business of Senate in open and public meetings.
2. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects the specific Senate proposal for a student elected Rector on Senate as being guilt by association without sufficient representation.
3. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society proposes as an initial step towards adequate student representation on the Senate that at least two student representatives be elected by the student body to the Senate.

/....

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

-36-

Simon Fraser Student Society  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Office of the President  
October 31, 1966.

The Senate  
c/o Mr. D. P. Robertson  
Secretary to the Senate  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2, B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I have been instructed by the Executive Council to inform you that after considerable discussion and careful consideration the Executive Council must regretfully decline acceptance of the Senate offer to place a student elected Rector on the Senate. The Council's decision is contained in a three point resolution as follows:

Whereas, the Senate resolution as communicated to the Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society in a letter dated September 14, 1966, involves students in the responsibility for decision making without allowing sufficient student votes, it resolved that:

1. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects any and all forms of student representation on Senate that are not accompanied by a proposal to carry on the business of Senate in open and public meetings.
2. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society rejects the specific Senate proposal for a student elected Rector on Senate as being guilt by association without sufficient representation.
3. The Executive Council of the Simon Fraser Student Society proposes as an initial step towards adequate student representation on the Senate that at least two student representatives be elected by the student body to the Senate.

1....

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

-35-

Simon Fraser University Student Society  
Burnaby 2, British Columbia

September 14 1966

The Senate  
c/o Mr. D. P. Robertson  
Registrar  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2 B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I was gratified to receive the formal notice of the Senate's decision to include a student representative on the Senate. At this time I would like to request that the Senate give consideration to providing a set of Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings for the Student Society's information so that we may be more fully prepared to choose our Senate representative.

With regards to the election procedure and those eligible I would request that the Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more are the only eligible voters. The basis for my request lies in the fact that all students taking four or more semester hours pay Student Society fees and are thus considered members of the University community. I would also like to point out that in many cases students taking less than 12 hours are those who like myself are involved in considerable non-academic activities and in order to do justice to both course load and co-curricular activities have decided to reduce their load to less than 12 hours. I would appreciate the Senate's careful consideration of this point.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott  
President

SM 4/3/68

-35-

*Appendix  
Part*

Simon Fraser University Student Society  
Burnaby 2, British Columbia

September 14 1966

The Senate.  
c/o Mr. D P. Robertson  
Registrar  
Simon Fraser University.  
Burnaby 2 B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I was gratified to receive the formal notice of the Senate's decision to include a student representative on the Senate. At this time I would like to request that the Senate give consideration to providing a set of Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings for the Student Society's information so that we may be more fully prepared to choose our Senate representative.

With regards to the election procedure and those eligible I would request that the Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more are the only eligible voters. The basis for my request lies in the fact that all students taking four or more semester hours pay Student Society fees and are thus considered members of the University community. I would also like to point out that in many cases students taking less than 12 hours are those who like myself are involved in considerable non-academic activities and in order to do justice to both course load and co-curricular activities have decided to reduce their load to less than 12 hours. I would appreciate the Senate's careful consideration of this point.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott  
President

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

-35-

Simon Fraser University Student Society  
Burnaby 2, British Columbia

September 14 1966

The Senate  
c/o Mr. D P. Robertson  
Registrar  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby 2 B.C.

Dear Mr. Robertson,

I was gratified to receive the formal notice of the Senate's decision to include a student representative on the Senate. At this time I would like to request that the Senate give consideration to providing a set of Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings for the Student Society's information so that we may be more fully prepared to choose our Senate representative.

With regards to the election procedure and those eligible I would request that the Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more are the only eligible voters. The basis for my request lies in the fact that all students taking four or more semester hours pay Student Society fees and are thus considered members of the University community. I would also like to point out that in many cases students taking less than 12 hours are those who like myself are involved in considerable non-academic activities and in order to do justice to both course load and co-curricular activities have decided to reduce their load to less than 12 hours. I would appreciate the Senate's careful consideration of this point.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Mynott  
President

SM 4-3/68

*Openness  
Price*

-34-

To: Members of the Senate

From: Thomas H. Brose

Date: August 1st 1966

STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SENATE

That the Act establishing Simon Fraser University government did not include representation for students is one of the serious omissions in the document.

I think students should be represented on Senate, and I thus support this aspect of Professor Baker's fine suggestion that Senate proceed to create a seat for the students.

However, I think the person chosen should be the students' choice - with no prior restrictions imposed by us. Only the students can best judge who can best represent them. Further, since Simon Fraser University has proclaimed itself in favour of educational innovation, we should encourage this innovation. Rather than reaching across the seas or the border for a precedent, we have the opportunity to join those very few universities who have recognized this generation's students' desire to be involved in their university. The students do not want the paternalism of which much of past university-student relationships consisted. There is no master-servant relationship in a healthy democratic community. Those who wish to continue such a system were born in the wrong age. The university in my opinion, should be a workshop, a microcosm, of the kind of society Canada is striving for - not a haven for tradition at the expense of the realities of the time in which we live.

Therefore I wish to offer the following amendment to the proposal of Professor Baker:

That the Senate authorize a seat under its power in Section 23(i), and that it designate that seat as the seat of the student representative.

Further, that we request the students to nominate a person residing in British Columbia and to elect their representative sometime in October so as to have a representative at the new session of Senate.

Finally, the title of the representative - if we need a title - should be the choice of the students. Let us create our own traditions.

SM 4/3/68

*Open  
Price*

-34-

To: Members of the Senate

From: Thomas H. Brose

Date: August 1st 1966

STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SENATE

That the Act establishing Simon Fraser University government did not include representation for students is one of the serious omissions in the document.

I think students should be represented on Senate, and I thus support this aspect of Professor Baker's fine suggestion that Senate proceed to create a seat for the students.

However, I think the person chosen should be the students' choice - with no prior restrictions imposed by us. Only the students can best judge who can best represent them. Further, since Simon Fraser University has proclaimed itself in favour of educational innovation, we should encourage this innovation. Rather than reaching across the seas or the border for a precedent, we have the opportunity to join those very few universities who have recognized this generation's students' desire to be involved in their university. The students do not want the paternalism of which much of past university-student relationships consisted. There is no master-servant relationship in a healthy democratic community. Those who wish to continue such a system were born in the wrong age. The university in my opinion, should be a workshop, a microcosm, of the kind of society Canada is striving for - not a haven for tradition at the expense of the realities of the time in which we live.

Therefore I wish to offer the following amendment to the proposal of Professor Baker:

That the Senate authorize a seat under its power in Section 23(i), and that it designate that seat as the seat of the student representative.

Further, that we request the students to nominate a person residing in British Columbia and to elect their representative sometime in October so as to have a representative at the new session of Senate.

Finally, the title of the representative - if we need a title - should be the choice of the students. Let us create our own traditions.

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Price*

-34-

To: Members of the Senate

From: Thomas H. Brose

Date: August 1st 1966

STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SENATE

That the Act establishing Simon Fraser University government did not include representation for students is one of the serious omissions in the document.

I think students should be represented on Senate, and I thus support this aspect of Professor Baker's fine suggestion that Senate proceed to create a seat for the students.

However, I think the person chosen should be the students' choice - with no prior restrictions imposed by us. Only the students can best judge who can best represent them. Further, since Simon Fraser University has proclaimed itself in favour of educational innovation, we should encourage this innovation. Rather than reaching across the seas or the border for a precedent, we have the opportunity to join those very few universities who have recognized this generation's students' desire to be involved in their university. The students do not want the paternalism of which much of past university-student relationships consisted. There is no master-servant relationship in a healthy democratic community. Those who wish to continue such a system were born in the wrong age. The university in my opinion, should be a workshop, a microcosm, of the kind of society Canada is striving for - not a haven for tradition at the expense of the realities of the time in which we live.

Therefore I wish to offer the following amendment to the proposal of Professor Baker:

That the Senate authorize a seat under its power in Section 23(i), and that it designate that seat as the seat of the student representative.

Further, that we request the students to nominate a person residing in British Columbia and to elect their representative sometime in October so as to have a representative at the new session of Senate.

Finally, the title of the representative - if we need a title - should be the choice of the students. Let us create our own traditions.

SM 4/3/68

*Oppenheus  
Proc.*

-33-

If the Faculty are to be represented, I suggest that the student body should also be represented. I would arrange this through the creation of a new office - that of Rector - one which is traditional in many universities in the United Kingdom and at Queen's in Canada. The Rector would be elected by the current student population for a period of five or six years. He would be a distinguished citizen resident in British Columbia. His office and title would be largely honorary and his duties would include the giving of a Rectorial address at least once each year and voting membership on the Board of Governors. He would not be responsible to or report back to the student body save in the most general way, but he would in a sense be the friend and advocate of the students in the affairs of the University.

The President's Report (1961-62)

The University of British Columbia.

SM 4/3/68

*Appendix  
Proc.*

-33-

If the Faculty are to be represented, I suggest that the student body should also be represented. I would arrange this through the creation of a new office - that of Rector - one which is traditional in many universities in the United Kingdom and at Queen's in Canada. The Rector would be elected by the current student population for a period of five or six years. He would be a distinguished citizen resident in British Columbia. His office and title would be largely honorary and his duties would include the giving of a Rectorial address at least once each year and voting membership on the Board of Governors. He would not be responsible to or report back to the student body save in the most general way, but he would in a sense be the friend and advocate of the students in the affairs of the University.

The President's Report (1961-62)

The University of British Columbia.

SM 4/3/68

*Appendix  
Brie.*

-33-

If the Faculty are to be represented, I suggest that the student body should also be represented. I would arrange this through the creation of a new office - that of Rector - one which is traditional in many universities in the United Kingdom and at Queen's in Canada. The Rector would be elected by the current student population for a period of five or six years. He would be a distinguished citizen resident in British Columbia. His office and title would be largely honorary and his duties would include the giving of a Rectorial address at least once each year and voting membership on the Board of Governors. He would not be responsible to or report back to the student body save in the most general way, but he would in a sense be the friend and advocate of the students in the affairs of the University.

The President's Report (1961-62)

The University of British Columbia.

SM 4/3/68

Appendix  
Three

-32-

To: President

From: R. J. Baker,  
Head, Department of English

Subject: Rector

July 12, 1966

Student Representation on Senate

I would like to put on the agenda for the next Senate meeting the motion that I gave notice of at the last meeting. I propose that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Rector.

The Rector would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students for a period of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia.

The Rector would not be directly responsible to the student body but he would address them once a year. His particular responsibility in Senate would be the welfare of students.

The position is well established in Scottish Universities, and our name, and links with Lord Lovat, would make it appropriate for us to use the same term. I attach the statement made by President Mackenzie on his retirement; it will be noted that he recommended that the Rector be a member of the Board of Governors. It is not, however, within the power of Senate to make such a proposal.

R. J. Baker.

SM 4/3/68

Appendix  
One

-32-

To: President

From: R. J. Baker,  
Head, Department of English

Subject: Rector

July 12, 1966

Student Representation on Senate

I would like to put on the agenda for the next Senate meeting the motion that I gave notice of at the last meeting. I propose that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Rector.

The Rector would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students for a period of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia.

The Rector would not be directly responsible to the student body but he would address them once a year. His particular responsibility in Senate would be the welfare of students.

The position is well established in Scottish Universities, and our name, and links with Lord Lovat, would make it appropriate for us to use the same term. I attach the statement made by President Mackenzie on his retirement; it will be noted that he recommended that the Rector be a member of the Board of Governors. It is not, however, within the power of Senate to make such a proposal.

R. J. Baker.

*Openness  
Proc.*

-32-

To: President

From: R. J. Baker,  
Head, Department of English

Subject: Rector

July 12, 1966

Student Representation on Senate

I would like to put on the agenda for the next Senate meeting the motion that I gave notice of at the last meeting. I propose that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Rector.

The Rector would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students for a period of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia.

The Rector would not be directly responsible to the student body but he would address them once a year. His particular responsibility in Senate would be the welfare of students.

The position is well established in Scottish Universities, and our name, and links with Lord Lovat, would make it appropriate for us to use the same term. I attach the statement made by President Mackenzie on his retirement; it will be noted that he recommended that the Rector be a member of the Board of Governors. It is not, however, within the power of Senate to make such a proposal.

R. J. Baker.

SEN 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

31

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate (cont'd)

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills.

CARRIED

It was further agreed that the committee be composed of four members, the membership of the committee to be left to the discretion of the President, with the recommendation that one member be a non-faculty member of Senate and that one member be the Registrar.

SA 4/3/68

*Openness  
Proc.*

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

,31

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate (cont'd)

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills.

CARRIED

It was further agreed that the committee be composed of four members, the membership of the committee to be left to the discretion of the President, with the recommendation that one member be a non-faculty member of Senate and that one member be the Registrar.

SM 4/3/68

*Openess  
Proc.*

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate (cont'd)

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills.

CARRIED

It was further agreed that the committee be composed of four members, the membership of the committee to be left to the discretion of the President, with the recommendation that one member be a non-faculty member of Senate and that one member be the Registrar.

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Prog*

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate (cont'd)

Ellis, Rieckhoff and students John Mynott, Dave York, Mike Campbell and Greg Stacey. As a result of this meeting Mr. Mynott was asked if he and some of his colleagues wished to present the Student Society's case in person at a Senate meeting. He agreed this would be desirable. At the meeting the student newspaper editor, Mr. Mike Campbell, was asked to consider that he was not present at the meeting as a reporter and he agreed, but has since asked to accompany the student delegation to Senate as a reporter.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by K. E. Rickhoff

"that the student delegation be admitted"

CARRIED

Moved by A. M. Unrau, seconded by J. L. Dampier

"that the request of the reporter to attend the meeting for the interview be denied"

CARRIED

John Mynott, the President of the Student Council, was then introduced to the meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Mynott stated that the question of open and public meetings, as stated in item 1. of the letter distributed to Senate, was the most important facet of the whole question. He was asked to what extent this was a Student Council decision and to what extent it was a publically discussed issue. He stated that the decision was a decision of the Executive Council in consultation with a number of students on campus and some of the executive and other members of the Canadian Union of Students.

Mr. Mynott left the meeting at 3:10 PM.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills

"that a Senate committee be established to meet with a committee of students to discuss the question of student participation in Senate"

The Chairman stated that from the discussion he would take the terms of reference for the committee to be to investigate the whole question of student participation in Senate and the openness of Senate meetings.

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Prog  
30*

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate (cont'd)

Ellis, Rieckhoff and students John Mynott, Dave York, Mike Campbell and Greg Stacey. As a result of this meeting Mr. Mynott was asked if he and some of his colleagues wished to present the Student Society's case in person at a Senate meeting. He agreed this would be desirable. At the meeting the student newspaper editor, Mr. Mike Campbell, was asked to consider that he was not present at the meeting as a reporter and he agreed, but has since asked to accompany the student delegation to Senate as a reporter.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by K. E. Rickhoff

"that the student delegation be admitted"

CARRIED

Moved by A. M. Unrau, seconded by J. L. Dampier

"that the request of the reporter to attend the meeting for the interview be denied"

CARRIED

John Mynott, the President of the Student Council, was then introduced to the meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Mynott stated that the question of open and public meetings, as stated in item 1. of the letter distributed to Senate, was the most important facet of the whole question. He was asked to what extent this was a Student Council decision and to what extent it was a publically discussed issue. He stated that the decision was a decision of the Executive Council in consultation with a number of students on campus and some of the executive and other members of the Canadian Union of Students.

Mr. Mynott left the meeting at 3:10 PM.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills

"that a Senate committee be established to meet with a committee of students to discuss the question of student participation in Senate"

The Chairman stated that from the discussion he would take the terms of reference for the committee to be to investigate the whole question of student participation in Senate and the openness of Senate meetings.

SM 4/3/68

*Openness  
Prog*

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate (cont'd)

Ellis, Rieckhoff and students John Mynott, Dave York, Mike Campbell and Greg Stacey. As a result of this meeting Mr. Mynott was asked if he and some of his colleagues wished to present the Student Society's case in person at a Senate meeting. He agreed this would be desirable. At the meeting the student newspaper editor, Mr. Mike Campbell, was asked to consider that he was not present at the meeting as a reporter and he agreed, but has since asked to accompany the student delegation to Senate as a reporter.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by K. E. Rickhoff

"that the student delegation be admitted"

CARRIED

Moved by A. M. Unrau, seconded by J. L. Dampier

"that the request of the reporter to attend the meeting for the interview be denied"

CARRIED

John Mynott, the President of the Student Council, was then introduced to the meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Mynott stated that the question of open and public meetings, as stated in item 1. of the letter distributed to Senate, was the most important facet of the whole question. He was asked to what extent this was a Student Council decision and to what extent it was a publically discussed issue. He stated that the decision was a decision of the Executive Council in consultation with a number of students on campus and some of the executive and other members of the Canadian Union of Students.

Mr. Mynott left the meeting at 3:10 PM.

Moved by A. E. Branca, seconded by J. Mills

"that a Senate committee be established to meet with a committee of students to discuss the question of student participation in Senate"

The Chairman stated that from the discussion he would take the terms of reference for the committee to be to investigate the whole question of student participation in Senate and the openness of Senate meetings.

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.  
29

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3A Student Representative on Senate (cont'd)

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society (cont'd)

T. B. Bottomore stated that he felt this was getting away from the idea of minutes: that they were for the information of those who discuss the business of the meetings and the business of the meetings would be deteriorated by such action. He prefers that the minutes of a meeting of any body be confined to the membership of that body: to go beyond this is to restrict open discussion. He stated he was opposed to circulating the minutes.

T. H. Brose stated that he did not believe candor would restrict the body: that since Senate did not have Proceedings, as did the House of Commons, minutes and papers were the record of Senate and he believed people on campus should have that record available.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the second part of the motion.

CARRIED

Procedures for Election of Student Representative

The Registrar requested a ruling on his suggestion that nomination forms for nomination of a student representative required twenty signatures.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by J. F. Ellis

"that nomination forms for the student representative should require twenty signatures"

CARRIED

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate

The Registrar reported that because he felt that the letter from the Student Society, which had been distributed to all members, required some clarification, he consulted with Dean Bottomore, acting President at the time, about the advisability of meeting with the students before the letter was discussed in Senate. With the concurrence of Dean Bottomore a meeting was held on Friday, November 4th. Present were the Registrar, Professors Baker, Brose,

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.  
29

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3A Student Representative on Senate (cont'd)

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society (cont'd)

T. B. Bottomore stated that he felt this was getting away from the idea of minutes: that they were for the information of those who discuss the business of the meetings and the business of the meetings would be deteriorated by such action. He prefers that the minutes of a meeting of any body be confined to the membership of that body: to go beyond this is to restrict open discussion. He stated he was opposed to circulating the minutes.

T. H. Brose stated that he did not believe candor would restrict the body: that since Senate did not have Proceedings, as did the House of Commons, minutes and papers were the record of Senate and he believed people on campus should have that record available.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the second part of the motion.

CARRIED

Procedures for Election of Student Representative

The Registrar requested a ruling on his suggestion that nomination forms for nomination of a student representative required twenty signatures.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by J. F. Ellis

"that nomination forms for the student representative should require twenty signatures"

CARRIED

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate

The Registrar reported that because he felt that the letter from the Student Society, which had been distributed to all members, required some clarification, he consulted with Dean Bottomore, acting President at the time, about the advisability of meeting with the students before the letter was discussed in Senate. With the concurrence of Dean Bottomore a meeting was held on Friday, November 4th. Present were the Registrar, Professors Baker, Brose,

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3A Student Representative on Senate (cont'd)

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society (cont'd)

T. B. Bottomore stated that he felt this was getting away from the idea of minutes: that they were for the information of those who discuss the business of the meetings and the business of the meetings would be deteriorated by such action. He prefers that the minutes of a meeting of any body be confined to the membership of that body: to go beyond this is to restrict open discussion. He stated he was opposed to circulating the minutes.

T. H. Brose stated that he did not believe candor would restrict the body: that since Senate did not have Proceedings, as did the House of Commons, minutes and papers were the record of Senate and he believed people on campus should have that record available.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the second part of the motion.

CARRIED

Procedures for Election of Student Representative

The Registrar requested a ruling on his suggestion that nomination forms for nomination of a student representative required twenty signatures.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by J. F. Ellis

"that nomination forms for the student representative should require twenty signatures"

CARRIED

NOVEMBER 7, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

4A Letter from Student Society Rejecting Proposal of Representative of Students on Senate

The Registrar reported that because he felt that the letter from the Student Society, which had been distributed to all members, required some clarification, he consulted with Dean Bottomore, acting President at the time, about the advisability of meeting with the students before the letter was discussed in Senate. With the concurrence of Dean Bottomore a meeting was held on Friday, November 4th. Present were the Registrar, Professors Baker, Brose,

SM 4/3/68

Openers  
Part 20

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

3A Student Representative on Senate

1) Eligibility to vote

The members considered the request of the President of the Student Society that Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more would be the only eligible voters on the election of a Student Representative on Senate

Moved by K. E. Rieckhoff, seconded by C. J. Frederickson

"that the decision of Senate to require a student to be enroled twelve semester hours or more to be eligible to vote be reaffirmed"

CARRIED

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society

Senate considered the request from the President of the Student Society for Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings.

After considerable discussion the Chairman recommended that the Registrar write a report on each meeting of Senate and send the summary report to the President of the Student Society, the Peak, and any other party who was interested. This report could be written so that supporting papers would not be necessary.

It was pointed out that it could be assumed that the Student Representative, who will receive all documentation for Senate, will communicate matters of importance to the students.

A. R. MacKinnon recommended that there should be a place where the minutes with the papers are available.

J. Mills amended his motion to state

"that the request of the Student Society to have Senate minutes provided be met by making the Library copy of the minutes available to students"

The Chairman then called for a vote in two parts for the motion by J. Mills, seconded by A. R. MacKinnon

"that the Registrar be requested to prepare a summary to be distributed freely in the community"

CARRIED

"that the agenda, supporting papers and minutes be kept in the Library and made available upon request to any member of the University community: the papers for this copy to be subject to the discretion of the Registrar"

SM 4/3/68

Open  
PAC, 20

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

3A Student Representative on Senate

1) Eligibility to vote

The members considered the request of the President of the Student Society that Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more would be the only eligible voters on the election of a Student Representative on Senate

Moved by K. E. Rieckhoff, seconded by C. J. Frederickson

"that the decision of Senate to require a student to be enroled twelve semester hours or more to be eligible to vote be reaffirmed"

CARRIED

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society

Senate considered the request from the President of the Student Society for Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings.

After considerable discussion the Chairman recommended that the Registrar write a report on each meeting of Senate and send the summary report to the President of the Student Society, the Peak, and any other party who was interested. This report could be written so that supporting papers would not be necessary.

It was pointed out that it could be assumed that the Student Representative, who will receive all documentation for Senate, will communicate matters of importance to the students.

A. R. MacKinnon recommended that there should be a place where the minutes with the papers are available.

J. Mills amended his motion to state

"that the request of the Student Society to have Senate minutes provided be met by making the Library copy of the minutes available to students"

The Chairman then called for a vote in two parts for the motion by J. Mills, seconded by A. R. MacKinnon

"that the Registrar be requested to prepare a summary to be distributed freely in the community"

CARRIED

"that the agenda, supporting papers and minutes be kept in the Library and made available upon request to any member of the University community: the papers for this copy to be subject to the discretion of the Registrar"

SPI 4/3/68

Open  
PAC 20

OCTOBER 3, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Letter from J. Mynott, President, Student Society (attached)

3A Student Representative on Senate

1) Eligibility to vote

The members considered the request of the President of the Student Society that Senate reconsider its decision that students with 12 semester hours or more would be the only eligible voters on the election of a Student Representative on Senate

Moved by K. E. Rieckhoff, seconded by C. J. Frederickson

"that the decision of Senate to require a student to be enroled twelve semester hours or more to be eligible to vote be reaffirmed"

CARRIED

2) Distribution of Senate minutes to Student Society

Senate considered the request from the President of the Student Society for Senate minutes for each of the Fall meetings.

After considerable discussion the Chairman recommended that the Registrar write a report on each meeting of Senate and send the summary report to the President of the Student Society, the Peak, and any other party who was interested. This report could be written so that supporting papers would not be necessary.

It was pointed out that it could be assumed that the Student Representative, who will receive all documentation for Senate, will communicate matters of importance to the students.

A. R. MacKinnon recommended that there should be a place where the minutes with the papers are available.

J. Mills amended his motion to state

"that the request of the Student Society to have Senate minutes provided be met by making the Library copy of the minutes available to students"

The Chairman then called for a vote in two parts for the motion by J. Mills, seconded by A. R. MacKinnon

"that the Registrar be requested to prepare a summary to be distributed freely in the community"

CARRIED

"that the agenda, supporting papers and minutes be kept in the Library and made available upon request to any member of the University community: the papers for this copy to be subject to the discretion of the Registrar"

SM 4/3/68

Opposition  
Brose  
27

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B. Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

R. J. Baker stated that he considered this would be a desirable step now as there is a great deal of concern about various groups being represented.

C. D. Nelson stated that he did not consider three years too long to deny representation by students on Senate. He reported that one of the members of the student government intends to take only a small number of courses, so that he can devote himself to student government. He stated that this was a criticism on the number of things that have to be done and considered it would take three years to sort them out and come to some sort of pattern for the trimester system. He considered that a representative elected by students to Senate was a good way to start and that such representation would give the students a great deal of help.

T. H. Brose stated that there appeared to be some feeling that a non-student should be the representative the students choose and stated that they should be trusted to elect a non-student.

Moved by D. H. Sullivan, seconded by T. H. Brose

"to delete the words "or a member of faculty" from the motion proposed by R. J. Baker"

AMENDMENT LOST

The Chairman then asked for a vote on the motion by R. J. Baker,

"that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Student Representative. This Student Representative would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students registered in courses at the time of the election, and for a term of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia"

CARRIED

G. L. Bursill-Hall abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded in the minutes.

The questions of which students would be eligible to vote and the best time for holding the election of the student representative to Senate were discussed and it was agreed that students registered for twelve semester hours or more were eligible to vote and that the election be held in the spring semester (1967): The elected representative to take his seat at the February Senate meeting.

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
P.R.C.  
27

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B. Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

R. J. Baker stated that he considered this would be a desirable step now as there is a great deal of concern about various groups being represented.

C. D. Nelson stated that he did not consider three years too long to deny representation by students on Senate. He reported that one of the members of the student government intends to take only a small number of courses, so that he can devote himself to student government. He stated that this was a criticism on the number of things that have to be done and considered it would take three years to sort them out and come to some sort of pattern for the trimester system. He considered that a representative elected by students to Senate was a good way to start and that such representation would give the students a great deal of help.

T. H. Brose stated that there appeared to be some feeling that a non-student should be the representative the students choose and stated that they should be trusted to elect a non-student.

Moved by D. H. Sullivan, seconded by T. H. Brose

"to delete the words "or a member of faculty" from the motion proposed by R. J. Baker"

AMENDMENT LOST

The Chairman then asked for a vote on the motion by R. J. Baker,

"that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Student Representative. This Student Representative would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students registered in courses at the time of the election, and for a term of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia"

CARRIED

G. L. Bursill-Hall abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded in the minutes.

The questions of which students would be eligible to vote and the best time for holding the election of the student representative to Senate were discussed and it was agreed that students registered for twelve semester hours or more were eligible to vote and that the election be held in the spring semester (1967): The elected representative to take his seat at the February Senate meeting.

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.  
27

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B. Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

R. J. Baker stated that he considered this would be a desirable step now as there is a great deal of concern about various groups being represented.

C. D. Nelson stated that he did not consider three years too long to deny representation by students on Senate. He reported that one of the members of the student government intends to take only a small number of courses, so that he can devote himself to student government. He stated that this was a criticism on the number of things that have to be done and considered it would take three years to sort them out and come to some sort of pattern for the trimester system. He considered that a representative elected by students to Senate was a good way to start and that such representation would give the students a great deal of help.

T. H. Brose stated that there appeared to be some feeling that a non-student should be the representative the students choose and stated that they should be trusted to elect a non-student.

Moved by D. H. Sullivan, seconded by T. H. Brose

"to delete the words "or a member of faculty" from the motion proposed by R. J. Baker"

AMENDMENT LOST

The Chairman then asked for a vote on the motion by R. J. Baker,

"that Senate add a member elected by the students, and that such a member be called a Student Representative. This Student Representative would not be a student or a member of faculty. He would be elected by bona fide students registered in courses at the time of the election, and for a term of three years; he should be a resident of British Columbia"

CARRIED

G. L. Bursill-Hall abstained from voting and requested that this be recorded in the minutes.

The questions of which students would be eligible to vote and the best time for holding the election of the student representative to Senate were discussed and it was agreed that students registered for twelve semester hours or more were eligible to vote and that the election be held in the spring semester (1967): The elected representative to take his seat at the February Senate meeting.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

"that Senate authorize the seat and designate it as the seat of the representative of the students and permit the students to elect someone in October as their representative on Senate"

The Chairman ruled that this would be an alternative to the first motion, since the motion included not only the position of a Rector now, but moved to broaden the concept later.

R. J. Baker then amended his motion to state

"that Senate add a member elected by the students"

This would leave the title for the decision of the students. He stated he would not agree to a student representative.

T. H. Bottomore stated that the proposal that Senate should elect a non-student seemed difficult. He pointed out that the appointment would be for three years and that this was a long time to delay student representation by the students. He recommended that the matter be deferred until there was a more complete student body and the representation could be open.

G. Bursill-Hall requested clarification on the motion: whether it was on the position of a Rector who was a non-student or a Rector who might be a student representative.

The Chairman stated that the motion was in three parts:

1. The proposal as set out in the paper presented by R.J. Baker,
2. amended to read instead of "Rector", "the representative member of Senate elected by the students", and
3. in due course when a full spectrum of students is in attendance at the University, the whole question of limitations will be examined.

D. H. Sullivan stated that by the terms of the Act the term of appointment was three years. This would mean that a freshman or sophomore would be the only student eligible. Therefore he was against the motion. He also objected to the fact that members of faculty were excluded, stating that what the students would want would probably be a representative from the faculty.

E. S. Lett asked why it was urgent to consider this question at this time and asked if there would be any loss in deferring the discussion until there was a full complement of students.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

"that Senate authorize the seat and designate it as the seat of the representative of the students and permit the students to elect someone in October as their representative on Senate"

The Chairman ruled that this would be an alternative to the first motion, since the motion included not only the position of a Rector now, but moved to broaden the concept later.

R. J. Baker then amended his motion to state

"that Senate add a member elected by the students"

This would leave the title for the decision of the students. He stated he would not agree to a student representative.

T. H. Bottomore stated that the proposal that Senate should elect a non-student seemed difficult. He pointed out that the appointment would be for three years and that this was a long time to delay student representation by the students. He recommended that the matter be deferred until there was a more complete student body and the representation could be open.

G. Bursill-Hall requested clarification on the motion: whether it was on the position of a Rector who was a non-student or a Rector who might be a student representative.

The Chairman stated that the motion was in three parts:

1. The proposal as set out in the paper presented by R.J. Baker,
2. amended to read instead of "Rector", "the representative member of Senate elected by the students", and
3. in due course when a full spectrum of students is in attendance at the University, the whole question of limitations will be examined.

D. H. Sullivan stated that by the terms of the Act the term of appointment was three years. This would mean that a freshman or sophomore would be the only student eligible. Therefore he was against the motion. He also objected to the fact that members of faculty were excluded, stating that what the students would want would probably be a representative from the faculty.

E. S. Lett asked why it was urgent to consider this question at this time and asked if there would be any loss in deferring the discussion until there was a full complement of students.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3B Student Representation on Senate (cont'd)

"that Senate authorize the seat and designate it as the seat of the representative of the students and permit the students to elect someone in October as their representative on Senate"

The Chairman ruled that this would be an alternative to the first motion, since the motion included not only the position of a Rector now, but moved to broaden the concept later.

R. J. Baker then amended his motion to state

"that Senate add a member elected by the students"

This would leave the title for the decision of the students. He stated he would not agree to a student representative.

T. H. Bottomore stated that the proposal that Senate should elect a non-student seemed difficult. He pointed out that the appointment would be for three years and that this was a long time to delay student representation by the students. He recommended that the matter be deferred until there was a more complete student body and the representation could be open.

G. Bursill-Hall requested clarification on the motion: whether it was on the position of a Rector who was a non-student or a Rector who might be a student representative.

The Chairman stated that the motion was in three parts:

1. The proposal as set out in the paper presented by R.J. Baker,
2. amended to read instead of "Rector", "the representative member of Senate elected by the students", and
3. in due course when a full spectrum of students is in attendance at the University, the whole question of limitations will be examined.

D. H. Sullivan stated that by the terms of the Act the term of appointment was three years. This would mean that a freshman or sophomore would be the only student eligible. Therefore he was against the motion. He also objected to the fact that members of faculty were excluded, stating that what the students would want would probably be a representative from the faculty.

E. S. Lett asked why it was urgent to consider this question at this time and asked if there would be any loss in deferring the discussion until there was a full complement of students.

SM 4/3/68

Appendix  
Page  
25

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings (cont'd)

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by W. M. Hamilton

"that the Information Officer be invited to attend Senate meetings at the discretion of the Chairman"

CARRIED

During the discussion it was pointed out that copies of Senate minutes were available for perusal by faculty in the Library and in the office of the Registrar.

Moved by T. H. Brose, seconded by R. J. Baker

"that copies of Senate minutes be made available in faculty department offices."

CARRIED

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Papers presented by R. Baker and T. Brose (attached)

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3B. Student Representation on Senate

" R. J. Baker commented on his paper, stating that ultimately he would agree with the suggestion presented in the paper submitted by T. H. Brose, but felt this should evolve slowly: and that student representation should commence by having the students elect a non-student.

G. Bursill-Hall stated that he was in favor of the proposal outlined in the paper by R. J. Baker, but would not at this time support any motion that resulted in a student becoming a member of Senate.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by C. D. Nelson

"that the proposal by R. J. Baker on Student Representation on Senate be adopted as the first step towards student representation"

T. H. Brose stated that he felt the idea of a student representative was good, but did not share the hesitancy of other members to allow the students to participate in their university. He then proposed an amendment to the motion made by R. J. Baker,

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
P.D.C.

25

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings (cont'd)

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by W. M. Hamilton

"that the Information Officer be invited to attend Senate meetings at the discretion of the Chairman"

CARRIED

During the discussion it was pointed out that copies of Senate minutes were available for perusal by faculty in the Library and in the office of the Registrar.

Moved by T. H. Brose, seconded by R. J. Baker

"that copies of Senate minutes be made available in faculty department offices."

CARRIED

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Papers presented by R. Baker and T. Brose (attached)

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3B. Student Representation on Senate

" R. J. Baker commented on his paper, stating that ultimately he would agree with the suggestion presented in the paper submitted by T. H. Brose, but felt this should evolve slowly: and that student representation should commence by having the students elect a non-student.

G. Bursill-Hall stated that he was in favor of the proposal outlined in the paper by R. J. Baker, but would not at this time support any motion that resulted in a student becoming a member of Senate.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by C. D. Nelson

"that the proposal by R. J. Baker on Student Representation on Senate be adopted as the first step towards student representation"

T. H. Brose stated that he felt the idea of a student representative was good, but did not share the hesitancy of other members to allow the students to participate in their university. He then proposed an amendment to the motion made by R. J. Baker,

SM 4/3/68

*Openers  
Proc.*

25

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes (cont'd)

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings (cont'd)

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by W. M. Hamilton

"that the Information Officer be invited to attend Senate meetings at the discretion of the Chairman"

CARRIED

During the discussion it was pointed out that copies of Senate minutes were available for perusal by faculty in the Library and in the office of the Registrar.

Moved by T. H. Brose, seconded by R. J. Baker

"that copies of Senate minutes be made available in faculty department offices."

CARRIED

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

Papers presented by R. Baker and T. Brose (attached)

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3B. Student Representation on Senate

" R. J. Baker commented on his paper, stating that ultimately he would agree with the suggestion presented in the paper submitted by T. H. Brose, but felt this should evolve slowly: and that student representation should commence by having the students elect a non-student.

G. Bursill-Hall stated that he was in favor of the proposal outlined in the paper by R. J. Baker, but would not at this time support any motion that resulted in a student becoming a member of Senate.

Moved by R. J. Baker, seconded by C. D. Nelson

"that the proposal by R. J. Baker on Student Representation on Senate be adopted as the first step towards student representation"

T. H. Brose stated that he felt the idea of a student representative was good, but did not share the hesitancy of other members to allow the students to participate in their university. He then proposed an amendment to the motion made by R. J. Baker,

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Parc.

24

HISTORY OF DISCUSSION IN SENATE

REGARDING

OPENNESS AND STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
prepared by The Registrar

NOVEMBER 29, 1965 - Senate Minutes

" Dr. Ellis advised that there were several members of faculty waiting outside wanting to know if the Senate would permit spectators. A brief discussion followed in which the members generally expressed their reluctance to permit the admission of spectators at this time.

It was moved by Mr. Frederickson and seconded by Dr. Rieckhoff:

That visitors be excluded from Senate at this time and that the matter be reconsidered after Senate has been in existence for some time.

Dr. Maud had been asked by his colleagues to support their visiting the meeting and was therefore opposed to the motion. Mr. Bawtree then requested that a specific date be set for re-opening the issue. Dr. Shrum recommended that the matter should be postponed until Senate is more fully constituted.

An amendment was moved by Dr. Bursill-Hall and seconded by Mr. Bawtree:

That the matter be reviewed when Senate is more fully constituted.

CARRIED

The amended motion then carried.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings:

Moved by D.H. Sullivan, seconded by T.H. Brose

"that meeting of Senate be open to any member of the University community who provides sufficient reason; the President to decide upon which such requests should be granted"

MOTION LOST

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.

24

HISTORY OF DISCUSSION IN SENATE

REGARDING

OPENNESS AND STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
prepared by The Registrar

NOVEMBER 29, 1965 - Senate Minutes

" Dr. Ellis advised that there were several members of faculty waiting outside wanting to know if the Senate would permit spectators. A brief discussion followed in which the members generally expressed their reluctance to permit the admission of spectators at this time.

It was moved by Mr. Frederickson and seconded by Dr. Rieckhoff:

That visitors be excluded from Senate at this time and that the matter be reconsidered after Senate has been in existence for some time.

Dr. Maud had been asked by his colleagues to support their visiting the meeting and was therefore opposed to the motion. Mr. Bawtree then requested that a specific date be set for re-opening the issue. Dr. Shrum recommended that the matter should be postponed until Senate is more fully constituted.

An amendment was moved by Dr. Bursill-Hall and seconded by Mr. Bawtree:

That the matter be reviewed when Senate is more fully constituted.

CARRIED

The amended motion then carried.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings:

Moved by D.H. Sullivan, seconded by T.H. Brose

"that meeting of Senate be open to any member of the University community who provides sufficient reason: the President to decide upon which such requests should be granted"

MOTION LOST

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.

24

HISTORY OF DISCUSSION IN SENATE

REGARDING

OPENNESS AND STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
prepared by The Registrar

NOVEMBER 29, 1965 - Senate Minutes

" Dr. Ellis advised that there were several members of faculty waiting outside wanting to know if the Senate would permit spectators. A brief discussion followed in which the members generally expressed their reluctance to permit the admission of spectators at this time.

It was moved by Mr. Frederickson and seconded by Dr. Rieckhoff:

That visitors be excluded from Senate at this time and that the matter be reconsidered after Senate has been in existence for some time.

Dr. Maud had been asked by his colleagues to support their visiting the meeting and was therefore opposed to the motion. Mr. Bawtree then requested that a specific date be set for re-opening the issue. Dr. Shrum recommended that the matter should be postponed until Senate is more fully constituted.

An amendment was moved by Dr. Bursill-Hall and seconded by Mr. Bawtree:

That the matter be reviewed when Senate is more fully constituted.

CARRIED

The amended motion then carried.

AUGUST 29, 1966 - Senate Minutes

3D. Observers at Senate Meetings:

Moved by D.H. Sullivan, seconded by T.H. Brose

"that meeting of Senate be open to any member of the University community who provides sufficient reason: the President to decide upon which such requests should be granted"

MOTION LOST

SM 4/3/68

Appendix  
Sec.

23

What about the in-between ground? What does the committee think of two? The Committee will accept the suggestion that it leave the number to Senate, but recommend that one would be better than none.

Leave the number up to Senate, and go to what kind of student it should be. Would it be a student in good standing who to maintain his place on the Senate must remain a student in good standing.

Yes, a student of the age of 19 in good standing at the time of election. Is a student in good standing any student registered at the University? Students may elect a student who is not on the campus at that time. He may be a student on a semester off.

Does that mean with the one person, if he took a semester off would the students be without representation?

If a Faculty member takes research time off he notifies Senate and they appoint a substitute.

If a student was working in the area he could maintain his representation to Senate.

The Committee has done the task it has been charged with. The next meeting of Senate is January 9 and the Senate then goes through the Graduate and Undergraduate Calendars. This item will be on the agenda but it is doubtful if Senate will have time to get to it, because the calendars must get out. This item deserves a special meeting with nothing else being discussed. Senate will probably call a special meeting to discuss these recommendations sometime later in January.

Could the students be present at the meeting when the recommendations are discussed?

It could be arranged.

The Chairman will attempt to write the history, the arguments pro and con, re-write the minutes and recommendations and send the whole report to Senate. As soon as the Chairman has rewritten this he should get the Committee together again.

Next meeting to be notified.

Mr. Don Murray  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

D.P. Robertson Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SM 4/3/68

Approved  
DCC

23

What about the in-between ground? What does the committee think of two? The Committee will accept the suggestion that it leave the number to Senate, but recommend that one would be better than none.

Leave the number up to Senate, and go to what kind of student it should be. Would it be a student in good standing who to maintain his place on the Senate must remain a student in good standing.

Yes, a student of the age of 19 in good standing at the time of election. Is a student in good standing any student registered at the University? Students may elect a student who is not on the campus at that time. He may be a student on a semester off.

Does that mean with the one person, if he took a semester off would the students be without representation?

If a Faculty member takes research time off he notifies Senate and they appoint a substitute.

If a student was working in the area he could maintain his representation to Senate.

The Committee has done the task it has been charged with. The next meeting of Senate is January 9 and the Senate then goes through the Graduate and Undergraduate Calendars. This item will be on the agenda but it is doubtful if Senate will have time to get to it, because the calendars must get out. This item deserves a special meeting with nothing else being discussed. Senate will probably call a special meeting to discuss these recommendations sometime later in January.

Could the students be present at the meeting when the recommendations are discussed?

It could be arranged.

The Chairman will attempt to write the history, the arguments pro and con, re-write the minutes and recommendations and send the whole report to Senate. As soon as the Chairman has rewritten this he should get the Committee together again.

Next meeting to be notified.

Mr. Don Murray  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

D.P. Robertson Chairman

DATE:

SM 4/3/68

Approved  
doc.

23

What about the in-between ground? What does the committee think of two? The Committee will accept the suggestion that it leave the number to Senate, but recommend that one would be better than none. Leave the number up to Senate, and go to what kind of student it should be. Would it be a student in good standing who to maintain his place on the Senate must remain a student in good standing. Yes, a student of the age of 19 in good standing at the time of election. Is a student in good standing any student registered at the University? Students may elect a student who is not on the campus at that time. He may be a student on a semester off. Does that mean with the one person, if he took a semester off would the students be without representation? If a Faculty member takes research time off he notifies Senate and they appoint a substitute. If a student was working in the area he could maintain his representation to Senate.

The Committee has done the task it has been charged with. The next meeting of Senate is January 9 and the Senate then goes through the Graduate and Undergraduate Calendars. This item will be on the agenda but it is doubtful if Senate will have time to get to it, because the calendars must get out. This item deserves a special meeting with nothing else being discussed. Senate will probably call a special meeting to discuss these recommendations sometime later in January. Could the students be present at the meeting when the recommendations are discussed? It could be arranged.

The Chairman will attempt to write the history, the arguments pro and con, re-write the minutes and recommendations and send the whole report to Senate. As soon as the Chairman has rewritten this he should get the Committee together again.

Next meeting to be notified.

Mr. Don Murray  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

D.P. Robertson Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

It would be nicer to have more than one student member. If a student is elected to Senate could he stand up for himself and the students without support? Faculty do not need other Faculty members to prop them up. Why three to hold the argument up? The discussion started with a representative, one, and now all of a sudden it has to be three because one cannot be loud enough.

Three would hardly be a voting block, because Senate will elect an equal number of Faculty. It is realistic to have one person confidently voice the opinions of the whole student body.

Two or three students can give you a more unbiased voice of student representation on Senate.

Why not wait one year for the second and two years for the third? The students may, at certain times, present a voting block but never a power block. It is a sensible experiment to have three people but just one is asking a lot of newly elected student.

What benefit would it be to Senate to have one, two or three? Would it be beneficial to have more than one?

Could it not be put this way? The students are strongly, universally of the opinion that the student representation should be three.

Should it be left up to Senate to decide? Certainly. Senate will decide ultimately anyway.

One student representative for the time being would be sufficient, it is a renovation of the constitution of Senate and if put on that basis it would probably be more likely to succeed. Three would give the students more security, because of having three there, but some members have the suspicion that Senate would not go for three students immediately.

Is the disagreement based on what it is thought Senate will go along with or what would be more beneficial to Senate.

It is experimental for the time being so it cannot be said with certainty that three would be better than one.

There is nothing lost with letting a thing like this evolve gradually.

In Senate the student representative will not be there primarily as a spokesman for students but as a member of Senate.

Senate should be urged to try it with one, then two, then three.

If the students get two or three, Faculty will get the same and Senate will end up with 30 to 35 members. Senate meetings run quite long enough now. The first recommendation regarding openness should not be forgotten. If the Committee recommends a gallery and three students, some members may think things are getting too cluttered.

It is not known if one, two or three will work better. Why should we start with three? We do not have to rush. Senate has run along closed for many years and now we are saying that Senate will need to be open and have three students to be effective!

Could it not be agreed to only having one student representative? The only point is that some feel that three students would be more effective than one and the argument against three is a dislike of increasing the size of the Senate.

Maybe at this stage the Senate would be wise to admit students to committees who were not Senators.

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Prac -

22

It would be nicer to have more than one student member. If a student is elected to Senate could he stand up for himself and the students without support? Faculty do not need other Faculty members to prop them up. Why three to hold the argument up? The discussion started with a representative, one, and now all of a sudden it has to be three because one cannot be loud enough.

Three would hardly be a voting block, because Senate will elect an equal number of Faculty. It is realistic to have one person confidently voice the opinions of the whole student body.

Two or three students can give you a more unbiased voice of student representation on Senate.

Why not wait one year for the second and two years for the third? The students may, at certain times, present a voting block but never a power block. It is a sensible experiment to have three people but just one is asking a lot of newly elected student.

What benefit would it be to Senate to have one, two or three? Would it be beneficial to have more than one?

Could it not be put this way? The students are strongly, universally of the opinion that the student representation should be three.

Should it be left up to Senate to decide? Certainly. Senate will decide ultimately anyway.

One student representative for the time being would be sufficient, it is a renovation of the constitution of Senate and if put on that basis it would probably be more likely to succeed. Three would give the students more security, because of having three there, but some members have the suspicion that Senate would not go for three students immediately.

Is the disagreement based on what it is thought Senate will go along with or what would be more beneficial to Senate.

It is experimental for the time being so it cannot be said with certainty that three would be better than one.

There is nothing lost with letting a thing like this evolve gradually.

In Senate the student representative will not be there primarily as a spokesman for students but as a member of Senate.

Senate should be urged to try it with one, then two, then three.

If the students get two or three, Faculty will get the same and Senate will end up with 30 to 35 members. Senate meetings run quite long enough now. The first recommendation regarding openness should not be forgotten: If the Committee recommends a gallery and three students, some members may think things are getting too cluttered.

It is not known if one, two or three will work better. Why should we start with three? We do not have to rush. Senate has run along closed for many years and now we are saying that Senate will need to be open and have three students to be effective!

Could it not be agreed to only having one student representative? The only point is that some feel that three students would be more effective than one and the argument against three is a dislike of increasing the size of the Senate.

Maybe at this stage the Senate would be wise to admit students to committees who were not Senators.

SM 4/3/68

Openness  
Price -

22

It would be nicer to have more than one student member. If a student is elected to Senate could he stand up for himself and the students without support? Faculty do not need other Faculty members to prop them up. Why three to hold the argument up? The discussion started with a representative, one, and now all of a sudden it has to be three because one cannot be loud enough.

Three would hardly be a voting block, because Senate will elect an equal number of Faculty. It is realistic to have one person confidently voice the opinions of the whole student body.

Two or three students can give you a more unbiased voice of student representation on Senate.

Why not wait one year for the second and two years for the third? The students may, at certain times, present a voting block but never a power block. It is a sensible experiment to have three people but just one is asking a lot of newly elected student.

What benefit would it be to Senate to have one, two or three? Would it be beneficial to have more than one?

Could it not be put this way? The students are strongly, universally of the opinion that the student representation should be three.

Should it be left up to Senate to decide? Certainly. Senate will decide ultimately anyway.

One student representative for the time being would be sufficient, it is a renovation of the constitution of Senate and if put on that basis it would probably be more likely to succeed. Three would give the students more security, because of having three there, but some members have the suspicion that Senate would not go for three students immediately.

Is the disagreement based on what it is thought Senate will go along with or what would be more beneficial to Senate.

It is experimental for the time being so it cannot be said with certainty that three would be better than one.

There is nothing lost with letting a thing like this evolve gradually.

In Senate the student representative will not be there primarily as a spokesman for students but as a member of Senate.

Senate should be urged to try it with one, then two, then three.

If the students get two or three, Faculty will get the same and Senate will end up with 30 to 35 members. Senate meetings run quite long enough now. The first recommendation regarding openness should not be forgotten. If the Committee recommends a gallery and three students, some members may think things are getting too cluttered.

It is not known if one, two or three will work better. Why should we start with three? We do not have to rush. Senate has run along closed for many years and now we are saying that Senate will need to be open and have three students to be effective!

Could it not be agreed to only having one student representative? The only point is that some feel that three students would be more effective than one and the argument against three is a dislike of increasing the size of the Senate.

Maybe at this stage the Senate would be wise to admit students to committees who were not Senators.

By talking about restrictions there is an underlying assumption of an irresponsible electorate. If you are going to take a chance on an irresponsible electorate you must make realistic limitations. The age limit is a realistic limitation.

There could be an irresponsible electorate and therefore restrictions are required. Residence could possibly be interpreted to mean 30 semester hours accumulated Simon Fraser credit. The person who has been in attendance at a university for one year.

A lot of graduate students who come here may have a tremendous amount of experience in university affairs and an active interest in university business. A graduate student only needs five or ten semester hours. Perhaps the stipulation we require is that they have been in attendance at some university.

It was suggested that stipulation should be made for nineteen years of age and over. Agreed.

Now what about the question of university experience.

If students want to elect someone without university experience they should be allowed to do so. Senate should not stipulate this. Senate should have only one concern - that he is a student when elected and continues to follow his studies. This is assuming that he is a student and would continue to be a student for the three year term. If this committee decides to stipulate that it is a student.

Why has 'Rector' been rejected?

On the basis that it might be a person who was not aware of the problems of students today and might not have been in contact with university life for a good number of years.

Would there be violent objections if representation was limited to students at Simon Fraser University completely? This would be the most acceptable representation for students to have on Senate. You have to have someone from inside the community.

General discussion followed on the effect of student representation in respect to the increase in numbers on the Senate. Section 1 of the Act was cited (for each student representative on the Senate, Faculty would have a representative. Three student representatives would mean three Faculty representatives, increase to Senate would be six).

The Committee should talk about the numbers of representatives? A very useful suggestion. It will be very difficult to get Senate to go beyond one representative at this time. However, pending its experience for one year, Senate might add another member and possibly after another year, another one, and the one representative could grow to three.

Will three students cause more trouble than one? If you try for one you might get it, for three you might have three times the difficulty in getting it.

SM 4/3/68

Agendas  
etc. 21

By talking about restrictions there is an underlying assumption of an irresponsible electorate. If you are going to take a chance on an irresponsible electorate you must make realistic limitations. The age limit is a realistic limitation.

There could be an irresponsible electorate and therefore restrictions are required. Residence could possibly be interpreted to mean 30 semester hours accumulated Simon Fraser credit. The person who has been in attendance at a university for one year.

A lot of graduate students who come here may have a tremendous amount of experience in university affairs and an active interest in university business. A graduate student only needs five or ten semester hours. Perhaps the stipulation we require is that they have been in attendance at some university.

It was suggested that stipulation should be made for nineteen years of age and over. Agreed.

Now what about the question of university experience.

If students want to elect someone without university experience they should be allowed to do so. Senate should not stipulate this. Senate should have only one concern - that he is a student when elected and continues to follow his studies. This is assuming that he is a student and would continue to be a student for the three year term. If this committee decides to stipulate that it is a student.

Why has 'Rector' been rejected?

On the basis that it might be a person who was not aware of the problems of students today and might not have been in contact with university life for a good number of years.

Would there be violent objections if representation was limited to students at Simon Fraser University completely? This would be the most acceptable representation for students to have on Senate. You have to have someone from inside the community.

General discussion followed on the effect of student representation in respect to the increase in numbers on the Senate. Section 1 of the Act was cited (for each student representative on the Senate, Faculty would have a representative. Three student representatives would mean three Faculty representatives, increase to Senate would be six).

The Committee should talk about the numbers of representatives? A very useful suggestion. It will be very difficult to get Senate to go beyond one representative at this time. However, pending its experience for one year, Senate might add another member and possibly after another year, another one, and the one representative could grow to three.

Will three students cause more trouble than one? If you try for one you might get it, for three you might have three times the difficulty in getting it.

By talking about restrictions there is an underlying assumption of an irresponsible electorate. If you are going to take a chance on an irresponsible electorate you must make realistic limitations. The age limit is a realistic limitation.

There could be an irresponsible electorate and therefore restrictions are required. Residence could possibly be interpreted to mean 30 semester hours accumulated Simon Fraser credit. The person who has been in attendance at a university for one year.

A lot of graduate students who come here may have a tremendous amount of experience in university affairs and an active interest in university business. A graduate student only needs five or ten semester hours. Perhaps the stipulation we require is that they have been in attendance at some university.

It was suggested that stipulation should be made for nineteen years of age and over. Agreed.

Now what about the question of university experience.

If students want to elect someone without university experience they should be allowed to do so. Senate should not stipulate this. Senate should have only one concern - that he is a student when elected and continues to follow his studies. This is assuming that he is a student and would continue to be a student for the three year term. If this committee decides to stipulate that it is a student.

Why has 'Rector' been rejected?

On the basis that it might be a person who was not aware of the problems of students today and might not have been in contact with university life for a good number of years.

Would there be violent objections if representation was limited to students at Simon Fraser University completely? This would be the most acceptable representation for students to have on Senate. You have to have someone from inside the community.

General discussion followed on the effect of student representation in respect to the increase in numbers on the Senate. Section 1 of the Act was cited (for each student representative on the Senate, Faculty would have a representative. Three student representatives would mean three Faculty representatives, increase to Senate would be six).

The Committee should talk about the numbers of representatives? A very useful suggestion. It will be very difficult to get Senate to go beyond one representative at this time. However, pending its experience for one year, Senate might add another member and possibly after another year, another one, and the one representative could grow to three.

Will three students cause more trouble than one? If you try for one you might get it, for three you might have three times the difficulty in getting it.

SM 4/3/68

Opposition  
to  
age

You could have sixteen-year-olds elected. Collective wisdom is not a good guarantee. To trust to the electorate is not always best. There are democratic restrictions about people who can and cannot be elected.

The person who has been exposed has had a better opportunity to develop a mature judgment. If the students want to elect a non-student this is fine. If they want a student this is fine. The lowest possible age is the voting age. Senate should have a person that is an adult.

The standard of debate and thinking in the Senate is a high one. A student who is not nineteen would unlikely qualify in that respect. Even the students would want a limitation of this nature so that they may have the views of the student body presented to the Senate. This would not come from a student who has been here for the first semester, from high school.

Although not in disagreement with nineteen years of age the view was expressed that this person should be in attendance for a certain amount of time. You have to gain a certain knowledge of the university to get involved in the Senate. A two semester limit is quite reasonable.

At least one of the Faculty members elected in the fall has only been here for one semester.

There is quite a difference. Although a Faculty member may only have been here for one semester, at least he has been around universities for a considerable time and has the experience, even though he is a new member of Faculty. He has six or seven years under his belt.

It was suggested that for the candidate's nomination to be valid he should have been here for at least one semester.

Is it decided that the representative must be a student.

Opposition was expressed to a non-member of the University community. If he is a student he should have been in attendance for one semester. If he is a Faculty member no restrictions could be placed. Surely the majority would not want to see anyone from outside the University representing the students.

If the students wanted to elect someone from outside the University, why should anyone step in their way. It seems that there are people already who have been here for more than two semesters who do not know what is going on. People who take interest can learn very quickly and learn as they go along. What guarantee is it giving anybody by placing a residence restriction on the candidate?

There are two points of view here. If you do want to insist on some sort of residence requirement you run into a lot of additional troubles. Is a resident 10, 12 or 15 semester hours? Must he have passed all his courses? Is an age limit required? Some second year students do not know what is going on at the University. What is going to happen when these people start voting for candidates?

SA 4/3/68

Open  
P-100

You could have sixteen-year-olds elected. Collective wisdom is not a good guarantee. To trust to the electorate is not always best. There are democratic restrictions about people who can and cannot be elected.

The person who has been exposed has had a better opportunity to develop a mature judgment. If the students want to elect a non-student this is fine. If they want a student this is fine. The lowest possible age is the voting age. Senate should have a person that is an adult.

The standard of debate and thinking in the Senate is a high one. A student who is not nineteen would unlikely qualify in that respect. Even the students would want a limitation of this nature so that they may have the views of the student body presented to the Senate. This would not come from a student who has been here for the first semester, from high school.

Although not in disagreement with nineteen years of age the view was expressed that this person should be in attendance for a certain amount of time. You have to gain a certain knowledge of the university to get involved in the Senate. A two semester limit is quite reasonable.

At least one of the Faculty members elected in the fall has only been here for one semester.

There is quite a difference. Although a Faculty member may only have been here for one semester, at least he has been around universities for a considerable time and has the experience, even though he is a new member of Faculty. He has six or seven years under his belt.

It was suggested that for the candidate's nomination to be valid he should have been here for at least one semester.

Is it decided that the representative must be a student.

Opposition was expressed to a non-member of the University community. If he is a student he should have been in attendance for one semester. If he is a Faculty member no restrictions could be placed. Surely the majority would not want to see anyone from outside the University representing the students.

If the students wanted to elect someone from outside the University, why should anyone step in their way. It seems that there are people already who have been here for more than two semesters who do not know what is going on. People who take interest can learn very quickly and learn as they go along. What guarantee is it giving anybody by placing a residence restriction on the candidate?

There are two points of view here. If you do want to insist on some sort of residence requirement you run into a lot of additional troubles. Is a resident 10, 12 or 15 semester hours? Must he have passed all his courses? Is an age limit required? Some second year students do not know what is going on at the University. What is going to happen when these people start voting for candidates?

SM 4/3/68

Opposition  
P.C.C.

You could have sixteen-year-olds elected. Collective wisdom is not a good guarantee. To trust to the electorate is not always best. There are democratic restrictions about people who can and cannot be elected.

The person who has been exposed has had a better opportunity to develop a mature judgment. If the students want to elect a non-student this is fine. If they want a student this is fine. The lowest possible age is the voting age. Senate should have a person that is an adult.

The standard of debate and thinking in the Senate is a high one. A student who is not nineteen would unlikely qualify in that respect. Even the students would want a limitation of this nature so that they may have the views of the student body presented to the Senate. This would not come from a student who has been here for the first semester, from high school.

Although not in disagreement with nineteen years of age the view was expressed that this person should be in attendance for a certain amount of time. You have to gain a certain knowledge of the university to get involved in the Senate. A two semester limit is quite reasonable.

At least one of the Faculty members elected in the fall has only been here for one semester.

There is quite a difference. Although a Faculty member may only have been here for one semester, at least he has been around universities for a considerable time and has the experience, even though he is a new member of Faculty. He has six or seven years under his belt.

It was suggested that for the candidate's nomination to be valid he should have been here for at least one semester.

Is it decided that the representative must be a student.

Opposition was expressed to a non-member of the University community. If he is a student he should have been in attendance for one semester. If he is a Faculty member no restrictions could be placed. Surely the majority would not want to see anyone from outside the University representing the students.

If the students wanted to elect someone from outside the University, why should anyone step in their way. It seems that there are people already who have been here for more than two semesters who do not know what is going on. People who take interest can learn very quickly and learn as they go along. What guarantee is it giving anybody by placing a residence restriction on the candidate?

There are two points of view here. If you do want to insist on some sort of residence requirement you run into a lot of additional troubles. Is a resident 10, 12 or 15 semester hours? Must he have passed all his courses? Is an age limit required? Some second year students do not know what is going on at the University. What is going to happen when these people start voting for candidates?

SAT. 4/3/69

Openness  
Proc.

MINUTES OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
ON SENATE AND OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS  
FRIDAY DECEMBER 9 1966

PRESENT:

Senate Committee

D.P. Robertson - Chairman  
A.E. Branca  
T.H. Brose  
K.E. Rieckhoff

Student Committee

J. Mynott  
R. Watt  
W. Engleson

Minutes of previous meeting and history of this topic in Senate Meetings to date were distributed to the members.

It was suggested that the Committee discuss the form of student representation which is where it left off last week. Just before the last meeting ended it was decided to state that anybody is eligible to be elected by the students. Is it wished to put more details in the recommendations, or leave it at that? Does the Committee think there should be any limitations?

It is expected that Senate will want certain guarantees or considerations. It is doubted very much if the Senate would accept a sixteen-year-old kid just out of school for three months as a fit member. Just what form the restrictions could take and still leave it free is a difficult question. In a short discussion after our last meeting with other members of this committee the possibility was discussed of saying that the candidates should be voting age, assuming that if they are considered old enough for voting they will be responsible representatives.

What is the voting age? Nineteen years old.

This would exclude most of the first and second year students.

Some doubt was expressed about setting a definite age. Some preference was expressed for experience gained at Simon Fraser say, in attendance for two years. If an age was set, Senate could get someone who was here for the first time and still be a good Senate member.

Would this not come out in the election?

Another point is, some of the Senate members and Faculty members have not been here that long and yet seem to have made responsible Senate members.

SM. 4/3/68

Openness  
Proc.

MINUTES OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
ON SENATE AND OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS  
FRIDAY DECEMBER 9 1966

PRESENT:

Senate Committee

D.P. Robertson - Chairman  
A.E. Branca  
T.H. Erose  
K.E. Ricckhoff

Student Committee

J. Mynott  
R. Watt  
W. Engleson

Minutes of previous meeting and history of this topic in Senate Meetings to date were distributed to the members.

It was suggested that the Committee discuss the form of student representation which is where it left off last week. Just before the last meeting ended it was decided to state that anybody is eligible to be elected by the students. Is it wished to put more details in the recommendations, or leave it at that? Does the Committee think there should be any limitations?

It is expected that Senate will want certain guarantees or considerations. It is doubted very much if the Senate would accept a sixteen-year-old kid just out of school for three months as a fit member. Just what form the restrictions could take and still leave it free is a difficult question. In a short discussion after our last meeting with other members of this committee the possibility was discussed of saying that the candidates should be voting age, assuming that if they are considered old enough for voting they will be responsible representatives.

What is the voting age? Nineteen years old.

This would exclude most of the first and second year students.

Some doubt was expressed about setting a definite age. Some preference was expressed for experience gained at Simon Fraser say, in attendance for two years. If an age was set, Senate could get someone who was here for the first time and still be a good Senate member.

Would this not come out in the election?

Another point is, some of the Senate members and Faculty members have not been here that long and yet seem to have made responsible Senate members.

SMT. 4/3/69

Openness  
Proc.

MINUTES OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
ON SENATE AND OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS  
FRIDAY DECEMBER 9 1966

PRESENT:

Senate Committee

D.P. Robertson - Chairman  
A.E. Branca  
T.H. Erose  
K.E. Rieckhoff

Student Committee

J. Mynott  
R. Watt  
W. Engleson

Minutes of previous meeting and history of this topic in Senate Meetings to date were distributed to the members.

It was suggested that the Committee discuss the form of student representation which is where it left off last week. Just before the last meeting ended it was decided to state that anybody is eligible to be elected by the students. Is it wished to put more details in the recommendations, or leave it at that? Does the Committee think there should be any limitations?

It is expected that Senate will want certain guarantees or considerations. It is doubted very much if the Senate would accept a sixteen-year-old kid just out of school for three months as a fit member. Just what form the restrictions could take and still leave it free is a difficult question. In a short discussion after our last meeting with other members of this committee the possibility was discussed of saying that the candidates should be voting age, assuming that if they are considered old enough for voting they will be responsible representatives.

What is the voting age? Nineteen years old.

This would exclude most of the first and second year students.

Some doubt was expressed about setting a definite age. Some preference was expressed for experience gained at Simon Fraser say, in attendance for two years. If an age was set, Senate could get someone who was here for the first time and still be a good Senate member.

Would this not come out in the election?

Another point is, some of the Senate members and Faculty members have not been here that long and yet seem to have made responsible Senate members.

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate Page  
Opponents*

b) Respect

- remove the suspicion that student "voice" is merely a device to keep the mob quiet rather than a way of enriching Senate by respecting legitimate student concern.

AGAINST

a) Inexperience

- a chance students may elect a green youth who would be completely ineffective

b) Time

- Senate activities take up a lot of time - a student should not be expected to devote this much time to non-studies.

c) Confidentiality

- Students should not be present when other students' affairs are discussed.

S. M. 4/3/68

Senate  
Opinions

b) Respect

- remove the suspicion that student "voice" is merely a device to keep the mob quiet rather than a way of enriching Senate by respecting legitimate student concern.

AGAINST

a) Inexperience

- a chance students may elect a green youth who would be completely ineffective

b) Time

- Senate activities take up a lot of time - a student should not be expected to devote this much time to non-studies.

c) Confidentiality

- Students should not be present when other students' affairs are discussed.

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate Page  
Opinions*

b) Respect

- remove the suspicion that student "voice" is merely a device to keep the mob quiet rather than a way of enriching Senate by respecting legitimate student concern.

AGAINST

a) Inexperience

- a chance students may elect a green youth who would be completely ineffective

b) Time

- Senate activities take up a lot of time - a student should not be expected to devote this much time to non-studies.

c) Confidentiality

- Students should not be present when other students' affairs are discussed.

ARGUMENTS1. OPENNESSFOR

- a) Community - remove the feeling of secrecy, even stealth, and thereby bring closer the various elements of the academic community.
- b) Communication - allow those who are interested in such things freedom to observe and thereby gain firsthand knowledge rather than rumours.
- c) Ideas - allow all elements of the University to participate to some extent and thereby widen the net to catch ideas and opinions before decisions are made.

AGAINST

- a) Tradition - Senate meetings at Canadian Universities have always been closed.
- b) Inhibition - the presence of a gallery would inhibit the present frankness in debate due to the fear of misinterpretation of words and attitude by the casual observer.
- c) Exhibition - there might be a tendency to 'play to the gallery' and espouse short-term popular causes at the expense of long-term benefits to the University.
- d) Confidentiality - items such as some discipline cases should not be decided in public.

2. DIRECT STUDENT REPRESENTATION (COMPARED TO A NON-STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE)FOR

- a) Effectiveness - more likely to result in a representative who knows and understands today's University students. A student representative would usually be on campus and more accessible to other students.

S.M. 4/13/68

Jan 3,  
Apparatus

ARGUMENTS

1. OPENNESS

FOR

- a) Community
  - remove the feeling of secrecy, even stealth, and thereby bring closer the various elements of the academic community.
- b) Communication
  - allow those who are interested in such things freedom to observe and thereby gain firsthand knowledge rather than rumours.
- c) Ideas
  - allow all elements of the University to participate to some extent and thereby widen the net to catch ideas and opinions before decisions are made.

AGAINST

- a) Tradition
  - Senate meetings at Canadian Universities have always been closed.
- b) Inhibition
  - the presence of a gallery would inhibit the present frankness in debate due to the fear of misinterpretation of words and attitude by the casual observer.
- c) Exhibition
  - there might be a tendency to 'play to the gallery' and espouse short-term popular causes at the expense of long-term benefits to the University.
- d) Confidentiality
  - items such as some discipline cases should not be decided in public.

2. DIRECT STUDENT REPRESENTATION (COMPARED TO A NON-STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE)

FOR

- a) Effectiveness
  - more likely to result in a representative who knows and understands today's University students. A student representative would usually be on campus and more accessible to other students.

S.M. 4/13/68

for  
Openness

## ARGUMENTS

### 1. OPENNESS

#### FOR

- a) Community
  - remove the feeling of secrecy, even stealth, and thereby bring closer the various elements of the academic community.
- b) Communication
  - allow those who are interested in such things freedom to observe and thereby gain firsthand knowledge rather than rumours.
- c) Ideas
  - allow all elements of the University to participate to some extent and thereby widen the net to catch ideas and opinions before decisions are made.

#### AGAINST

- a) Tradition
  - Senate meetings at Canadian Universities have always been closed.
- b) Inhibition
  - the presence of a gallery would inhibit the present frankness in debate due to the fear of misinterpretation of words and attitude by the casual observer.
- c) Exhibition
  - there might be a tendency to 'play to the gallery' and espouse short-term popular causes at the expense of long-term benefits to the University.
- d) Confidentiality
  - items such as some discipline cases should not be decided in public.

### 2. DIRECT STUDENT REPRESENTATION (COMPARED TO A NON-STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE)

#### FOR

- a) Effectiveness
  - more likely to result in a representative who knows and understands today's University students. A student representative would usually be on campus and more accessible to other students.

S.M. 4/3/68

Senate 2  
A.p.c. 1

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Openness

"that Senate open its meetings to observers subject to the following conditions:

- a) that observers be limited to Simon Fraser University students, faculty and staff only
- b) that the number of observers be controlled
- c) that observers be made aware of the necessity for proper demeanor
- d) that one student reporter for The Peak be named by the Editor as the official "Senate" reporter
- e) that motions to conduct any Senate meeting or part of a meeting "in camera" be carried on a simple majority vote
- f) that the University community be made aware that Senate may revoke the privilege of attending Senate meetings as an observer to any or all individuals."

2. Student Representation

"that Senate establish seats for members elected by and from the student body as follows:

- a) one member to be elected immediately\*
- b) One additional member to be elected one year from now
- c) One further member to be elected a year after the second

subject to the following conditions:

- a) to be eligible for nomination a student must be 19 years of age or more
- b) to be eligible for nomination and to retain his seat the member must be a student in good standing as defined by the Senate.

(\*Note: the Committee draws Senate's attention to the fact that the three students who met with it were unanimously opposed to the staggered introduction of the three student representatives, preferring to elect three immediately.)

RECOMMENDATIONS1. Openness

"that Senate open its meetings to observers subject to the following conditions:

- a) that observers be limited to Simon Fraser University students, faculty and staff only
- b) that the number of observers be controlled
- c) that observers be made aware of the necessity for proper demeanor
- d) that one student reporter for The Peak be named by the Editor as the official "Senate" reporter
- e) that motions to conduct any Senate meeting or part of a meeting "in camera" be carried on a simple majority vote
- f) that the University community be made aware that Senate may revoke the privilege of attending Senate meetings as an observer to any or all individuals."

2. Student Representation

"that Senate establish seats for members elected by and from the student body as follows:

- a) one member to be elected immediately\*
- b) One additional member to be elected one year from now
- c) One further member to be elected a year after the second

subject to the following conditions:

- a) to be eligible for nomination a student must be 19 years of age or more
- b) to be eligible for nomination and to retain his seat the member must be a student in good standing as defined by the Senate.

(\*Note: the Committee draws Senate's attention to the fact that the three students who met with it were unanimously opposed to the staggered introduction of the three student representatives, preferring to elect three immediately. )

S.M. 4/3/68

Senate 2  
April

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. Openness

"that Senate open its meetings to observers subject to the following conditions:

- a) that observers be limited to Simon Fraser University students, faculty and staff only
- b) that the number of observers be controlled
- c) that observers be made aware of the necessity for proper demeanor
- d) that one student reporter for The Peak be named by the Editor as the official "Senate" reporter
- e) that motions to conduct any Senate meeting or part of a meeting "in camera" be carried on a simple majority vote
- f) that the University community be made aware that Senate may revoke the privilege of attending Senate meetings as an observer to any or all individuals."

### 2. Student Representation

"that Senate establish seats for members elected by and from the student body as follows:

- a) one member to be elected immediately\*
- b) One additional member to be elected one year from now
- c) One further member to be elected a year after the second

subject to the following conditions:

- a) to be eligible for nomination a student must be 19 years of age or more
- b) to be eligible for nomination and to retain his seat the member must be a student in good standing as defined by the Senate.

(\*Note: the Committee draws Senate's attention to the fact that the three students who met with it were unanimously opposed to the staggered introduction of the three student representatives, preferring to elect three immediately.)

S.M. 4/3/68

*Revised for  
Experiments*

### Introduction

The Senate Committee to Study Student Representation and the Openness of Senate Meetings was established at the Senate Meeting of November 7, 1966. The members were named by the President a few days later.

At the request of the Secretary of Senate the President of the Student Society named three students to meet with the Committee. The Committee met on a number of occasions, always with the students present, and wishes to go on record expressing deep gratitude to the students: John Mynott, Rob Watts, and Bill Egleson, for their candor, charm, and goodwill throughout the discussions.

The Committee decided to present, as well as its recommendations and arguments, the minutes of its meetings. In spite of two different recording secretaries, cursory editing, and the resultant disjointedness of these minutes, the Committee feels they do give the flavour of the discussion which might be missed if only the bare bones were presented.

Respectfully submitted

A.E. Branca  
T.H. Brose  
K. Reickhoff  
D.P. Robertson - Chairman

S.M. 4/3/68

*Senate, 1968  
Openness*

### Introduction

The Senate Committee to Study Student Representation and the Openness of Senate Meetings was established at the Senate Meeting of November 7, 1966. The members were named by the President a few days later.

At the request of the Secretary of Senate the President of the Student Society named three students to meet with the Committee. The Committee met on a number of occasions, always with the students present, and wishes to go on record expressing deep gratitude to the students: John Mynott, Rob Watts, and Bill Egleson, for their candor, charm, and goodwill throughout the discussions.

The Committee decided to present, as well as its recommendations and arguments, the minutes of its meetings. In spite of two different recording secretaries, cursory editing, and the resultant disjointedness of these minutes, the Committee feels they do give the flavour of the discussion which might be missed if only the bare bones were presented.

Respectfully submitted

A.E. Branca  
T.H. Brose  
K. Reickhoff  
D.P. Robertson - Chairman

S. M. 4/3/68

*Branca, Brose  
Reickhoff  
Robertson*

### Introduction

The Senate Committee to Study Student Representation and the Openness of Senate Meetings was established at the Senate Meeting of November 7, 1966. The members were named by the President a few days later.

At the request of the Secretary of Senate the President of the Student Society named three students to meet with the Committee. The Committee met on a number of occasions, always with the students present, and wishes to go on record expressing deep gratitude to the students: John Mynott, Rob Watts, and Bill Egleson, for their candor, charm, and goodwill throughout the discussions.

The Committee decided to present, as well as its recommendations and arguments, the minutes of its meetings. In spite of two different recording secretaries, cursory editing, and the resultant disjointedness of these minutes, the Committee feels they do give the flavour of the discussion which might be missed if only the bare bones were presented.

Respectfully submitted

A.E. Branca  
T.H. Brose  
K. Reickhoff  
D.P. Robertson - Chairman

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I	1
II	2
III	3
IV	5
V	24

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I	1
II	2
III	3
IV	5
V	24

S.M. 4/3/68

*Senate Page  
Opinions*

CONTENTS

		<u>PAGE</u>
I	Introduction	1
II	Recommendations	2
III	Summary of Arguments	3
IV	Minutes of Committee Meetings	5
V	History of Senate Discussion	24

S. M. 4/3/68

Free procedure  
Operation of Senate  
5

REPORT  
of  
SENATE COMMITTEE  
to study  
STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
and  
OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS.

JANUARY 1967

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S. M. 4/3/68

*Free procedure  
Openness of Senate*

REPORT  
of  
SENATE COMMITTEE  
to study  
STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
and  
OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS.

JANUARY 1967

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.M. 11/3/68

*Free procedure  
openness of the Senate*

REPORT  
of  
SENATE COMMITTEE  
to study  
STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
and  
OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS.

JANUARY 1967

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

S.M. 4/3/68

Revised Procedure  
Openness of Senate

MINUTES OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
ON SENATE AND OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS  
MONDAY NOVEMBER 28, 1966

PRESENT:

Senate Committee

D.P. Robertson - Chairman  
A.E. Branca  
T.H. Brose  
K.E. Ricckhoff

Student Committee

J. Mynott  
R. Watt  
W. Engleson

The Chairman briefly outlined the events leading to the formation of the Committee.

It was stated that Senate would be interested in knowing why students want representation: that perhaps the best approach would be to find out 1) how students felt they should be represented, 2) what do they feel they could contribute, 3) what would justify opening the Senate meetings.

It was stated that the Student Society was most concerned with the openness of Senate meetings and suggested this question be discussed first. It was further stated that the students were not interested in representation by a "Rector".

It was pointed out that the use of the term "Rector" was wrong and that Senate did not use it.

It was stated that the issue for all students on the committee was openness of meetings and that although the Executive Council of the Student Society may not represent the students it does have open meetings. To the present time students had not heard any arguments why Senate meetings could not be open.

It was stated that there were various reasons why opening the meetings might be desirable: one reason was a matter of attitude so that it was clear that nothing was being put over on anyone, and to alleviate suspicion.

If another reason was communication, the speaker questioned whether open Senate meetings were the best means of accomplishing this, as there are many other avenues open. He was not clear on the purpose of having anyone listening.

It was stated that openness of this sort was part of the recent Anglo Saxon political tradition. The move has been to open public bodies to make as much information as possible available to the people and make people at ease with these bodies. The University is a public body and in terms of the University community it involves all of us. We should expect decisions to be made openly. Suspicion comes from the unknown. Listening and seeing how government performs is not so strange. What is strange is that universities never before have tried open meetings.

S.M. 4/3/68 *Green, Treasurer  
Oppress of people*

It was conceded that the Parliamentary argument may be good from a psychological point of view but in fact although the parliament of Canada is open the real work is done in parliamentary committees and in the corridors

It was mentioned that right now Senate was closed even to faculty, except those who were members, that if there were open Senate meetings and greater awareness of just who Senators are there would be more non Senate people in the community who could participate in the corridor discussions.

It was stated that the person who wanted to inform himself could do so. It was then stated that many members of Senate are only names on a paper. There are quite a number of faculty members who are bitter over the exclusion of their presence to watch Senate. At the first Senate meeting some of them came to the door requesting entrance.

It was stated that from the students' point of view there are not many avenues open to students.

It was asked if anyone was prepared to give reasons for having closed meetings - in practice and principle.

It was stated that it was tradition and while we could break tradition there should be a good reason. Students likened Senate to a legislature, which is not a true analogy. The actions of Senate are completely circumscribed by the Act. In government members are elected by the public. Openness is there in Senate in the sense that minutes are available for study by all and the speaker could not understand why the matter of how the debate progresses should be a matter of interest. There are some matters of privacy and members may not want the reasons for their arguments made public. He saw two things of importance to students - the curriculum and discipline - and asked what else was of interest to students. He then suggested that the committee go through the Act section by section.

It was asked why Senate honored student representation in the first place. Presumably it was to report back to students. The speaker asked what the distinction was between having a representative of the sort Senate agreed upon and having students present at meetings. The reply was that students want direct representation not third party representation. The speaker thought Senate would be disposed to give students direct representation so that one or more students could be free to present the student point of view.

It was stated that some of the reasons for keeping the meetings closed were that the presence of spectators might affect Senators' candidness that other University Senate meetings were closed, and that there were personal matters discussed which should not be discussed in public.

The discussions which took place in Senate on the establishment of a grading system were mentioned. It was stated that the speaker personally might use strong language to another Senator to support his point of view. This could indicate to an observer a deep rift between the two of them and could create a damaging impression of the University community, which was completely false. If the meetings were open it would be necessary for the Senators to restrain themselves and the debate would be less useful.

S.M. 4/3/68 *Grace P. Hartman*  
*University of California*

It was further stated that the man who argues strongly desires that his argument have some privacy - that such an argument could give an impression not desired by the speaker if reported publicly out of context.

It was said that to students Senate seemed a rubber stamp body; that all students know is the final decision and none of the debate and this gives the impression of rubber stamping. Students and other members of the University have the right to know the issue and to do some 'politicing'.

It was stated that it was just this that Senate wished to avoid. Senate wanted to make a decision for the benefit of the University and not for the ephemeral popularity of the motion.

The likeness of Senate to the executive of a company was felt to be unfortunate, but it was felt that this would not change until the government of the University changed. The product of a university is vitally interested in what is going on.

Section 54 of the Act was referred to, article by article. Section 54 reads "It is the duty of the Senate and it has power

54(a) to regulate the conduct of its meetings and proceedings, including the determining of the quorum necessary for the transaction of business and the election of its members to the Board of Governors

The opinion was expressed that aside from the question of appointment this (representation on the Board) could not be anything a student could be interested in. The speaker could see no reason why any student should be on the Board. It was stated that a lot of the proceedings of the Board would not be of interest to students just as they may not be to many members of Senate but that some would be interested in knowing what items were on the agenda.

54(b) to provide for the government, management, and carrying-out of curriculum, instruction, and education offered by the University

The students expressed interest in this and it was stated that surely the question of curriculum was the responsibility of faculty - that students do not dictate on questions of curriculum. It was stated that faculty are charged with this responsibility because they are specialists. The question was asked: "What can a student tell a Dean about what should be studies?" In reply it was stated that students would not dictate but could contribute considerably to the discussion. Perhaps the student point of view could be educational to Senate members because many of them had been away from formal education for many years and did not appreciate new ideas. It was pointed out that the curriculum is not created at Senate and that it was at the point of creation that student opinion might be most useful. The feed-back from the students regarding curriculum is straight to faculty, faculty puts it together, and it goes to Senate for approval and co-ordination with other faculties. Student interest comes in vitally at the commencement stage. It was agreed that this was where the communication with students did take place but that there was a point in the Senate where suggestions from the students should

Openness of Senate  
S. M. 4/13/68 General Procedure

be considered. Such things as how many hours in a course or how many courses in a semester could be questions of vital concern to students.

It was suggested that this matter of interest was something to clarify. It was necessary to decide whether students should not only be interested in decisions but should be permitted to influence decisions. There was no doubt about the interest.

It was stated that if meetings were open there would generally only be a few students present. The students were asked if those watching would wish to go and see Senators and whether students should have the power to influence a decision. The reply was that if a student did so it would be unlikely that he would be influencing the Senator without a very good argument. The idea of influencing by pressure lobbying was highly unlikely. The only way students could influence decisions was by bringing up a point of view that had not occurred to faculty. For instance, the question of work load of the individual student - it would be easy for a member of Senate to evaluate what any student said about his own work load. On the question of work load it was asked how openness of meetings and direct representation solved this. The reply was that the curriculum goes before Senate and if this appeared on the agenda and if the meetings were open, students would go around to as many Senators as possible and present their own point of view.

It was stated that communication was so good at the lower level that it was not needed at a higher level and this was disagreed with. It was then stated that there were clear-cut channels now existing, that they were very well known and very much considered by Senate and faculty. It was not possible to do nearly as much to change things at Senate as it was at the early stages.

It was stated that one of the possibilities was that some of the distance between Senate and students would disappear, but that basically the previous statement was correct. It was possible to talk to most faculty members and it was unlikely that openness of Senate would create any magical change in decision making. It was one more avenue of communication.

It was stated that the two benefits derived would be the constructive suggestions from students and the question of the change in attitudes, which is not very tangible. It was stated that Senate should have the power to revoke the openness of meetings at any time, but that the question of open meetings in principle would be a tremendous step to a change in attitude.

It was stated that each department makes up its own curriculum but that there were sometimes changes to make to work one faculty in with another. It was pointed out that the Senate, in 54 b) acts as a permissive body: it does not dictate a course, it approves a course requested by a department through a faculty. Most of the curriculum is decided in faculty and students are free to talk to faculty.

S.M. 4/3/68 *Openness of Senate  
Senate Procedure*

The meaning of "instruction" in 54 b) was queried. This was felt to be the way in which the curriculum was carried on and the way in which it was imparted to the students: for instance lectures, labs, or tutorials.

54(c) to determine all questions relating to the academic and other qualifications required of applicants for admission as students to the University or to any Faculty, and to determine in which Faculty the students pursuing each course of study shall register

On the question of admissions it was asked if students coming from other Universities and Colleges might have something to offer on the question of credit. It was pointed out that Senate decided the calendar requirements and the Senate Committee on Admissions tells the Registrar what to accept. It was asked whether students could be of any value to the Senate Committee on these decisions. It was pointed out that students can always go to the Registrar if they feel there has been an injustice. It was further pointed out that section 63 f) outlined the means by which students could submit grievances to the faculties. It was asked how openness of meetings would help 54 c). The reply was that students should have a voice even in the Senate Admissions Committee.

54(e) to provide for and to grant degrees, including honorary degrees, diplomas and certificates of proficiency, except in theology.

It was agreed that students could offer no assistance on this question.

54(f) to approve the establishment or discontinuance by the Board of any Faculty, department, course of instruction, chair, fellowship, scholarship, exhibition, bursary or prize

It was stated that if students were anxious for a new branch of study and the department was not particularly interested this could be an area where faculty and students might make suggestions to Senate. It was asked how openness of meetings would contribute to this. It was then asked what reasons would exist for not having meetings open to discuss items such as this, except the point of using strong language and arguments. It was pointed out that the onus was not on Senate, but on the students, to argue the reasons why meetings should be open. It was suggested that the question might be taken from the other point of view but that was saying "let's open Senate because what harm will it do" which is not a very impressive argument with which to combat tradition. We must present what good it would do.

54(g) to award fellowships, scholarships, exhibitions, bursaries, and prizes

It was stated that the criteria on bursaries is something students could contribute to.

54(h) from time to time to determine which members of the teaching and administrative staffs shall be members of each Faculty

It was stated students felt that if teaching assistants were considered members of the faculty it would make a great change in the University climate. It was stated that a discussion of this could be vital to students. It was then suggested that the agenda be made available sometime before the meeting so that teaching assistants who saw their status would be discussed could attend and if they asked someone to present their opinion they would want to be present at the meeting to see that their opinion had been put forward.

It was stated that if you feel you have looked at the arguments and then watch the debate, and hear the arguments which you did not even think of, it could demonstrate the weakness of your arguments and give you another point of view. You could be convinced under these conditions of the decision being the right one, where you might not be if you had not been present. It was stated that while this might be true, students might not be experienced enough to weight the other side of the argument. It was pointed out that people tend to avoid controversy in an open meeting and the bigger the forum the greater this effect may be. The criteria for choosing Senators was queried and it was stated that if the students chose representatives they would choose the most outspoken. It was pointed out that it should be remembered that this was a scholarly community not a forum for professional orators.

The question of press was mentioned and it was stated that in talking about openess the meeting was also talking about admitting reporters.

54(i) to make rules and regulations for the management and conduct of the library

It was stated that this was of vital interest to every member of the community, that it was one of the most important and a positive reason for students being present. Students have definite suggestions. It was stated that there was machinery to deal with this: that there was a Senate Committee on the Library which would be willing to talk to any student.

It was stated that the major arguments for not having the Senate meetings open appeared to be that it is too high a body and that students can go to committees. This means Senate is a rubber stamp: it does not indicate that Senate may or may not accept recommendations. If this is the case there is no real reason for Senate at all. Because there are decision

making bodies below Senate does not eliminate the good to be derived from openness of Senate meetings. It is still Senate that makes the ultimate decision..

The Chairman pointed out that there were Senate committees because Senate could not handle the mass of detail. The question of why there was any difference in student representation on Senate committee and student representation on Senate itself was asked. It was then stated that tradition was a very powerful factor. It was agreed that there would be some positive value gained from student participation in the question of library affairs, under 54 i).

54(j) to provide for the preparation and publication of a calendar

It was stated that the calendar was a fine example of where students are required: that it was difficult to see how grade XII students could be expected to understand the calendar and the rules and regulations: the speaker had worked with the University of British Columbia calendar and had found it difficult to understand the Simon Fraser calendar.

It was stated that this question of a calendar which could be readily understood by all levels of intelligence and sophistication was constantly being worked on and it was stated that there could be constructive suggestions from students, although it was queried that this should be done at Senate level.

The students did not know what Senate does on the calendar and it was stated that Senate gave general direction and it was suggested that for the topics just mentioned the Registrar was the most useful person to see.

54(k) to make such recommendations to the Board as may be deemed proper for promoting the interests of the University or for carrying out the objects and provisions of this Act

It was stated that students could be very interested in items arising here.

54(l) to deal with all matters reported by the Faculties, as affecting their respective Faculties, and to consider and take action upon all such matters as shall be reported to the Board

It was agreed that there was no apparent need for students to be involved in this question, although the article was too vague to allow definitive discussion.

54(m) to exercise disciplinary jurisdiction with respect to students in attendance at the University by way of appeal from any decision of the Faculty Council

It was pointed out that Senate had to approve recommendations of any discipline committee and of Faculty Council and that since Senate sometimes upsets the ruling of Faculty Council, student attendance on this item might be useful. It was then stated that rules are laid down by Senate and have the force of law.

It was asked if the students desired a court and the answer was no. It was stated that if Senate has the ultimate power of decision on regulations then in matters of decision on regulations the students should be permitted to see the regulation which will govern their behavior being made.

54(n) to make or alter any University rule or regulation, providing the rule or regulation so made or altered is consistent with the provisions of this Act and with the laws of the Province

It was noted that m) and n) were close together.

54(o) to enter, subject to the approval of the Board, into agreements with any corporation or society in the Province which has power to prescribe examinations for admission to the corporation or society for the purpose of conducting examinations and reporting results; and every such corporation or society has power to enter into such agreements; and to make regulations as to the conduct and financing of such examinations and examinations conducted by the Senate by virtue of any other Statute of the Province, and the publication of their results. No part of the cost of such examinations shall be a charge upon or be paid out of University funds

It was agreed that there was little of interest to students here, nor was there much scope for their counsel to be helpful to Senate on this item.

54(p) to fix the terms of affiliation with other universities, colleges, or other institutions of learning and to modify or terminate such affiliation

It was stated that students who are concerned with the university might well have something to say about this. There was another statement to the effect that it could be left to Senate itself, that the speaker could see no way that student observers at Senate could contribute to this topic.

S.M. 4/3/68

*Openness of Senate  
Practice of Procedures*

The Chairman in summation stated that what had been decided was that the one argument that is most important is that there would be a better climate of opinion if Senate did not conduct meetings in secret - we would have a more open society.

It was stated that the discussion had centred more on direct representation than on openness. It was then stated that the most effective way to get effective participation would be openness. It was pointed out that if a committee were set up a student could know why and could go to committee members and contribute. As far as the Library Committee is concerned, the fact that students knew who members were and when it was going to meet could be useful so that the Committee could receive briefs from any member of the community, and suggestions could go on to Senate. This would broaden the whole process in a very helpful way.

It was agreed to call another meeting of the committee the following Thursday, December 1st, from 8.30 to 10.30. The Chairman suggested that anyone who wanted to prepare a paper submit it for discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12.35 p.m.

Miss Ruth Broderick  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

D.P. Robertson - Chairman

DATE:

S.M. 11/3/68

*Opening of Senate  
Procedure*

MINUTES OF SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY STUDENT REPRESENTATION  
ON SENATE AND OPENNESS OF SENATE MEETINGS  
THURSDAY DECEMBER 1, 1966

PRESENT:

Senate Committee

D.P. Robertson - Chairman  
A.E. Branca  
T.H. Erose  
K.E. Rieckhoff

Student Committee

J. Mynott  
R. Watt  
W. Engleson

It was said that all discussion so far had revolved around openness of meetings, which is of prime concern. In going through the various sections and duties of the Senate as is mentioned in the transcription, there are very few areas in which students have no concern at all. There are some areas where they have a mild concern, there are some areas where they have definite interest and can present valuable suggestions.

It was suggested that the meeting look at the matter of 'opening' Senate. If Senate was 'opened' what about Faculty Meetings, Curriculum Committees and all the other subsidiary committees? Is there any need for closed meetings by any group except on those occasions that we have talked about and where there is definite agreement. Committees at some time or other bring a summary or recommendation to the Senate and therefore most of the academic business of the University does come before the Senate. It may be desirable by some to have every kind of meeting open and desirable by some to have these meetings remain closed. It would seem that if you at least allowed Senate to be 'opened' the final decision would be open to view by the Faculty and the students.

Tradition is that in closed meetings Senators can present strong arguments in a strong manner when they see fit and observers are denied admission because of the rumours that might spread from these meetings being open. This may be the only reason this tradition originated.

University of British Columbia students are asking for election for a sufficient number of students to have enough students to put on each committee. As many students on the Senate as there are committees operating. It is understood that there are matters which would require closed meetings and on these grounds the 'openness' would be rejected. In matters of this kind the public would be asked to leave and the meeting would proceed in camera. In camera meetings would apply to all members of the Senate. If the representatives would not abide by the commitments implied by an in camera meeting they would be asked to leave.

3. M. 4/13/68 *Openness of Senate*  
*Space Available*

A lot of reference is being made to Senate's similarity to Parliament. No reference has been made to Cabinet meetings which are not 'open' and never reported to the public. Concern was expressed about 'opening' meetings. You cannot keep out the press. The press is not known as a responsible body. In a situation where the press reports out of context it can do the University a lot of damage - we have suffered from the Press before, and have no reason to trust its judgment.

A view was expressed that there are some differences in what Senate is, in terms of analogies, if one looks at the Act and at the traditional rules of Senates in Universities. The Senate does come out to be more or less a representative body. Some people from the public, some from the Government, some from the Faculties, appear on the Senate and it is enjoined to be the governing body of the University. To call Senate a Cabinet of sorts seems to be an elevation of the types of things that Senate considers and an elevation of the things that go on at a university to a political level that is warranted.

With regard to the Press, a watch is possible. All members of the University Committee have Library Cards and it is possible to limit the attendance to the community of the University. We have an Information Officer and if there are misrepresentations made this can be countered. There is a need for some consideration by this group of the concern of the public as to university affairs which has recently developed in Canada. Previously university education was for the select few of the community and today education in university, as in high school, is considered part of the right of the public.

This faces the university with a very different situation. It has a public which is more diversified in interests. Representation on Senates of this nature was much different in the 20's and 30's. Even now though, there is much more cross-representation in most organizations in Canada today than on our Senate and our Board of Governors. This new attitude to higher education changes the rules for bodies of this kind and some adjustment for these changes has to be made.

Except for the consideration of press and publicity and the ability of Senate members to express themselves without concern of misrepresentation, there are definite advantages to having open Senate meetings. Some do not agree with the argument of tradition. This matter of inhibiting candor is the practical thing that is to be considered and the meeting must consider what things might be done to overcome this disadvantage and if it cannot be overcome what can be done as an alternative.

There is a limited number of spectator seats available and for any meeting people can make application. If this privilege is given it is on the express understanding that the matters discussed are University business and no discussion should be held outside the University and certainly that nothing is to be reported to the newspapers or news media.

It could be a very good idea to have an understanding that the gallery does not have freedom to come and go as it pleases. Press could be held down because of the space available. Student newspaper coverage of a Senate meeting should not be detrimental in any way but of course this could not be guaranteed.

5.M. 4/3/68

*Openness of Senate  
Senate procedure*

How is the student newspaper organized and how is it controlled by the governing bodies of the University?

With the Student Society being incorporated within a couple of weeks the final responsibility for the newspaper will lie with the Student Society and therefore the University should not have to step in at any time to protect its legal liability. Rather than restricting the newspaper, we should instead endeavour to get the best reporters available or better still we could have the Editor appoint a permanent Senate Reporter.

The Student Society stands in the same relationship to the University as the C.B.C. to the Government. To bring it into line you could cut its funds off.

Are Student Council meetings open to the Senate? Yes, in fact the President has attended a number.

The Senate could invite one particular reporter to cover the meetings. If anyone wished to question the reporter the Senate would know whom to question about the reporting. If one person could be obtained to cover the meetings this would help. Also any reporting of direct quotes by this Senate Reporter should be checked with the member making the quote. This could be done but a quote out of context of a statement.....

Would we assume that responsible reporting is possible?

If there are to be privileges, there are to be restrictions. If there were a gallery, it would have to be a responsible gallery.

What would be involved in the mechanics of opening Senate meetings? Does it require altering in the Constitution? Under Section 54 (a) Senate has the power to regulate the conduct of its meetings and proceedings.

So far the meeting has discussed a lot of pros and cons. There does not seem to be a very definite weight on one side or the other.

What arguments would there be against having the meeting temporarily opened. The Senate would retain the right to call for 'in camera' meetings.

The Peak recently quoted the President as saying "let's try it and see". He was no doubt referring to all new ideas, opening Senate being one of them.

One of the strongest points against openness is that in an open meeting candidness would be jeopardized and mischief would be caused by mis-reporting.

Senate does have the power to accept this sort of thing on an experimental basis and one cannot say what will happen, it has never been tried.

It has been suggested that the kind of openness would be a limited type if only controlled by the physical limitation of a gallery. At the most 30 people could sit in seats around the walls of the chamber.

S.M. 4/3/68

*Openness of Senate  
Senate participation*

The Student Council room is much more useable for this purpose.

A view was expressed that the students had made out a very strong case. The speaker was inclined strongly towards the students' point of view, except to screening the public in matter the Senate thinks best and observers adopting a proper demeanour and subject to responsible reporting. If all these things are noted down to govern these matters then the committee should be in favour of open meetings. Tradition can be broken experimentally and if these privileges have been broken Senate can revoke the privileges.

Control could be exercised by having observers draw tickets from, say the Registrar's Office if they are interested in attending a particular meeting. This would perhaps be better as the responsibility of the Student Council and the Faculty Association. There would be some control on the numbers, which would be left to a later date.

It was asked if the Senate meetings are opened what about student representation?

Firstly, assume that Senate turns down the recommendation and will not have open Senate meetings. Do the Students still want representation?

If the Senate decides to keep meetings closed, it would be up to the students to decide what the next step would be. This committee should discuss representation on the assumption that Senate has accepted its recommendation for open meetings.

If matters discussed in closed meetings were matters dealing with the student body students would find it very difficult to participate as they would feel it was their responsibility to discuss quite openly in the presence of their fellow students.

What representation of the students would the Committee recommend?

There should be a resolution that whoever is elected is a member of the Senate and takes on the same responsibilities as other Senators.

There should be only one loyalty and this is to the Senate.

What kind of representation should the Committee recommend to Senate? Start with it wide open, it could be anybody.

It is agreed that Senate should have direct student representation. The students should have the right to choose who will represent them.

Reviewing the history of this issue in Senate it was revealed that it was felt that the students are not at this point in sufficient number in maturity, as far as first or second year students are concerned. At some later date the representation should be students themselves, it was thus proposed that the representation should be other than a student and also other than a Faculty member as the faculty were already well represented.

S.M. 4/3/68 *Opinions of Senate  
Senate procedure*

-20-

The suggestion was made that it would perhaps be better to try it without a student first and see how it develops.

The Committee discussed the type of student, age, etc., that should be selected as representative. It was agreed that this should be left up to the student body to select either by campaigning or selection by the Student Council. On the whole it was felt that matters of restriction should be a matter discussed at a General Student Meeting and not restricted to discussion within this committee.

Mr. Don Murray  
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

D. P. Robertson - Chairman

The minutes of the third meeting, Friday, December 9, 1966,  
concern only the matter of student representation on Senate.

FEBRUARY 6, 1967 - Senate Minutes

3A Report of the Senate Committee on Student Representation and Openness of Senate Meetings

K. E. Rieckhoff presented the Committee's report. He said that the Committee's frank discussion on the openness 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 openness 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 openness 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.

/....

S.M. 4/3/68 *Senate procedures*  
*Openness of Senate*

-22-

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...

S.M. 4/3/68 *Senate procedure  
Opinion of Senate*

-23-

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...

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate procedure  
Openness of Senate*

-24-

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...

-25-

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 crumple 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...

S.M. 4/3/68

*Senate procedures  
Openness of Senate*

-26-

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...

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate procedure  
openness of Senate*

-27-

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

SEPTEMBER 11, 1967 - Senate Minutes

3A Notice of Motion, S. Yandle: "That the question of the closed nature of Senate Meetings be re-opened" - S-19

Senate was reminded of its resolution passed in February 1967 "that Senate not be opened for one year at which time Senate consider the matter of openness of Senate". The Chairman ruled that a resolution to re-open discussion of a matter which had been tabled for a year was a procedural matter requiring a two-thirds majority, and cited Robert's Rules of Order Article 31 "...When a question has been postponed to a certain time, it becomes an order of the day for that time and cannot be taken up before that time except by a reconsideration, or by suspending the rules for that purpose, which requires a two-thirds vote.", and Articles 48 and 68.

Moved by S. Yandle, seconded by J.S. Foulds

"that the question of the closed nature of Senate meetings be re-opened"

/....

S.M. 4/3/68 *Senate procedures*  
*Openness of Senate*

-28-

S. Yandle said that the student representatives had encountered a number of difficulties in discussing Senate matters with students because of the number involved; they had been requested to report to Student Council and this reporting had been subjected to distortion. At the discussions in Senate in February 1967 it had been made clear that students in general were more interested in having open meetings than in having representatives in closed sessions.

The Chairman reminded the meeting that the question was a procedural matter of re-opening discussion on a matter which Senate had established would be re-opened in February 1968. M.A. Lebowitz challenged the ruling of the chair arguing that since the Notice of Motion had been made in advance only a majority vote was required. The challenge was put to the vote and the chairman upheld.

Senate then voted on whether the discussion of the closed nature of Senate meetings should be re-opened at this time.

In favour	12
Opposed	11

MOTION LOST

J.S. Foulds indicated he would write for The Peak on Senate matters, as an experiment in communication with students.

S.M. 4/3/68

*Senate Procedure  
Openness of Senate*

-29-

UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT IN CANADA

The Duff-Berdahl report in its discussion of the role of Senate does not touch upon the matter of open Senate meetings. At a meeting on University Government (October 1967), Professor Berdahl is quoted as saying:

"I agree with Mrs. Yandle that secrecy is bad. At San Francisco State College where I teach, meetings are open to the Press. This is a mixed advantage and disadvantage. Sometimes both faculty and students look ridiculous. I agree that Senate and Board should operate in the open as much as possible."

S.M. 4/13/68 Openness of Senate  
Senate Procedure

INTERIM REPORT OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - JANUARY 23, 1968

Student Relationships with Governing Bodies including Senate and Board of Governors had not been discussed at the time of presentation of this Report. In its general discussion of University Committees (Part 2) the following is recorded:

2L. Openness. "It was felt that it was important at Simon Fraser that wherever possible committees and bodies should hold "open" meetings. A clear definition of "open" is not yet agreed upon, however three degrees of "openness" were discussed.

- i) the procedure whereby the students and other members on various committees or bodies report regularly to the Executives of the constituent bodies that appoint them.
- ii) that meetings be open to observers on invitation
- iii) that meetings be open to anyone to attend but that those attending could also speak upon recognition of the chair. Such meetings could be reported by the Peak.

It was recognized that committees open to observers or participants should be free to go "in camera" if they deemed it necessary. It was also noted and appreciated that the President had recently said, in a letter to Student Council, that any University Committee advising him should be free to declare itself open in whatever sense it desired. As a result several committees had so declared.

S.M. 4/3/68

*General procedure  
Openness, private*

-31-

REPORT OF THE ALUMNI COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT (ALUMNI ASSOCIATION  
OF U.B.C., SEPTEMBER, 1967)

Chapter VIII. The Senate.

Page 38 Open Meetings.

"There are some occasions on which the Senate, for purposes of communication, may wish to open its meetings to the public. The Senate is best able to judge if and when this should take place."

AT OTHER UNIVERSITIES

C.U.P.                   October 17 1967. The Guelph University Senate decided  
October 67.           against open meetings. An open meeting clause was  
                          completely deleted from the report presented by the  
                          Committee on University Government. The open meeting  
                          clause lost by a considerable majority.

The Chairman of Senate is quoted

"It was felt by the Senate that quality of  
debate might deteriorate if there were open  
meetings. Open meetings might make of the  
Senate a rubber-stamping body."

TO: Members of Senate

FROM: Simon Foulds, Stanley Wong, Sharon Yandle,  
Student Representatives on Senate.

RE: OPEN SENATE MEETINGS

After consultation, the Student representatives decided to submit their own paper on senate secrecy directly to Senate rather than engage in the deliberations of the committee struck by Senate at the February meeting. Our decision to do so was based on our belief that given both the interest manifested by students in this question and its importance to them, that a separate paper prepared by students on behalf of students is appropriate. Furthermore, we consider that a matter of this nature is best discussed as freely and thoroughly as possible in Senate itself. Since the question is at the least as important (and, we think, more so) as the election of a Senate representative to the Board, we suggest that the most fruitful discussions would take place not in an appointed committee but in a Committee of the Whole, and will so move in the upcoming March meeting.

Therefore, we have chosen not to present herein a complete discussion of the case against Senate secrecy, but rather a summary of points which we would request be fully aired in Senate itself.

The first of these is the fact that students on Senate, representing 7,000 constituents, are unable to communicate to them as faculty representatives, can and do to their constituents. Our only means to do so are thus through the medium of the Peak. The institution of the regular Peak column on Senate written by us has, we feel, provided an excellent medium for the communication of opinion, but as such it is primarily an editorial outlet and cannot adequately substitute for proper objective reporting, as opening Senate meetings would allow.

Secondly, we believe that our inability to make known Senate proceedings to students directly handicaps us in our capacity as representatives. The sheer impossibility of communicating to students, many of whom, unlike the faculty, have little knowledge of the sphere of activity or workings of Senate, unnecessarily isolates us from those who elected us. This serves in large part to negate the *raison d'être* underlying the inclusion of students on Senate, which, we understand, was to allow students to make known their views and participate in the decisions affecting them. We must admit that the very fact of Senate secrecy has placed us in the position of not really knowing the views of many issues. The end result is that despite student representation, many if not most students view Senate as a body foreign to and removed from them, governing not on their behalf but over and against them.

Thirdly, the quest for open Senate meetings is by no means confined to this campus but is a point of concern, if not contention, at many, many universities across Canada among students who believe that secrecy has negated the more progressive recommendations of the Duff-Berdahl Report. Indeed, this view was echoed by Professor Berdahl himself at a national conference on university government at the University of Toronto last October. Expressing his dismay at the dissatisfaction so many students

S. M. 4/3/68

*Senate procedures  
Openness of Senate*

- 2 -

including the Canadian Union of Students, with the Report, he noted that had he and Sir James Duff realized the discrepancy between student representation and closed Senate meetings they would have included in their Report a recommendation against secrecy.

Last, but by no means least, we believe that opening Senate meetings is a necessary step toward ensuring the closer integration of all sectors of the university community. While these barriers between students and faculty and students and administration exist, we do not think it possible to create the atmosphere of co-operation and trust which all members of the university community believe to be a necessary prerequisite to the right and proper functioning of a good university.

There are, of course, other points to be raised on this question. We have not included them here, since our concern in this paper is strictly as students and student representatives, and the points herein are only those of direct concern to us as such. We hope Senate will concur with us on bringing the question in its entirety to a Committee of the Whole.

c.c. Senate Committee on open Senate meetings.

Date: February 23, 1968  
Ref. SY:kp