

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1969, FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

PRESENT:

Strand, K. T.

Chairman

Baird, D. A.
Burstein, K. R.
Campbell, M. J.
Carlson, R. L.
Cole, R. E.
Funt, B. L.
Kenward, J. K.
Kirchner, G.
Korbin, D. G.
Lachlan, A. H.
MacKinnon, A. R.
Munro, J. M.
Rogow, R.
Srivastava, L. M.
Stratton, S. T.
Sullivan, D. H.
Turnbull, A. L.
Walkley, J.
Wassermann, Mrs. S.
Webster, J. M.

Evans, H. M.

Secretary

Barboza, Miss J.

Recording Secretary

Norsworthy, Mrs. R.

Recording Secretary

ABSENT:

Caple, K. P.
Claridge, R. W.
Collins, M.
Drache, Mrs. S.
Freiman, Mrs. L.
Hamilton, W. M.
Hean, A.F.C.
Hutchinson, J. F.
Lebowitz, M. A.
McDougall, A. H.
McLean, C. H.
Perry, G. N.
Sayre, J.
Tuck, D. G.
Vidaver, W. E.

Professors J. P. Hertzog, N. J. Lincoln, G. M. Newman and J. H. Tietz, from various Departments in the Faculty of Arts, were in attendance briefly to answer questions in connection with Paper S.298. Professor J.A.P. Day was in attendance for discussion of Paper S.293 and Paper S.305b.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Chairman outlined the motions on the floor at the time Senate adjourned its meeting of December 1, 1969. He then stated that chairmen of various Departments of the Faculty of Arts were waiting to testify in support of their programs.

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by J. Walkley,

"that Item 4 b) ii) and Item 5 a) and b) on the agenda be postponed until Item 6 (Reports of Faculties) can be discussed."

Question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

2. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

Curriculum Changes: Undergraduate Courses

a). Faculty of Arts - Paper S.298

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by R. Carlson,

"that the Archaeology Studies new course proposals 101-3 and 436-3, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted."

M. Campbell enquired of the Chair as to the disposition of Paper S.272 on Priorities of New Courses, and was advised that the Academic Planner was revising the proposal and that it will be coming back to Senate in due course.

D. Sullivan stated that if Senate approves the new courses additional teaching assistants will be required, or that if faculty or assistants can not be hired, current courses would have to be dropped to accommodate the new courses. It was stated that if the Departments wished to present new courses and can do so with the resources allocated to them, they should be permitted to proceed without Senate debating the issue.

It was moved by D. Korbin, and seconded by J. Kenward that "the course, Archaeology 101-3, be sent back to the Curriculum Committee to get correct information," but the motion was withdrawn when he was assured by D. Sullivan that the statement on the course proposal in connection with additional teaching assistant requirements would be deleted from the paper, as alternatives had been identified. The Chairman noted that either additional assistants would be required, or there would be a substitution of courses.

S.M. 8/12/69

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by G. Kirchner,

"that Economics and Commerce new course proposals, Economics 101-3, Commerce 371-3 and Economics 390-3, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted by Senate."

In reply to questions by D. Korbin, Professor Hertzog stated that Commerce 371 is a study of organization and theories using multi-disciplinary perspectives and research. He stated that it is impossible to identify a specific discipline with regard to organization theory. He outlined the high qualifications of the professors available to teach the course, each being a specialist in his own field.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by R. Rogow,

"that the English Department courses 202-4, 203-4, 212-3, 467-2, 419-3, 469-2, 420-3 and 470-2, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by R. Cole,

"that History 403-5, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted."

D. Sullivan mentioned that the course is the only one which offers study of periods before 1715, and that it is an extension of the present boundaries providing a marginal area where there has been interest shown.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by G. Kirchner,

S.M. 8/12/69

"that French 152-4, 230-3, 411-4, 412-4, 430-3, 431-3 and 448-4, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted."

D. Baird reminded Professor Lincoln that the library resources in the University in the area of French-Canadian Literature were not extensive, and that undergraduate students do not have borrowing privileges at U.B.C. Professor Lincoln stated that students would be expected to purchase their books.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by M. Campbell,

"that Russian 449-3, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by R. Carlson,

"that Scandinavian 120-4, outlined in Paper S. 298, be adopted."

D. Kirchner mentioned that Modern Elementary Scandinavian suggested that a new language was proposed, to which Professor Lincoln stated that the intention was that any one of the Scandinavian languages would be taught. However, he agreed that the word "Languages" should be added after "Scandinavian" in the course title.

Question was called on the amended motion "that Scandinavian 120-4, titled 'Elementary Modern Scandinavian Languages,' outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted," and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by G. Kirchner,

"that Spanish 110-3 and 111-3, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

S.M. 8/12/69

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by G. Kirchner,

"that the Philosophy courses, comprised of
Philosophy 209-3, 208-3, 438-3, 488-2, 439-3
and 489-2, outlined in Paper S.298, be adopted."

Professor Tietz explained that it was the intention to offer the History of Philosophy courses 438 and 439 in January, 1970, with others not to be offered until at least the Summer Semester.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

L. Srivastava stated that in view of what transpired while approving the Faculty of Arts course changes he would recommend that in consideration of new courses by Senate, other than those on new programs, there should be no implied commitment that additional faculty or teaching assistant support would be available to the department proposing the new courses. He stated also that if Senate accepted this recommendation much of the arguing that goes on at Senate would be avoided. He pointed out that although Senate should be aware of the hiring of faculty and teaching assistant support, the hiring of these people is not a matter for Senate to decide. The Chairman stated that this recommendation would be noted.

b) Faculty of Education - Paper S.299 - Pass/Withdrawal Proposal

Moved by A. MacKinnon, seconded by S. Wassermann,

"that approval be given to the two category
grading system for ^{Education} 401, 402 and 405, as
presented in Paper S.299."

A very extended debate was undertaken. It was suggested that one segment of the University should not proceed with a grading system which differs with that of the University as a whole. It was pointed out by S. Wassermann that the proposal represents 18 months of detailed consideration by the students and faculty in the Professional Development Program, and A. MacKinnon, agreeing that study was needed before any consideration be given for other areas, noted the proposal was for ^{Education} 401, 402 and 405 only.

Amendment moved by J. Kenward, seconded by D. Korbin,

"that Section 1, paragraph (e) and (i) of the Implementation Procedures for Pass/Withdraw read 'The student would be assured of the right to appeal to the Department Head and two (elected) students; the Dean of the Faculty; and the Senate - in that order - if he so chooses.'"

S.M. 8/12/69

J. Kenward felt that as there is to be an appeal mechanism, students should be involved in it. However, S. Wassermann stated that the students who had originated the proposal were opposed to other than experienced professionals judging competency. A motion was made by L. Funt, seconded by D. Sullivan, "that the discussion be postponed until a paper is brought to Senate regarding the present status of appeal procedure," but this was withdrawn.

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by D. Sullivan,

"that this matter be referred back to the Faculty of Education for further clarification, to be brought forward at the next meeting of Senate."

D. Sullivan spoke at length in support of referral. He emphasized that the effect of the proposal would have wide implications in grading and appeal mechanisms throughout the University and that a number of items contained in the paper should be clarified by the Faculty of Education. S. Wassermann was opposed and L. Srivastava spoke on anticipated difficulties.

A. MacKinnon explained that the paper had been extensively examined in the Department of Professional Foundations and in the Faculty as a whole. It was added that the basic principle of the Professional Foundations program is to give students a maximum chance of success, with an opportunity to withdraw without penalty for failure.

Amendment moved by J. Munro, seconded by M. Campbell,

"that the motion be amended to add the words
'and also to the Examination and Grading
Practices Committee' after the word 'Education.'"

Question was called on the Munro/Campbell amendment to the Srivastava/Sullivan referral motion, and a vote was taken.

AMENDMENT TO REFERRAL
MOTION FAILED

6 in favor
10 opposed

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

MOTION TO REFER
FAILED

Question was called on the Kenward/Korbin amendment to paragraphs (e) and (i), of Section 1 of the Implementation Procedures for Pass/Withdraw, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT TO MAIN
MOTION FAILED

S.M. 8/12/69

Numerous questions were answered by S. Wassermann and A. MacKinnon in connection with the proposal which is applicable to portions of the Professional Development Program, ~~pp~~ ^{Education} 401, 402 and 405, only.

An amendment was suggested by D. Korbin, seconded by J. Kenward, "that paragraph (b) of Section 2 of the Implementation Procedures for Pass/Withdraw be amended to read 'The names would be submitted to a Scholarship Committee, consisting of 3 faculty members from the departments and one student elected by students in the Education Department, who would make the decisions regarding the scholarship awards,'" but the Chairman indicated that he would expect the mover and seconder to respond to questions raised in the earlier debate, and, if then appropriate, would ask for the amendment.

D. Sullivan, noting that the paper defined the proposal as a grading system, and that S. Wassermann had indicated it was not, enquired which was correct. S. Wassermann confirmed it was a grading system but that it was hoped that solution could be found to removal of the stigma of failure in a professional programme with significant emphasis on grading. Considerable debate followed.

D. Korbin expressed the opinion that the institution of a Pass/Withdrawal system presents a series of innovations in terms of scholarships and that it would be valuable for students and faculty to have a student sitting on the Committee.

Amendment was moved by D. Korbin, seconded by J. Walkley,

"that Item 2 (b) be amended to add 'one student elected by students from the Department of Professional Foundations.'"

It was then moved by K. Burstein, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that the matter be referred to the Faculty of Education and the Senate Committee on Examination and Grading Practices."

Question was called on referral, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO REFER
FAILED

Question was called on the amendment to add one student to the Scholarship Committee, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

8 in favor
9 opposed

S.M. 8/12/69

Amendment moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by R. Carlson,

"that Item c. on page 1 - 'the student is requested to withdraw because there is doubt about his competence' - be deleted, and that appropriate editorial changes be made."

Question was called on this amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

9 in favor
9 opposed

An amendment was suggested by L. Srivastava, seconded by R. Cole, "that reference to Senate in the appeals procedures be deleted," and L. Srivastava stated that inasmuch as the judgment of a student takes place during the course of the student's field work over a period of seven weeks there is no possibility that an appeal would reach Senate in time for the appeal to be helpful. D. Korbin argued that the amendment was out of order as it contravenes the context of Section 63(e) of the Universities Act. The Chair ruled the amendment out of order but indicated he would seek legal clarification on this point, and that the amendment suggested would not be considered at this point.

An amendment was moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that the wording of the Procedures, in all substantive sections pertaining to withdrawal, be amended to read that the initiating of the request to withdraw be placed on the professorial faculty and the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the Associates."

S. Wassermann explained that Associates in Education and the Associates of the Centres assess the ability of students in classrooms, that the members of faculty are not that close to the direct assessment, and decisions are made only after careful and thoughtful consideration between the Associates and faculty.

Question was called on the motion to amend substantive sections, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

8 in favor
9 opposed

Amendment was moved by J. Munro, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that Items (e) and (i) of Section 1 on the last page of Implementation Procedures for Pass/Withdraw be deleted, with editorial changes."

J. Munro explained that he had proposed the amendment because Section 63(e) of the Universities Act specifies that there is automatic appeal from decisions.

Question was called to delete Items (e) and (i) of Section 1, last page, of Paper S.299, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Question was called to adopt Paper S.299 as distributed, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

3. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

a) Paper S.297 - Senate Committee on the Interdisciplinary Program in Kinesiology - Curriculum Changes

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by A. MacKinnon

"that Kinesiology 100-3, as outlined in Paper S.297, be adopted."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

4. REPORT OF FACULTIES

Graduate Courses - Faculty of Science

a) Paper S.300 - Biological Sciences 832, 833

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by G. Kirchner

"that Biological Sciences 832-3 and 833-3, outlined in Paper S.300, be adopted."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

b) Paper S.301 - Mathematics 808-4

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by A. Lachlan,

"that Mathematics 808-4 as outlined in Paper S.301 be adopted."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by A. Lachlan,

"that Mathematics 808-4 be permitted to be offered in the Spring 1970 Semester."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

5. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

Paper S.305b - A Proposal for the Establishment of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board and the Senate Appeals Board.

The Chairman outlined the progress which had been made up to the point of adjournment of the Senate meeting of December 1, 1969, wherein the main motion on the floor, moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by D. Sullivan, was

"that Senate approve the section of Paper S.305b pertaining to the establishment of a Senate undergraduate Admissions Board, considering only the procedures and operation, deferring membership at the moment."

He said there was then an amendment proposed by D. Korbin and seconded by J. Kenward,

"that the sentence 'Decisions by the SUAB shall be final' be deleted from the first paragraph on p. 2 of Paper S.305b."

D. Korbin spoke at length in defence of his amendment to the paper, and L. Srivastava outlined reasons for the structure of the paper as presented. L. Srivastava served notice of an amendment to add to the first paragraph under Procedure on p. 2, the substance of which would be, "Before taking these cases to SUAB the Registrar's Office will inform the student that his case is being taken to SUAB and the student should provide all relevant information as well as extenuating circumstances, if any, and that the SUAB decision will be final."

S.M. 8/12/69

After considerable debate, the question was called on the Korbin/Kenward amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Amendment was moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that the first paragraph under Procedure on p. 2 be amended by adding 'Before taking these cases to SUAB, the Registrar's Office will inform the student that his or her case is being taken to SUAB, that he or she should provide all relevant information as well as extenuating circumstances, if any, and that the SUAB decisions on his or her case shall be final.'"

Argument on the procedure continued, and L. Srivastava explained that the Registrar's Office executes policy, but an error in policy can be appealed to the Appeals Board, and where there is no policy the matter must go to the Admissions Board for adjudication and a final decision. It was then moved by D. Korbin, seconded by J. Kenward, "that the amendment be amended to read 'and that decisions on policy by SUAB shall be final.'" R. Rogow stated that inasmuch as L. Srivastava's amendment was an addition of a sentence, and D. Korbin's proposal was a change in a sentence, it would be necessary to dispose of the first motion. Thereupon D. Korbin withdrew his motion.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

10 in favor
4 opposed

D. Korbin repeated his motion, which was seconded by J. Kenward, but the Chair ruled it out of order on grounds of redundancy inasmuch as the Admissions Board would be a subcommittee of Senate. The ruling was challenged by D. Korbin, seconded by J. Kenward. A vote was taken and the ruling of the chair was sustained, with 8 in favor of the ruling and 2 opposed.

Question was called on the main motion dealing with approval of Paper S.305b pertaining to establishment of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board, considering only procedures and operation, and a vote taken.

MOTION ON PROCEDURES
CARRIED

The Chairman then requested permission of the assembly for Dr. Meakin to substitute for Professor Day in presenting a summary of the discussion by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standings in connection with Paper S.305b and Paper S.293.

D. Meakin stated that the present Senate Committee endorsed Paper S.305b with three exceptions:

1. Membership of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board.
2. Membership of the Senate Appeals Board.
3. Majority required for a decision of the Appeals Board.

The Senate Committee recommended the adoption of a composition of membership similar to that of the present Committee, with six faculty members, with each Faculty to elect two members, each member to serve a two year term (staggered) and the Academic Vice-President replacing the Registrar (or his designate) as Chairman.

With reference to the Appeals Committee, the recommendation was that there be a Committee of five voting members, to include one faculty member from each Faculty and two students, and an alternate for each member.

Decisions of the Appeals Board, it was suggested, could not be final unless three members of the Committee agreed on a decision.

Moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by S. Wassermann,

"that membership of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board be as outlined in Paper S.305b, page 2, as presented by J. Sayre."

Amendment was moved by D. Korbin, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that the Academic Vice-President, Dean of Student Affairs, Director of Admissions and the Registrar all be made non-voting members."

D. Korbin stated that his motion was consistent with a motion passed by the Simon Fraser Students Council and also consistent with the general philosophy of the paper. He stated that policy should be the responsibility of faculty and students and the function of the executive is to administer that policy. Debate continued at length.

Amendment to the amendment was moved by J. Munro, seconded by A. Turnbull,

"that the Academic Vice-President be deleted from the motion outlining the non-voting members."

S.M. 8/12/69

K. Burstein argued that the last motion was contradictory to the amendment, but the Chairman ruled that it was in order. R. Carlson challenged the ruling and was seconded by K. Burstein. The ruling of the Chair was upheld by a majority vote.

A. Turnbull stated that it was necessary to form a committee with an odd number and that the Academic Vice-President, as Chairman, is the logical person to vote.

Question was called to delete the Academic Vice-President from the list of non-voting members, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT TO THE
AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment to the amendment was moved by R. Rogow, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that the Dean of Student Affairs be deleted
from the list of non-voters."

R. Rogow stated that the main reason for granting the Acting Vice-President a vote is that his is an academic appointment and he is a regular member of faculty. As the Dean of Student Affairs holds the same appointments, it is an unwise precedent to deny faculty members voting privileges.

Question was called on the amendment to the amendment to delete the Dean of Student Affairs from the list of non-voting members, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT TO THE
AMENDMENT CARRIED

8 in favor
7 opposed

Amendment to the amendment moved by L. Srivastava, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that the Director of Admissions be deleted from
the list of non-voters."

L. Srivastava said that the Director of Admissions is most deeply involved in admissions procedures and should have a vote, but J. Munro argued that the Director of Admissions and the Registrar could effectively play their roles without a vote.

S.M. 8/12/69

Question was called on the amendment to the amendment on permitting the Director of Admissions to vote, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT TO THE
AMENDMENT FAILED

8 in favor
8 opposed

Question was called on the amended motion to admit the membership of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board as outlined in Paper S.305b, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

6 in favor
7 opposed

As the membership proposed in Paper S.305b had been defeated, it was moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that the Committee consist of the Academic Vice-President, Director of Admissions (non-voting), 3 faculty members, 3 students and 1 Senator (non-voting)."

D. Sullivan contended that two members from the Registrar's Office were not necessary on the Committee, but that a Senator would provide liaison and information flow.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

3 in favor
10 opposed

Moved by R. Carlson, seconded by S. Wassermann,

"that the membership of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board be as that contained in Paper S.293."

Amendment was moved by J. Kenward, seconded by D. Korbin,

"that five students, elected from the student body, be included on this Committee."

S.M. 8/12/69

Debate ensued on the necessity for students on such a Committee and desirability of granting the Director of Admissions voting privileges. D. Sullivan suggested that a 15-man Committee would be unwieldy. S. Stratton, seconded by D. Sullivan, moved that Senate move into a Committee of the Whole, but withdrew the motion when the Chairman assured him that this would not be helpful in bringing the matter to a conclusion.

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by A. MacKinnon,

"that the previous question be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS
QUESTION CARRIED

12 in favor
5 opposed

Question was called on the amendment to add 5 students to the composition of membership contained in S.293, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

9 in favor
5 opposed

Amendment was moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by J. Webster,

"that three faculty and two students be
deleted from the membership."

Question was called on this amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

10 in favor
1 opposed

Amendment was moved by D. Korbin, seconded by J. Kenward,

"that the Dean of Student Affairs be
deleted from the membership."

Question was called on this amendment, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

7 in favor
6 opposed

S.M. 8/12/69

Moved by D. Sullivan, seconded by K. Burstein,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION ON PREVIOUS QUESTION
CARRIED

9 in favor
4 opposed

Question was called on the amended main motion substituting for the composition contained in Paper S.293 a membership consisting of the Academic Vice-President (non-voting except in case of a tie); 3 faculty members, 3 students, Director of Admissions (non-voting) and the Registrar or his designate (non-voting), and a vote taken.

AMENDED MOTION CARRIED

11 in favor
5 opposed

Moved by K. Burstein, seconded by R. Carlson,

"that the Open Session of Senate adjourn."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

4 in favor
10 opposed

The Chairman stated that he would ask Senators to vote on acceptance or rejection of the membership of the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board as comprised of the Academic Vice-President (non-voting except in the case of a tie); 3 faculty members; 3 students; Director of Admissions (non-voting); and the Registrar or his designate (non-voting).

Question was called to accept this membership, and a vote taken.

MEMBERSHIP ACCEPTED

(Note: The final question related to the numbers and types of members, but not to the other items of Paper S.293 on membership.)

Moved by L. Funt, seconded by G. Kirchner,

"that the Open Session of Senate adjourn."

S.M. 8/12/69

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

12 in favor

6. ADJOURNMENT

The Open Session of Senate adjourned at 1:15 a.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary