

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
HELD MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1973, 3172 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 7:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present:

Strand, K.

Chairman

Aronoff, S.
Banister, E. W.
Beirne, B. P.
Birch, D. R.
Burkle, E.
Copes, P.
Coté, P. T.
Daem, J. P.
D'Auria, J. M.
Dawson, A. J.
DeVoretz, D. J.
Doherty, P. M.
Eastwood, G. R.
Eliot Hurst, M. E.
Emmott, A. H.
Hollibaugh, A. L.
Jamieson, D. H.
Kissner, R. F.
Kitchen, J. M.
MacPherson, A.
Munro, J. M.
Nair, K. K.
Reid, W. D.
Rieckhoff, K. E.
Salter, J. H.
Seager, J. W.
Smith, W.A.S.
Wagner, P. L.
Wheatley, J.
Wilson, B. G.

Evans, H. M.

Secretary

Nagel, H. D.

Norsworthy, R.

Recording Secretary

Absent:

Baird, D. A.
Brown, R. C.
Caple, K. P.
Ellis, J. F.
Sadleir, R.M.F.S.
Sterling, T. D.
Sutherland, G. A.
Swangard, E. M.

In attendance:

Mugridge, I.

SEATING OF SENATOR

The Secretary announced the result of a recent student election wherein Erich Burkle, having polled the highest number of votes, had been elected to replace P. M. Doherty as student Senator for balance term of office to May 31, 1975.

It was moved, seconded and carried that Erich Burkle be seated on Senate.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Open Session of October 1, 1973 were approved as distributed.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. REPORT OF CHAIRMAN

Paper S.73-119 - Financial Statement

The Chairman noted that, in accordance with Section 50 of the Universities Act, the Financial Statement as at March 31, 1973 had been distributed for information.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

1. Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

1. Paper S.73-120 (Former S.73-114) - Rules of Procedure of Senate

Moved by A. MacPherson, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate adopt the 'Rules of Procedure of Senate,' as set forth in Paper S.73-120, to supersede all previous Rules of Procedure of Senate effective immediately."

A. MacPherson explained that this paper had been submitted in response to instructions of Senate to recommend rules and procedures for Senate and the submission represented a codification of the current operating rules. A number of questions were raised. The Chairman pointed out that the paper is not a recommendation from the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules, but what the rules are; that it is the intention of this Committee to bring forward suggestions as to the improvement of these rules and the Committee will do this within the format indicated. S. Aronoff felt that if the motion was to ratify procedures that have been in practice, he questioned the necessity of bringing forward such a motion.

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Wheatley,

"That the motion as set forth in Paper S.73-120
be tabled."

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

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED

17 in favor
10 opposed

The Chairman urged individual Senators who are critical of the rules of Senate to forward their criticisms to the Secretary of Senate so that the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules can give them consideration prior to the Senate meeting.

2. Senate Committee on Non-Credit Instruction

1. Paper S.73-121 - Report on Committee Activities, Summer Semester 1973

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate ratify the courses approved for offering during the Fall Semester 1973 by the Senate Committee on Non-Credit Instruction, as set forth in S.73-121, as follows:

<u>Offered by</u>	<u>Course Title</u>
Continuing Education	The Photographer's Eye
Continuing Education	Let's Do Music
Geography Department	Canadian Landscape II
Department of Modern Languages	Chinese (Mandarin) for Beginners
Kinesiology and Continuing Education	Introduction to Dance Therapy
Computing Center	Computer Programming for Paraplegics
Physics Department	Glassblowing
Chemistry Department	Seminar Series in Forensic Chemistry
Reading and Study Center	Reading and Study 001
Reading and Study Center	English Language Program
Reading and Study Center	Typing Course
Reading and Study Center	Rapid Reading for the Business and Professional Community
Recreation Center	Aquatics
Recreation Center	Fitness
Recreation Center	Sports and Games
Recreation Center	Combatives
Recreation Center	Outdoor Program
Library	Access to Information
Arts Center	Elementary Dance - 733-W202
Arts Center	Intermediate/Advanced Dance - 733-W204
Arts Center	Choreographers Workshop - 733-W208

Arts Center	Super 8mm Film - 733-W301
Arts Center	Introduction to Video - 733-W351
Arts Center	Continuing Video - 733-W352
Arts Center	Madrigal Singers - 733-W401
Arts Center	Choir - 733-W402
Arts Center	Beginning Recorder - 733-W410
Arts Center	Intermediate Recorder - 733-W411
Arts Center	16mm Film - 733-W312
Arts Center	Advanced Recorder - 733-W413
Arts Center	Renaissance Ensemble - 733-W491
Arts Center	String-Wind Ensemble
Arts Center	Purcell String Quartet at Home
Arts Center	Rehearsal - 733-W499
Arts Center	Acting/Directing - 733-W501
Arts Center	Design/Technical - 733-W531
Arts Center	Voice Production and Sight Reading - 733-W403
English Department	English 001
Computing Center	Introduction to Job Control Language
Computing Center	Computer Center Orientation
Computing Center	Introduction to APL 1
Computing Center	Introduction to APL 2
Health Services	Industrial First Aid Course"

S. Aronoff requested that a correction to the motion be noted in that the course in Glassblowing was not offered by the Physics Department but by the Glassblowing Shop. As there was no objection, the Chairman ruled that the motion would be altered accordingly.

Question was called on the motion as amended, and a vote taken.

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

3. Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

1. Paper S.73-122 - New Course Proposal Form and Covering Memorandum

The Chairman noted that Paper S.73-122 had been distributed to Senate for information.

2. Paper S.73-123 - Faculty of Arts - Proposal for a Minor in English

Moved by S. Smith, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That Senate approve the establishment of a Minor in English, as set forth in S.73-123, as follows: For a minor in English, a student must obtain credit or standing in any two of English 101, 102, and 103; credit or standing in either of English 202 and 203; and 15 credits in upper division English, of which 10 shall be in 5-credit lecture and seminar combinations drawn from any 2 of the 7 sets of alternatives shown under Plan A in the English Majors and Honors programs. The department recommends

S.M. 5/11/73

that the remaining 5 be made up of a similar lecture and seminar combination from within or without those sets, but will permit the student to acquire them in any other manner, with one exception: he may not register in the seminar alone of any lecture and seminar combination."

Moved by R. Kissner, seconded by J. P. Daem,

"That discussion of Paper S.73-123 be postponed until Senate directs the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies to review the general requirements for minors as earlier established by Senate and recommends a rational policy for all minor programs."

R. Kissner was of the opinion that all minors should be submitted on the basis of a uniform rationale policy which had not yet been specified in any calendar. K. Rieckhoff disagreed, stating that minors had been approved for a number of departments and there was publication of a number of coherent designs. Although S. Smith considered a review of policies related to minor programs was desirable, he did not consider Paper S.73-123 should be delayed until the completion of such a review.

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

MOTION TO POSTPONE FAILED

Moved by A. Hollibaugh, seconded by J. Seager,

"That the proposal for a Minor in English be tabled."

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

MOTION TO TABLE FAILED

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

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

3. Paper S.73-124 - Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies - New Course Proposals - GS 102-3 - Music in History I; GS 103-3 - Music in History II

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by S. Smith,

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-124, the new course proposals for:

General Studies 102-3 - Music in History I
General Studies 103-3 - Music in History II."

Amendment was moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by A. MacPherson,

"That GS 102-3 and GS 103-3 be limited to one offering and subsequent review by Senate."

K. Rieckhoff stated that the reason for the amendment was that courses of this type should be temporary offerings pending possible establishment of a Fine Arts Department when they could later be considered for permanent placement therein. B. Wilson agreed to incorporation of the amendment in the motion. There was no objection from the floor.

Question was called on the motion as amended, and a vote taken.

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

4. Paper S.73-125 - Report on Curricular Issues Relating to Undergraduate Education

It was agreed that, as the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies is not a member of Senate, the Vice-President, Academic would be considered the mover of each of the motions contained in Paper S.73-125, and J. P. Daem would be recorded as the seconder, and that each motion would be considered sequentially.

Motion 1 - Procedures for Reviewing and Approving Curriculum Changes

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) That SCUS normally will consider the Faculty Curriculum Committees to be the major investigatory body in matters relating to curriculum and review.
- b) That the recommendations of Faculty Curriculum Committees be received by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies except under four conditions.
 - i) The documentation of the course proposed or program change is inadequate, i.e. the answers on the course proposal form and supporting memoranda where appropriate do not indicate how the course fits into the program, is too vaguely worded, etc.
 - ii) There is a specific reason, such as course overlap with another department which has not been adequately dealt with by the Faculty Curriculum Committee. The difference from the first condition is that SCUS must state specifically the reason for referral, whereas under the first condition, it may simply refer by indicating areas of insufficient documentation.

S.M. 5/11/73

iii) Where a Faculty Curriculum Committee is unable to resolve an issue, it should clearly state the nature of the problem and refer to SCUS for a recommendation which must then be approved by the department(s) and Faculty Curriculum Committee(s) concerned. If the parties involved agree to disagree, then the issue accompanied by the alternative solutions will be forwarded to Senate for resolution.

iv) Where Faculty Undergraduate Curriculum Committee proposals do not conform to Senate policy or to the department's previously stated policy."

K. Rieckhoff requested that it be noted in the minutes that the motions contained in Paper S.73-125 apply specifically to undergraduate studies. He also requested that section b) of Motion 1 be amended to read:

"That the recommendation of Faculty curriculum committees after appropriate approval by the respective Faculty be received by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies except under four conditions."

As there was no objection, the Chairman ruled that the amendment would be incorporated in the motion. In the following discussion several semantic points were conceded, resulting in the following revision of section b) of Motion 1:

"That the recommendations of Faculty curriculum committees as approved by the relevant Faculty will be returned after consideration by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies if one or more of the following conditions pertain."

At this point J. Wheatley offered a procedural suggestion that discussion continue in a committee of the whole for half an hour on the entire document, and gave notice of motion to refer the matter back to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for redrafting.

Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by A. MacPherson,

"That Senate continue for the next half hour to consider S.73-125 informally."

Question was called on the motion for informal consideration limited to one-half hour, and a vote taken.

MOTION FOR INFORMAL
CONSIDERATION CARRIED

During consideration of the document the following points were noted:

S.M. 5/11/73

Issue 1 - Procedures for Reviewing and Approving Curriculum Changes

J. P. Daem expressed concern regarding lack of student representation on Faculty curriculum committees in the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies when such committees were recommended to be considered the major investigatory bodies.

J. Wheatley felt there could be clearer documentation requested in subsection iii) to provide an indication of reasons for disagreement on issues in order that SCUS might refer such unresolved matters appropriately.

J. Munro was of the opinion that approval of the Faculty was required on any curriculum committee recommendation prior to furtherance and that this should be incorporated in all subsections of section b). A. MacPherson suggested that all reference to Faculty curriculum committees should be replaced with reference to Faculties. It was accepted that the reference to committees recognizes the principle of approval by Faculty-throughout.

Issue 2 - Overlap of Course Content Between Courses Offered Within a Department, Within a Faculty Across Faculties

K. Rieckhoff asked that the wording of Motion 2 and all other sections of the document be such that it is clearly understood that the actions of curriculum committees do not carry legal weight until approved by the Faculty concerned.

(It had been accepted that the reference to Faculty curriculum committees recognizes the principle of requiring approval by Faculty.)
P. Copes, recognizing that many courses overlap to some extent with other courses offered throughout the University, suggested Senate's concern should be the degree of overlap. J. Wheatley felt the section should be rewritten to identify an investigatory body responsible for considering allegations of serious overlap, whether across Faculties, within a Faculty, within a department. J. Munro considered that, in addition to naming an investigatory body, the duties and responsibilities should be clearly defined. K. Rieckhoff felt that if there was concern on overlap some person or body would identify the concern, and this would initiate any required investigation.

J. P. Daem was of the opinion that overlap was a concern in courses numbered in the 100 and 200 levels, but in the upper levels a variation of expertise in the same field could afford considerable benefit.

P. Wagner referred to part a) of the motion and requested a clear reference to the authority involved in joint approval and justification of course proposals.

Issue 3 - Proliferation of Course Offerings

E. Banister commented that a mechanism was provided in Motion 3 for consideration of any question of the overlap of courses during departmental review.

Issue 4 - Use of Directed Readings, Directed Studies and Directed Research Courses

P. Doherty registered objection to section f) of Motion 4 as he was of the opinion that lower level students should be admitted to Directed Research/Reading/Study courses even if only a limited number were admitted.

P. Copes felt Issue 4 did not recognize two classes of Directed Reading courses and that regulations should be specified for both, that is for those so-called and for special circumstances where a regular course could be given this way.

A. Hollibaugh asserted that instructor, rather than student, justification of need for courses in this category was more realistic. K. Rieckhoff countered that proposals as set forth in the paper were intended to avoid abuse of the availability of alternatives to standard methods of instruction.

P. Doherty wondered about deadlines for submission of student statements of justification for admission to these courses.

On the question of standardizing credit hour assignment, J. D'Auria received information to the effect that the task would be the responsibility within rather than between Faculties.

Issue 5 - Use of Special Topics Courses

S. Aronoff questioned the need of burdening Senate with the requirements of section f) of Issue 5. K. Rieckhoff responded that Senate had a vital interest in the content of all course offerings. J. Munro added that the condition of Senate ratification of non-credit offerings was equally as pertinent to credit offerings. The Chairman concurred with the same legal reasoning and indicated he would bring it to the attention of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies. A. MacPherson commented that there had been a recommendation at an earlier meeting of Senate that a report be submitted on Special Topics courses but this had not been received. The Chairman responded that he had asked the Vice-President, Academic to check the Senate reference and discuss the matter further with him. J. P. Daem noted that 5 i) was in conflict with Issue 6.

Issue 6 - Course/Contact Hour Relationship (For regularly Scheduled Courses Only)

J. Munro commented that the motion would be improved if it took the form of a direction to departmental undergraduate curriculum committees that they initiate a review of credit or contact credit hour relationship in departments.

Issue 7 - Use of Vector Patterns (For Regularly Scheduled Courses)

There were no comments on this issue.

Issue 8 - Relationship between Contact Hours and Out-of-Class ^{Preparation} ~~Graduation~~ Requirements

J. P. Daem said there were discrepancies between Faculties on this issue and calendar guidelines were essential for student edification. He felt a review in the Faculty of Science was required to establish an equitable workload in course offerings in relation to other Faculties. P. Wagner cautioned that averages were difficult to establish because of individual differences in relation to learning capabilities.

Issue 9 - Retroactivity of Calendar Changes as they Affect Graduation Requirements

R. Kissner commented that a student should be entitled to graduate under the conditions of any calendar, which would permit him to apply for graduation under the most advantageous regulations.

Issue 10 - Moratorium on Calendar Changes

J. Munro expressed disappointment in the fact that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies had not submitted recommendations on this issue, and suggested that further consideration be given to the matter with a view to publishing a policy statement.

Issue 11 - Criteria for Numbering Courses

B. Wilson suggested a revision was required by adjusting and correcting the use of level and division in the wording of this issue. J. Munro was interested in the volume of renumbering that would be required to meet the criteria and wondered if it was practical or necessary.

Issue 12 - Operating Procedures for Waiving Course, Department and Faculty Requirements

K. Rieckhoff noted that a report to Senate from the Registrar on waivers granted during a semester appeared to be desirable.

S. Aronoff referred to section b) 2, and suggested that credit by examination was preferable to waiver by the departmental chairman.

Senate moved out of informal discussion at 9:00 p.m. to give formal consideration to Paper S.73-125.

Moved by J. Wheatley, seconded by P. Wagner,

"That Paper S.73-125 be referred back to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for redrafting in the light of the informal discussion."

B. Wilson spoke in opposition to referral, noting that substantive changes had been requested only regarding Issues 1 and 11.

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

11 in favor
15 opposed

The assembly then returned to consideration of Motion 1 on Procedures for Reviewing and Approving Curriculum Changes.

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by B. Wilson,

"That Motion 1 be referred back to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies."

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

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

Motion 2 - Overlap of Course Content Between Courses Offered Within a Department, Within a Faculty, Across Faculties

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) That, in all cases where overlap in course content exists, Faculty Curriculum Committees be charged with requiring jointly approved and justified course proposals to be submitted by the departments involved. Such charge to apply to both departments within a single Faculty and across Faculties.
- b) That, where a jointly approved course proposal is not forthcoming from the departments involved, the issue be referred by the departments involved, to the Faculty Curriculum Committee(s) for resolution.
- c) That, where an overlap in course content cannot be resolved at either the department or Faculty level, the issue be resolved by Senate upon the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies."

B. Wilson commented that the main objection appeared to be concern relating to identification of overlap in the same department, but Issue 3 had been designed to resolve any problem.

Question was called on Motion 2, and a vote taken.

MOTION 2 CARRIED

Motion 3 - Proliferation of Course Offerings

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) At the time of internal or external departmental review, departments be required to review all of their course offerings with a view to eliminating those no longer appropriate to the department's objectives.
- b) That justification for the continuance of any specific course offering may be requested, at any time, by the Faculty Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies or Senate.
- c) That any course not offered within a six semester period be deleted from the Calendar unless adequate justification for retaining the course is presented to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and Senate. The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies to be charged each semester with reviewing course offerings under this ruling and making appropriate recommendations to Senate."

In reply to a question by J. Munro on the proposed timing of departmental reviews in the Faculty of Arts, S. Smith stated that an attempt was being made to complete the entire series within three years, and to complete the review of four departments this year. B. Wilson commented that internal or external reviews provided an opportunity for review of courses, but curriculum committees could address the question at any time.

Question was called on Motion 3, and a vote taken.

MOTION 3 CARRIED

Motion 4 - Use of Directed Readings, Directed Studies and Directed Research Courses

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) That the offering of all directed reading, directed study and directed research courses offered within a department be approved by the Departmental Chairman.
- b) That the chairman's approval be based upon a submission by the instructor covering each of the following:-
 - 1) a statement of how the course is to be conducted
 - 2) a statement of how the student's performance will be assessed for grading purposes
 - 3) a written statement by the student justifying his need to take this particular course in lieu of one of the regular courses offered by the department.
- c) That the present practice of having Senate approve the establishment of directed research/readings/and study courses for departments but not the content of such courses be continued.
- d) As a general principle, that an instructor in a directed research/readings/or study course should expect to meet with his students singly or together for weekly consultation.
- e) That departmental and Faculty curriculum committees be charged with the task of standardizing the credit hours assigned to their directed research/readings/and study courses.
- f) That only upper level students (those who have completed at least 60 semester credit hours) be eligible to enrol in directed research/readings/and study courses.
- g) That all Faculties be required to recommend to Senate policies regarding the maximum number of such courses (or credit hours) a student must take for credit toward the degrees of that Faculty.

- h) That vector numbers for all directed research/readings or study courses be deleted from both the University's Calendar and Course Guide.
- i) That directed research/readings/or study courses not be permitted as substitutes for either required courses or special topics courses."

An amendment was proposed by B. Wilson which would result in section e) of Motion 4 reading as follows:

- e) "That departmental and Faculty curriculum committees, subject to the approval of the Faculty, be charged with the task of standardizing the credit hours assigned to their directed research/readings/and study courses."

K. Rieckhoff questioned the need for such a motion, stating that the inclusion of this fact in the minutes should be sufficient. The Chairman concurred.

It was moved by A. Hollibaugh, seconded by P. Doherty, that section b) 3) be deleted from Motion 4, but following discussion it was agreed by the mover and seconder that rather than deletion the section could be amended to read as follows:

- b) 3) "a written statement justifying the need to take this particular course in lieu of one of the regular courses offered by the department."

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Moved by P. Doherty, seconded by R. Kissner,

"That section f) of Motion 4 be deleted."

P. Doherty contended that lower level students could also gain considerable advantage in academic experience by being eligible to take courses of this nature. A. Hollibaugh concurred. K. Rieckhoff noted that considerable material is involved in directed readings and a restriction on enrolment is preferable. He noted that Motion 12 provided flexibility to accommodate unique situations.

Question was called on the motion to delete section f), and a vote taken.

MOTION TO DELETE FAILED

13 in favor
13 opposed

Considerable discussion ensued regarding section i) of Motion 4 and its possible effect of precluding students from graduating on time or resulting in a long waiting period to meet requirements for graduation.

Amendment was moved by A. Hollibaugh, seconded by P. Wagner, "That the word 'not' be deleted from section i) of Motion 4, but on further consideration the amendment was altered to read:

- i) "That directed research/readings/or study courses may be permitted as substitutes for either required courses or special topics courses."

It was noted that Issue 12 of Paper S.73-125 had relationship to the motion under consideration.

Moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That Motion 12 be considered now prior to continuing with consideration of Motion 4 and the amendment to section i)."

Question was called on postponement of consideration of Motion 4 and the amendment on the floor and for consideration of Motion 12, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO POSTPONE CARRIED

Motion 12 - Operating Procedures for Waiving Course, Department and Faculty Requirements

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) That departmental chairmen be empowered in special cases to waive departmental regulations on the recommendation of the departmental undergraduate curriculum committee; that Deans of Faculties be empowered in special cases to waive Faculty regulations on the recommendation of Faculty undergraduate curriculum committees.
- b) That the primary criteria under which waivers may be granted be established as follows:
 - 1) where a student has been misadvised and can provide substantive evidence
 - 2) where a student can demonstrate to a department that he has formal training or background for which he did not receive direct course academic transfer credit. (The waiver does not include the granting of additional formal semester hours credit, but may remove the necessity of undertaking certain prescribed courses.)
 - 3) where departmental programs have changed and eliminated courses or otherwise substantially changed the graduation requirements affecting the student
 - 4) where a student has satisfied the spirit but not the

letter of University, Faculty or departmental regulations.

- c) That departmental offices, in the case of departmental waivers, and the dean's office, in the case of Faculty waivers, maintain documentation on all waivers granted and advise in writing the department concerned, the student and the Registrar where affirmative action has been taken on a waiver request."

B. Wilson requested that a further section be added to Motion 12, stating:

- d) "That the Registrar report to Senate all cases of departmental waivers and faculty waivers on a semester basis."

As there was no objection from the assembly, the addition to the motion was accepted.

Moved by J. Seager, seconded by R. Kissner,

"That the words 'special cases' wherever they appear in section a) of Motion 12 be deleted."

B. Wilson opposed the amendment, stating that departmental regulations were Senate regulations and the reference was to the academic content of a program which has some integrity, and it should only be waived in special cases.

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

MOTION FAILED

10 in favor
17 opposed

Amendment was moved by R. Kissner, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That section a) of Motion 12 be amended to read, 'That departmental chairmen be empowered in special cases to waive departmental regulations, preferably on the recommendation of the departmental undergraduate curriculum committees; that Deans of Faculties be empowered in special cases to waive Faculty regulations, preferably on the recommendation of the Faculty undergraduate curriculum committees.'"

R. Kissner commented that there were instances when a reply to a petition for waiver was urgently required to permit graduation.

S.M. 5/11/73

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

9 in favor
14 opposed

Amendment was moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"To add under section b), subsection 5) 'where students may suffer undue hardships as a result of prevailing regulations.'"

J. P. Daem was of the opinion that where a student can demonstrate that not waiving a regulation would constitute a hardship, the regulation should be waived and primary criteria stipulated in the paper to permit such action. S. Aronoff agreed it was necessary to provide avenues to permit graduation, but asked that the amendment be revised to indicate a more direct intent. Several Senators suggested alternate phrasing.

Question was called on the amendment as moved, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

S. Aronoff then proposed a modification to section b) 2 to establish the notion of credit by examination as an example of a waiver: "Where a student can demonstrate to a department by means of an examination that he has formal training or background. (The waiver would include the granting of additional formal semester hours credit and would remove the necessity of undertaking certain prescribed courses.)"

J. Munro proposed the following as an addition to section a):- Departmental regulations are considered to be those contained in departmental sections of the calendar and faculty regulations are those contained in the Faculty sections of the calendar - but this wording currently could not operate.

Amendment was moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That a new section c) be inserted in the motion which would state 'where the lack of offerings of a degree requirement would delay a student's graduation unduly, the Chairman be permitted to substitute a directed study/research/reading course,' and the balance of the motion following be relettered as required."

B. Wilson offered substitute wording to provide grammatical requirements, "That departmental chairmen be empowered in cases where the unavailability of required course offerings might cause undue delay to graduation to allow substitution of directed study/research/reading courses," and the substitution was allowed.

S.M. 5/11/73

Moved by A. Emmott, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That the previous question be put."

The Chairman noted that the motion was undebatable, and required two-thirds majority vote to carry.

Question was called on the motion for the previous question, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

24 in favor

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

19 in favor

3 opposed

In response to a request by J. Seager, the Chairman outlined Motion 12 as amended:

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) That departmental chairmen be empowered in special cases to waive departmental regulations on the recommendation of the departmental undergraduate curriculum committee; that Deans of Faculties be empowered in special cases to waive Faculty regulations on the recommendation of Faculty undergraduate curriculum committees.
- b) That the primary criteria under which waivers may be granted be established as follows:
 - 1) where a student has been misadvised and can provide substantive evidence
 - 2) where a student can demonstrate to a department that he has formal training or background for which he did not receive direct course academic transfer credit. (The waiver does not include the granting of additional formal semester hours credit, but may remove the necessity of undertaking certain prescribed courses.)
 - 3) where departmental programs have changed and eliminated courses or otherwise substantially changed the graduation requirements affecting the student
 - 4) where a student has satisfied the spirit but not the letter of University, Faculty or departmental regulations.

- c) That departmental chairmen be empowered in cases where the unavailability of required course offerings might cause undue delay to graduation to allow substitution of directed study/research/reading courses.
- d) That departmental offices, in the case of departmental waivers, and dean's offices, in the case of Faculty waivers, maintain documentation on all waivers granted and advise in writing the department concerned, the student and the Registrar where affirmative action has been taken on a waiver request.
- e) That the Registrar report to Senate all cases of departmental waivers and faculty waivers on a semester basis."

Question was called on Motion 12 as amended, and a vote taken.

MOTION 12 CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY

Motion 4 - Use of Directed Readings, Directed Studies and Directed Research Courses

The Chairman drew attention to the amendment on the floor relating to section i) of Motion 4, but A. Hollibaugh stated that it was now redundant and requested permission to withdraw his amendment. As there was no objection, the amendment was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Amendment was moved by R. Kissner, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"That the title of the directed research/reading/study courses reflecting course content be submitted by the instructor and the student to the Registrar and be included on the student's transcript."

R. Kissner stated that the logic of the amendment was that courses in this category were in the same area as the student's program and should be recorded on the permanent record. S. Aronoff was of the opinion that such a proposal should not be entertained unless it has the approval of the curriculum committee. B. Wilson said the content of any course should not appear on the transcript unless it is approved by Senate. D. DeVoretz commented that there were mechanisms to provide information on the content of directed reading courses other than the transcript.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

Moved by A. Dawson, seconded by J. P. Daem,

"That Motion 4 be referred back to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies."

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

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

P. Doherty expressed the opinion that referral should be accompanied by instructions to the Committee, but the Chairman responded that the Deans attend the meetings of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and they would be guided by the minutes of this meeting of Senate.

Motion 5 - Use of Special Topics Courses

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) That departments include in the University's Calendar and Course Guide a general statement to the effect that special topics courses are offered and that students should obtain further information from the department prior to registration. (Note: this initial contact would give departments an opportunity to learn what special topics students want to see initiated and thus facilitate the introduction of special topics courses.)
- b) That, as general University guidelines, special topics courses should be utilized to:
 - 1) fill a particular gap in a department's curriculum
 - 2) respond to student/faculty interests which are worthwhile at the moment but not necessarily of continuing relevance to a department's program
 - 3) experiment with a particular subject matter area before considering it for introduction into the regular curriculum.
- c) That all Faculties recommend policies to Senate regarding the maximum number of such courses (or credit hours) a student may include for credit toward the degrees of that Faculty.
- d) That the present practice of having Senate approve the establishment of special topics courses for departments but not the contents of such courses be continued.
- e) That the Chairman, on the advice of the Departmental Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, be charged with approving the content of all special topics courses offered.

- f) That once each semester, Deans of Faculties report to Senate on topics covered under special topics, such report to include:
- 1) the calendar description of each course offered, including the course number, credit hours, vector description, course description.
 - 2) a detailed description of the specific courses offered including the name of the responsible faculty member, a course outline and/or syllabus, a reading list, and method of instruction.
 - 3) the number of students enrolled in each course.
- g) That special topics courses be regarded as regularly scheduled courses, i.e. that class meetings are held on a regular basis.
- h) That vector patterns for special topics courses be deleted from the University Calendar and incorporated into the Course Guide.
- i) As a guiding principle for special topics courses, that one contact hour be set equal to one credit hour.
- j) That where a department wishes to deviate from principle i) above, a justification for the variance must be provided to the Faculty and Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committees and to Senate."

Amendment was moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by A. Hollibaugh,

"To delete sections i) and j) of Motion 5, and substitute the following, as in Issue 6: 'That the determination of the appropriate relationship between credit and contact hours rest with departmental undergraduate curriculum committees subject to the approval of Faculty Curriculum Committees, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and Senate.'"

J. P. Daem was of the opinion that consistency of guidelines for special topics and regularly scheduled courses was essential. I. Mugridge agreed that some kind of guiding principle was considered desirable and possible for special topics courses.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

10 in favor
12 opposed

S.M. 5/11/73

Question was called on Motion 5, and a vote taken.

MOTION 5 CARRIED

19 in favor

Motion 6 - Course/Contact Hour Relationship (For Regularly Scheduled Courses* Only)

* A regularly scheduled course is defined as a semester length course expected to be meeting for a predetermined total number of contact hours per week in lecture, tutorial, seminar or laboratory as approved by Senate.

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

That the determination of the appropriate relationship between credit and contact hours rest with departmental undergraduate curriculum committees subject to the approval of Faculty Curriculum Committees, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and Senate."

Moved by A. Dawson, seconded by A. MacPherson,

"That Motion 6 be referred back to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies."

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

MOTION TO REFER MOTION 6
CARRIED

17 in favor
7 opposed

I. Mugridge asked that Senate provide instructions to the Committee. A. Hollibaugh commented that he hoped it would be recommended to the Committee that sections i) and j) of Motion 5 be incorporated with Motion 6 to achieve some degree of uniformity. J. Wheatley suggested that contradictory statements be eliminated and that guidelines be developed in relation to established limits.

Motion 7 - Use of Vector Patterns (For Regularly Scheduled Courses)

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

- a) That all vector patterns be eliminated from University Calendars.
- b) That each course description contained in University calendars be accompanied by an indication of the nature of the course, e.g. lecture/tutorial, lecture/tutorial/laboratory, seminar, etc.

- c) That within the total number of contact hours assigned to a course, and subject to the approval of the departmental undergraduate curriculum committee, the Chairman be permitted to vary the vector pattern. Such vector patterns to reflect only the in-class requirements and the calendar description of the course.
- d) That vector patterns for all regularly scheduled courses be included in Course Guides.
- e) That only departmental approval be required for all course vector patterns to be included in the Course Guide; departmental approval to be in writing and submitted to the Registrar."

Moved by A. Hollibaugh, seconded by J. Seager,

"That Motion 7 be referred until Motion 6 is resolved."

A. Hollibaugh stated that the motion to refer was based on the wording of section c).

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

MOTION TO REFER MOTION 7
CARRIED

14 in favor
11 opposed

It was noted that there was no motion attached to Issue 8 - Relationship between Contact Hours and Out-of-Class Preparation Time.

Motion 9 - Retroactivity of Calendar Changes as they Affect Graduation Requirements

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

Before or upon entering the final 60 credit hours (72 credit hours for the Honors program) students must make a formal Declaration of Major (or Honors) with this formal declaration to establish the requirements for graduation as indicated in the published Calendar in effect at the time of the declaration. A change of major or honors field will be deemed a new declaration."

The Secretary explained that the clause was applicable to the first declaration, but a new declaration involving a change in field would be under the regulations of the calendar in effect at the time of the subsequent declaration.

Amendment was moved by R. Kissner, seconded by J. P. Daem,

"That the words 'or future calendars at the student's discretion,' be added at the end of the first sentence of the motion."

R. Kissner said that rules change and the student should be governed by his choice of calendars. B. Wilson was agreeable to the amendment.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Question was called on the motion as amended, and a vote taken.

MOTION 9 AS AMENDED
CARRIED

18 in favor

It was noted that there was no motion attached to Issue 10 - Moratorium on Calendar Changes.

Motion 11 - Criteria for Numbering Courses

"That Senate approve, as set forth in S.73-125,

That the following criteria be established as guidelines for departments in determining the number levels to be assigned individual courses:

- 1) 000 level courses
- 2) 100 level courses - are designed to introduce students to a discipline at the University level; students will normally be expected to enrol in such courses during their first and second levels of University; such courses will not demand pre-requisites at the University level although previous learning experiences in the discipline or related disciplines at the secondary school level may be recommended or required.
- 3) 200 level courses - assume either previous learning experiences in the discipline or related disciplines; both content and teaching level will be more advanced than courses offered at the 100 level; students will normally be expected to enrol in such courses during their third and fourth levels of University; pre- and co- requisites may be identified.

- 4) 300 level courses - assume a substantive amount of previous learning experiences in either the discipline or related disciplines; both content and teaching level will be more advanced than courses offered at the 200 level; students will normally be expected to enrol in such courses during their fifth and sixth levels of University; only in exceptional circumstances will courses offered at this level not have pre- and/or co- requisites associated with them.
- 5) 400 level courses - assume a substantive amount of previous learning experiences in either the discipline or related disciplines; both content and teaching level will be more advanced than courses offered at the 300 level; students will normally be expected to enrol in such courses during their seventh and eighth levels of University; prerequisites will always be demanded for courses offered at this level."

B. Wilson pointed out that the use of the words "level" and "division" in a number of instances was incorrect, but the necessary adjustments could be left to the Registrar.

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by D. DeVoretz,

"That the motion be divided between Item 1 and Items 2, 3, 4, and 5."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO DIVIDE CARRIED

Moved by B. Wilson, seconded by D. DeVoretz,

"That Item 1 of Motion 11 be referred to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for definition."

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

MOTION TO REFER ITEM 1
OF MOTION 11 CARRIED

Discussion continued on the remaining part of the divided question, Items 2 - 5 inclusive.

Amendment was moved by J. Munro, seconded by D. DeVoretz,

"That there be added, after item 5, the last sentence of the rationale on page 21, 'deviations from these recommendations should be permitted provided they are acceptable to the Faculty curriculum committee, the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and Senate.'"

S.M. 5/11/73

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

Amendment was moved by R. Kissner, seconded by J. P. Daem,

"That the last clause in Item 5 be deleted and the last clause of Item 4 be substituted therefor, i.e. replace 'prerequisites will always be demanded for courses at this level' with 'only in exceptional circumstances will courses offered at this level not have pre- and/or co- requisites associated with them.'"

It was generally agreed that a full prerequisite scheme is impractical, although S. Aronoff was of the opinion that the question involved the degree of sophistication of the course. P. Copes considered that not all 400 level courses require a prerequisite course; that the degree of maturity of the student is often the prerequisite.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Item 5 then read as follows:

"400 level courses - assume a substantive amount of previous learning experiences in either the discipline or related disciplines; both content and teaching level will be more advanced than courses offered at the 300 level; students will normally be expected to enrol in such courses during their seventh and eighth levels of University; only in exceptional circumstances will courses offered at this level not have pre- and/or co-requisites associated with them.

Question was called on the main motion as amended.

MAIN MOTION ON THE
DIVIDED QUESTION
CARRIED
(Editorial changes to
be made)

6. REPORTS OF FACULTIES

There were no reports from Faculties

7. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Notice of Motion

1. Paper S.73-126 - Senate Rule - Reports of Committees (Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

The Chairman noted that this paper was subject to debate at the next meeting.

2. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of Senate is scheduled for Monday, December 3, 1973, at 7:30 p.m.

3. Other Items

1. Paper S.73-127 - Motion to Establish a Committee to Consider Expected Paper on University-Government Relationships

Moved by J. D'Auria, seconded by A. Dawson,

1. "That an ad hoc committee be established by the Senate of this University to consider the paper from the task force on higher education established by the Minister of Education of British Columbia relating to the relationship between universities and government and possible changes to the Universities Act, - the SFU Senate committee to be charged with preparing an assessment of such report and recommendations pertaining thereto for consideration by this Senate; i.e. a report on the task force report by the January meeting of Senate."

J. D'Auria commented that he had made a few editorial changes to the motion set forth in Paper S.73-127, and that the task force intends to hold open hearings on January 17. The Chairman added that he had received a letter from the Commissioner of Education advising that the working papers will be forthcoming for distribution.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by J. D'Auria, seconded by A. Dawson,

2. "That this committee consist of three members of Senate."

Amendment was moved by J. P. Daem, seconded by A. MacPherson,

"That the Committee consist of five members of Senate, two members of faculty, two students, and one academic administrator."

J. P. Daem said that if the committee is going to look at the recommendations all bodies should be represented. J. D'Auria felt a smaller committee would be more effective in working rapidly on a specific document.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

6 in favor
20 opposed

S.M. 5/11/73

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

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by J. D'Auria, seconded by A. Dawson,

3. "That Senate for tonight's meeting suspend its rules on nominations and voting to now nominate and elect the members to this committee."

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Moved by J. D'Auria, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"That R. Kissner, B. Beirne, and S. Smith be nominated to the Committee."

The Chairman declared that it was usual to enquire if those nominated were willing to stand for election. K. Rieckhoff then nominated J. Wheatley to the committee. As all nominees were willing to stand for election, ballots were distributed, and the Secretary reminded Senators that under Senate election rules, in order to be valid, ballots must contain three votes. Results of the election were announced as follows:

Elected:	B. P. BEIRNE
	R. F. KISSNER
	W.A.S. SMITH

4. Confidential Matters

The assembly moved into Closed Session at 11:58 p.m.

H. M. Evans
Secretary