



Students in Nat. Sci. 176B voted decisively that they were dissatisfied with their pollution course. See story below. Excalibur - Dave Cooper

Discipline report is being included in new calendars

By BOB ROTH

The Council of the York Student Federation has demanded that university president Murray Ross publicly retract a statement made in the new York academic calendars that the Laskin report is now university policy governing student conduct.

Amid assurances from assistant vice-president (student services) John Becker that the report on student discipline was still open for discussion, the Faculty of Science and Atkinson College calendars were released last week stating:

"Members of the University are referred to the report of the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities which sets forth the basic concepts which should prevail at the University with respect to the behaviour of students.

"By accepting membership in the University, a person acknowledges his willingness to abide by these concepts," the calendar says.

The statement is also expected to appear in the Faculty of Arts calendar, Faculty of Fine Arts calendar and the Glendon College calendar.

On Feb. 25, the CYSF pulled its representative off the university court following news that Ross was implementing the Laskin report recommendations.

At that time Becker assured students that the report was not being implemented and was even holding public forums on the report.

Among the report's many contentious recommendations is the one calling for penalties such as expulsion to be applied against students while calling for a simple "apology" from administration offenders.

The fact — now confirmed by Becker — that the statement in the calendars was approved last December has outraged many students who feel the president's office has been engaged in a conscious act of deception since the Laskin report was released in November.

At that time Ross assured the York community that the report's recommendations would not be implemented without student and faculty approval.

Since the release of the calendar statement, however, many critics are claiming that Ross had no intention of consulting students and that "public forums" are simply being used to create illusions of community participation.

In an emergency session Friday, the CYSF executive issued a three-point ultimatum to Ross:

—"that he publically retract the statement on student conduct appearing in the academic calendars confirming the adoption and implementation of the Laskin Report.

—"that a letter be sent to all members of York University informing them of the inaccuracy of the statement in the calendar.

—"that the community be made aware in this letter that the CYSF is not

STUDENT CONDUCT

Members of the University are referred to the report of the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities which sets forth the basic concepts which should prevail at the University with respect to the behaviour of students.

By accepting membership in the University, a person acknowledges his willingness to abide by these concepts. Copies of this report are available from the Masters of the Colleges, the Deans and other university offices.

Within each College, a College member is responsible to the Master, Dean or Principal or the College Court established to regulate these matters.

In addition, there is a University Court composed of student and faculty members which hears complaints, grievances and other charges concerning behaviour. There is also an Appeal Court. The Administrator of this Court system is responsible for calling this court into being and, more important, for trying to reconcile differences of opinion before issues reach the Court.

Municipal by-laws, provincial and federal legislation and regulations are fully applicable to the activities of the University and to individual students regardless of where they are, on or off campus.

The Laskin discipline report has been included in the new York calendars.

represented on the university court, and to this date, has not accepted the Laskin Report as University policy."

At its regular meeting Thursday the council of the Faculty of Arts also criticized the calendar statement and decided to prepare thousands of counter-statements to be distributed on campus along with its 1970-71 calendar due out yesterday.

Howard Adelman, chairman of the senate Duff-Berdahl committee, which is now examining the Laskin report, said Sunday the calendar statement was obviously a "mistake."

Adelman, acting dean of Atkinson College, personally ordered the writing

Asked if he would approve of an insert in the calendars to rectify the situation, Becker said, "An insert at this time is not terribly useful."

He urged students to "wait until September." The origins of the Laskin report started in the fall of 1967 when W.P. Scott chairman of the board of governors told Pro Tem (Glendon college weekly) reporters that he was recommending to the board that York set up a committee to investigate student discipline.

Scott was concerned at that time about the tense campus situation in North America and was particularly upset about a controversy at the University of Toronto over an allegedly obscene article printed in the student newspaper.

In Feb. 1968, Ross set up the discipline committee under the chairmanship of freshman board member Mr. Justice Bora Laskin.

Shortly after the committee's formation, the Glendon student representative resigned, declaring the committee illegitimate.

The committee made its report Nov. 27 and listed 83 recommendations. It virtually calls for a ban on student/faculty strikes or sit-ins.

According to the York University Act (Article 13 (2) C), Ross has sole power over student discipline and can at any time legally, if not morally, implement the Laskin report.

CYSF president Paul Axelrod said on Friday: "It appears that when we thought Ross was trying to railroad the Laskin report through, we were right."

"I've always felt that the administration at this university doesn't take students very seriously — especially when it comes to university policy.

"It appears now, that we will have to convince Ross that students are here to be taken seriously."

Harold Kaplan, chairman of the council of the Faculty of Arts, was also surprised that the president's office had prepared the calendar statement only one month after the Laskin report was released.

He said the faculty at that time was given assurances that it was to be consulted.

"I wouldn't want to speculate on what motives were involved" in the statement's approval, he said.

Student Conduct

Members of the University are referred to the report of the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities which sets forth the basic concepts which should prevail at the University with respect to the behaviour of students.

By accepting membership in the University, a person acknowledges his willingness to abide by these concepts.

Municipal by-laws, provincial and federal legislation and regulations are fully applicable to the activities of the University and to individual students regardless of where they are, on or off campus.

"Not applicable": Atkinson calendar.

Students walk out of class in natural science protest

By JOHN KING

About 40 students walked out of a lecture in the Natural Science 176A course on "Science, Technology and Society" Friday protesting against the course content, the lecture format and the need for a final examination in the course.

Thirteen of the students later confronted Faculty of Arts associate dean W.W. Piepenberg with their complaints and presented him with a petition signed by 62 of the 95 students in the lecture, saying they "think that the course does not merit writing a final exam."

In a class vote in the lecture only 19 students voted to hold any examination in the course.

Council of the York Student Federation academic affairs commissioner Joe Polonsky, who had been directed by the council to attend the Friday lecture to discuss with students their complaints and opinions on the course, had suggested a take-home exam as an option to the three-hour faculty examination, but course director James A. Burt, vetoed it.

"A take-home exam is not an easy exam, it is quality research and there is a good possibility you will all fail" if the students insisted on a take-home exam, Burt said.

Only two of the 19 votes cast in favor of an examination were for a take-home exam.

The students were to meet with arts dean John Saywell at 9:15 this morning to discuss their grievances.

Natural Science 176A erupted again yesterday when lecturer James A. Burt refused to allow student Dean Zalev two minutes to tell the class the outcome of the Friday meeting with arts associate dean W.W. Piepenberg and of the meeting today with arts dean John Saywell.

"I'm running this class," Burt said. "If you want to talk go outside — it's not cold — or get a room from Mr. Annis."

After a doomed bid to lecture Burt was interrupted by a student's question: "What about feedback analysis?"

Burt didn't feel that the question was relevant and ordered the student to leave.

The student refused. Burt told the class "either he leaves or I do."

After a few confused minutes of hurled insults Burt declared the lecture cancelled.

The class stayed on until 1:50 pm and discussed the course in general and in particular the action to be taken at Saywell's meeting this morning.

At the meeting with Saywell this morning the students will present the following statement:

"The students in Natural Science 176A agree that

"A. The course has failed to be of value as a learning situation.

"B. The course has failed primarily because of 1) careless selection, 2) incoherent organization and 3) insipid presentation of subject material on the part of Prof. J.A. Burt.

"C. A final exam in NS176A would be

of little or no value as 1) a learning experience or 2) a criteria of student evaluation.

"D. The students in NS176A should be granted the option of 1) writing a final exam and being graded in NS176A, 2) not writing a final exam in which case NS176A would be ungraded (i.e. pass/fail evaluation)."

Dean Zalev, one of the students representing students in the course in negotiations with the faculty, told Piepenberg that Burt's lecture style was "very dry" and that the course description had been misleading.

He said the science part of the course had been handled on "a skimpy level" and described it as "a grocery list of scientific inventions."

The technology part of the course, he said, was a poorly taught course on computers. Students described the course content as too technical, too simplistic and too factual.

In the part of the course which was to

25 leave pollution class protesting content, exam

Dissatisfaction with Natural Science 176B on Friday wasn't as marked as that in the Natural Science 176A lecture an hour earlier, but 25 students, one-third of the class, did walk out of class class after a heated 20-minute debate about course content and the validity of having a final exam.

The students who left selected delegates to go with Council of the York Student Federation academic affairs commissioner Joe Polonsky when he met with course director M. Katz yesterday at 11 am to discuss problems with this course on pollution, particularly the validity of having a final exam.

As in the earlier Nat. Sci. 176A class, Polonsky initiated the discussion. He explained what had happened in 176A and then asked if 176B students were interested in taking similar action.

Students on Friday were divided on whether or not they wanted a final exam, even though most agreed that the course had been boring and somewhat of a failure.

About half the class felt that they would write an exam just to get the course finished without any more hassle. People in this group felt also that the final would probably be a "snap test."

Other students, many of whom later walked out, argued that having an exam would be the ultimate legitimization of a course which most of the people in the class agreed had been ineptly-organized throughout the year.

They also pointed out that there was relatively little material on which they could write an orthodox exam, as there have been only about eight real lectures.

Unlike 176A, students never got to a vote on whether or not there should be a final exam. The only vote taken was one on whether or not students were

discuss society, Zalev said, "it appeared he was paying lip service to us" by bringing in poor-quality guest lecturers, one of whom "almost got laughed out of the hall."

Students complained that Burt gave out mimeographed sheets at the beginning of his lectures and that when one student asked him about the handouts, Burt said that virtually all the final exam will be based on the sheets.

Students taking the science, technology and society course during the last three years have continually complained about its shortcomings, but little has been changed.

At the end of November, 1969, 133 students in the course signed a petition to science dean H.I. Schiff, expressing dissatisfaction with the course content, the lecture format and the style of examinations. "We got the runaround," Mark Cohen, another of the students who walked out of the lecture, said.

dissatisfied with the course. A majority indicated they were.

On March 4, Katz had agreed to give up four lecture hours during March to speakers requested by a group of students who had protested that the course "was being presented in a way that destroys already existing interest" in pollution.

In the meeting yesterday morning, Katz, in response to demands for no final exam, said he expected grades for students in the class would not be much different from their marks during the year.

In a vote in yesterday's lecture 44 students voted against a final examination in the course and 38 students voted in favor of an exam.

About 35 students abstained from the vote.

Katz is taking the results of yesterday's vote to science dean H.I. Schiff.

Council's back Glendon gets new gov't

Students at Glendon College elected a new student council Friday, the first student government the college has had since the last council and the council-appointed chief returning officer resigned en masse in October, 1969.

The new council, led by acclaimed president David Phillips, will work through the summer to draft a new constitution for the student union and will resign in October to allow new elections.

Students at the college passed a referendum sponsored by Phillips last month asking the resigned chief returning officer to begin student council elections under the terms of the old constitution.

The resignations of the CRO and the council last October had left the college without any form of student government, since a new student council could not be elected without a CRO, and a new CRO could not be appointed without a student council.

The four new councillors are Andre Foucault, Bob Beadle, Charlie Bryan and Lori Moore.