

There's a war on
in Africa - Page 7

Excalibur

Vol. 4, No. 26

THE YORK UNIVERSITY WEEKLY

March 19, 1970



IT'S JUST FOR FUN ANYWAY

Excalibur - Tim Clark

The plate may be backwards, but Brad Weiner, one of the members of York's new baseball club, can still hit the ball and have fun. Steve Thomas, the club's president, looks on. The club plans casual games in the spring and summer and hopes to start up an inter-collegiate team. If baseball is your groove too, call Steve at 638-2094.

Ross: Discipline report is now university policy

By BOB ROTH

York University president Murray G. Ross confirmed yesterday that the basic concepts of the Laskin report on student discipline are now university policy.

In a meeting with the executive of the Council of the York Student Federation, Ross said that under Article 13 (2) C of the York University Act he has the power to implement the report and has decided to adhere to its basic concepts and principles.

He said, however, it was an "interim measure" and agreed to send a letter to that effect to all members of the York community. He said he would prepare one by tomorrow.

However, five minutes after his meeting with the CYSF, Ross met with the university senate Duff-Berdahl committee which is now studying the Laskin report.



Murray G. Ross

There, he presented a draft copy of his proposed letter dated Tuesday, March 17.

The committee was not satisfied with the letter and is engaging in negotiations with Ross.

The controversy over the Laskin report arose last week when the university academic calendars were released indicating that the report had been implemented.

Earlier Ross and his assistant, John Becker, had assured the students and faculty that the report would not be implemented without their approval.

Both the CYSF and the York University Faculty Association have expressed disapproval of parts of the report.

On Tuesday the Founders College representative on the university court resigned in protest. The CYSF representative was withdrawn earlier.



Paul Axelrod

The Founders representative, Ronald Freedman, resigned "in support of the position taken by the Council of the York Student Federation and the Council of the Faculty of Arts."

"It is my belief that the action taken by Dr. Ross is an inexcusable step backwards in the goal of student participation in the affairs of the university community," the letter said.

On Tuesday the Council of the Faculty of Arts put inserts into all their calendars stating disapproval of Ross's act.

Rolly Stroeter, a student member of the Laskin committee has also expressed his disapproval and signed a petition being circulated supporting the CYSF stand.

Ross said he has implemented the demands to modify his power under the York Act, but he admitted that legally he could at any time overrule or even abolish the court.

Ross said it would take three years to change the act which gives him that power.

He said he will use the principles of the Laskin report "until the university decides what they're going to do with the Laskin report."

CYSF president Paul Axelrod, who is opposed to many of the concepts and principles outlined in the report said the report fails to deal adequately with the definition of the university and concepts of freedom.

For instance, he said, students challenging professors in lectures is easily interpreted under the Laskin report as a disruption and therefore a misdeed, but how does one deal with an inflexible professor in a natural science course where there are "students being cheated of what they should have been experiencing?"

Compromise possible

NS 176A demands rejected by science

By BOB WALLER

After almost four months of disruptions, wrangles over the merit of course content and the validity of a compulsory final exam, students in Natural Science 176A yesterday afternoon saw their demands for a revised form of evaluation rejected by course director J.A. Burt and by the Faculty of Science.

Following the decision yesterday afternoon by the science committee on examinations and academic standards to allow course director James A. Burt to evaluate the students with a final exam, the students met with arts dean John T. Saywell.

Saywell then set a meeting for today of the first year general education interdisciplinary committee and the NS176A negotiating committee to examine the dispute as it now stands.

Saywell said that the committee will decide what action it should recommend the arts faculty take on standing if any students in the course decide not to write the final exam and thereby receive a failing grade from Burt.

The arts faculty exam board would have the last say in setting final grades.

The meeting will be at 3:30 pm today in room S942 in the Ministry of Love. The demands, revised after two days of intensive meetings between the NS176A negotiating committee and arts and science faculty, were as follows:

"1. If the student desires a 'letter' grade, i.e. A, B, C, etc., he must write the final examination.

"2. If the student desires to be graded on a 'pass/fail basis', the basis for the grade will be: (a) his Christmas examination AND (b) his optional essay or oral research project/book oral research project AND (c) 500 word critique of the course.

"If the student desires a pass/fail grade, but has not completed 2) (b), then he must complete this part on or before the examination date."

The key in the rejection of the demands was Burt's refusal to change the evaluation policy in the Science, Technology and Society course despite a last-minute plea by the students' negotiating committee yesterday at noon.

Burt argued that "it's a good suggestion but at this point in the game, there is no way to accept it. If such a scheme had been proposed in the fall, I probably would have considered it more seriously. Probably I also would have run a pass/fail course differently."

He added that he had been given the power by his superiors to "plan the course from 'T equals O' down to the end and I think the exam is a good thing."

Burt told the negotiating committee that if there was to be a change in evaluation at this stage, it would have to be the sole responsibility of either the arts and/or science faculties but he would not support the proposed changes.

He also said, "they asked me to give the grades and this is the only way I will do so without new explicit directions from above."

If Burt had been amicable to the students' demands, science dean H.I. Schiff told students yesterday morning, there was a strong possibility that the science curriculum committee would endorse the change.

At the same meeting, arts dean John T. Saywell said that the Council of the Faculty of Arts would probably not look with disfavor on the change.

At press time late yesterday afternoon the student negotiating committee had not decided what course of action to take except to make a formal report of the negotiations to the class tomorrow.

The course had erupted on Friday when about 40 students walked out to protest against the course content, lecture format and merit of writing a final examination.

During two days of meetings between the NS176A negotiating committee, Saywell, Schiff and Burt saw the original request of the NS176A class revised many times over until the final compromise, which was presented to Burt yesterday.

At their first meeting on Tuesday morning with Saywell, the committee asked that "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)."

At that time, a third option was added on the suggestion of Saywell stating that if people wished, they could get a final letter grade without writing the final exam. The mark would be similar to aegrotat standing.

Saywell, who said that "my own personal feeling is that criticism of the course is widespread" and "I anticipated the revolution in natural science next fall," reported the results of the meeting to Schiff.

Saywell also agreed that "the social implications in this course and other natural science courses are not being brought out well."

Around noon Saywell called student Dean Zalev, according to Zalev, and told him that "You've made your point."



H. I. Schiff

...why don't you just write the exam... If nobody in 176A writes an exam, then five other courses won't want to write... Next year 30 courses won't want to write... and you'll have to convince Dean Schiff."

Tuesday afternoon, Schiff and the negotiating committee met for two hours. When it was over, the original demands had been tentatively scrapped and the committee was to go back to the class with a proposal that as an alternative to the exam, students could write an essay-type critique of the course which would be made by Schiff instead of Burt.

Schiff, who said that "you are the victims of a course which was new given by a new lecturer" would not agree to anyone getting credit in the course and not attempting 100 per cent of the evaluation.

He sympathized: "Look, I don't know what the hell to say about the exam bit. Complaints about 176A are all valid and negotiable and should be a continuing dialogue."

Tuesday evening the negotiating committee met and decided that the compromise with Schiff was a perversion of the mandate given by the class, and was not a satisfactory solution to the problems of NS176A.

They developed the demands that were ultimately rejected by Burt.

Prof petitioned in 171

Students in the Natural Science 171 course on "The Nature and Growth of the Physical Sciences" got mad last Wednesday when course director C.A. Hooker told them they would be writing an exam with 70 objective questions, as well as a 3,000-word essay.

So 68 per cent of the class signed a petition on Friday to protest.

Hooker changed the requirement so that now students only have to answer 45 of the 70 questions on the objective

exam. A lot of the students were pacified.

But some of them are still uptight. Ted Pilkington, E2, is going to ask for five minutes to speak to the students about the course in Hooker's lecture tomorrow, and he's going to draw up another petition asking Hooker to drop either the exam or the essay completely.

"For the time involved to do a good exam which no one wants to take," Pilkington said Tuesday, "this isn't worth it."

Five candidates expected on senate presidential ballot Tuesday

By JOHN KING

It now appears there will be five names on the York presidential ballot when senators cast their preferential votes next week.

Although a formal list has not yet been drawn up, the lineup is expected to include two of the three candidates on the original "short list" of candidates — John T. Saywell, York's arts dean and University of Toronto dean of arts and science Albert D. Allen.

The newcomers in the ring are expected to be John H.G. Cripio, the head of the industrial relations department at U of T, David Slater, the dean of graduate studies and research at Queen's University and Osgoode law professor I.R. Feltham. Feltham is one of the two York faculty members on the board of governors.

It appears that James M. Gillies, the head of York's faculty of administrative studies, who was reportedly strongly supported as a candidate by board chairman William Pearson Scott, has also missed out on the second short list of candidates.

According to reliable sources, the first list ran into significant opposition from Scott when it was presented to York's board-senate executive committee Dec. 4, because of the small number of candidates on the list and the omission of Gillies' name.

Gillies had been mentioned as a possible presidential candidate since the Committee of Search for a New President started meeting in May, 1969. Sources in the administration had expected his name to be on the second list when it comes to the senate next Tuesday.

Another potential York president, present University of Calgary president A.W.R. Carrothers, rumored to have been discussed by the search committee when they were making up the second short list, was never actually approached by the committee.

A special secret senate meeting has been called for next Tuesday, when the committee will submit its report listing the final slate of candidates. Senators will be able to vote by secret ballot for the candidates of their choice from the time of the adjournment of the

special meeting until 4:30 Thursday. Results of the senate vote will be released only to Scott, the chairman of the board, and Laskin, the chairman of the search committee, who is also a board member.

The board will appoint the next president, keeping in mind that whoever it is must have the "broad support" of the senate.

Before the senate meeting Tuesday the committee has to submit its report to Scott. The search committee wound up its second series of interviews Tuesday night with a re-interview of Saywell.

The first series of interviews, which ended late in November, 1969, resulted in three candidates' names being presented to the board — Saywell, Allen and McGill University vice-principal Michael K. Oliver.

Oliver dropped out after the names were released in EXCALIBUR and The Globe and Mail Dec. 9. He is reportedly a strong contender for the soon-to-be-open principalship of McGill.

On Jan. 5 Saywell withdrew from the race

charging that the procedure was "unwise, if not disastrous."

In his letter of withdrawal, Saywell said the senate should have the "preponderant say" in the presidential selection. He also criticized the secrecy of the selection and reporting procedure, calling it "a procedure which ensures that the new president... will take office under a cloud."

On Jan. 8 Allen withdrew, also criticizing the selection procedure. He said he felt the new president should be chosen by a committee representing all parts of the university — students, faculty, senate and board.

"It would be foolish to take it on unless one could feel very well assured of general support and sympathy throughout the university," Allen said.

Both men left open the possibility that they would accept renomination if the procedure were changed to overcome their objections. Saywell said Tuesday night that in spite of his re-interview he had not yet officially

thrown his hat back into the ring.

Apparently the committee decided to submit the maximum number of candidates on their second short list to avoid the problem of one of the candidates dropping out.

The search committee's terms of reference restricted them to presenting no less than three and no more than five names.

The criteria used by the selection committee were redefined before the second series of interviews was started.

York president Murray G. Ross announced his intention to retire as York's chief administrator effective June 30, 1970, in a letter to Scott in December, 1968.

The search committee, struck at a board-senate executive committee meeting Feb. 19, 1969, was to have completed its report by early November, 1969. The entire selection of the new president had been expected to be completed by the end of November.

The selection procedure should now be completed by early April.