Saturday, February 5th, 1921.

510 An adjourned special meeting of the Senate of the University of British Columbia was held on Saturday, February 5th, 1921, at 4 p.m., in the Board Room at the University offices.

511 Present: The President in the Chair, Dean R. W. Brock, Dean H. T. J. Coleman, Mr. W. Sadler, Mr. P. A. Boving, Mr. E. G. Matheson, Dr. E. H. Archibald, Dr. T. H. Boggs, Dr. H. Ashton, Mr. L. F. Robertson, Mr. T. A. Brough, Judge F. W. Howay, Mr. G. E. Robinson, Mr. W. P. Argue, Miss A. B. Jamieson, Mr. J. H. Senkler, Principal W. H. Vance, Mr. J. M. Turnbull.

512 The call for the adjourned meeting was presented as follows:

> An adjourned special meeting of the Senate of The University of British Columbia will be held in the Board Room of the University on Saturday, February 5th, 1921, at 4 p.m.
>
> To continue the business in connection with, and arising from, the Christmas examination results and the action taken by Faculty in reference to certain students, as outlined in the agenda of the special meeting of Senate of Wednesday, February 2nd.

513 A letter from Mr. H. W. Baker, who appeared before Senate on February 2nd, was read.

Mr. Argue)
Dr. Boggs) That it be filed.

Carried.

514 The minutes of the special meeting of February 2nd, 1921, were read for the information of Senate, but not for confirmation.

515 A report from Faculty, on Senate's request for a reconsideration of the appeal of students required to withdraw as a result of the Christmas examinations, was submitted:-

> In the matter of the reconsideration, at the request of the Senate, of the question of the standing of those students who failed at the mid-session examinations and were asked to withdraw from the University, Faculty submits the following report:-

The Faculty would, therefore, respectfully urge upon Senate:-

(1) That students dismissed in January 1921 be not re-admitted.

(2) That Faculty, in reconsidering its action in asking certain students to withdraw from the University under the regulation of Senate, feels that, short of disregarding this regulation entirely, no more lenient application than it has made, could possibly have been made.

(3) That while the shortness of time has not permitted the fullest consideration of the question, from the facts before us and our own experience, we feel that the practice which prevails in the great Universities of Canada, and which has been followed here, is not an unwise one.

(4) That we are of the opinion that the interests of the University will be best safeguarded if Senate's direction in this regard stand as at present, and Faculty be given the widest discretion in applying the regulation.

(5) That Faculty notices with regret and calls the attention of Senate to the fact that reputable and influential citizens so far forget the respect due to Senate in its judicial capacity as to assume that the members are to be influenced in the discharge of their duties by considerations of what "a few determined men" may be induced to undertake in the way of political propaganda directed against the University.

Mr. Robinson)
Mr. Argue) That it be received and considered clause by clause.

Carried.

Mr. Robinson)
Dr. Ashton) That clause 1 of the report be adopted.

In connection with this, Dr. Ashton presented a statement of the reasons for Faculty's position, and the Secretary reported with regard to the practice in other Canadian Universities in the matter of withdrawal of students in mid-session because of unsatisfactory work. The statement of Faculty's reasons for its position is as follows:-

(1) The argument was advanced before Senate that the practice of dismissal at Christmas, prevalent in American Universities, was justified there by the fact that they did not control Matriculation; that it was not justified here because we do. It was pointed out in Faculty (a) That there is more control of schools sending candidates to the University in America than there is here, (b) That we do not control Matriculation, but are only represented on the Board of Examiners.

(2) The argument was advanced before Senate (a) That this practice was an American one, (b) That students dismissed from this University were lost to the Province, because they went, as a result, to American Universities. The Faculty is unable to follow this argument.

(3) The practice is not merely an American one, it is followed by the great Canadian Universities and more leniently applied here than at McGill, as the following telegrams will show:-

From Queen's University, Kingston -

> "The Science Faculty at Queen's for years have dropped at mid-session students who failed in half their papers. This year about fifteen were dropped. The Arts Faculty is beginning this practice."

From the University of Toronto -

> "Both University and Colleges have repeatedly refused admission to unsatisfactory students on January 1st, opening of Easter Term."

From McGill University -

> "Yes, sent away this year nine out of one hundred and fifty in Arts, seven out of eighty-three in Commerce, twenty-six out of one hundred and ninety in Applied Science. Not unusual in Law, Medicine, and Dentistry and applies as a rule only to First Year in other Faculties."

(4) The Faculty is not composed of men who are mere bookworms, but men who have themselves taken part in sports and student activities - some of them have created and are giving much of their time to the very clubs that have been cited as of value. But these same men are convinced that training comes, not from the abuse of all these activities, but from careful combination of study and student activities. This lesson should be learned at once, for the University course is only too short as it is.

515a Copy of telegrams sent, February 1st, 1921, to:-

James Brebner,
Registrar,
Toronto University,
Toronto.

W. E. McNeill,
Registrar,
Queen's University,
Kingston.

J. A. Nicholson,
Registrar,
McGill University,
Montreal.

"Does (Toronto,-Queen's,- McGill University) ever exclude students at mid-session because of unsatisfactory record? Reply collect.

S. W. Mathews,
Registrar,
University of British Columbia."

(Inserted by order of Senate, February 16th, 1921.)

(5) Many parents rely upon the Faculty to encourage their sons and daughters to obtain a balanced education. For this many of them are making great financial sacrifices and would resent any attitude of the Faculty that could be interpreted as permission to waste half the first year.

(6) As the students dismissed had failed in at least three out of five subjects, there can be no doubt that they were wasting their time and that they would be quite unlikely to profit by the second term's work. They would also call for an undue proportion of the instructors' attention in the second term and this would be unfair to the great majority of the students.

Principal Vance)
Mr. Senkler) That the discussion of this matter be adjourned until the regular meeting of Senate, which takes place on February 16th, 1921.

Carried.

L. D. Kinnell Stanley W. Mathews

Chairman. Secretary.