

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, April 12, 1999 at ~~7:00~~ 5:30 pm in room 3210 West Mall Complex

Open Session

*As amended
by Senate
May 17/99*

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair

Akins, Kathleen
Boland, Lawrence
Bowman, Marilyn
Chan, Albert
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
Crossley, David
D'Auria, John
Dunsterville, Valerie
Emerson, Joseph
Emmott, Albert
Finley David
Fletcher, James
Gagan, David
Gillies, Mary Ann
Harris, Richard
Heaney, John
Kanevsky, Lannie
Kirczenow, George
Lewis, Brian
Marteniuk, Ron
Mathewes, Rolf
Mauser, Gary
McInnes, Dina
Morris, Joy
Naef, Barbara
Overington, Jennifer
Percival, Paul
Peterson, Louis
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Pinfield, Larry (representing J. Waterhouse)
Sanghera, Balwant
Thompson, Janis (representing R. Barrow)
To, Shek Yan
Weeks, Daniel
Wortis, Michael
Yerbury, Colin (representing L. Burton)
Zazkis, Rina

Absent:

Beattie, Suzan
Berggren, Len
Coleman, Peter
Dhillon, Khushwant
Giffen, Ken
Jones, John
Ogloff, James
Osborne, Judith
Reader, Jason
Russell, Robert
Segal, Joseph
Veerkamp, Mark
Wickstrom, Norman

In attendance:

Gupta, Arvind
Little, Jack
Macdonald, Bob
Tront, Russell
Warrington, Simon
Williams, Kevin

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services and Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, Secretariat Services
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

On behalf of Senate, the Chair welcomed newly elected Student Senator, D. Crossley to the meeting. The Chair reported that D. Crossley has also been elected as President of the Simon Fraser Student Society and as a student representative on the Board of Directors – Burnaby Mountain Community Corporation.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The order of the agenda was changed so that Item 5 d.ii – Paper S.99-36 – could be considered as the first item under Reports of Committees. Following this revision, the agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of March 1, 1999

Reference was made to approval of the minutes on page 2 and concern was expressed that the correction made to the minutes of February 1st regarding familial appointments did not reflect the criticism that was made. Suggestion was made that the added sentence to the 2nd paragraph on page 5 of the February 1st minutes should be changed to read: University hiring of faculty should be based on academic excellence rather than familial relationships. Following this amendment, the Minutes were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

4. Report of the Chair

i) Faculty Awards

Senate was advised that Gail Anderson, School of Criminology was one of the winners of the 40 under 40 award which is a national award where 40 Canadians under the age of 40 are recognized for their contribution to their field of study. A ceremony to honor the winners will take place in Toronto and a number of SFU Alumni in the Toronto area have been invited to be in attendance with Professor Anderson when she receives her award.

ii) Budget Information

Although the University had not yet received an official letter from the Government, the Chair reported that SFU had been given 256 fully funded FTEs and had been given an additional small amount of funding in compensation for the tuition freeze. SCEMP has recommended that the enrolments be restored to Arts and Science. There was no change to the base budget and the tuition freeze remains in effect for the fourth year. In terms of revenue per student, SFU was behind the Canadian average. Discussions have taken place and advice received from the Senate Committee on University Budget. The final budget will be submitted to the Vice-President Finance and Administration shortly.

5. Reports of Committees

- d) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- i) Paper S.99-36 – Senate Library Committee – Revised membership

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by J. Morris

“In response to the External Review of the Library Report Recommendation, it is moved that the following changes be made to the membership of the Senate Library Committee:

- 1) Replace the current student membership by one undergraduate and one graduate student, selected by the Simon Fraser Student Society, and one alternate undergraduate and one alternate graduate student, selected by the Simon Fraser Student Society. An alternate may attend meetings and may vote in the absence of the regular member.
- 2) Add one Librarian (a voting member), to be elected by the staff employee group (2 year term)
- 3) Add one Library staff person (a voting member) to be elected by the staff employee groups (2 year term).

These changes would take effect 1 June 1999. Terms will be staggered in the first year.”

Senate was advised that the purpose of the motion was to make the membership of the Senate Library Committee more representative of the University community.

Amendment moved by A. Chan, seconded by G. Mauser

“that the words in point (1) ‘selected by the Simon Fraser Student Society’ be replaced by ‘elected by Senate’ in the two places where they occur in this sentence”

Opinion was expressed that since this was a Senate committee, Senate should have the right to determine membership.

It was noted that the faculty members on the committee were elected by and from their respective Faculties and not by Senate. Opinion was expressed that the Student Society was the representative body for students at SFU and should therefore have the right to choose its representatives, especially to committees responsible for making changes to policies that have a significant impact on students. There have been communication problems between student representatives on SLC and the Student Society, and it was felt that the amendment undermined the recommendations of the external reviewers and the Senate Library Committee itself. It was pointed out that the review committee had actually suggested that student reps be elected by the students, not selected by the Student Society, but since it was not feasible to hold general elections for each Senate committee, it was more appropriate for Senate to elect members to its committees. It was noted that having students elected by Senate does

not eliminate the Student Society's participation as they can still submit nominations for election by Senate.

It was pointed out that several Senate committees have similar membership structures whereby some of their members are elected by Senate and some are elected/selected by other constituencies and opinion was expressed that all members on all Senate committees should be elected by Senate. Inquiry was made as to whether this motion could be ~~deferred~~ ^{referred} back to the Senate Review Committee. It was pointed out that the Senate Review Committee would look at this issue in any event and there was no need to ~~defer~~ ^{refer} it at this time.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

The following Student Senators wished to have their dissent noted for the record: J. Morris, J. Overington, and D. Crossley.

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

MAIN MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

- a) Senate Committee on Academic Planning
- i) Paper S.99-32 – Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences (PIMS)

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-32, the establishment of the SFU site of the Pacific Institute for the Mathematical Sciences (PIMS) as a Schedule B institute under Policy R40.01”

A. Gupta, School of Computing Science and PIMS-SFU Site Director, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

In response to an inquiry concerning cost, Senate was advised that the University would provide base budget funding of \$75,000. Concern was expressed that there was no clause to deal with harassment issues and suggestion was made that it might be appropriate to include a statement that if harassment were to occur the current policy of each university would take effect. It was pointed out that the documentation specified that PIMS would conduct its activities in accordance with university policy.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Secretary's Note: The motion as set out above differs from the motion in S.99-32 approved at Senate in that it includes the additional phrase “SFU site of the” to reflect that the University is formally establishing an SFU site for an existing organization with sites at other institutions

b) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Continuing Studies

i) Paper S.99-33 – Non-Credit Certificate in Object Technology Programming

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by R. Marteniuk

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-33, the Non-Credit Certificate in Object Technology Programming”

A request to revise the motion as follows, was accepted as a friendly amendment:

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-33, the Non-Credit Certificate for the Object Technology Program”

R. Macdonald, Director of Continuing Studies in Applied Sciences, R. Tront, School of Computing Science, S. Warrington and K. Williams, students currently enrolled in the pilot program, were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that the proposal had been developed by the Faculty of Applied Sciences in response to frequent requests from industry and alumni to offer substantive professional development programs. The program focuses on developing the knowledge and skills that would enable participants to compete successfully in the rapidly expanding field of software development. The program consists of a curriculum in software design and development and would be delivered full time for six months followed by a six month paid internship with a BC high tech company. The Program would be administered by a Curriculum Advisory Committee in the Faculty of Applied Sciences which would be responsible for ensuring the academic quality of the curriculum and the quality of the instruction. The proposed fee of \$17,500 would recover all costs and was comparable with programs being offered by other public and private providers. The OTP program started with one cohort of students as a pilot program in September 1998 and would end in April 1999. The pilot was necessary because the OTP was relatively unique, being full cost recovery and requiring the full cooperation of industry to offer internships to all students.

Brief discussion ensued with respect to the process for starting up programs on a pilot basis. Senate was informed that non-credit pilot programs do not require Senate approval unless they wish to establish the program as a non-credit certificate program.

Reference was made to existing arrangements for the sharing of costs associated with non-credit courses and revenue generated by high fees from professional programs such as the EMBA program and inquiry was made as to how the revenue from this program would be administered. Senate was advised that discussions were ongoing and concern was expressed that this issue had not yet been resolved.

Questions were raised with respect to what happens to instructors in the program if the demand goes down and what kind of evaluation procedures were available. Inquiry was made about the grading system and whether there was a full spectrum of

grades available with an appeal and/or a withdrawal process and whether the Registrar's Office was involved in terms of keeping records of the grades and issuing transcripts. Senate was advised that all record keeping was done internally in the program and there was no formal process for withdrawal. It was noted that most non-credit programs normally have a pass/fail format and concern was expressed that the grading protocol for this program gave the appearance that this program might be trying to evolve towards a credit program within the non-credit structure. Senate was advised that the impetus for having grades was to demonstrate the progress of students to industry. There was no intent to turn the program into a credit program.

Discussion turned to the issue of workload. Senate was advised that it was a very intensive workload, approximately eight hours a day, with a mixture of hands-on work and lectures.

It was suggested that since the whole area of technology changes so rapidly it might be more appropriate to establish a framework for a more general program for offering and introducing new kinds of technology quickly rather than concentrating on a program built around one specific technology. It was agreed that the University should find some kind of mechanism to allow learning on demand to be offered in a timely fashion and it was an issue that should be given consideration. Opinion was expressed that this was an important issue for the University in terms of what type of programs would be offered under the traditional publicly funded university structure versus those offered at market costs. The Chair suggested that the Vice-President Academic and SCAP take this under advisement.

In response to inquiries, the students in attendance advised Senate that they took the program in order to get a foothold and experience in the workforce and the short term learning experience was also very attractive. Both students felt it was important for the program to be based at a university as it added credibility to the courses/program.

Discussion returned to the issue of grading/transcripts and the difference between the proposed non-credit program versus a credit program. It was pointed out that the transcript and the certificate itself would be issued by the Faculty of Applied Sciences, not by the Registrar's Office. All records would be kept internally. It was stressed that this program would not be accepted by as a credit program nor could successful completion of a non-credit course be applied towards work in a degree program. It was pointed out that the University has a quasi-legal system dealing with grades and grade appeals and concern was expressed that grades in this program were beyond scrutiny of the current grading policy and there was no formal mechanism for appeal. Opinion was expressed that one of the virtues of non-credit courses/programs in Continuing Studies was that they were not graded formally.

Opinion was expressed that non-academic technology training programs that have no regular faculty members and no official grades might better be offered at technology institutions such as Tech BC or BCIT rather than at a university. It was pointed out that this program does not set precedents. There have been other very successful programs of this type within Continuing Studies, including a very good program from Applied Sciences that involved BC Tel. It was noted that in Continuing Studies highly qualified instructors are brought in from the community to carry out course instruction under the guidance of tenure-track faculty. It was also pointed out that SFU had a responsibility to its graduates and to the employers who hire SFU graduates to provide

recurrent education and upgrading. Expectations are that the University will have to do more rather than less of this in the future.

Comment was made that many issues were raised during discussion. A suggestion that the persons responsible for offering the program report back to Senate in three years time on the academic and financial aspects of the program was accepted as a friendly amendment, with the motion revised as follows:

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-33, the Non-Credit Certificate for the Object Technology Program, and a report on the academic and financial aspects of the program be provided to Senate in three years”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

c) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.99-34 – Faculty of Arts – History Calendar Revision

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by J. Pierce

“that the following be added to the History entry in the graduate Calendar: Full-time M.A. thesis-option students are expected to complete their degree requirements in five semesters and project-option students in three semesters. Part-time thesis-option students are expected to complete their requirements in eight semesters and part-time project-option students in six semesters”

J. Little, Graduate Program Chair, History Department, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was reminded that this change had been referred back to SGSC for consideration and brief background information was provided. It was pointed out that students who do not complete their thesis in the expected timeframe would not be removed from the program but the time would be taken into consideration as part of the normal review of the student’s progress in the program.

Amendment moved by J. Emerson, seconded by J. Overington

“that the word ‘normally’ be inserted in front of the two appearances of the word ‘expected’, and that the following sentence be added to end of the motion: The six full-time fee payment requirement is not applicable to these programs”

The latter part of the motion was ruled out of order since it related to fees and was a matter for the Board of Governors. The first part of the motion was accepted as a friendly amendment. Following brief discussion with respect to the proposed wording, the motion was revised as follows:

“that the following be added to the History entry in the graduate Calendar: Full-time M.A. thesis-option students will normally complete their degree requirements in five semesters and project-option students

in three semesters. Part-time thesis-option students will normally complete their requirements in eight semesters and part-time project-option students in six semesters”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

Brief discussion ensued with respect to fees for this program when six full-time fee units are the minimum, but B. Clayman noted that students completing in less time are only required to pay for the time in the program.

- d) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- i) Paper S.99-35 – Policy on Endowed Academic Appointments

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by M. A. Gillies

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-35, the revised Policy A10.03 – Endowed Academic Appointments”

Senate was advised that the revised policy was brought forward at this time to accommodate the University’s advancement campaign for which the President has targeted possibly up to twenty new endowed professorships beginning with six that would take effect September 1st this year. Minor changes have been made to the policy having to do with making the professorships available for the purposes of recruitment, renewal and retention of highly qualified faculty, particularly making them available to faculty members of any rank. In addition, as a result of discussions at previous Senate meetings, revisions have been made to include Senate approval for the establishment of the terms of reference for endowed University Chairs.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- 6. Other Business
There was no other business.
- 7. Information
Date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, May 17, 1999.

The Open Session adjourned at 7:00 pm. The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, Secretariat Services