

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, May 10, 2004 at 5:30 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Beynon, Peter
Brennand, Tracy
Budd, James
Cameron, Rob (representing B. Lewis)
Collinge, Joan (representing C. Yerbury)
Copeland, Lynn
da Silva, Gisele
D'Auria, John
Dickinson, John
Driver, Jon
Fizzell, Maureen
Giacomantonio, Chris
Gill, Alison
Gillies, Mary Ann (representing J. Pierce)
Gregory, Titus
Haunerland, Norbert
Hira, Andy
Honda, Barry
Horvath, Adam
Li, Zi-Nian
McFetridge, Paul
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Plischke, Michael
Rozell, Sara
Sears, Camilla
Tombe, Trevor
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Daniel
Wessel, Silvia
Wong, Josephine
Woodbury, Rob

Absent:

Apaak, Clement
Atkins, Stella
Clayman, Bruce
Dunsterville, Valerie
Fung, Edward
Gordon, Robert
Grimmett, Peter
Gupta, Kamal
Heaney, John
Higgins, Anne
Kaila, Pam
Kalanj, Tiffany
Krane, Bill
Love, Ernie
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
Scott, Jamie
Shaker, Paul
Smith, Don
Van Aalst, Jan
Wong, Milton
Yoo, Rick

In attendance:

Dinning, Mike
Hanlan, Lee
Krebs, Dennis

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

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of April 5, 2004
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the Minutes.
4. Report of the Chair
There was no report from the Chair.
5. Question Period
There were no questions submitted.
6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Appeals Board

i) Paper S.04-36 – Annual Report (For Information)

L. Hanlan, SAB Chair, and M. Dinning, SAB Secretary, were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

There were no questions, and the Annual Report of the Senate Appeals Board was received by Senate for information.

B) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.04-37 – Undergraduate Curriculum Implementation Task Force Recommendations

D. Krebs, Chair of the Task Force and several members of the Task Force and the Support Groups were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

By way of introduction, Senate was advised that the report and recommendations currently before Senate provide details with respect to the implementation of writing, quantitative and breadth requirements previously approved in principle by Senate.

Recommendation 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Fizzell

“that University-wide WQB graduation requirements be implemented for students admitted to SFU for the Fall 2006 semester as outlined in the memorandum dated April 27, 2004 from D. Krebs”

Senate was informed that the following notation which was inadvertently omitted needed to be added to the information under Recommendation 1 in the above-noted memorandum: *Students must obtain a grade of C- or better in all of the courses in question.*

A motion to divide the question so that the WQB requirements could be voted on separately was ruled out of order by the Chair because the intention of the original motion as approved by Senate in-principle was to legislate these requirements as a package.

The ruling of the Chair was challenged and the following motion was moved by P. Percival, seconded by J. D’Auria

“that the ruling of the Chair be over turned”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

Request was made by a Student Senator to consider Recommendation 4 prior to Recommendation 1. Student Senators felt it was important to have assurances that adequate support and resources would be put in place to assist students before actually passing any of the new requirements. There was no objection to the request, and the motion with respect to Recommendation 1 was set aside in order to deal with Recommendation 4.

Recommendation 4

Moved by C. Giacomantonio, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that a Task Force or equivalent body be created to explore the establishment of a Student Learning Centre”

Amendment moved by S. Rozell, seconded by J. Wong

“that the following statement be added to the end of the existing motion: *and to ensure that adequate resources are put in place to support the continuation and graduation requirements, and the foundational skills courses*”

The Vice-President, Academic advised that every effort would be made to put in place the support mechanisms needed to enable students to succeed but he could not guarantee an open ended commitment to provide resources. The Task Force had already extensively considered the question of resources and the intent of the Vice President Academic was to receive advice from the existing task force as well as advice from the new task force with respect to appropriate resources.

The following concerns were expressed with regard to the wording of the amendment:

- consideration of resources was largely *ultra vires* to Senate legislation;
- no clear meaning as to what was meant by 'adequate resources' and therefore no way to measure success/failure;
- the word 'ensure' concerned several Senators. Alternative suggestions were made;
- the purpose of the Student Learning Centre was not defined and if aims/goals were stated, the questions of resources and the Centre's success/failure could be more easily measured.

Senate was advised that the intent of the amendment was to leave the definition of 'adequate resources' to the discretion of the task force. It was hoped that the task force would consider more than just the creation of a Student Learning Centre and take into account the needs of the University's various campuses when determining the adequate resources needed to support these new requirements.

Concern was expressed that there was too much micromanagement and too much detailed instruction in the motion as amended. It was noted that under the original motion the task force would look at and receive input with respect to all of the issues raised and there was no need to have so much detail at this point.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

In response to an inquiry on the main motion, Senate was advised that the Vice President Academic would be responsible for the establishment of membership and terms of reference of the task force.

Concern was expressed that the documentation made no reference to the recommendations of the task force coming back to Senate, and opinion was expressed that as senior academic body, Senate should have input in the establishment and operation of a Student Learning Centre. Senate was advised that the task force will make recommendations to the Vice-President, Academic and that the Vice President Academic will take the necessary recommendations to SCUP and, as required, to Senate. Suggestion was made to include reference to this process in the motion. However Senate was assured that any recommendation

respecting the Student Learning Centre would come back to Senate and this understanding would be recorded in the Minutes.

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

MOTION (RECOMMENDATION 4) CARRIED

Recommendation 1

Discussion returned to Recommendation 1 which had already been moved and seconded.

Moved by P. Percival, seconded by J. D'Auria

“that B be removed from the expression WQB”

One Senator expressed doubt that general breadth requirements could be mandated across Faculties, and concern was expressed with the formula proposed by the Task Force. Senators were reminded that this question was fully debated when Senate approved this issue in principle and subsequent consultations by the Task Force across the University found significant support for legislated breadth requirements.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

Amendment moved by P. Percival, seconded by J. D'Auria

“that third bullet under Recommendation 1 in the Krebs memo dated April 27, 2004 be changed to *“all undergraduate major and honors programs include a minimum of 24 credits of breadth but the details of the breadth requirements be left up to Faculties”*”

The following comments/opinions were expressed with respect to the above-noted amendment:

- Programs in various departments and Faculties were quite varied and giving flexibility to each Faculty would result in positive changes;
- Earlier attempts to deal with breadth simply characterized breadth in terms of taking courses outside one's own discipline or Faculty and did not provide much benefit to the students. The current proposal, without the amendment, was a significant improvement since all designated breadth courses had to meet certain criteria so students were exposed to different modes of thought which was more beneficial than just taking courses outside their own discipline and Faculty;
- Concern was expressed, especially with respect to Science courses, that students would not have the required background/prerequisites needed to take the courses that would expose them to a true mode of scientific thought and therefore these details should be left up to individual Faculties.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

Opinion was expressed that the 2006 deadline seemed rather short. Senate was advised that the development of breadth courses had already begun and that writing intensive courses would be offered this Fall to approximately 2,000 students. The Task Force was aware of existing courses and how many new courses had to be created and felt that the 2006 deadline was realistic.

In response to an inquiry about resources for new courses, Senate was advised that some resources have already been made available and expectations were that the additional funds required would be allocated.

The issue of disqualifying courses with specific prerequisites was raised and Senate was advised that the underlying spirit was to provide intellectually accessible and appropriate courses to students outside the discipline who do not have background, but students majoring in the discipline could fill the requirements by taking appropriate courses that have prerequisites.

Reference was made to the writing classes which would be offered in the Fall, and inquiry was made about class size. Senate was advised that class sizes differ considerably and different courses employ different models to teach writing, but in all cases, relatively small groups of students would be given very close attention by providing additional TA assistance.

Question was called on Motion 1,
and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Recommendation 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M.A. Gillies

“that applicants to SFU be required to demonstrate their competence in English language skills, to be in effect in the Fall 2006 semester as outlined in the memorandum dated April 27, 2004 from D. Krebs”

Senate was informed that on page 3 regarding Recommendations 2, reference to the required grade should be changed to *a minimum grade point average of C-*.

Brief discussion occurred with respect to the language requirements between SFU and other local universities.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Recommendation 3

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Plischke

“that admission standards pertaining to quantitative skills be in effect in the Fall 2006 semester as outlined in the memorandum dated April 27, 2004 from D. Krebs”

Senate was informed that a reference to *obtaining a grade of C-* was inadvertently omitted on page 4 and had to be added to the information under Recommendation 2 in the above-noted memorandum.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

It was noted that there was no mention of timeline and reference to the memorandum dated April 27, 2004 from D. Krebs was missing from both Recommendations 5 and 6. Senate was advised the implementation timeline for all recommendations was Fall 2006 and the reference to the memorandum had inadvertently been omitted. Inclusion of both these items was accepted as a friendly amendment to both motions.

Recommendation 5

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M.A. Gillies

“that new Foundational Writing Skills courses be developed for students admitted to SFU with low grades in English and/or low scores on a language proficiency test as outlined in the memorandum dated April 27, 2004 from D. Krebs, effective Fall 2006”

Brief discussion ensued about the impact of new courses on space, teaching, and financial resources.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

Recommendation 6

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Fizzell

“that the new Foundational Quantitative Skills courses be developed for students with low grades in Mathematics, as outlined in the memorandum dated April 27, 2004 from D. Krebs, effective Fall 2006”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

On behalf of Senate, the Chair thanked members of the Task Force for all of their hard work.

ii) Paper S.04-38 – Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Committee on University Priorities was received by Senate for information.

C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.04-39 – Curriculum Revisions – Criminology

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the reinstatement of Crim 440 from temporarily withdrawn status.

7. Other Business

On behalf of Senate, the Chair conveyed thanks and appreciation to the following Senators whose terms of office end on May 31, 2004: John D’Auria, Alison Gill, Titus Gregory, John Heaney, Andy Hira, Pam Kaila, Tiffany Kalanj, Joseph Peters, Jan Van Aalst, Rick Yoo. Certificates to thank and recognize service on Senate were presented.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate will take place on Monday, June 7, 2004.

Open Session adjourned at 6:45 pm, and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat