

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, February 6, 2006 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC
Open Session

Present:

Schellenberg, Betty, Vice-Chair of Senate

Apaak, Clement
Breden, Felix
Brennand, Tracy
Budd, James
Caufield, Sarah
Corbett, Kitty
Delgrande, James
Dickinson, Peter
Driver, Jon
Easton, Stephen
Ester, Martin
Fizzell, Maureen
Gordon, Irene
Gordon, Robert
Halpern, Erica
Harder, Derrick
Hayes, Michael
Honda, Barry
Horvath, Adam
Hunsdale, Shawn
Javed, Wasseem
Joffres, Michel
Jones, John (representing B. Lewis)
Krane, Bill
LaBrie, John
Love, Ernie
MacKenzie, Christine
MacLean, David
Magee, Sean
Owen, Brian (representing L. Copeland)
Percival, Colin
Percival, Paul
Pierce, John
Pinto, Mario
Plischke, Michael
Scott, Jamie
Shaker, Paul
Tilley, Kevin
Uhlmann, Sasha
van Baarsen, Amanda
Warner, D'Arcy
Waterhouse, John
Williams, Peter
Wong, Josephine
Woodbury, Robert

Absent:

Black, Sam
Dickinson, John
Fleming-Saraceno, David
Grimmett, Peter
Hauerland, Norbert
Louie, Brandt
McArthur, James
Smith, Don
Stevenson, Michael
Weeks, Dan
Zandvliet, David

In attendance:

Angerilli, Nello
Davison, Allan
Munro, Jock
Osborne, Judith

Heath, Ron, Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

1. Approval of the Agenda

The motion on Senate paper S.06-19 was withdrawn from the Agenda and Senate was notified that a motion would be put forward for Senate to move into a quasi Committee of the Whole in order to allow a full discussion of this paper.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of January 9, 2006

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

Reference was made to an article in the January 30th edition of *The Peak* concerning allegations that students in a fourth year Business course were informed that unless they assigned intellectual property to a third party they would receive failing grades for the course. It was believed that the issue was before the Ombudsperson, and a question was raised as to whether or not university ~~polices~~ ^{policies} were complied with in this case. The Vice-President Academic stated that if the matter was under consideration by appropriate appeal agencies, his preference would be to allow that process to be completed, after which he would be pleased to report back to Senate.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.06-15 – Revision to Policy GP 29 Search Committee for Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by F. Breden

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the revision of Policy GP 29 Search Committees for Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents, dated 24 January 2006”

J. Osborne, Associate Vice-President, Legal Affairs, was available to respond to questions.

Reference was made to the matter of open meetings. Senate was advised that under the current policy open meetings were required for some positions and not for others, and the intent was to have open meetings continue for key academic positions within the university. Recommendation was made that the wording should be more explicit and a

suggestion to change section 2.b.vi to read as follows was accepted as a friendly amendment:

- vi. establishing such further operational procedures as it may require, including open meetings for short-listed candidates for Vice-President, Academic, Vice-President, Research, Associate Vice-President, Academic, and others where appropriate

The change of wording with respect to the selection of up to three additional members was discussed. It was pointed out that in the current policy additional members for some committees had to be faculty members whereas in the new wording additional appointments may be members of any part of the university community. A concern was expressed that this could result in unbalanced memberships if senior administrators were selected under this process. Senate was advised that membership for senior administration (level of Deans and above) was explicitly set out in the policies and the intent of the wording was to allow flexibility to accommodate the particular needs of a position. A suggestion to add "except from the senior administration" to the last sentence under "Conditions" with respect to the appointment of up to three additional members was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Brief discussion followed with respect to item 1.f under Search Committee Procedure in regard to what constitutes a perceived conflict of interest. It was pointed out that concerns have been expressed in the past that direct subordinates of persons being hired have a conflict of interest and should not be on the search committee. Senate was advised that a person in that position would not normally be considered as having a conflict of interest.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- ii) Paper S.06-16 – Revision to Policy AD1.06 Commercial Activities and Advertising (For Information)

J. Osborne, Associate Vice-President, Legal Affairs, was available to respond to questions.

D. Harder, on behalf of the Student Society, advised Senate that extensive consultation with SFSS had taken place with regard to the proposed revisions and the Student Society was very supportive of the revised policy.

Reference was made to section 4.5 of the policy that outlined activities where special permission was not required, and it was suggested that student clubs affiliated with the Simon Fraser Student Society should be included in this section. It was pointed out that SFSS was currently negotiating sub-agreements with respect to their vendor program in the AQ concourse and that student clubs were able to book through that process. The Vice-President, Legal Affairs advised that concerns from student clubs were not forthcoming during consultations with the university community but indicated that she would pass the information on for consideration prior to approval by the Board of Governors.

- B) Senate Committee on University Priorities
- i) Paper S.06-17 – Cohort Special Arrangements Program – Master of Global Health (For Information)

The last sentence of Section 2 under 'Comments on the fee structure' on page 16 implied that the program was not fully developed and a question was raised as to why it was before Senate at this point. Senate was advised that the intent of the Faculty was to convert the cohort program (which has a limited life span of three years) to a regular program and the reference referred to the development of the full proposal for the regular program, at which time the Faculty would have a better idea of the financial needs of students.

Clarification was requested with regard to the reference to guaranteed admission in comment three in the same section. Senate was advised that the Master's program was linked to the Diploma Program in Global Health and expectations were that applicants to the Masters Program would be accepted directly while others might be given a provisional acceptance or not accepted until they complete the Diploma program.

It was pointed out that at SCUP, the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences made a commitment to the possibility of revising the fee structure and/or the support mechanisms should assumed employer or private support not be forthcoming. The Dean reiterated the commitment to monitor the fee structure and re-evaluate as necessary.

- iii) Paper S.06-18 – CIBC Centre for Corporate Governance and Risk Management

Moved by E. Love, seconded by A. van Baarsen:

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the creation of the CIBC Centre for Corporate Governance and Risk Management”

In response to an inquiry about funding over a ten year period versus the five year period proposed by the funding agency, Senate was advised that the amount of funding was the same whether it was used over five years or ten years but that the University felt that it was more sensible to use the funds over the longer period and that the donors have no objection.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- iii) Paper S.06-19 – International Student Recruitment and Retention Strategy

The motion as outlined on this paper had been withdrawn from the agenda but in order to permit wide-ranging discussion to allow an opportunity to better understand the proposal, Senate would move into a quasi Committee of the Whole.

N. Angerilli, Acting Associate Vice-President, Students and International, and J. Munro, Professor Emeritus were available to respond to questions.

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by S. Easton

“that Senate move into a quasi Committee of the Whole for discussion of this item”

Following an inquiry about having a fixed time limit for the discussion, the motion was amended (with the agreement of the mover/seconded) as follows:

“that Senate move into a quasi Committee of the Whole for a period not longer than one hour”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

The session began with an overview of the University’s strategy for internationalization. The following points are a summary of the ensuing discussion.

- No target has been set for SFU international undergraduate student admissions after 2006. Expectations are that targets will come to the March meeting which is when they would normally come to Senate following consideration by SCEMP.
- No clear definition of international student – desire to increase cultural diversity versus desire to increase students who pay differential fees. It was noted that SFU would benefit from both.
- If international students become Canadian citizens, diversity remains the same.
- Diversity of international students is important; need more students from countries outside Asia - concern about IBT’s ability to deliver non-Asian international students. IBT has independent colleges outside of Asia and has demonstrated that they could help SFU move towards a more diverse population of international students.
- No guarantee that students recruited by IBT would necessarily come to SFU.
- Retention issues affect international students recruited domestically, as well as abroad; high drop out rate of students recruited directly from high school; the proposal does not address internal issues.
- Language is an issue. IBT students have a good success rate in other universities and association with IBT would provide the University with an opportunity to learn what might be done to assist international students who must acclimatize to a different way of teaching and learning.
- Proposal does not address problems with language and learning/teaching styles as part of the arrangement. Since this was part of what IBT did as opposed to what SFU did, it was not included. IBT has small class sizes which would be difficult for SFU to achieve in first year classes, and instructors at IBT are trained specifically to teach students who do not use English as a first language, which helps tremendously with student comprehension.

- Arrangement with IBT is only part of the University's strategy for internationalization. SFU would continue with regular recruiting processes and work to improve retention of all international students.
- IBT agreement was part of an overall policy but Senate was not aware of the overall policy.
- Would SFU's image be tarnished if included in the list of institutions associated with IBT?
- Why use a private company rather than invest in in-house solutions?
- IBT arrangement means that there is no oversight by SFU governing bodies – Senate; concerns about quality of students, treatment and quality of instructors, concerns about fair employment practices for IBT instructors. Expectations are that instructors would be drawn from the same pool of people that SFU draws on for sessional teaching – PhD students, college instructors, etc. and SFU has been assured that wages similar to those at SFU would be paid.
- How can SFU exercise control or ensure adequate standards in a private company? Told that there are mechanisms in place to deal with specific concerns about control and quality of students and instructor. Some of these issues are in the contract which is not accessible to Senate.
- Concern about admission guarantees. IBT students would fall under the same category as college transfers and discussions are underway locally as to what would be an appropriate level of guarantee for college transfers – comparable process to the admission guarantee currently provided to high school graduates.
- Don't want to be the first to have a contract like this with a for profit company that is answerable to its shareholders. This type of arrangement common in the United States – some arrangements work well, others don't.
- What provincial oversight is there? There is no real oversight - would be the responsibility of SFU to monitor quality. If arrangement doesn't work out, SFU has the opportunity to exit from the agreement.
- Opinion was expressed that Australia has done a bad job in terms of post secondary education and why SFU would affiliate itself with a company from that environment was questioned.
- Is IBT affiliated or independent? Both terms used – need clarification.
- What space is expected to be used – who pays for the cost of renovations? Two possibilities being examined: multi-tenant facility in Discovery Park and the Cornerstone facility. Costs of renovating factored into analysis of returns and costs associated with the partnership and can be easily recovered.

When the speakers' list was exhausted and the time period elapsed, a motion to move out of the quasi Committee of the Whole was approved.

C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.06-20 – Faculty of Applied Sciences – Curriculum Revisions (For Information): Computing Science, Engineering Science

Senate was advised that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses and minor revisions to existing courses

and program requirements in the School of Computing Science and the School of Engineering Science.

ii) Paper S.06-21 – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences – Curriculum Revisions (For Information): Contemporary Arts

Senate was advised that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses in the School for Contemporary Arts.

Brief discussion took place with respect to the prerequisites for FPA 264. The Chair of SCUS was asked to follow up the inquiry and clarify the information on the documentation to rectify any discrepancies.

iii) Paper S.06-22 – Faculty of Business Administration – Curriculum Revision (For Information)

Senate was advised that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved nine new courses, and minor revisions to existing courses in the Faculty of Business Administration.

iv) Paper S.06-23 – Faculty of Education – Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate was advised that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses and the deletion of eleven special topics courses.

D) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.06-24 – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences – Curriculum Revisions (For Information): Economics, English, Gerontology, Philosophy

Senate was advised that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses, and minor revisions to programs and existing courses in Economics, English, Gerontology, and Philosophy.

ii) Paper S.06-25 – Faculty of Science – Curriculum Revisions (For Information): Biological Sciences, Molecular Biology, Statistics and Actuarial Science

Senate was advised that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved twelve new courses, and minor revisions to programs and existing courses in Biological Sciences, Molecular Biology, Statistics and Actuarial Science.

E) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.06-26 (Revised) – Elections

Senate's attention was directed to the newly distributed paper, S.06-26 (Revised) which contained the final slate of candidates as well as an information sheet for candidates in positions where elections were required. Outstanding vacancies would be carried forward.

The results of elections to Senate Committees are as follows:

Senate Committee on Academic Integrity in Student Learning and Evaluation (SCAISLE)

One Undergraduate Student (Alternate) to fill an existing vacancy for term of office to May 31, 2006. No nominations received

Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries (SPCSAB) and Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee (SUAAC) – DUAL POSITION

One Undergraduate Student to replace E. Johansen for term of office to May 31, 2006.
Elected by acclamation: Karen Tse

Senate Committee on University Honours (SCUH)

One Faculty Senator (Health Sciences) to replace C. MacKenzie for term of office to May 31, 2008. No nominations received

One Student Senator to replace E. Johansen for term of office to May 31, 2007.

Elected by acclamation: Shawn Hunsdale

Research Ethics Board (REB)

One Member from the University Community to replace A. Drobnies for term of office to May 31, 2007.

Elected by acclamation: Sandra Wong

One Student Member to replace E. Halpern for term of office to May 31, 2007.

Candidates: A. Kupferschmidt, C. McInnes, S. Uhlmann

Elected: Sasha Uhlmann

Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)

One Faculty Member (Education) to replace C. Amundsen for term of office to May 31, 2006.

Elected by acclamation: Paul Neufeld

7. Other Business

As required by the University Act, A. Watt reported that since J. Francis would be away from her Senator position for one year, a by-election to seek a replacement for the period of her leave would be undertaken at the same time as the regular election of faculty members to Senate. No by-election would take place to seek a replacement for the balance of term of office for Student Senator E. Johansen who had resigned.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting is Monday, March 6, 2006.

Open Session adjourned at 8:40 pm and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt, Director, University Secretariat