

As Amended by
Senate 11/3/99

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, February 1, 1999 at 7:00 pm in room 3210 West Mall Complex

Further amended
by Senate
12/4/99

Open Session

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair

Akins, Kathleen
Barrow, Robin
Berggren, J. Len
Boland, Lawrence
Bowman, Marilyn
Burton, Lynn Elen
Chan, Albert
Coleman, Peter
Copeland, Lynn
D'Auria, John
Dunsterville, Valerie
Emerson, Joseph
Emmott, Alan
Finley, David
Fletcher, James
Gagan, David
Gillies, Mary Ann
Harris, Richard
Hart, Stephen (representing B. Clayman)
Heaney, W. John
Jones, Colin
Jones, John
Kanevsky, Lannie
Kirczenow, George
Marteniuk, Ron
Mathewes, Rolf
McInnes, Dina
Morris, Joy
Overington, Jennifer
Percival, Paul
Peterson, Louis
Peters, Joseph
Russell, Robert
To, Shek Yan
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Daniel
Wortis, Michael

Absent:

Beattie, Suzan
Dhillon, Khushwant
Giffen, Ken
Lewis, Brian
Mauser, Gary
Naef, Barbara
Ogloff, James
Osborne, Judith
Pierce, John
Reader, Jason
Sanghera, Balwant
Segal, Joseph
Veerkamp, Mark
Warsh, Michael
Wickstrom, Norman
Zazkis, Rina

In attendance:

Delany, Paul
Heinrich, Kathy
Pinto, Mario
Reich, Blaize

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services and Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, Secretariat Services
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 January 11, 1999
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
Reference was made to the comments on page 4 with respect to Senate's responsibility for the terms of reference of endowed chairs, and opinion was expressed that the University Act required Senate to consider not only the terms of reference but the establishment of the endowed chair itself. Senate's attention was drawn to item 5.d.i (Senate review) on the agenda and suggestion was made that it would be more appropriate to discuss this matter under that item.
4. Report of the Chair
On behalf of Senate, the Chair extended congratulations to Kathleen Akins who won the \$1 million (U.S.) James S. McDonnell Centennial Fellowship for her work in Philosophy and Neuroscience.

Commenting on a recent article that appeared in SF ^{News} Week with regard to increased funding and ending the tuition freeze, the Chair stressed that it was not the University's intention to lobby the Government to end the tuition freeze. He also wished to point out that material appearing in SF ^{News} Week is not edited by the administration even though SF ^{News} Week is funded by the university. A group of faculty and staff make up the editorial board for SF ^{News} Week and they try to protect the independence of the publication in order to maintain its credibility and authenticity.

The Chair reported that he was pleased to see a report in the Globe and Mail on the funding situation in Canadian universities. Reference had been made to the erosion of funding over the past ten years and how Canadian universities were falling behind their U.S. competitors. The Chair advised that the Presidents of B.C. universities have had very good discussions with the Provincial Government on this issue and he was pleased that the B.C. Government, over the past five years, had supported universities very well relative to other Ministries and other provinces across Canada. However, there were still major problems with funding, particularly in relation to revenue per student. The budget had been presented to the Ministry and circulated to all employee groups and the Student Society. Four items were requested – increased revenue per student, increased access, increase of non-salary expenditures, and that a greater share of the access dollars be given to universities.

Reference was made to a recent article in the Vancouver Sun about Milton Wong being nominated as SFU's next Chancellor. The paper erroneously reported that Dr. Wong had been nominated by the Faculty Association. The news release clearly stated that the Alumni Association had nominated Dr. Wong and the Vancouver Sun printed a retraction and apologized for the error.

The Chair reported that Evaleen Jaeger Roy had been elected as the new Chair of the Board of Governors. Ms. Jaeger Roy is the first person to be Chair who was once an undergraduate student at SFU and a student member of the Board of Governors.

5. Reports of Committees

- a) Senate Nominating Committee
i) Paper S.99-15 Revised – Elections

The following are the results of elections to the following Senate Committees:

Senate Committee on International Activities (SCIA)

One Undergraduate Student Senator to replace Winnie Cheng from date of election to May 31, 2000.

Elected by acclamation: Shek Yan To

Senate Appeals Board (SAB)

One Undergraduate Student (Alternate) to replace Jason Reader from date of election to May 31, 1999.

Candidates: J. Fletcher, S. Haynes
Elected: James Fletcher

Calendar Committee

One Faculty Senator. In this first election, term of office will be from date of election to May 31, 2001. Thereafter, the term of office shall be for two years commencing on June 1st.

Elected by acclamation: John D'Auria

One Student (at-large). In this first election, term of office will be from date of election to May 31, 2000. Thereafter, the term of office shall be for one year commencing on June 1st.

Elected by acclamation: Shek Yan To

- b) President's Task Force on Faculty Renewal and Retention
i) Paper S.99-16 – Draft Report – For Discussion

Members of the Task Force (K. Heinrich, Chair, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, P. Delany, Department of English, M. Pinto, Department of Chemistry, and B. Reich, Faculty of Business Administration) were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

The Chair of the Task Force provided a brief introduction to the report. The Task Force sought input from people internal and external to the University and conducted a detailed survey of Chairs about what happens to faculty at the University, and surveyed new faculty members about their perceptions of SFU, the hiring process and why they chose to come to SFU. Copies of the reports are available from the Office of the Vice-President Academic. The Task Force also reviewed existing processes and policies. Reallocation through a decentralized budget process and funding through the Strategic Initiatives Fund plays an important role in the University's process and the first recommendation of the Task

Force is that the process be clarified and criteria established to reflect what is important to the University as an institution so that decisions can be made accordingly. The report also focuses on three aspects of leadership – departmental chairs, mid-career appointments, and recognition of senior faculty members. Recommendations are suggested as to how best support and acknowledge faculty in these three areas. Recommendations are also made with respect to the support of new faculty members, and the consideration of some form of a transitional retirement program. The Task Force welcomed comments and suggestions on the draft report from Senate.

Opinion was expressed that the report was flawed in its emphasis on strategic opportunities. A result of this emphasis might be the neglect of core disciplines which must be renewed and strengthened in order to support other disciplines and programs within the university. It was suggested that there were different views on what was and what was not a core program. Further opinion was expressed that it would have been more helpful if the Task Force had included suggestions about implementation of their recommendations. Suggestion was also made that the recommendation 1 should contain reference to decentralization.

Reference was made to the emphasis on selectivity and the direction of resources to high demand programs, and concern was expressed about who would be making decisions on the criteria listed in recommendation one. It was noted that although the document contained a thorough discussion on strategy and long term planning, it lacked recommendations with respect to implementation and implied that decision-making would not be made at the departmental or Faculty level. It was also pointed out that Senate was responsible for academic programs and yet Senate's role in the academic planning process was not mentioned anywhere in the report. Decentralization of the university budget, together with decision-making and program planning at the grass roots level has been enthusiastically adopted and has worked very well since its inception. Concern was expressed that recommendation 1 moves in the opposite direction and contravenes the spirit of the present process.

It was pointed out that the terms of reference specifically refer to the recruitment of new faculty and the consideration of initiatives that have been successful elsewhere. Opinion was expressed that the report does not specifically address either of these issues. It was further suggested that the first three recommendations overlap with the planning process and that the Task Force had strayed from its terms of reference and its mandate. It was noted that the mechanisms currently in place to handle reallocation and resources work well and the Task Force should be considering innovative and creative ^{ideas} relevant to hiring the best quality faculty.

It was suggested that recommendation 2 was too vague and questions were raised as to who would make such decisions and who would identify the areas where senior appointments were needed.

Objection was raised with respect to recommendation 3 and the suggestion that all departments include initiatives for joint appointments with external agencies. It

was pointed out that this might be appropriate for some departments but it was inappropriate for others.

With respect to recommendation 4.5 concerning spousal hiring, suggestion was made that it would have been useful to include some concrete suggestions regarding implementation. It was pointed out that departments being approached to hire a spousal appointment really had no incentive to do so, particularly if the appointment was not in an area of high priority in their three-year plan or if the candidate was not a top ranking individual. Brief discussion followed with respect to possible methods of implementation. ~~Opinion was expressed that familial hiring be discouraged because the University should aim for strong professional relations rather than supporting ones which could lead to conflict of interest situations.~~ *University hiring should be based on academic excellence rather than familial relationships.* Opinion was expressed that recommendation 1 was likely motivated by the realization that sufficient funding would not be received from the Government to support excellence in all areas and therefore selective funding and transfer of resources to stronger programs would be necessary. If so, it was suggested that more emphasis should be placed on the Strategic Initiatives Fund to plan reallocation over Faculties. Suggestion was made the fund should be increased in value and redistributed to those areas necessary to the development of the University. It was pointed out that Senate, through the recommendations of SCAP, would play a valuable role in determining the priorities of the University.

It was suggested that one issue which needed discussion was whether it was desirable to have a differential reallocation/redistribution of resources and how that should be accomplished.

Concern was expressed about the suggestion to increase the Strategic Initiatives Fund because it taxed all departments/programs and only focussed on internal redistribution. Suggestion was made that departments should be allowed to strengthen the quality of their programs through the receipt of external funds and the University needed to allow outside agencies to earmark funding for specific programs.

Opinion was expressed that the Strategic Initiatives Fund was a short term solution for long term problems and that the University needed to focus on restructuring and redistribution in order to make a difference in the long term.

Further opinion was expressed that the allocation of the Strategic Initiatives Fund was not the real issue involved in faculty renewal. The issue related to the competitive market in which new faculty members have to be recruited. It was pointed out that in order to compete for the best faculty, the University currently had to give up two positions to hire one new person and eventually would end up with a much smaller faculty complement than it started with simply because of the nature of the competitive process. It was suggested that the most important issue in terms of future faculty renewal was whether the University was determined to be equally competitive in all areas of the University and, if so, how that could be done within the current budget situation. Comment was made that the University must be careful during periods of fiscal restraint not to create a lot of mediocre departments with mediocre faculty simply because those are the only persons available.

Suggestion was made that the Task Force include in their report statements encouraging the University to allow direct input from faculty into the operation of service areas such as health, counselling and community services in order to make them more useful for existing and new faculty members.

Comment was made that the university could encourage departments to be more proactive and creative in their searches. If funds were allocated well in advance to departments which expect to have a vacant position within the next two years, they could seek out and aggressively pursue highly qualified candidates. Brief discussion ensued about possible methods and examples of successful searches conducted in this way were given.

It was also noted that under current practices, departments are under pressure to hire or else lose the position. It was suggested that the administration consider allowing departments to postpone a search if necessary.

It was noted that the American issue had not been addressed in the report. Questions such as to how to retain Canadian candidates or bring them back to Canada, what the University's position was on American candidates, and what the University's attitude was with respect to the law and what can be accomplished within the limits of the law need to be discussed.

Concern was expressed that recommendation 1 appears to combine two different goals as though they were one – academic excellence and attracting resources from external sources. Opinion was expressed that these goals were different and if separated they could both be met but the report needed to carefully separate one from the other and separate the mechanisms for achieving them.

Comment was made that one of the best features of SFU, from the student's point of view, was the high degree of available interdisciplinary opportunities. Concern was expressed that too much focus and in-fighting over internal redistribution of funds would have a negative impact on these opportunities.

Opinion was expressed that the leadership training for Chairs as suggested in recommendation 5.2 was demeaning and might be viewed as a barrier to faculty who are equally qualified to become the Chair of their department. Suggestion was made that the wording be changed to make it such that training was available to anyone who wished to take advantage of it rather than making it a requirement of the position. It was pointed out that the Task Force had found support from the Chairs for this idea. The intent was to acknowledge the difficulty of the job, to identify potential leaders and better support faculty in the administration by helping them better understand their role and the problems associated with the Chair's position.

Concerns were expressed that the recommendations in general were open-ended and there appeared to be more emphasis on the University as a market place rather than as a scholarly institution.

The Chair of the Task Force advised Senate that the Task Force intended to rewrite the report following completion of their consultations across the University. The schedule of consultations was posted on the Web and the final report was expected to be completed by the end of March. The Chair of the Task Force felt the debate had been useful and beneficial to the committee and thanked Senate for its comments.

Moved by R. Russell, seconded by M. Wortis

“that Senate considers Recommendations 1 and 3 outside the mandate of the Task Force and recommends that these recommendations be struck from the report”

The Chair reminded Senate that the report was before Senate for consultation and comment, not approval, and if approved, the motion would take the form of advice to the Task Force rather than explicit direction to exclude any recommendations. The Chair felt that the Task Force had to be free to look at all possible ideas and discuss those ^{ideas} with other members of the campus community.

It was noted that the Task Force had listened to Senate’s concerns and was likely to take them into consideration when the report was revised and opinion was expressed that the motion was inappropriate at this draft stage.

Contrary opinion was expressed that the motion in fact provided the Task Force with a straw vote on the opinion of Senate and would give a clear indication of Senate’s view on this issue.

It was stressed that the Task Force had been asked to consult with the community about issues relating to faculty renewal, and the committee has asked a broad range of questions and consultations are not yet finished. It was felt it was unusual for Senate as only one of the constituencies to be consulted to attempt to tell the Task Force what it should and should not investigate.

Comment was made that although Senate could not dictate what should be in the report, Senate had a right to its opinion. Since the impetus behind the motion was that Senate felt that recommendations 1 and 3 fell outside the mandate of the committee, a suggestion to delete the second half of the motion was accepted as a friendly amendment. Amended motion follows:

“that Senate considers Recommendations 1 and 3 outside the mandate of the Task Force”

Opinion was expressed that the motion did not capture the spirit of the debate and that such a strong motion was inappropriate at this time.

Moved by J. D’Auria, seconded by P. Percival:

“that the motion be tabled until the next report is presented to Senate”

Brief discussion took place with respect to whether the motion to table had been made to close debate. The Chair ruled the motion to table required a 2/3 majority vote.

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

MOTION TO TABLE DEFEATED

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

MAIN MOTION DEFEATED

On behalf of Senate, the Chair extended thanks to members of the Task Force.

- c) Senate Committee on University Budget
- i) Paper S.99-17 – Annual Report – For Information

Reference was made to a motion passed by Senate in March 1998 instructing SCUB to develop guidelines to be negotiated with the administration about communicating budget information to SCUB. Inquiry was made as to the progress of those negotiations and whether SCUB was now satisfied with the information it receives.

The Chair of SCUB indicated he was unclear as to the motion referred to and since the next meeting of SCUB will involve the communication of budget matters he was unable to say whether there is a problem until after that meeting has taken place.

It was noted that past annual reports had contained documentation and recommendations from SCUB to the President relating to each year's budget discussions, and inquiry was made as to why this information was not included in the documentation before Senate.

The Chair of SCUB indicated that procedures have changed because of the change in the administration but he would make inquiries with respect to the issues raised.

- d) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- i) Paper S.99-18 – Senate Review

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Morris

“that Senate approve the Terms of Reference and Membership of the
Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Review, as set out in S.99-18”

A clerical error was noted in the first line of the second page, and the word 'organizational' was changed to 'organization'.

Clarification was requested with respect to the role of this committee versus the purpose of the committee currently reviewing University policies in relation to Senate's responsibilities under the University Act. It was pointed out that this committee would have to read, define and understand the University Act but it was a fairly open review of Senate and its organization.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.99-19 – Election Rules – Waiver

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by A. Chan

“that for the 1999 Convocation Election, the date by which the election shall be completed shall be May 7th and not April 15th as stated in the Rules of Senate”

It was noted that the change had the support of the majority of members of the Electoral Standing Committee and inquiry was made as to whether there was a minority objection. Senate was advised that at the time the paper was prepared two members of the committee had supported the change; the other member had not responded but has since supported it.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

6. Other Business

Reference was made to the article in The Peak with respect to one of the Student Senators losing her seat on Senate and clarification was requested with respect to eligibility requirements. The Registrar was requested to provide the information to interested Senators during the break. (Student Senators are required to take a minimum of 18 credit hours over the twelve month period.)

Reference was made to the action of the Senate Committee on International Activities delegating decision-making authority to its Chair and opinion was expressed that this violated their terms of reference. Suggestion was made that the committee should bring an amendment to Senate if they wished to change their mandate. It was noted that any Senate committee may, within limits, delegate authority to its chair when it serves the purpose of the committee. The case referred to applied to only one instance which was essential to the conduct of the business of the University in general and the Committee in particular. Senate was advised that individual departments and Faculties receive international contracts that require approval for the contract or memorandum of understanding in a very short time frame. If they had to wait for a special meeting of the Committee to be convened they ran the risk of losing the contract and its associated revenue. SCIA therefore gave the Chair authorization on its behalf to deal with such contracts on a timely basis with the outcome to be reported at its next meeting.

7. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate has been scheduled on Monday, March 1, 1999.

The Open Session adjourned at 9:10 pm. Following a brief recess, the Assembly moved into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, Secretariat Services