

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

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

Open Session

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair
Al-Natour, Sameh
Atkins, Stella
Baldwin, Paul (representing L. Copeland)
Barrow, Robin
Benezra, Michael
Boland, Larry
Budra, Paul
Chuah, Kuan
Clayman, Bruce
Crossley, David
D'Auria, John
Davidson, Willie
Delgrande, James
Emerson, Joseph
Finley, David
Fletcher, James
Gillies, Mary Ann
Harris, Richard
Heaney, John
Hyslop-Margison, Emory
Jones, John
Marteniuk, Ron
Mathewes, Rolf
Mauser, Gary
McBride, Stephan
McFetridge, Paul
McInnes, Dina
Munro, Jock
Niwinska, Tina
Osborne, Judith
Peters, Joseph
Peterson, Louis
Pierce, John
Reader, Jason
Russell, Robert
Sanghera, Balwant
Steinbach, Christopher
To, Shek Yan
Waterhouse, John
Wessel, Silvia
Wortis, Michael
Yerbury, Colin

Absent:
Chan, Albert
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Kanevsky, Lannie
Kirczenow, George
McArthur, James
Naef, Barbara
Ogloff, James
Paterson, David
Smith, Michael
Wong, Milton
Zazkis, Rina

In attendance:
Berggren, Len
Brockman, Joan
Cameron, Rob
Fizzell, Maureen
Nesbitt, Tom
Plischke, Michael
Preece, Daniel
Seager, Allen
Schwarz, Carl
Thewalt, Jenifer

Watt, Alison, Director, Secretariat Services
Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services and Registrar
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 October 4, 1999
It was noted that M. Benezra should have been recorded as absent rather than present. Following this change, the Minutes were approved.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
The Chair reported that revisions to the Student Conduct Policies would come back to the December Senate meeting for consideration.
Secretary's Note: Revisions were still in progress and would be brought forward to a later meeting of Senate.
4. Report of the Chair
 - i) Honorary Degree
The Chair was pleased to report that Julie Payette had accepted the University's offer and had agreed to come to Vancouver to receive her honorary degree which would be awarded at a special ceremony, the details of which had yet to be confirmed.
 - ii) Mission Statement
The Chair reported that he hoped to have a working draft of this document available in the near future for full discussion by Senate.
5. Reports of Committees
 - a) Senate Nominating Committee
 - i) Paper S.99-60 – Elections
The following are the results of elections to Senate Committees:

Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS)
One Alternate Student (at-large) to fill an existing vacancy to May 31, 2000.
Senate was advised that the nomination of S. Galbaransingh had been withdrawn by the student.
Elected by acclamation: David Yau

Senate Appeals Board (SAB)
One Alternate Graduate Student (at-large) to replace Thomas du Payrat from date of election to May 31, 2000.
Elected by acclamation: Dan Preece

Committee to Review University Admissions (CRUA)
One Graduate Student (at-large) to replace Ruth Derksen as the Regular member from date of election to May 31, 2000.
Elected by acclamation: Carmen Choi

b) University Board on Student Discipline and Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals

i) Paper S.99-61 – Annual Report (For Information)

J. Brockman, Co-Ordinator of the UBSD, and J. Thewalt, Chair of SCODA, were in attendance in order to respond to questions. In response to an inquiry, brief explanation was provided with respect to the decision-making process of the UBSD.

In response to an inquiry as to whether there were plans to publicize the report, the Chair indicated that the report would be published in both SF News and The Peak.

Inquiry was made as to the status of the annual report required under the harassment policy. Senate was informed that the report was late but was forthcoming.

c) Senate Committee on Academic Planning

i) Paper S.99-62 – External Review – Department of Mathematics and Statistics (For Information)

J.L. Berggren, Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Further details were requested with respect to recommendation six relating to the establishment of a separate department of statistics. Senate was advised that the recommendation dated back to the Department's previous review and, since Statistics had grown and become a more active part of the Department, the current reviewers felt the issue should be revisited. It was noted that separation could not occur without additional resources so this was not an imminent issue. At the present time the Department was trying to work out an arrangement which provided an increased degree of autonomy for the statisticians while at the same time enabled the unit to work together as a department.

Reference was made to statements in the fourth paragraph on page 3 which outlined changes which would result in a reduced level of service to students and a net decrease in the overall quality of instruction. Opinion was expressed that Senate should be concerned about the consequences of financial constraints which result in such changes not only in the Department but throughout the University.

ii) Paper S.99-63 – External Review – Department of Physics (For Information)

M. Plischke , Chair of the Department of Physics, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

d) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning/Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.99-64 – Course space restrictions (For Information)

R. Cameron, School of Computing Science was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Brief discussion took place with respect to the course restriction process and Senate was advised that the intent of the proposal was to give relevant priority to students who had not completed upper division requirements over students who had completed the requirements.

e) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

i) Paper S.99-65 – Faculty of Business Administration – Continuance Requirements for Direct Entry Students to the BBA Program

M. Fizzell, Faculty of Business Administration, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Motion #1

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that Senate rescind the motion (amended) contained in S.99-30 as follows: ‘that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors as set forth in S.99-30 that the 15% cap on Category 1 admissions to the Faculty of Business Administration be removed and replaced by the requirement that the maintenance CGPA for Category 1 students be raised to B- (2.67) until these students have completed all the lower division requirements (with the exception of BUS 207 and BUS 254)’ ”

Opinion was expressed against rescinding the motion given that Business Administration limits the overall number of students granted admission, and unlimited direct admission for Category 1 students merely substitutes one inequity for another because each direct entry student admitted results in less space for existing students wishing to enter the major. These same students were also required to have a higher GPA than the directly admitted students, and suggestion was made that either the fixed limit on Category 1 students remain or the disparity between the GPA for Category 1 students

and Category 3 and 4 students be addressed by requiring a higher continuance GPA for Category 1 students.

It was pointed out that although the Faculty admits in four categories, once admitted, all students are students of the Faculty and should be treated in the same way. Having a maintenance average for one category of students that was different from other categories was felt by the Faculty to be unfair.

A disagreement of opinion was expressed with respect to the term 'students of the Faculty'. It was stressed that the Business major did not start until the third year so the notion of direct admissions being in the Faculty and subject to a different set of rules was misleading.

In response to an inquiry, clarification was provided with respect to how the continuance GPA was determined for students admitted from the other categories. Senate was advised that Category 1 students do not impact the number of other students until they reach 45 credit hours so there has been no impact to date. Expectations are that when direct entries are taken into consideration for the first time in the Spring semester 2000 they would have little, if any, impact on the determination of the GPA for other categories.

Brief discussion took place with respect to the impact the direct admission policy has had on admissions to the Faculty and the quality of students being admitted.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion #2

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by R. Marteniuk

"that Senate approve, as set forth in S.99-65, that the 15% cap on Category 1 admissions to the Faculty of Business Administration be removed"

Concern was raised about the removal of the cap because unlike other Faculties, Business Administration was the only Faculty to explicitly determine admission to the Faculty by means of a GPA and had four different categories of admission which placed it in an unequal position to other Faculties. Opinion was reiterated that unlimited direct admission for Category 1 students would merely substitute one inequity for another and this policy was unfair to students who are not admitted directly to the Faculty.

Amendment moved by L. Boland, seconded by C. Steinbach

"that the motion be amended by deleting the word 'removed' and substituting the words 'increased to 25%'"

In response to inquires about the percentage distribution for the various categories, Senate was advised that without counting Category 1 students, the Faculty admits approximately 500 new students per year and 45-50% of those admissions are Category 3 students. As the Category 1 students move into the 300 level courses, expectations are that the number of Category 3 students would drop to about 30%. It was pointed out however that direct entry students do not replace students from other categories on a one-to-one basis since many of them would have high enough GPA's to be admitted in any event.

Inquiry was made as to whether there was a significant difference in programs between direct entry students and students transferring into Business at a later stage. Senate was advised that Category 1 students were required to follow the same program as the other students. However, Category 1 students tend to sample a wide range of courses while Category 3 and 4 students tend to take courses which elevate their GPAs.

It was noted that the direct entry program works quite well in that it allows flexibility for individual programs and Faculties to compete for top quality students and at the same time provides the opportunity for Faculties/Departments to meet the needs of transfer students from college and other programs within the University.

Brief discussion ensued with respect to whether the motion was a directive to the Faculty of Business Administration or to SCEMP when they set the University's admission targets. It was pointed out that when SCEMP defines the number of enrolments in Categories 1 and 2, in a sense, they define Categories 3 and 4 in total, so both the Faculty and SCEMP have some say in the division of Business enrolments.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

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

MOTION CARRIED

f) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.99-66 – Faculty of Arts – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions

Motion #1:

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-66, the following revision in the Division of Interdisciplinary Studies: Deletion of the

Spanish Program (Honors, Major, Minor, Extended Minor, Joint Major in Spanish and Latin American Studies, and the Joint Major in French and Spanish)"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion #2:

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Pierce

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-66, the following revision in the Department of History: Proposed Minor Program in Labour Studies including new courses: LBST 101 and 301"

A. Seager, Department of History, and T. Nesbitt, Centre for Labour Studies were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Senate received information that SCUS, acting under delegated authority, approved course deletions/new courses and/or minor curriculum revisions in Archaeology, Canadian Studies Program, Contemporary Arts, Criminology, Economics, English, Co-op Education Program in Liberal Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Women's Studies.

g) Ad Hoc Senate Review Committee

i) Paper S.99-67 – Draft Report (For Discussion)

The following members of the Committee were present at the meeting and available to respond to questions: J. Munro (Chair), M.A. Gillies, D. Preece, and J. Waterhouse.

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by L. Boland

"that Senate move into a quasi-committee of the whole"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Senate was provided with a brief overview of the report and brief background explanation was given for each section. The Committee hoped to gain a sense of what Senate wanted in a final report and how Senate felt about the Committee's recommendations prior to the Committee carrying their work to a further stage.

Concerns were expressed about

- the abolition of SPCSAB and the transfer of the policy-making responsibilities to the adjudication committees

- SCUS and SGSC reporting directly to Senate as there was a potential that curriculum issues would have to be argued in detail on the floor of Senate
- the transfer of SCUB responsibilities to a new priorities committee having a similar membership as SCAP and this same committee having responsibility for both the planning/academic review process and budget process
- the one year trial period for afternoon meetings
- at-large student positions on Senate committees being appointed by SFSS
- the elimination of alternate members on Senate committees
- the lack of support documentation and rationale for the recommendations of the committee

Senators, particularly student senators, were invited to provide the Committee with written submissions (within the next ten days) with respect to the issue of how student positions on Senate committees are filled. Senators were reminded about the second open meeting of the Committee to be held at the Harbour Centre campus on Thursday, November 4th at 3:00 pm.

h) Senate Library Committee

Senate continued on in the quasi-committee of the whole.

i) Paper S.99-68 – Annual Report of the Senate Library and Annual Report of the Library (For Information)

The annual reports were presented to Senate for information.

i) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

Senate continued on in the quasi-committee of the whole.

i) Paper S.99-69 – Procedures for Mid-Term Review of Senior Academic Administrators (For Discussion)

C. Schwarz, President of the Faculty Association, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that the document was a result of approximately two years of discussion between the Faculty Association and the Administration and was before Senate for input. It was also pointed out that because of the difficulty implementing this type of evaluation, agreement had been reached with the SFUFA Executive that, prior to the document becoming official policy, an initial evaluation would be carried out on a trial basis. J. Osborne had volunteered for the review.

Concerns were expressed about

- the amount of work created for everyone involved in the process

- the potential difficulty in attracting qualified administrators and making SFU less competitive with other universities because of the review process
- the lack of student representation in the review process
- decisions by administrators being made based on factors which would result in a good review rather than on other considerations
- the lack of clarification with respect to the meaning of Part B, Section 10 and the reference in Part B to the reliability of responses
- the involvement of the Faculty Association in the process
- the lack of due process for someone who disagreed with the findings of the review
- the timing of the review

The Chair thanked Senate for its comments and indicated that a trial review will be carried out after which the policy as drafted would be revisited and a further document would come back to Senate for consideration.

6. Other Business

Senate continued on in the quasi-committee of the whole.

i) Paper S.99-70 – President's Response to the Task Force on Faculty Renewal and Retention (For Discussion)

The Chair referred to comments received from the Executive of the Faculty Association which had been circulated to Senate and advised that he had also received comments from others in the University and that the next document would clarify some of the language.

D. Finley wished Senate to note his opposition on ethical grounds to spousal hiring which was referred to on page 8. He felt hiring should be done on individual merit and it was an ethical mistake to endorse a policy on spousal hiring.

Reference was made to the addition of a significant number of endowed professorships and concern was expressed that such hiring took away from the actual teaching faculty of the University.

Opinion was expressed that the University should be very careful when engaging in external partnerships to make sure that they were academically based and served the needs of the institution and were not pursued just for the funding aspect.

Discussion ensued with respect to the ongoing competition challenges between US universities and other Canadian universities. The Chair indicated that SFU was very cognizant of the difficulties facing the university and he noted the issue of faculty renewal and retention was a very serious issue in terms of both policy and budget planning which he hoped was reflected in the document.

Nothing was reported back to the main assembly from quasi-committee of the whole.

The open session adjourned at 9:20 pm, and the Assembly moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, Secretariat Services