

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on  
Monday, July 9, 2001 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair

Al-Natour, Sameh

Aloi, Santa

Bawa, Parveen

Blackman, Roger (representing J. Pierce)

Chang, Jack

Clayman, Bruce

Collins-Dodd, Colleen

Copeland, Lynn

Cowan, Ann (representing C. Yerbury)

D'Auria, John

Davidson, Willie

Delgrande, James

Dunsterville, Valerie

Gerson, Carole

Gerwel, Wojtek

Gill, Alison

Grimmett, Peter

Gupte, Jaideep

Heaney, John

Hill, Ross

Jackson, Margaret

Jensen, Britta

Klymson, Sarah

Mauser, Gary

McInnes, Dina

Meredith, Lindsay (representing E. Love)

Naef, Barbara

Osborne, Judith

Paterson, David

Percival, Paul

Sirri, Odai

Smith, Michael

Tansey, Caralyn

Thompson, Janny (representing R. Barrow)

Van Aalst, Jan

Warren, Joel

Absent: Atkins, Stella

Budra, Paul

Chan, Albert

Dempster, Peter

Driver, Jon

Giffen, Ken

Haunerland, Norbert

Jones, John

LaRocque, Linda

Marteniuk, Ron

McArthur, James

McFetridge, Paul

Muirhead, Leah

Peters, Joseph

Russell, Robert

Sekhon, Devinder

Thandi, Ranbir

Waterhouse, John

Weldon, Larry

Wessel, Sylvia

Wong, Milton

Wortis, Michael

In attendance:

Weinberg, Hal

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services and 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 June 4, 2001  
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  
The Chair reported that the University Presidents' Council was working to keep issues of post-secondary education high on the public agenda and, to this end, he was actively engaged in consultations with members of the Government and newly elected MLAs in Vancouver and Burnaby.
5. Question Period  
Senate was advised that a series of questions had been submitted by J. Warren with regard to the appointment process for the J.S. Woodsworth Chair. The Chair reminded Senators that an independent review of this issue has been set up. Expectations were that responses to the kind of questions raised would be forthcoming from the review and it was not appropriate to comment at this point. In response to further questions, the Chair emphasized that he did not know and had never met or had any discussion with Lyman Robinson and that the only connection Mr. Robinson had to SFU was that he was under contract to the University for the purposes of conducting the review. In response to a question about making the non-confidential conclusions of the report public, the Chair indicated this was his intention.
6. Reports of Committees
  - A) Senate Nominating Committee
    - i) Paper S.01-50 Revised – Elections to Senate Committees  
Senate was advised that C. Collins-Dodd was elected by acclamation to replace J. Zaichkowsky on the Senate Committee on University Priorities to December 31, 2001, and that no nominations had been received for the positions for any of the committees listed in S.01-50. These vacancies would be carried forward. Senators were encouraged to submit suggestions for nominations to the Senate Nominating Committee.
  - B) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
    - i) Paper S.01-51 – Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry
      - a) New Program: Joint Major in Molecular Biology and Biochemistry and Business Administration

Moved by R. Blackman, seconded by M. Smith

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the Joint Major in Molecular Biology and Biochemistry and Business Administration, as set forth in S.01-51, effective 2002-3”

The ensuing discussion primarily focussed on concerns about the lack of breadth requirements and whether or not there was a need to include an ethics course specifically developed for molecular biology and biochemistry students.

Senate was advised that SCUS had discussed the ethics issue and while a course in ethics was identified as being desirable for the program, the lack of such a course was not felt to be sufficient enough reason to derail the program. It was pointed out that the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry was in the process of developing a second year course entitled Biotechnology and the Society which provide an ethics component for Science students. It was suggested that the Business ethics course – Business 303 - could be reworked to include more focussed topics that would be covered within the joint major program from a Science point of view. Opinion was expressed that the proposed program represents a much broader program than is typical for a Science student and satisfies the existing policies of Senate and of the Faculty of Science.

Question arose as to why only English was offered as part of the lower division Business requirements when other Arts courses such as Philosophy were acceptable in other major programs within Business. A friendly amendment was accepted suggesting that the lower division Business requirements be broadened to include appropriate Arts courses such as Philosophy. There was also discussion of the need for a writing course specifically designed for science students.

Concern was expressed about the creation of this new program and the impact it would have on the available course spaces for Business students. Opinion was expressed that it might be better to concentrate on the current enrolment difficulties rather than offering a new program to an entirely different group of students who would then be competing for spaces in Business. The issue of access was briefly discussed and Senate was advised that the majority of students accepted into Business programs progress through their programs on a timely basis.

In response to an inquiry about entrance requirements, Senate was advised that students would have to meet Faculty of Science requirements for admission since completion of the program would result in a B.Sc. degree from the Faculty of Science.

Senators were reminded that a thorough review of the undergraduate curriculum was currently underway by the Ad Hoc Senate Committee to Review the Undergraduate Curricula and Senators were encouraged to communicate the concerns and observations expressed during the Senate debate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- b) Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the following curriculum revisions:
- New courses: MBB 432 and MBB 300
  - Change to course number, title, prerequisite, credit hour, description, and vector: MBB 311 to 308, and MBB 312 to 309
  - New Co-Op Education courses: MBB 151, 251, 351, 451, 452

ii) Department of Earth Sciences

a) Paper S.01-52 – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the following curriculum revisions:

- Prerequisite change: EASC 301
- Deletion of EASC 404 and 405
- New courses: EASC 313, 404, 413
- Minor revisions to course requirements for the Major program

b) Paper S.01-53 – SCUS Annual Report

Senate received the Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for information.

C) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

Paper S.01-54 – Faculty of Arts – Graduate Curriculum Revisions

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved the curriculum revisions in the following departments;

i) Department of Archaeology

- Minor program revisions to streamline the MA program
- Editorial revisions to clarify Calendar wording for the PhD program
- Addition of ARCH 876 as a required course for all graduate students

ii) Department of French

- Addition of Option: MA with Project
- Change of title: FREN 811, FREN 812, FREN 816
- Deletion of FREN 800, 801, 802, 807, 808, 809, 813, 814, 815, 817, 818, 830, 831, 832
- New courses: FREN 803, FREN 804, FREN 805, FREN 806, FREN 810, FREN 897

iii) Faculty of Arts – MA Co-Op Option

- MA Co-Op Education Program Option, including new practicum courses: LBRL 750, LBRL 751, LBRL 752

iv) Department of Philosophy

- Addition of a Specialized Thesis Option at the MA level
- Introduction of area distribution requirements at the MA and PhD levels
- Minor revisions to the course requirements for the PhD program
- Editorial revisions to clarify Calendar wording, including the wording for admission to graduate programs

- v) Department of Psychology
    - Change all five (5) credit graduate seminars to three (3) credits
    - Change Calendar description for PSYC 825
    - Change in requirements – PhD Clinical Program
    - Removal of Table I Experimental Graduate Program and Table 3 Clinical Psychology Program from Calendar
  - vi) Department of Sociology and Anthropology
    - MA Co-Op Program Option, including new practicum courses: SA 890, SA 891, and SA 892
- D) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- i) Paper S.01-55 – Research Ethics Policy

Moved by W. Davidson, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the Policies and Procedures for Ethics Review of Research Involving Human Subjects – June 5, 2001, as set forth in S.01-55”

Concerns were expressed from some members of the Faculty of Education with regard to the definition of research. Some of the requirements of the teacher training program such as the need to practice performance based assessment might be considered ‘research’ under the definitions outlined in Section 1 and therefore would require research ethics approval. However, since the same course might vary from one semester to the next depending on the instructor, obtaining approval would be problematic. It was suggested that activities within the teacher training program probably fall within the ambit of Section 1.7 and would therefore be excluded from research ethics approval. Suggestion was made that if there was a question as to whether the content of a course or program might be subject to ethics review, the Department or Faculty should submit it for evaluation. If deemed to require research ethics approval, the course/program would be reviewed once and designated as a research ethics approved course/program and would only need to be re-evaluated if the content of the course/program was changed.

H. Weinberg, faculty member currently involved in the review of research proposals under existing Policy R20.01, was invited by the Chair to comment on the proposed policy. He expressed his opinion that the proposed policy was a very sensible and workable policy. He also felt that while the policy provided protection to research subjects, it was unlikely to bog down the research process within the university.

Reference was made to the definition of researcher (Section 2.1) which seemed to imply that the term included both the supervisor and people underneath the supervisor. Concern was expressed that if misconduct by one member of the research group occurred, the supervisor would also be held responsible for this action. It was pointed out that there was a specific policy in place for issues of misconduct and that policy would have its own definitions. Since each policy stood alone definitions from one policy to another do not carry over.

In response to an inquiry as to whether consideration had been given to the six comments from the Tri-Councils, Senate was advised that a lot of thought had been given to the comments but it was felt that there was no need to incorporate them into the policy as it stands. It was suggested, however, that the policy be monitored in light of the comments which may or may not need to be addressed when the policy comes up for review in the future.

Reference was made to Section 1.6 with respect to the first sentence regarding the various classes of research that are excluded from requirements of ethics review. In order to clarify the wording, it was suggested that reference to Simon Fraser University be added and the following revised wording was accepted as a friendly amendment:

1.6 Certain classes of research involving human subjects are excluded from the requirement of ethics review *by the Research Ethics Board at Simon Fraser University.*

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

There is no Senate meeting in August. Date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, September 17, 2001.

Open Session ended at 8:25 pm and, following a brief recess, Senate moved into Closed Session.

Alison Watt  
Director, University Secretariat