DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE
Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, July 8, 2002 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 West Mall Centre

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate   Absent:

Apaak, Clement   Aloi, Santa
Atkins, Stella   Barrow, Robin
Bourke, Brynn   Chan, Albert
Blackman, Roger   Chen, Danny
Clayman, Bruce   D'Auria, John
Cowan, Ann (representing C. Yerbury)   Gerson, Carole
Driver, Jon   Gordon, Robert
Dunsterville, Valerie   Grimmett, Peter
Garcia, Carlos   Higgins, Anne
Gill, Alison   Jensen, Britta
Gupta, Kamal   Mauser, Gary
Harris, Mary (representing L. Copeland)   McArthur, James
Haunerland, Norbert   McFetridge, Paul
Heaney, John   McInnes, Dina
Hill, Ross   Phipps, Kate
Horvath, Adam   Poletz, Taira
Jackson, Margaret   Sekhon, Devinder
Jones, Colin   Thandi, Ranbir
Jones, John   Van Aalst, Jan
Kemper, Michelle   Weldon, Larry
Krane, Bill   Wong, Milton
Lewis, Brian   Zaichkowsky, Judith
Meredith, Lindsay (representing E. Love)
Naef, Barbara
Percival, Paul   In attendance:
Peters, Joseph   Duguid, Stephen
Russell, Robert   Hedberg, Nancy
Tyab, Azam
Vaisey, Jacques
Waterhouse, John
Wessel, Silvia
Wortis, Michael (representing W. Davidson)

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 3, 2002
     Reference was made to the action under Section 7 on page 11 and question was
     raised as to whether SCAR had considered the appropriateness of Senate's
     action. Senate was advised that SCAR had discussed this matter and concluded
     that the moving of the motion was implicit so that the motion to table was in
     order and properly approved by Senate.

     Following this discussion, 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 on the success of the June Convocation ceremonies and
     reminded members that the ceremonies are of great significance to students, their
     friends and relatives and are very important to the wider advancement of the
     University's interest. Senators and faculty were encouraged to attend.

     The Chair noted that the Ministry of Advanced Education is pursuing an
     'Accountability Agenda' aimed at steering universities by reference to
     performance indicators relative to a wide array of political and policy objectives.
     Concern was expressed that such a policy would commit universities to
     performance in certain areas not determined by Senate or other internal bodies of
     governance and, as further information becomes public, Senate will be informed.

     The Chair also advised Senate that concerns had arisen about the process
     proposed by the Ministry for the allocation of funding for the Leadership Chairs.
     The process does not favour mid-range universities such as SFU and UVic, and
     efforts are being made to seek some improvement in the allocation formula.

5.   Question Period
     On behalf of concerned Engineering students, B. Bourke requested an
     explanation as to how the integration of Tech BC into SFU would affect the
     labelling of former Tech BC courses specific to Engineering and the accreditation
     of the Engineering program at SFU by the professional Engineering Associations.
     Senate was advised that the potential issue arose with respect to the use of the
     term "Engineering" in the Computer and Communications stream at Tech BC
     and whether the use of that term might call into question the accreditation of the
     entire Engineering program at SFU. Senate was assured that if there was a threat
     to the existing accreditation of SFU's Engineering program, the reference to the
     word engineering in the Tech BC context would simply be changed.

6. <u>Reports of Committees</u>

A) <u>Senate Nominating Committee</u>
i) <u>Paper S.02-51– Elections</u>

Senate was advised that Jacques Vaisey was elected by acclamation to the Senate Nominating Committee and the Committee to Review University Admissions, and Reza Pourvali was elected by acclamation in the dual position to the Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries/Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee. All other vacancies would be carried forward to the next meeting.

B) <u>Senate Committee on University Priorities</u>

i) <u>Paper S.02-52 – Establishment of the BC Synchrotron Institute (BCSI)</u>

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the establishment of the BC Synchrotron institute (BCSI) as outlined in document S.02-52"

Amendment moved by C. Apaak, seconded by B. Bourke

"that the Board of the BC Synchrotron Institute include a graduate student"

Opinion was expressed that since the Institute would benefit graduate students they should be part of the decision making body.

Senate was advised that the Board was envisaged as a Province wide Board with members drawn from representatives across all of the participating universities. The original wording did not preclude having a graduate student from amongst the representatives but having a faculty member and graduate student representative from each university was not envisaged. Expectations were that the Vice Presidents Research would be consulted and assist in the identification of representatives.

A Senator inquired about whether advisory committees or organizational structures within universities such as user groups would be formed, and from which representatives could be drawn. Reference was made to the governance of TRIUMF which was similar and a brief discussion followed. Senate was advised that each university would have a site director who might choose to establish user groups but that level of detail was beyond the scope of the document before Senate.

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

ii)   Paper S.02-53 – Cognitive Science Program External Review

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

> "that Senate concurs with the recommendations from the Senate
> Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the
> Cognitive Science Program on priority items resulting from the
> external review as outlined in S.02-53"

Dr. Nancy Hedberg, Co-ordinator of the program, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that the program was originally established as a small elite program that had attracted a relatively small number of very good students. Several years ago changes were made to the curriculum which made it more attractive to students and enrolments increased significantly. The program has now reached a decision point where either it has to be developed with appropriate administrative structure and resources or it has to be kept as a small elite program. The recommendation from the external review which was supported by the Dean of Arts and SCUP was to move in the direction of a broader program.

It was noted that the external reviewer was the candidate for the CRC Chair in the program and question was raised as to a conflict of interest. Senate was informed that the review took place prior to the candidate being considered for the CRC and that the reviewer had left it up to the University to determine which option they wished - either reduction to an elitist program or development into a larger, broader based program.

In response to an inquiry as to whether it was common to have a single person on an external review committee, Senate was advised that while departments normally have three external reviewers, it was not atypical to have only one for a program review.

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION CARRIED

iii)   Paper S.02-54 – Department of Humanities External Review

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

> "that Senate concurs with the recommendations from the Senate
> Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the
> Department of Humanities on priority items resulting from the
> external review as outlined in S.02-54"

Dr. Stephen Duguid, Chair of the Department, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Brief discussion took place with respect to the recommendation concerning the J.S. Woodsworth Chair. In response to a concern that the recommendation may change the sentiment of the Woodsworth Chair. Senate was advised that the recommendation was simply to advise the department to clarify ~~its~~ the location and precise duties *of the Woodsworth Chair.*

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION CARRIED

iv)   Paper S.02-55 – Motions from the SFU at Surrey Short Term Academic Planning Committee

Motion 1
Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by C. Apaak

> "that the SFU Surrey interim administrative structure be continued"

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION 1 CARRIED

Motion 2
Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

> "that Information Technology and Interactive Arts be maintained as the names of the two program streams at the SFU Surrey campus"

In response to an inquiry about the effect of recommendations from the long term planning committee on the motions currently before Senate, Senate was advised that recommendations from the long term planning committee would supercede the recommendations from the short term planning committee.

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION 2 CARRIED

Motion 3
Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

> "that the program name of "Program in Information Technology and Interactive Arts" be adopted for use as the name of the program offered at the SFU Surrey campus"

Amendment moved by J. Vaisey, seconded by C. Apaak

> "that the following wording be added to the existing motion: and that the Computer and Communication Engineering stream be renamed not to include the word Engineering"

Brief discussion took place with respect to the appropriateness of the amendment. The Chair felt that approving the programs would by implication approve the sub-streams named under them and ruled the amendment in order.

Since verbal assurances had been given to Senate earlier that any difficulties arising from the use of the word Engineering would be dealt with, the **amendment was accepted as friendly** with the motion now reading,

> "that the program name of "Program in Information Technology and Interactive Arts" be adopted for use as the name of the program offered at the SFU Surrey campus, and that the Computer and Communication Engineering stream be renamed not to include the word Engineering"

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION 3 AS AMENDED CARRIED

Motion 4
Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

> "that the Information Technology and Interactive Arts undergraduate streams as currently constituted be considered Bachelor degree level offerings and merit an SFU Bachelor's degree credential"

In light of motions 5 and 6, question arose as to the necessity of the motion 4. Senate was advised that motion 4 simply established the level of the programs and addressed one of the terms of reference of the Short Term Planning Committee.

Moved by P. Percival, seconded by M. Wortis

> "that Motion 4 be tabled"

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION TO TABLE FAILED

An inquiry was made as to whether Faculty Curriculum Committees in Science and Applied Sciences and SCUS were consulted in the assessment of these degree programs. Senate was informed that the process followed had been initiated through Senate with Senate approval.   The Short Term Planning Committee included representatives from academic units that had an interest in and a knowledge of the programs and, because of the need to act with dispatch, the recommendations of the Short Term Planning Committee were referred to SCUP where, once again, there was opportunity for faculty and unit input.

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION 4 CARRIED

Motion 5
Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

> "that those students who were admitted to Tech BC prior to 2002 and who successfully complete the program requirements in the Information Technology program stream will be awarded the BSc (Information Technology)"

P. Percival advised that there was a large amount of documentation missing from the material distributed to Senate which he felt was very pertinent to the consideration of Motions 5 and 6. Senate had been alerted to this problem prior to the meeting and copies of the missing documentation were available from the Secretary of Senate. He urged Senators to review the material prior to making a decision.

Concern was expressed that the Tech BC programs do not in general satisfy SFU requirements for an SFU B.Sc. degree and opinion was expressed that labelling them as B.Sc. might dilute the value of the SFU B.Sc. degree. However, it was noted that Tech BC students had, in good faith, enrolled at Tech BC for B.Sc. degrees and it was suggested that those students should be treated with some generosity. Suggestion was made that the degree name should be amended as a way of distinguishing it as a special circumstance.

Amendment moved by M. Wortis, seconded by P. Pericval

> "that the degree name in the above motion be changed to B.Sc. (Information Technology, Tech BC)"

The intent of the amendment was to apply to all students currently enrolled at Tech BC.

Concern was expressed about the inclusion of the location as part of the degree name. Reference was made to a similar process when SFU offered degrees with Fraser Valley. Comment was made that because of the sensitivity of the issue and concerns that many people have with respect to the name of the degree, it was felt that labelling it as a special case would help to diffuse the concerns.

D. Brokenshire, a Tech BC student and member of the Short Term Planning Committee was invited by Senate to participate as a resource person.

D. Brokenshire informed Senate that Tech BC students would not have any objection to the name being on the degree but he did not understand the necessity for making a distinction when a review of a student's transcript would clearly indicate that the student took part of their studies at Tech BC. He felt that adding the location and making such a distinction might result in the degree being viewed as a lesser degree.

Brief discussion followed with respect to the nature/names of degrees from other institutions and it was suggested that there was a fairly uniform understanding of what constituted a B.Sc. degree.

J. Waterhouse expressed opinion that SFU had an ethical obligation to help students through to the degrees they signed up for. However, he acknowledged the deep feelings of colleagues that the amount of coverage, not the quality of coverage, was insufficient to warrant the granting of a Science degree and, in the spirit of compromise, **the amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment.**

Question was called on the motion,
and a vote taken.   MOTION 5 AS AMENDED CARRIED

Motion 6
Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

> "that those students who were admitted to Tech BC prior to 2002 and who successfully complete the program requirements in the Interactive Arts program stream will be awarded the B.Sc. (Interactive Arts, Tech BC)"

Opinion was expressed that students completing the Interactive Arts (IA) program should be satisfied with a BA degree from SFU and inquiry was made as to their point of view on this issue. Senate was advised that current Tech BC students felt that since they did not sign up for a BA degree and since there was more Science in their program than many SFU BA degrees they should be awarded a B.Sc. degree.

Senate was advised that the original motion from the Short Term Planning Committee was to grandfather the senior students from the IA program with a Bachelor of Science and to require the remaining students in second and first years to take additional Science to meet SFU's requirements if they wished to obtain a Bachelor of Science, otherwise they would receive a Bachelor of Arts. This was changed by SCUP and concern was expressed that it may set a precedent for the long term recommendations. Speaking on behalf of the Dean of Science, M. Wortis wished to state for the record that the Dean wanted to make it absolutely clear that the Faculty of Science did not in any way expect this to be a precedent for the long term. The issue would have to be revisited and discussed but in the short term it was felt that as a matter of fairness students who enrolled in good faith at Tech BC should be treated with generosity. The amended name more than sufficiently differentiates it from B.Sc. degrees at SFU and takes into consideration the special concerns of this unique circumstance.

Brief discussion followed with regard to the Science content of the BA in Computing Science degree in the Faculty of Applied Sciences as compared to the Science content in the Interactive Arts Program. Senate was advised that both of the programs at SFU Surrey have less Science than the Bachelor of Arts in Computing Science.

It was reiterated that students had enrolled in good faith in a program that they believed would lead to a B.Sc. degree and now that SFU has assumed responsibility for that program, SFU had an obligation to those students who are now members of SFU to provide them with the degree they signed up for.

A question was raised as to the status of students enrolling in the IA program in September 2002 and what degree they expect to receive. Senate was informed that students have been advised that they have entered a baccalaureate level program with the final disposition to rest with Senate following report/recommendation from the Long Term Planning Committee.

Assurance was sought, as a matter of record, that the contents of program requirements and appropriate degree credentials considered by the Long Term Planning Committee would receive a full review through department/schools/Faculty curriculum committees and SCUS/SCUP. B. Krane, as Chair of the Long Term Planning Committee provided Senate with that assurance.

Question was called and a vote taken.   MOTION 6 CARRIED

C)   Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i)   Paper S.02-56 – Revised Procedures, Criteria and Guidelines – WE Proposal

Moved by R. Blackman, seconded by A. Horvath

> "that Senate approve the changes to the existing procedures, criteria and guidelines for withdrawal under extenuating circumstances outlined in the proposal as set forth in S.02-56, effective Fall Semester 2002"

Noting the change from Fall 2003 to Fall 2002, inquiry was made about notification to students about the change. Senate was advised that students would be alerted to the change.

Question was called, and a vote taken.   MOTION CARRIED

ii)   Paper S.02-57 – School of Resource and Environmental Management Curriculum Change (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved a change in prerequisite for REM 445.

iii)   Paper S.02-58 – Faculty of Science – Undergraduate Curriculum Changes (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved one new course, deleted one course and approved minor changes to Certificate programs in the Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, and approved a new course in the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry.

D)   Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i)   Paper S.02-59 – Faculty of Science – Graduate Curriculum Changes (for Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved three new courses in the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry; approved one new course and minor revisions to an existing course in the Department of Mathematics; approved a change of degree requirements with respect to the number of credit hours required from 700 level courses in the Department of Earth Sciences; and approved the temporary withdrawal of one course in the Department of Biological Sciences.

7.   Other Business

i)   Paper S.02-60 – Election of a Fourth Convocation Senator

The following is the result of balloting in the election of a fourth Convocation Senator.
Candidates: P. Beynon, A. Businskas, M. Hancock, A. Kontzamanis, J. O'Flynn and D. Smith.

                    Elected: Peter Beynon

8.   Information
The date of the next regular meeting of Senate is Monday, September 16, 2002.

Open Session adjourned at 9:00 pm; the Assembly moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat