

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, September 16, 2002 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC
Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Absent:

Andrews, Ian
Apaak, Clement
Atkins, Stella
Beynon, Peter
Bourke, Brynn
Blackman, Roger
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
D'Auria, John
Driver, Jon
Garcia, Carlos
Gordon, Robert
Grimmett, Peter
Haunerland, Norbert
Higgins, Anne
Jackson, Margaret
Jensen, Britta
Kemper, Michelle
Krane, Bill
Lewis, Brian
Love, Ernie
Mathewes, Rolf (representing W. Davidson)
McFetridge, Paul
Naef, Barbara
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Phipps, Kate
Poirier, Guy
Poletz, Taira
Russell, Robert
Smith, Don
Thandi, Ranbir
Tyab, Azam
Vaisey, Jacques
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Weldon, Larry
Wessel, Silvia
Yerbury, Colin

Aloi, Santa
Chen, Danny
Dunsterville, Valerie
Gill, Alison
Gupta, Kamal
Heaney, John
Hill, Ross
Horvath, Adam
Jones, Colin
Jones, John
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
Warren, Joel
Wong, Milton
Zaichkowsky, Judith

In attendance:
Bartholomew, Kim
Hanson, Phil
Weeks, Daniel

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 July 8, 2002
A typing error (Hegberg should be Hedberg) on page 4 was noted. Reference was made to the section on the Woodsworth Chair on page 5. As currently written the word 'its' would refer to the Department. Suggestion was made that the sentence be reworded to clarify the location and precise duties of the Chair.

Following these amendments, the Minutes were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the Minutes.

4. Report of the Chair

On behalf of Senate, the Chair extended a welcome to the following new Senators: Ian Andrews, Acting Dean of Education, Peter Beynon, Convocation Senator, Don Smith, OIC appointed Senator, and Guy Poirier, faculty Senator from the Faculty of Arts. The Chair noted that both Lay Senators were past SFU students and past Presidents of the Alumni Association with experience and strong connections with SFU.

The Chair reported that the new SFU Surrey campus had been formally opened by the Lieutenant Governor, Iona Campagnola (Hon. LLD) and the Premier, Gordon Campbell (MBA graduate of SFU). At the opening ceremony much credit was given to SFU for keeping with its traditions of innovation and serious commitment to the needs of the wider community. The Chair advised that the very successful opening and merger would not have been possible without the enormous amount of hard work by many people in the University and he wished to acknowledge these efforts, particularly those of the transition team working under the Vice-President Academic.

The enrolment target for Surrey campus was to double the enrolment formerly at Tech BC. The Chair was pleased to report that not only has that target been met but enrolments have gone considerably beyond the target due to higher retention and acceptance rates in the Surrey programs. Final data was not yet available but it appeared that there has been a general increase in applications to SFU as well as an increase in retention and acceptance rates and enrolments are likely to be 5% above the overall enrolment targets for this year. Expectations are that the Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning would discuss the impact of this increase on future semesters.

The Chair also reported that a proposal to initiate construction of a new student residence will be presented to the Board of Governors at its next meeting. The new residence will be targeted at first year students and will include a meal service plan. In response to an inquiry about the source of capital funding for the project, the Chair indicated that the funding would be borrowed and paid off through a long term business plan through rent. The Chair was asked whether

there were any plans to increase graduate student housing. Senate was informed that although the proposed expansion was directed towards first year students, graduate students would indirectly benefit from the conference facilities that were built into the plans and from the hotel like accommodation that would be available for short term stays. The Chair advised that the University was aware of the need for graduate housing and explained that plans for expanded facilities were being discussed.

Referring to the visible removal of trees in the eastern most fringe of the campus, the Chair advised that this was the start of the new SFU UniverCity Community. He explained that the tree removal was required as part of the environmental management plan and that the short term damage was needed for long term sustainability and environmental protection.

5, Question Period

There were no questions.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.02-61 – Elections

Senate was advised that no further nominations were received and that Nancy Earle was elected by acclamation as an Alternate Graduate Student to the Senate Library Committee/Library Penalties Appeal Committee; Don Smith was elected by acclamation as the Lay Senator to the Senate Graduate Awards Adjudication Committee, and Peter Beynon was elected as a Senator at-large to the Electoral Standing Committee. All other vacancies would be carried forward to the next meeting.

B) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.02-62 – Proposal – Master of Public Policy Program

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the proposal for a Master’s of Public Policy program in the Faculty of Arts, as outlined in S.02-62”

N. Olewiler, Acting Director, Public Policy Program was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Opinion was expressed that although the proposal appeared to be very research based, it was intended for students desiring a professional career and there was felt to be a disconnect between what the program was based on and how it was being presented to the community. Suggestion was made that there should be at least some reference or preamble addressing the emphasis of it being a professional program. Senate’s attention was drawn to the preamble on page 2

which described the professional emphasis of the program and the focus on applied research.

Referring to the same paragraph on page 2, the inconsistency of the phrase 'relatively unique' was noted and grammatical errors were noted in the last bulleted section on page 23. Correction would be made by editorial revision.

Concern was expressed that the course descriptions for the Research Techniques and Quantitative Methods courses, particularly MPP 805, appeared to be similar to descriptions of introductory undergraduate courses. Suggestion was made that the courses should either have some reference to graduate level work or not be described as introductory courses. It was agreed that the wording would be changed to reflect that the level would be appropriate to a graduate program. It was also suggested that the Department of Statistics should be consulted when designing the details of these two statistics courses.

Reference was made to the MBA program and inquiry was made as to whether the MPP program would have a similar focus towards students already in the work force. Senate was advised that the focus was different and expectations were to have a balance between students coming directly out of an undergraduate degree program and students who are mid-career. Clarification was requested as to how different types of students would get equal access to the program. Senate was advised that there was no specific formula but academic standards would not be sacrificed for work experience nor would someone with considerable work experience be discriminated against. Since this was a new program there was no way of knowing what the student catchment would be but efforts would be made to have an interesting and highly qualified mix of students. In response to concerns about the Director or the Steering Committee making decisions on admissions, it was pointed out that academic programs make recommendations, not decisions, on admissions. Brief discussion followed with respect to the process for admitting graduate students.

Discussion turned to the costs of the program and the fees to be charged, and Senate was advised about the process which resulted in the proposed tuition fee. The differential fees are expected to cover the teaching costs of the program and to enable funds to be set aside for scholarships and bursaries for students with a demonstrated financial need. It was pointed out that a firm budget had not yet been determined nor had the differential fees been formulated but based on soft figures the Faculty of Arts felt it was in a position to support the program.

In response to a suggestion that Senate receive a report at some point on the success or failure rate of the program, the Chair indicated that since all programs were reviewed on a regular basis, Senate would receive a report through that process.

Discussion turned to the administrative reporting structure of the program and the role of the program director. Senate's attention was drawn to the section on governance in the documentation. A brief explanation was provided with respect to the normal reporting structure of such programs and Senate was

advised that the process outlined was in accordance with University policies and procedures.

The issue of internships was raised and it was stressed that they are very important to the success of the program. There was little mention of them in the documentation and it was noted that contacts should be initiated now so as to have the internships in place when the program begins. Senate was advised that response has been generally positive and that verbal commitments for internships have already been received from numerous agencies, particularly in Ottawa and in the Vancouver area.

In response to an inquiry about the inclusion of an ethics course, it was pointed out that ethics would likely be incorporated as a module in the introductory and applied policy analysis course sequence. There were also some excellent ethics courses available within the University which could be included.

Reference was made to the housing of the program in a new Division of Professional Programs in the Faculty of Arts and inquiry was made as to the status of that proposal. Senate was advised that the proposal which was still within the Faculty of Arts was not yet fully formulated and although the MPP program may eventually be included in the new Division of Professional Programs, it was able to stand alone with the appropriate reporting structure and financial resources. The proposed new Division will group together a number of programs with a common location and a common theme in order to optimize resources.

Concern was expressed that students were not involved in the development of the program and opinion raised that the process would have been more accountable and transparent with student input. It was stressed that indeed students had been involved throughout the process with elected student representation on the Faculty of Arts Graduate Studies Committee, the Assessment Committee for New Graduate Programs, the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, the Senate Committee on University Priorities, and Senate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.02-63 – External Review – Department of Philosophy

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 Philosophy on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.02-62”

P. Hanson, Chair of the Department was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.02-64 – External Review – Department of Psychology

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 Psychology on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.02-64”

K. Bartholomew, former Chair of the Department and D. Weeks, current Chair of the Department were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that the external reviewers recommended that the department not pursue a Psy.D. degree but the department had chosen to continue with the exploration of this option. Senate was advised that this was a controversial issue within the field of Psychology and within the Department. Students were enthusiastic about this option and there was a demand for this kind of program so the department felt it warranted further investigation.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iv) Paper S.02-65 – External Review – Continuing Studies

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 Office of Continuing Studies on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.02-65”

A grammatical error in point 3 was noted and a revision of the word ‘its’ to ‘their’ was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Reference was made to point 5 and discussion ensued with respect to the term ‘laddering’. In response to an inquiry, laddering was defined to mean moving from one program to a different program at a higher level. Concern was expressed about the transfer of credit from non-credit programs to credit programs. Senate was advised that non-credit certificate programs could be used for prior learning assessment and the Integrated Studies Program was cited as an example for the laddering process. It was stressed that prior learning assessment was used very carefully and conservatively in determining admissions to the Integrated Studies Program and opinion was expressed that this was not a good example for the use of laddering.

It was pointed out that the acceptance of the report did not endorse the process, but merely instructed the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Life Long Learning to discuss the issue and that any specific proposals for a laddering process would have to come to Senate for discussion.

Reference was made to point 3 and concern was expressed about the emphasis given to on-line learning. Suggestion was made that this was a controversial issue that needed to be looked at very closely with regard to the implications for the university and whether the university should be developing this technology. A suggestion to incorporate the words 'as appropriate' in the second sentence following the word 'activities' was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.02-67 – Proposed Changes to Grade Point Average needed for graduation

Moved by R. Blackman, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that Senate approve the proposed revision to the grade point average needed for graduation as set forth in S.02-67”

Senate received a brief explanation with respect to the difference between program GPA and graduation GPA. Opinion was expressed that the revised wording was confusing in that the term 'GPA' was used inconsistently in the proposal to mean two different things. As a result of discussion, a friendly amendment was accepted to change the first sentence under the heading Grade Point Averages Needed for Graduation in the proposed column on page 2, to read “Grade point averages (GPAs) used for graduation are the minimum....”.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

D) Senate Committee on Continuing Studies

i) Paper S.02-68 – Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies was received by Senate for information.

E) Senate Library Committee

i) Paper S.02-69 – Services to International Baccalaureate Students

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by L. Copeland

“that Senate approve the cancellation of the free borrower card service to IB students effective 1 September 2002”

Senate was provided with a brief background explanation of this issue and was advised that the benefits of the program do not warrant the cost.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

7. Other Business

i) Paper S.02-70 – Enrolment – Faculty of Education (For Information)

Senate received corrected data with respect to enrolments in the Faculty of Education for information.

8. Information

The date of the next regular meeting of Senate is Monday, October 7, 2002.

Open Session adjourned at 8:45 pm. Following a short recess, the Assembly moved into Closed Session.

Ron Heath
Dean of Student Services and Registrar