

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, October 7, 2002 at 5:30 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present:: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Al-Natour, Sameh
Aloi, Santa
Andrews, Ian
Beynon, Peter
Blackman, Roger
Brokenshire, David
Chen, Danny
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
D'Auria, John
Davidson, Willie
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Garcia, Carlos
Gerson, Carole
Gill, Alison
Grimmett, Peter
Hauerland, Norbert
Higgins, Anne
Hill, Ross
Jackson, Margaret
Jensen, Britta
Jones, Colin
Kemper, Michelle
Krane, Bill
Love, Ernie
Mauser, Gary
McFetridge, Paul
Parkhouse, Wade (representing B. Lewis)
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Phipps, Kate
Russell, Robert
Smith, Don
Thandi, Ranbir
Tyab, Azam
Vaisey, Jacques
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Yerbury, Colin

Absent:

Apaak, Clement
Atkins, Stella
Bourke, Brynn
Gordon, Robert
Gupta, Kamal
Heaney, John
Horvath, Adam
Jones, John
McArthur, James
Naef, Barbara
Poirier, Guy
Poletz, Taira
Warren, Joel
Weldon, Larry
Wessel, Silvia
Wong, Milton
Zaichkowsky, Judith

In attendance:

Heath, Nick
Krebs, Dennis
Morris, Dave

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services and Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

Concern was expressed that Senate's meeting time had been changed to accommodate the Chair's schedule rather than having the meeting chaired by the Vice Chair of Senate at the normal time. The Chair indicated that SCAR had felt it important for the President to be in attendance for the presentation of the annual financial statements and that this would not be a regular occurrence.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of September 16, 2002

Several grammatical/typographical errors were noted, and an annotated copy of the minutes with the corrections was submitted to the Secretary. Reference was made to the fourth paragraph on page 5. A suggestion was made to change the wording from 'maximize resources' to 'optimize resources'.

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 student Senators: Sameh Al-Natour and David Brokenshire.

Dr. Decha Sungkawan, Dean of Graduate Studies, Thammasat University in Bangkok was introduced to Senate. Senate was advised that Dr. Sungkawan is reviewing SFU's graduate studies policies and procedures and the role that research plays at the University as part of the Thai government's efforts to upgrade its university systems.

i) Paper S.02-71 – Annual Financial Statements (For Information)

D. Morris, Assistant Director of Accounting Services was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to page 20 under the description of TRIUMF. It was pointed out that each university appoints two members to the management board, not three as stated in the report. This same error occurred in last year's report and was pointed out at that time.

In response to an inquiry, clarification was provided as to what "prior year appropriations" on page 2 under Revenue referred to.

Reference was made to page 8, Statement of Operations and Changes in Operating Net Assets and a brief discussion ensued with respect to the increase in revenue in relation to the increase in research activities with respect to grants and contracts.

5. Question Period
There were no questions.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Nominating Committee
i) Paper S.02-72 – Elections

Senate was advised that no further nominations had been received. Gary Mauser was therefore elected by acclamation to the Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP) for term of office to May 31, 2004, and Anne MacDonald was elected by acclamation to the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) for term of office to May 31, 2004. All other vacancies would be carried forward to the next meeting of Senate.

B) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.02-73 – Final Report of the Ad Hoc Senate Committee to Review and Develop the Undergraduate Curricula

D. Krebs, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, as well as several members of the Committee were in attendance. D. Krebs was seated in order to respond to questions and was asked by the Chair to provide a brief summary of the process leading to the development of the motions before Senate.

Senate was advised that the Committee, consisting of faculty and student representation, had been formed in January 2001 and had actively met since its formation. The process which produced the recommendations reflected several phases. The first phase which the Committee characterized as information gathering lasted almost a year. During this period the Committee consulted extensive documentation, reviewed curriculum at other universities, and met with several departments and programs within SFU. At the end of this phase a discussion paper was produced which was well publicized and widely distributed. The next phase was a period of feedback and consultation culminating in the publication of the penultimate report. The penultimate report was also widely distributed and published on the web and the SFU community was asked for feedback. The report also was presented to SCUS, SCUP and Senate for discussion. Revisions were made and the final report was produced. In addition to numerous changes for clarification and elaboration, the final report reflects two substantial changes from the penultimate report: (a) it includes explicit details and clarification with respect to the impact of additional requirements in highly specialized concentrations, and (b) it clarifies that courses designated as quantitative (Q) intensive courses need not necessarily involve Mathematics. The Committee has offered a set of principles and guidelines and it was for Senate to decide whether to continue to the next stage or abort the entire initiative. It was pointed out that the motion did not ask Senate to vote on all the particulars and details in the recommendations. The Committee wanted to provide a fair amount of detail in order to give a good sense of the intent of the motions but the details will have to be worked out in consultation with

departments and programs and in the end may have to change in order to accommodate various constraints, particularly in highly specialized programs.

Motion 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate approve in principle the establishment of a 6-credit writing requirement for all Bachelor’s level degrees in a manner consistent with the guidelines in the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee and in ways that do not infringe upon the integrity of existing undergraduate programs”

Concern was expressed that the final report had not been reviewed by SCUS and that questions raised by SCUS following consideration of the penultimate report were not addressed in the final report. It was noted that the final report was produced on June 24th whereas the SCUS feedback on the penultimate report was only received on July 29th. It was pointed out that SCUS had had an extended discussion with the Committee and the final report reflected that input.

Clarification was requested on the meaning of the motion, particularly with respect to a possible inconsistency contained in the contrasting notions of a “requirement” and an “opt out” provision. The Chair explained that if the in principle motions were approved, Senate should expect a six credit writing requirement to be developed for all bachelors programs, unless exemptions are approved through the normal Senate approval processes.

A question was posed as to why the motion limited itself to existing programs. If a new program was proposed that was of academic value to the university but did not meet this requirement was the intent of the motion to restrict the introduction of such a program. Senate was advised that the inclusion of the word existing was in direct response to feedback received from various units on campus. **A suggestion to remove the word ‘existing’ from Motions 1, 2 and 3 was accepted as a friendly amendment.**

Reference was made to the wording ‘infringe upon the integrity’ and concern was expressed that the addition of extra credits would not necessarily infringe on the integrity of a program but it would be deemed unacceptable to existing programs. Suggestion was made that wording should be included to reflect that the implementation of the requirement would not necessitate the addition of credits to existing programs. Senate was assured that there was no intent to increase credit hour requirements in degree programs as a result of any of the motions before Senate. The intent was to have a university level writing requirement for all programs but the motion also permitted exemptions if departments could demonstrate that the integrity of the program would be impaired. The application to opt out would go through the normal university approval processes – SCUS, SCUP, Senate – for approval. It was stressed that the motion does not state that students must take six additional credits, it simply states that six credit hours of the courses taken within a degree program should have a writing requirement and be so designated as a writing course.

Considerable discussion followed with respect to details of implementation, resource and support services.

Amendment moved by P. Percival, seconded by J. D'Auria

“that ‘six credits’ be deleted from the motion”

It was suggested that specifying a certain number of credits was an implementation issue rather than an issue of principle and therefore the reference should be deleted and the details decided on later. It was pointed out that if too many details were removed the motions would become vacuous and give little guidance to the implementation committees.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

M. Stevenson left the meeting and the Vice-Chair, P. McFetridge, assumed the Chair.

Request was made to call the question on the main motion and Senate was asked to vote on whether the question should be called.

VOTE TO PROCEED TO QUESTION FAILED.

Concern was expressed with the use of the term ‘opting out’. It was suggested that departments would have to prepare and submit justification for an exemption from a university wide requirement and this would require approval from the Faculty level through the normal processes to Senate.

Discussion turned to the meaning of ‘in principle’ in relation to ‘consistent with the guidelines’. Interpretation was provided by the Vice President Academic that the implementation committee would be urged to consider the comments included in the recommendations under writing requirement as well as the guidelines and to develop specific implementation processes which would have to be approved by Senate.

Amendment moved by P. Percival, seconded by G. Mauser

“that the words ‘in a manner consistent with the guidelines in the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee and in ways that do not infringe upon the integrity of undergraduate programs’ be deleted from the motion”

Opinion was expressed that the purpose of approval in principle should be direction and orientation to the implementation committee and that they should not be restricted to the guidelines as outlined in the document. It was noted that the whole question of the implementation process and the guidelines provided by the ad hoc committee was included in motion 6.

It was noted that the Committee had provided a set of directions for the way in which the University should approach the requirement and to delete reference to

the report would be inappropriate. It was also pointed out that it was important, especially to highly structured programs, that the clause about not infringing on the integrity of programs remain part of the motion.

With the agreement of the mover and seconder the **amendment was changed to read:**

“that the words ‘in a manner consistent with the guidelines in the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee and’ be deleted from the motion”

It was reiterated that deletion of the reference to the committee’s report left the motion too unspecific and concern was expressed that the implementation committee would not benefit from the guidance provided by the committee’s report.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Senate was advised that the motion, as amended, was as follows:

“that Senate approve in principle the establishment of a 6-credit writing requirement for all Bachelor’s level degrees in a manner consistent with the guidelines in the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee and in ways that do not infringe upon the integrity of undergraduate programs”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 1 CARRIED

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate approve in principle the establishment of a 6-credit quantitative requirement for all Bachelor’s level degrees in a manner consistent with the guidelines in the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee and in ways that do not infringe upon the integrity of undergraduate programs”

Concern was expressed about Arts students who might not have a strong mathematical background being able to meet the math requirement/math exam required for registration for Q courses.

Amendment was moved by P. Percival, seconded by C. Garcia

“that the words ‘in a manner consistent with the guidelines in the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee and’ be deleted from the motion”

The concern about the impact of this requirement on Arts students was stressed, especially in view of the details of implementation contained in the guidelines. Reference was made to the list of existing non-mathematical courses with

significant "Q" content and concern was expressed that the guidelines as currently written would require students to take a Math exam prior to registration in any of these courses.

It was stressed that the guidelines were to be used as a framework for the implementation committee and that when the task force considers these issues and makes recommendations, Senate will have opportunity to express its views on the specifics. Opinion was expressed that the current discussion should therefore be restricted to whether, as a matter of principle, there should be a six credit quantitative requirement.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Considerable discussion followed with respect to details of implementation, resource and support issues. The Vice President, Academic stated his intent to put in place not only support mechanisms for students but support for the development of courses. This issue has been given some consideration and it was felt that with reasonable adjustments to the university budget both the implementation of the recommendations and the implementation of support resources can be accomplished.

Request was made to call the question on the main motion and Senate was asked to vote on whether the question should be called.

VOTE TO PROCEED TO QUESTION CARRIED.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 2 CARRIED

Motion 3

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate approve in principle the establishment of a 24-credit breadth requirement for all Bachelor's level degrees in a manner consistent with the guidelines in the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee and in ways that do not infringe upon the integrity of undergraduate programs"

The issue of how heavily structured programs would operate within this requirement was raised. It was noted that most programs at SFU already require students to take a relatively large number of credits outside their programs. The intent of this recommendation was that departments should designate breadth courses within their areas that would satisfy breadth requirements. It was recognized that in highly specified programs there may not be room to fit in any extra breadth requirements and that was the reason for including the "integrity" clause. The guidelines were intended to provide direction on how to achieve breadth but the decision as to what constitutes breadth would be developed by the individual programs and departments. Concerns were expressed about imposing specific courses on students as it was felt that breadth should provide students with the flexibility and freedom to choose for themselves. Considerable

discussion ensued with respect to implementation details and existing practices with respect to obtaining breadth in programs.

A request was made that the next step in the process be explicitly explained and recorded in the minutes. Senate was advised that the following activities would follow approval of the motions. A committee or task force comprised of one representative from each of the Faculties and student representation would be formed to consult with Faculties and develop university requirements that would appear in the Calendar. These requirements would require approval by SCUS, SCUP and Senate and at each step there would be opportunity for faculty comment and input on the recommendations. With regard to the writing, quantitative and breadth requirements, departments would be asked to identify courses and requirements which would then require approval at the Faculty level through SCUS, SCUP to Senate. In addition, departments that wished to be exempted from some of the requirements because of the program integrity argument would present their request for approval at the Faculty level through the normal committees to Senate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 3 CARRIED

Senators were reminded that the meeting time limit of three hours had been reached and that a motion was required in order to continue.

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by I. Andrews

“that the meeting be extended in order to consider
Motions 4, 5 and 6”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO EXTEND MEETING TIME CARRIED

Motion 4

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate recommend that two GPAs be calculated and exhibited on students’ transcripts: the overall cumulative GPA (as is now done), plus a separate partial GPA for courses within each student’s major program, as determined by that program”

Senate was advised that the intention was that students should not be penalized in terms of their GPAs for experimenting in courses outside their major.

Opinion was expressed that creating a partial GPA would create two classes of students and by calculating the GPAs differently, there might be little incentive for students to do well in the courses and might affect the adjudication of scholarships. It was noted that GPAs were already calculated in specific ways depending on requirements of granting agencies and that students concerned about maintaining a good CGPA would still do their best to get a good grade in whatever course they took. It was stressed that this motion would not change a

student's cumulative grade point average for the purposes of calculating scholarships, entrance requirements, etc.

Amendment moved by A. Tyab, seconded by K. Phipps

"that a sentence be added to the motion stating that the calculation of the UDGPA will continue to be calculated and be part of the student transcript"

It was noted that Upper Division GPA was often used in graduate school admissions and concern was expressed that the lack of reference to the retention of the UDGPA implied that it would be dropped. It was stressed that the motion did not imply that the UDGPA would be dropped.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Senate was reminded that the motivation for the requirement was to encourage breadth experimentation without penalization. It was suggested that if the breadth courses were important enough to be part of a student's program they should not be treated differently from core courses and therefore it was not necessary to have two GPAs.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 4 CARRIED

Motion 5

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Driver

"that Senate authorize the Vice-President, Academic to establish a task force to address the issues of course availability, accessibility and timely completion as described in recommendation 6 of the June 24, 2002 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee"

Senate was advised that the ad hoc committee identified a problem with respect to course availability for students who must take particular courses for their degree requirements and the intent of the motion is to establish a task force to address this issue.

Amendment moved by K. Phipps, seconded by A. Tyab

"that the following sentence be added to the motion: the development and maintenance of additional support services such as writing and math centres be added to the issues which the task force will address"

It was noted that the motion addresses the general issue of availability for all courses in the university and therefore the amendment was not germane to the motion.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 5 CARRIED

Motion 6

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate authorize the Vice-President, Academic to establish an implementation task force structure that includes appropriate representation from each Faculty to assist academic units to implement Motions 1 through 4. Motions 1 through 4 will be implemented in accordance with established university policies and procedures (as outlined in the Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies) and the guidelines provided by the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee in its June 24, 2002 Final Report. Further, Senate recommends that sufficient resources be allocated to ensure the effective implementation of Motions 1-4”

In response to an inquiry, Senate was assured that there would be no change to Calendar copy until specific revisions were approved by Senate.

A suggestion to add student representation to the implementation task force structure was accepted as a **friendly amendment**.

A suggestion to replace the words ‘appropriate representation’ to ‘elected representation’ was also accepted as a **friendly amendment**.

Amendment moved by K. Phipps, seconded by A. Tyab

“that the following sentence be added to the motion: the development and maintenance of additional support services such as writing and math centres be added to the issues which the task force will address”

As a point of clarification it was noted that the intent was to have a two centres – a writing centre and a math centre.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Senate was advised that the motion, as amended, was as follows:

“that Senate authorize the Vice-President, Academic to establish an implementation task force structure that includes elected representation from each Faculty and student representation to assist academic units to implement Motions 1 through 4. Motions 1 through 4 will be implemented in accordance with established university policies and procedures (as outlined in the Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies) and the guidelines provided by the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee in its June 24, 2002 Final Report. Further, Senate recommends that sufficient resources be allocated to ensure the effective implementation of Motions 1-4. The development and maintenance of additional support services such as a writing centre and a math centre be added to the issues which the task force will address”

Question was called, and a vote taken. MOTION 6 (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

Moved by M. Kemper, seconded by J. D’Auria

“that Senate adjourn following completion of agenda item 6.C.i and that all further items on the agenda be referred to the next meeting of Senate”

Question was called, and a vote taken. MOTION CARRIED

On behalf of Senate, the Chair thanked Dr. Krebs and members of the Committee for all of their hard work.

C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

- i) Paper S.02-74 – Proposed changes to Academic Standing and Continuance Regulations

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate approve the proposed changes to regulations governing Academic Standing and Continuance, as set forth in S.02-74, in effect as of Summer Semester 2003”

N. Heath, Director of Admissions, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that, in this document, SCUS has attempted to correct some anomalies within the regulations and make the Calendar language more coherent and comprehensible. Inquiry was made about the process relative to

letters of permission and Senate was advised that the change of wording guarantees that credit would not be granted to students with RTW or EW standing.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm. The remaining agenda items would be carried over to the next meeting of Senate.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat