

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, January 6, 2003 at 7:00 pm in Room 3120 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Absent:

Aloi, Santa
Andrews, Ian
Beynon, Peter
Brokenshire, David
Chen, Danny
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
D'Auria, John
Davidson, Willie
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Gerson, Carole
Gordon, Robert
Gupta, Kamal
Hauerland, Norbert
Hill, Ross
Horvath, Adam
Jackson, Margaret
Kemper, Michelle
Krane, Bill
Lewis, Brian
Love, Ernie
McFetridge, Paul
Percival, Paul
Phipps, Kate
Pierce, John
Poirier, Guy
Poletz, Taira
Smith, Don
Thandi, Ranbir
Vaisey, Jacques
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Weldon, Larry
Yerbury, Colin

Al-Natour, Sameh
Apaak, Clement
Atkins, Stella
Bourne, Brynn
Garcia, Carlos
Grimmett, Peter
Heaney, John
Higgins, Anne
Jensen, Britta
Jones, Colin
Jones, John
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
Naef, Barbara
Peters, Joseph
Russell, Robert
Tyab, Azam
Warren, Joel
Wessel, Silvia
Wong, Milton
Zaichkowsky, Judith

In attendance:

Cameron, Rob
Dench, Sarah
Osborne, Judith
Percival, Graham
Weinberg, Hal
Whittlesea, Bruce

Heath, Nick, Acting 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 December 2, 2002
The Minutes of the Open Session of December 2, 2002 were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
Referring to the inquiry on page 3 concerning the President's authority to overturn findings of the UBSD as opposed to changing a penalty recommendation, Senate was informed that the President was not constrained by policy in that regard. However, the President reiterated that this had happened only rarely and under extraordinary circumstances.
4. Report of the Chair
The Chair reported that two key reports had been issued which he felt would interest Senate - the annual budget submission from The University Presidents' Council (TUPC) and a report by the special task force of the Premier's Progress Board regarding education and economic policies of the Government. Both reports substantially overlap in their content and both address the question of accessibility to universities. One of the key elements of the Task Force report is that real investment must be made to address the access problem to higher education which confirms what universities themselves have stressed to the Government. The two reports are also in agreement with respect to the research mission of the universities, namely funding and growth of enrolment in graduate education and improved funding and capacity for the research community of B.C. to participate in new research programs funded by the Federal Government. The Chair indicated he would keep Senate informed as responses are made to the reports.
5. Question Period
No questions were submitted.
6. Reports of Committees
 - A) Senate Nominating Committee
 - i) Paper S.03-1 - Elections
Senate received information that one nomination had been received, and that Arthur Roberts was therefore elected by acclamation as the Faculty Member at-large to the Committee to Review University Admissions (CRUA). All other vacancies would be carried forward to the next meeting.
 - B) Research Ethics Board
 - i) Paper S.03-2 - Annual Report (For Information)
B. Whittlesea, Chair of the Research Ethics Board and H. Weinberg, Director of the Office of Research Ethics were in attendance in order to respond to questions. Senate received the Annual Report of Research Ethics Board for information.
 - C) Senate Committee on University Priorities

- C) Senate Committee on University Priorities
i) Paper S.03-3 – External Review – Master’s of Pest Management

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by P. Percival

“that Senate concur with the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the Dean of Science, Department of Biological Sciences and the Master’s of Pest Management Program on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.03-3”

N. Haunerland, Senator and Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences expressed concern with respect to SCUP’s recommendations. He pointed out that the report and subsequent responses contained many different recommendations but none of the groups recommended a strictly course based program such as the one recommended by SCUP. Senate was advised that there was little interest within the Department to offer a course based program without research involvement. The development of such a program would involve major expense which the Department could not afford without taking resources from other areas in the Department. If the motion was approved as it stood, N. Haunerland felt that the Department would likely have to terminate the program. The Department, as a whole, would prefer a research based program with a reduced course involvement.

Senate was advised that SCUP’s recommendations were based on presentations from faculty involved in the Pest Management program, faculty in the Department of Biological Sciences and from the Dean’s office. Conflicting views were presented and SCUP attempted to come up with a program which was viable and economically possible within the Department of Biological Sciences. Senate’s attention was drawn to the first bullet in SCUP’s recommendations and it was reiterated that a research based degree with a specialization in Pest Management was available through the existing M.Sc. program in the Department. SCUP was told that there was a need in industry for people trained in pest management and representatives from the Pest Management Program felt the course based program option was an appropriate approach.

It was pointed out that there was a diversity of opinion among the people who have historically been involved in teaching the Pest Management Program and present members of the Department of Biological Sciences. Brief background information was provided and opinion expressed that students should have the option of both types of programs depending on how the Department felt it could best offer the program. An amendment to the wording of the first bullet to add ‘or the option of a research based M.Sc.’ was suggested. The amendment was considered out of order since the recommendation was from SCUP and did not form part of the formal motion before Senate. It was pointed out that SCUP recommended the model it deemed appropriate, that it was a recommendation not a requirement, and it was the prerogative of Departments to propose the specifics of any academic programs.

Opinion was expressed that although the recommendations did not form part of the motion, the ancillary material was very important and there was a clear implication that the Department was being asked to act on the recommendations and report back. An amendment to add the following at the end of the motion was suggested: "If the Dean and the Department find that these recommendations can not be followed without a negative impact on its undergraduate teaching and research program, alternative options should be considered before terminating the program". It was felt that the amendment was unnecessary since the recommendation was not intended to be a dictatorial requirement of SCUP and the need to report back was simply to advise SCUP on the outcome of its recommendations.

It was noted that the terms of reference of the external review asked whether the Department should offer a course based professional program, possibly with differential fees for an MPM degree and/or a research based program with standard fees for a M.Sc. degree. What SCUP proposed was neither and appeared to be a course-based program without differential fees. Senate was advised that SCUP had understood that one of the factors that made the program very expensive was the summer field program and so the recommendations were crafted so that cost recovery fees could be charged for that expensive component of the program. Since it was SCUP's understanding that the salaries of graduates of the MPM program were similar to those in other M.Sc. programs, SCUP felt that it was inappropriate to recommend differential fees even though it was primarily a course based program.

Considerable discussion ensued in which various suggestions to changes in wording were considered. It was pointed out that many program options already exist in other departments and suggestion was made that the Department work with the Dean of Graduate Studies to explore what the best option would be to continue the program.

The following change to the wording of the motion was accepted as a **friendly amendment**:

"that Senate receives the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the Dean of Science, Department of Biological Sciences and the Master's of Pest Management Program on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.03-3 and requests that the Department of Biological Sciences consider these recommendations and report to SCUP by July 2003 on its recommendations for the Pest Management Program"

Brief discussion followed in which assurance was given by the Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences that the Department would consult with the Dean of Graduate Studies with respect to this process.

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

ii) Paper S.03-4 – Terms of Reference for Various Task Forces/Groups to implement recommendations of Ad Hoc Senate Committee to Review and Develop the Undergraduate Curricula (For Information)

In response to an inquiry, assurance was given that decisions emanating from the work of the task force would be considered in accordance with existing University approval processes and would come forward to Senate for final approval.

Referring to the membership of the Implementation Task Force, it was pointed out that faculty representatives were elected but the student representative was appointed. A suggestion that the student representative be elected by Senate was accepted.

An inquiry was made as to why each Faculty was not represented on the various task forces/groups. Senate was advised that Faculty representation was in place for the overall Task Force, but that more content specific expertise was required for the support groups.

Following discussion, the document, with amendment, was received by Senate.

iii) Paper S.03-5 – Guidelines for Development of Professional Master's Programs at SFU

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that Senate approve the Guidelines for Development of Professional Master's Programs as outlined in document S.03-5”

Reference was made to Section IV.h and concern was expressed about the principle of charging differential fees. Senate was advised that the purpose of Section (h) was to ensure that Departments in developing new proposals address funding issues with the appropriate Dean and Vice President.

In response to an inquiry, Senate was advised that the guidelines were primarily for the development of new programs and that there was no intention to reclassify existing programs.

Concern was expressed about the wording of Section II.b and the implied preference for a cohort oriented program in Section IV.b. Senate was advised that Section II.b was an attempt to define what a professional program was and to set out some criteria that would mark it as a professional program. The cohort structure worked well in many professional programs and was used as an option but it was stressed that these were guidelines and were not prescriptive.

Brief discussion took place with respect to the use of the terms 'applied' and 'professional' and whether professional programs at the Ph.D. level should also be included. Senate was informed that a recent change to legislation allowed

BCIT and the University Colleges to offer professional Master's degrees and the guidelines were established to clarify the programs at the University level and to ensure that professional programs developed at SFU were consistent with the University's values, particularly research values. There was suggestion that guidelines for professional doctorates would likely require different requirements and the Chair suggested that this issue could be taken up by the Dean of Graduate Studies if there was sufficient interest.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

D) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.03-6 – Faculty of Applied Sciences – Proposed Changes to BC Grade 12 Admission Requirements

Moved by B. Lewis, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve changes to BC 12 Admission Requirements in the Faculty of Applied Sciences as set forth in S.03-6”

Reference was made to the proposed chart on page 3. Under the column for Engineering Science, a request to change the wording of the first cell within List 2 or 3 to 'any course' was made by Engineering Science and accepted as a **friendly amendment**.

An inquiry was made about the process for informing high schools of this type of change. Senate was advised that it was standard practice for the information to be published in recruitment materials and to have a phase in period to permit schools to adjust. Senate's attention was drawn to the last paragraph on page 4 of the document that sets out the phase-in provision.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-7 – Proposed Changes to the Academic Credit Hour Load Limits

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by A. Horvath

“that Senate approve changes to the Academic Credit Hour load limits as set forth in S.03-7”

Clarification was requested with respect to the intent of the motion. It was noted that the motion requested Senate to approve changes but neither the motion nor the document specified what the changes should be. Senate was advised that the intent of the motion was to request each Faculty to establish course load limits consistent with the principles set out in the documentation, and until such time as Faculties specify this information, there would be no limitations if the motion were approved.

The necessity of having such prescriptive regulations for students was questioned and it was pointed out that it would be perfectly acceptable if a Faculty did not wish to impose limitations.

Following a brief discussion, the following change to the wording of the motion was accepted as a **friendly amendment**

“that Senate approve changes to the regulations regarding academic credit hour load limits as set forth in S.03-7 and recommends that the credit hour limit by level be eliminated. If a Faculty so desires a single credit hour maximum can be set for students in a given Faculty credential or program”

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

iii) Paper S.03-8 – Faculty of Education – New Course EDUC 311 (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved a new course – EDUC 311.

iv) Paper S.03-9 – Faculty of Arts – Calendar Entry Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved editorial revisions in calendar entry for the Faculty of Arts as outlined in S.03-9.

v) Paper S.03-10 – Deletion of courses not offered/Temporarily Withdrawn Courses (For Information)

Senate regulation provides that any courses not offered within a six semester period be deleted from the Calendar unless adequate justification for retaining the course is presented by the Department. Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority approved the deletion of fourteen courses under this regulation.

Senate regulation also provides an option for departments to identify courses that have not been offered as ‘temporarily withdrawn’ if they do not wish to delete the course. Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, identified thirty-three courses under this category.

E) Calendar Committee

i) Paper S.03-11 – Academic Calendar of Events for 2003-3 to 2004-2

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by V. Dunsterville

“that Senate approve the proposed Academic Calendar of Events for 2003-3 to 2004-2, as set forth in S.03-11”

It was pointed out that although the documentation before Senate referred to three academic years, SCAR reminded the Calendar Committee of the need to evaluate the reading break before Senate considers the schedule for 2004/5 and 2005/6, and consequently, only the first year was before Senate for approval.

Reference was made to the Spring Semester 2004-1 and concern was expressed about the start of exams one day before Easter break. It was pointed out that having exams start after the Easter break would extend the exam period by more than one day and would interfere with the start of the Summer semester.

Although Summer Semester 2006 was not under consideration at this time, May 15th as the date for Victoria Day was questioned and request was made for the Committee to confirm the exact date.

A senator asked why the deadline dates for graduate grades were not included in the schedule. Senate was informed that the schedule was presented in the normal manner and this is the main schedule from which a series of other dates and deadlines are determined. It was suggested that graduate grades were due too early and should be due on the same day as all other grades. The Chair of the Committee advised that the Committee would review this item.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Since there was one other invited guest, the Chair suggested that Senate consider agenda Item G.i at this point so that the guest need not wait any longer. There were no objections to this suggestion.

G) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.03-16 – Confidentiality Policy – I 10.10 (For Information)

J. Osborne, Associate Vice-President, Policy, Equity and Legal was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that the policy was a codification of existing University practice as now required by Provincial Legislation. It was prompted by a recent ruling of the Information and Privacy Commissioner in which it was suggested that it would be useful if the University explicitly stated its operating rules with regard to this issue. The University community was widely consulted in the draft process and many useful suggestions were received.

A question arose with respect to employment performance versus employment history. Senate was advised that performance was covered under employment history as the term was broadly construed.

Following discussion, the paper was received by Senate.

F) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.03-12 – Faculty of Applied Sciences – Graduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information) – Computing Science

The following minor editorial revisions for clarification were made: i) Reduce M.Sc. project *option* course requirement from 9 courses to 8 courses; and in ii) the word 'ensuing' was changed to 'assuring'. Following these changes, Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to the M.Sc. program requirements and a slight update of overall wording to the Calendar entry.

ii) Paper S.03-13 – Faculty of Arts – Graduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to existing courses and programs in the following Departments/programs: Economics, Gerontology, History, Linguistics, Political Science, Psychology, and Women's Studies. Changes include the approval of six new courses ECON 828, ECON 832, ECON 892, GERO 822, PSYC 881, and WS 899; and minor revisions to existing courses and program requirements.

It was noted that there were a considerable number of typographical errors on pages 1 and 2 that Senate was assured would be corrected.

iii) Paper S.03-14 – Faculty of Education – Graduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a change in grading for five courses, a change of prerequisite for one course, and identified one course as being temporarily withdrawn.

iv) Paper S.03-15 – Faculty of Science – Graduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information) – Molecular Biology and Biochemistry

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a new course – MBB 838.

G) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

ii) Paper S.03-17 – Change in Membership – SCUP

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Kemper

“that Senate approve that the membership of the Senate Committee on University Priorities be amended to include one Student Senator Alternate to be elected by Senate”

Senate was informed that the change would allow students a similar process for an alternate student member as the motion passed at the December meeting with regard to alternate faculty members.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, February 3, 2003.

The Open Session was completed at 8:55 pm and Senate moved directly into Closed Session without adjournment.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat