

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, March 3, 2003 at 7:00 pm in Room 3120 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Al-Natour, Sameh
Aloi, Santa
Andrews, Ian
Apaak, Clement
Atkins, Stella
Beynon, Peter
Bourke, Brynn
Brokenshire, David
Clayman, Bruce
Collinge, Joan (representing C. Yerbury)
Copeland, Lynn
D'Auria, John
Davidson, Willie
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Garcia, Carlos
Gerson, Carole
Gupta, Kamal
Haunerland, Norbert
Hill, Ross
Horvath, Adam
Jackson, Margaret
Jensen, Britta
Kemper, Michelle
Krane, Bill
Lewis, Brian
Love, Ernie
Naef, Barbara
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Poirier, Guy
Russell, Robert
Vaisey, Jacques
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Weldon, Larry
Wessel, Sylvia
Zaichkowsky, Judith

Absent:

Chen, Danny
Gordon, Robert
Grimmett, Peter
Heaney, John
Higgins, Anne
Jones, Colin
Jones, John
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
McFetridge, Paul
Phipps, Kate
Poletz, Taira
Smith, Don
Thandi, Ranbir
Tyab, Azam
Warren, Joel
Wong, Milton

In attendance:

Angerilli, Nello
Calvert, Tom
Cameron, Rob
Hibbitts, Pat
Laba, Martin
Summers, Laurie
Taylor, Brenda
Wattamaniuk, Walter
Winne, Phil

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services/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 February 3, 2003
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
In response to an inquiry about the outcome of the re-evaluation of the student's work in the case of academic dishonesty in the Faculty of Education, Senate was advised that the re-evaluation was in progress and report would be made when the process was complete.
4. Report of the Chair
The Chair reported on the Federal and the Provincial budgets which came down coincidentally.

The federal budget was generally positive for universities and for research and development in Canada. Rather than one time commitments for indirect costs of research payments to universities, program expenditures have been entrenched in the budget on much the same formula as the one-time only payments were calculated. Also, the funding of granting councils has been considerably improved and a commitment to graduate education has been made by the funding of 2000 masters fellowships and 2000 PhD fellowships.

By contrast, the provincial budget made no new announcements with respect to university education other than a minor item relating to funding for new access to universities, the details of which were not yet available. Although budget letters have not been received, a small additional enrolment at SFU, funded at a lower average grant, was expected. So there was no serious change on the negative side, but also no important changes on the positive side. Universities were still faced with problems of capacity in terms of space and infrastructure.

A question arose as to whether any new financial programs would be put in place at SFU to assist disadvantaged graduate student TAs who might experience a decrease of income if SFU raises tuition fees. Senate was advised that an increase in graduate tuition triggers an automatic increase in graduate student funding of which TA salaries are one component. Recommendations concerning increases to graduate scholarships, entrance scholarships and new funding for special graduate entrance scholarships, all of which would assist and compensate students who experience difficulty with tuition fee increases, were currently being considered.

5. Question Period
There were no questions submitted.
6. Reports of Committees
 - A) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.03-27 – Policy Revisions GP 25 – Response to Violence and Threatening Behaviour (For Information)

P. Hibbitts, Vice-President Finance and Administration, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that Section 3.2. contained confusing language. The case management team appeared to be composed entirely of staff members and concern was expressed about the lack of representation from faculty and students. Inquiry was raised as to why this policy was required when the policy on human rights covers similar kinds of behaviour and suggestion was made that perhaps the two policies could be merged in some way. It was also noted that if a case in which a student was involved was dealt with under this policy, rather than going before a university disciplinary committee, it would go directly from the Director of Security to the President. Concern was expressed about the lack of that intermediate step. Senate was informed that the document was needed to deal with emergency situations but perhaps there was an interrelationship with the human rights policy and the student discipline policy. It was pointed out that when an issue came forward that overlapped more than one policy, assessment was made as to which policy was best to proceed under. P. Hibbitts indicated that the points raised would be taken under advisement

Following discussion, the policy was received by Senate for information.

ii) Paper S.03-28 – Proposed new Policy GP 32 – Environmental Management Policy (For Information)

P. Hibbitts, Vice-President Finance and Administration, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate received the above-noted policy for information.

iii) Paper S.03-29 – Proposed New Policy GP 33 – Animal/Pet Policy (For Information)

P. Hibbitts, Vice-President Finance and Administration, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to Section 2.d with respect to the financial and legal responsibility of pet owners and a question was asked about the applicability of this policy on visitors to campus with pets. Senate was advised that the University was simply putting in policy form that pet owners were responsible for the actions of their pets. In response to an inquiry about enforcement, Senate was informed that all complaints under the policy would be investigated and the campus community would be informed about the establishment of the new policy.

Following discussion, the policy was received by Senate for information.

iv) Paper S.03-30 – Policy Revision GP 18 – Human Rights Policy (For Information)

B. Taylor, Harassment Resolution Co-Ordinator, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that Section 4.2 basically stated that the operation of the policy would be held in confidence unless otherwise required by law. Concern was expressed that this would mean that members of the university community would be able to speak freely only if and when a matter went to court. Senate was advised that the confidentiality requirement would apply to the complainant, the respondent, and any witnesses and it was unlikely that any of these people would be comfortable releasing confidential information of another party into the public realm. In any event, the Freedom of Information/Protection of Privacy Act prohibits members of the university from releasing third party information.

Question arose about how the university community was educated with respect to this policy. Senate was advised that the Co-ordinator, when invited, speaks to classes of students and provides seminars for groups of employees as well as providing information to new employees during their orientation session. All University policies are accessible on the web.

Opinion was expressed that international students were usually unaware policies of this kind and suggestion was made that the education/orientation of international students with regard to this policy be given priority. B. Taylor indicated she would follow up on the suggestion.

Referring to Section 5.4, suggestion was made that it might be a good idea to require at least one person from each group (students, staff, faculty) to be present in order to make quorum so that decisions were not reached in the absence of representation from any group. The Vice-President Academic stated he would take the suggestion under consideration but he wanted to consult with the committee regarding their experience with attendance and quorum.

Following discussion, the policy was received by Senate for information.

B) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.03-31 – Program Proposal: PhD in Women’s Studies

Moved by J. Pierce, seconded by C. Gerson

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the proposal for a PhD in Women’s Studies program in the Faculty of Arts as outlined in S.03-31”

M. Kimball and S. Wendell, Department of Women’s Studies, were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that concerns had been expressed by the reviewers that there were no specifically earmarked PhD courses and there didn't appear to be appropriate resources for new course development. Senate was advised that the Department believed that the existing courses were appropriate for program completion at the PhD level and they were not concerned that both MA and PhD students would be in the same courses.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) SFU at Surrey Long-Term Academic Planning Committee

i) Paper S.03-32 – Report (For Discussion)

The following members of the Committee were in attendance in order to respond to questions: M. Laba (Chair of the sub-committee for academic programming); P. Winne (Chair of the sub-committee for pedagogy); L. Copeland (member and representing C. Yerbury, Chair of the sub-committee for campus development); L. Summers, Director of Academic Planning and Secretary to the Committee; R. Cameron; T. Calvert.

In order to permit wide-ranging discussion, and subject to the approval of Senate, the Chair declared that the meeting move into Quasi Committee of the Whole. There were no objections from Senate. Discussion started with an overview of the SFU Surrey Long-Term Planning process by the Committee's Chair, B. Krane. The following points are a summary of the lengthy discussion:

- Section 5 on Pedagogy, as currently constructed, appeared to several Senators to go beyond the mandate of the Committee. This section raised several important issues applicable to the other campuses and probably should be discussed separately and not as part of this report. It was noted that each of the elements in Section 5 did have relevance and applicability to Surrey however.
- Science programming options were discussed. The view was expressed that the provision of wet labs at the Surrey campus was not likely. Other programming options were being considered in a preliminary manner.
- Education programming options including at the master's level appeared to have a good fit with SFU Surrey.
- Business programming, one of the three program components at Tech BC, was also discussed. Questions were raised about the need for Business programming at Surrey, when there is a heavy emphasis on Business programs at Harbour Centre. The demand for these programs is expected to be strong, and consideration is being given to a proposed undergraduate program in Management of Technology, with a possible MBA program as well.

- Engineering Science and Computing Science have concerns about overlap issues, particularly Information Technology in the Surrey programs. It was also suggested that overlap may also be an issue with Contemporary Arts and Interactive Arts. A suggestion was made that perhaps Surrey programs could be housed within existing schools initially, rather than establishing a separate school at the outset. A separate school might evolve afterwards.
- The commitments envisaged by the Ministry of Advanced Education to Surrey and the technology focus of the programs were also discussed. The commitment to the technology focus is linked to the existing students and SFU has the ability to shape the programs it wishes to deliver. The Ministry has committed in its initial funding transfers to SFU, its willingness to fully fund undergraduate and graduate programs. SFU's interest would be a quality institution with the full complement of teaching and research opportunities.
- The urgent demographic need for the provision of post-secondary education in the Fraser region was stressed. The region is the fastest growing urban community in the country, with a significantly lower than average participation rate in post-secondary education. SFU Surrey is an opportunity to respond to the demographic and educational concerns of that community.
- Questions were raised about the current relationship between SFU Surrey and the rest of the University. SFU Surrey students are SFU students and are treated as such, including being eligible to receive scholarships, awards and bursaries. A question was posed about the application of the curricula revisions for Writing, Quantitative and Breadth skills and Senate was advised that the existing courses have many of these elements already incorporated into them.

The Chair reiterated the importance of moving forward with respect to decisions surrounding the Surrey campus and expressed his view that the University has the opportunity to expand the diversity of its programs, increase the range of research, and expand the complement of faculty, staff and students with programs that complement and enhance the core commitments of the Burnaby campus.

When the speakers' list had been exhausted, the Chair declared discussion closed and declared that the meeting move out of the Committee of the Whole.

D) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.03-33 – Faculty of Applied Sciences – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions

Moved by B. Lewis, seconded by S. Atkins

“that Senate approve the revised admission requirements for the Tech One Program as set forth in S.03-33”

Discussion ensued with respect to the Calendar language for the Tech One program. Concern was expressed that Chemistry was missing from the courses listed under the Second Semester. However, it was pointed out that Chemistry 101 was not included because of the requirement for wet labs. In response to an inquiry as to why BISC 100 was chosen over BISC 101, Senate was informed that BISC 100 was currently available as a Distance Education course. Comment was made that in the chart listing 9 Tech courses for deletion, six of which dealt with mathematics and three which dealt with probability and statistics, there were no courses in probability and statistics in the three replacement courses. It was pointed out that the goal was to ensure that students who start at the Surrey campus have math credits that were widely accepted in SFU programs and that statistics would be included in the development of the second year program. An error was pointed out regarding CMPT 101; it should be listed as a 4 credit course rather than a 3 credit course. It was noted however that the intent was that CMPT 101 when offered at the Surrey campus would be 3 credits, not four.

The intent of the second semester appeared to be to provide students with the possibility to take additional Science courses that would allow transfer and instead of specifying specific 100 level courses, suggestion was made that the requirement be changed to read any 100 level course in the Faculty of Science. This would then allow students the option of taking Chemistry courses at the Burnaby campus if they wished to do so. Senate was advised that the suggestion would be taken under advisement. If changes result, the changes will be reported back to Senate for information.

Brief discussion followed with respect to delegation of authority. Senate was advised that any Senator could give notice of motion either to remove the delegated authority or to make a revised ruling on curriculum revisions as passed by the committee under delegated authority.

Concern was expressed about the heavy workload. It was noted however that this was a cohort based intensive one year program and other programs such as Engineering also have an 18 credit hour requirement so this was not without precedent.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved Tech One Restructuring Calendar description, including new courses: TECH 117, TECH 124, TECH 114, BUS 130, BUS 131, TECH 100, TECH 101 and TECH 149. SCUS also approved, under delegated authority, the following new course in the School of Computing Science: CMPT 341.

ii) Faculty of Science – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions

a) Paper S.03-34 – Changes to MBB Major Program (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the deletion of the restriction on math course choice for students undertaking an MBB Major.

E) Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

i) Paper S.03-35 – Undergraduate Admission Targets for 2003/04

Motion 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Krane

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the undergraduate admission targets for each basis-of-admission group and for each semester in 2003/04 as set out in S.03-35, and that SCEMP be delegated authority to make further adjustments based on actual enrolment experience in 2003-2 and 2003-3”

Senate was advised that plans were to exceed the expected funded undergraduate FTEs. At present there were approximately 700 FTEs over target and if the University were to set admissions for the next academic year to bring down FTEs to the funded targets, admission grade point averages would have to be significantly increased. In order to smooth the transition to funded targets, SCEMP recommended having some unfunded FTEs for the coming academic year. The intent was to gradually bring the FTEs down to the funded target.

Brief discussion followed with respect to FTE enrolment and admission standards at the Surrey campus.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 1 CARRIED

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by I. Andrews

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the undergraduate admission targets to each Faculty as set out in S.03-35, Table 1, and that SCEMP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on actual enrolment experience in 2003-2 and 2003-3”

In response to an inquiry about the adjustment process delegated to SCEMP, Senate was advised that SCEMP would adjust the admission criteria for each of the programs and Faculties for the subsequent semesters based on the actual admissions in the summer and fall semesters. Assurance was sought and received that additional students would not be accepted after the targets had been reached.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 2 CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-36 – Admission of Associate Degree Students from BC Colleges and University Colleges

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Krane

“that Senate approve that commencing in 2004-3, the minimum admission average for Associate Degree students will be allowed to float above 2.00 and will be established each semester at 0.25 GPA points less than that required for regular transfer students”

Concern was expressed that more time should be given for advance notice of this change. Senate was advised that BCCAT had been consulted and they believed that 2004-3 semester provided adequate warning for students.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.03-37 – International Undergraduate Students at SFU including admission targets for 2003/4, 2004/5, 2005/6

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by I. Andrews

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors that a target for the number of international students, excluding exchange students, who are studying in undergraduate programs at SFU be established at 10% of SFU’s funded undergraduate FTE target in the academic years 2003/4, 2004/5, 2005/6”

Concern was expressed that the motion could be used to further escalate differential fees for international students. Senate was advised that if Senate approved the motion, the intent was to develop a fee structure for international students to cover the amount of tuition over the period in which they were registered in a program.

Reference was made to the proposal that 65% of international students be recruited from Canadian institutions, and comment was made that the contribution of international students coming directly from abroad should also be given high consideration. Senate was advised that plans were to recruit from overseas by an additional five percent and that the primary reason for recruitment from Canadian institutions was that the probability of success was much greater among international students who were already in Canada.

Brief discussion took place with respect to the impact of the proposed 10% on admission grade point averages for domestic students, and the proposed countries targeted for recruitment. The recruitment process itself was also discussed.

A motion to continue the meeting beyond 10:00 p.m. to conclude the open agenda was carried.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

F) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.03-38 – Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee was presented to Senate for information. Due to time constraints, the Chair requested that any questions be addressed to the Dean of Graduate Studies and if necessary reconsideration of the report be brought forward to the next meeting of Senate.

ii) Paper S.03-39 – Proposed New Graduate Regulation – 1.6.5 – Co-Supervision

Due to time constraints and the complexity of the issue, the Dean of Graduate Studies requested that the matter be deferred to the next meeting of Senate.

G) Senate Library Committee

i) Paper S.03-40 – Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Library Committee was presented to Senate for information. Due to time constraints, the Chair requested that any questions be addressed to the Vice-President Research and if necessary reconsideration of the report be brought back to the next meeting of Senate.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, April 7, 2003.

The Meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m. The agenda for the Closed Session was deferred to the next meeting of Senate.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat