

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, July 7, 2003 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Atkins, Stella
Beynon, Peter
Blackman, Roger (rep. J. Pierce)
Budd, James
Cameron, Rob (rep. B. Lewis)
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
da Silva, Gisele
D'Auria, John
Dunsterville, Valerie
Fizzell, Maureen
Fung, Edward
Gerson, Carole
Giacomantonio, Chris
Gordon, Robert
Heaney, John
Horvath, Adam
Jones, Colin
Kaila, Pam
Kalanj, Tiffany
Krane, Bill
Naef, Barbara
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Rozell, Sara
Sears, Camilla
Shaker, Paul
Vaisey, Jacques
Van Aalst, Jan
Wong, Josephine
Woodbury, Rob
Yoo, Rick

Absent:

Apaak, Clement
Chan, Wendy
Dickinson, John
Driver, Jon
Gregory, Titus
Grimmett, Peter
Gupta, Kamal
Hauerland, Norbert
Higgins, Anne
Hira, Andy
Lemay, Joanna
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
McFetridge, Paul
Plischke, Michael
Poirier, Guy
Russell, Robert
Smith, Don
Thandi, Ranbir
Waterhouse, John
Wessel, Sylvia
Wong, Milton
Yerbury, Colin

In attendance:

Marteniuk, Ron
Summers, Laurie
Wattamaniuk, Walter

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 May 12, 2003

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of June 2, 2003

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from either set of Minutes.

4. Report of the Chair

i) On behalf of Senate, the Chair welcomed Paul Shaker, the new Dean of Education, to Senate and to the University.

ii) As a result of an external review, the portfolio of the Vice-President External Relations was split creating two positions one of which was a new position, Vice-President, University Relations. A search process to fill the position on a continuing basis needed to be undertaken and because of the close correspondence between the new position and the previous position, SCAR agreed that it would be appropriate to use the same search committee composition and procedures approved under University policy GP 29 for the Vice-President, External Relations. There were no objections to this proposal.

iii) Referring to the recent IOC decision to award Vancouver the 2010 Winter Olympics, the Chair commented that SFU would be the site of a speed skating oval and indicated that it was important in the planning stage to define the legacy value of the facility for SFU and plan its use beyond the Olympics. To this end, the Associate Vice President Academic has been requested to initiate a planning committee which would be representative of academic programs most closely aligned with issues of sports sciences - Kinesiology, Psychology, and the Institute for Health Research and Education, etc. - to provide input with respect to building the facility in a way that maximizes the interest of the University. In addition, the Acting Vice-President University Relations has undertaken to set up an advisory committee with respect to external relation opportunities involved in the lead up to the Olympics.

iv) Referring to the ongoing construction on campus, the Chair reported on the following activities. At the Eastern most end of campus the UniverCity development was well underway with respect to the first four parcels of residential construction and the building (near the bus loop) of commercial/residential buildings as part of the first phase of that project. At the other end of the campus, construction was underway of two new residence towers and a dining facility for resident students. Alternative replacement parking was also underway to compensate for the loss of existing parking space as a result of this construction. In addition, the University was about to go to tender for the new Applied Sciences building.

It was expected that the tender process, including architectural drawings, would be complete by the Fall. There were other plans in motion to meet space demands in the core programs in the Arts and Sciences with funding for new construction to be based on a combination of funding through Federal research grants. The University was working very hard to develop a business case for those buildings so as to get those projects up and running as quickly as possible.

- v) With respect to recent press coverage regarding the David Noble case, the Chair commented that legal action has been launched against the University and neither the Chair nor other officers of the University were able to comment on the case until the matter was resolved by the courts.

5. Question Period

There were no questions.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.03-65 - Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Applied Sciences

a) Computing Science – Second Degree Program

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by R. Cameron

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the requirements of the Second Degree Program in the School of Computing Science, as set forth in S.03-65, effective September 2004”

Concern was expressed about a conflict of wording in the documentation concerning students who may not have the required background to gain entry to the second degree program. It was noted that internal transfer to Computing Science was not available to second degree students and inquiry was made as to how students with background deficiencies obtain the appropriate preparation. It was pointed out that students could be admitted to the program without an ideal background but they would not be assured of completion within 45 credit hours. It was suggested that the language of the Calendar description be modified as follows to clarify the wording conflict: “Students without this background may require additional time to complete lower division prerequisites prior to ~~program entry~~ commencement of upper division credits.”

Although they were supportive of the proposal, concerns were expressed by several Student Senators that this additional stream of enrolments to Computing Science could negatively affect access to courses for currently enrolled students. A question was posed as to what steps were being taken to ensure the current level of availability to courses, particularly upper division courses. Senate was advised that course availability in upper division Computing Science courses

had improved substantially as a result of the Double The Opportunities initiative. Upper division course space had been increased and students were now able to get courses in a timely fashion. Expectations were that the second degree program would not have that much of an effect but if enrolment demands became severe the second degree program would likely be suspended as was done in the past.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

b) Resource and Environmental Management – Course Changes (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to existing REM courses.

ii) Paper S.03-66 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Education

a) Co-Operative Education Program

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by A. Horvath

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the proposal for a Co-Operative Education Program in the Faculty of Education, as set forth in S.03-66, effective January 2004, including four new practicum courses”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

b) Course and Program changes (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to the B.Ed. as a 2nd Degree, the B.Ed. and PBD programs; and minor revisions to existing Education courses.

B) Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

i) Paper S.03-67 – Recommendations resulting from the Final Report of the course Accessibility Task Force

The following members of the Committee were in attendance in order to respond to questions: Roger Blackman (Senator and Chair), Walter Wattamaniuk, Laurie Summers, and Robert Gordon (Senator).

In order to permit wide-ranging discussion, the Chair suggested that Senate move into a Committee of the Whole.

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by R. Blackman

"that Senate move into Committee of the Whole"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion began with an overview of the process by the Committee's Chair. The following points are a summary of the lengthy discussion.

- An amendment to add the following phrase at the end of bullet four of motion one was proposed: "including an analysis of the effects of under funding by the Provincial and Federal Government to post secondary education". Opinion was expressed that chronic under-funding had a major effect on the accessibility of students to post-secondary education and therefore was an important issue for the task force to consider. In response, it was noted that this addition to the mandate would unduly expand the work of the committee. It was felt that the committee should stay focussed on feasible steps that could be taken to improve the allocation of resources and not go beyond that to the level suggested by the amendment.
- Tuition was felt to be an important accessibility issue and comment was made that the committee's mandate was incomplete without a discussion of that issue. It was noted that the relationship between tuition rates and course accessibility was a very complex issue and one which was not easily explored by the task force or the steering committee at the level being proposed.
- Reference was made to motion 2. It was noted that the development of a scheduling policy was a very complicated issue. The Task Force felt it was possible to identify incentives and resources that could lead to a more efficient scheduling system and make better use of unpopular teaching times. However, it was recognized that scheduling would vary by Faculty and department. It was felt that better scheduling would allow students a greater likelihood of getting the courses they wanted/needed in a timely fashion.
- Concern was expressed that motion 4 raised a conflict of interest with respect to the Vice President Academic. It was pointed out that this was a recommendation from the Task Force directed to the Vice President Academic. The VP Academic was not the author of the recommendation. He was the Chair of the committee that received the report from the Task Force.
- Question was raised as to the intent of motion 4. It appeared that the Task Force was recommending a redistribution of the University budget to ensure a greater emphasis on faculty positions and teaching assistantships which would result in academic departments and Faculties receiving larger budgets and other components of the University receiving less. The Task Force felt there should be greater support than there had been in the past and would like to see the issue of teaching and course accessibility given high priority in the allocation of resources but did not attach any specific numbers to the recommendation. Question was raised as to whether the proportion allocated to teaching purposes had increased as a result of the increase to department's teaching budgets for CFL and TA funding. It was thought that the increase in

instructional resources on a continuing base budget basis for this year was approximately 2-3% but more definitive figures could be obtained. Concern by Student Senators was expressed that increased funding for teaching positions could result in a tuition fee increase which should be the last resort. Since the Vice President Academic was not present to answer questions and concerns directly, it was suggested that motion 4 should be tabled.

- Suggestion was made that future instructional space should be made more flexible or adaptable to different configurations. It was noted that this was already under consideration in the planning of new instructional space. The Chair suggested that it might be useful to be more explicit regarding the modification of existing instructional space.
- It was noted that the document recommended that classroom space should be protected and not converted into other use. Suggestion was made that a percentage of funding from granting agencies should be used for instructional space.

When the speakers' list had been exhausted, a motion to move out of the Committee of the Whole was approved.

Motion 1

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate authorize the Vice-President, Academic to establish an Ad Hoc Steering Committee to:

- oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the Course Accessibility Task Force;
- create monitoring and evaluative mechanisms to assess the impact of the measures taken to address course accessibility;
- review departmental plans on how CATF recommendations will be implemented and to provide advice/comment where appropriate;
- explore additional areas and ideas to address course accessibility issues including, but not limited to, irregular time-tabling patterns, multi-semester scheduling, alternative methods of course delivery, and constraints on the development and offering of distance education courses etc.
- communicate and work with the University community in relation to course accessibility.

The suggested membership of the Steering Committee is as follows:

- Chair (appointed from the Faculty representatives)
- Faculty member representative from each of the Faculties
- 1 staff representative from the Registrar's Office
- 1 staff representative
- 1 senior undergraduate student
- Director, Academic Planning
- Director, Analytical Studies or designate"

Amendment moved by T. Kalanj, seconded by C. Giacomantonio

"that the following wording be added to end of bullet 4: including an analysis of the effects of under funding by the Provincial and Federal Government to post-secondary education"

Opinion was expressed that tuition increases and chronic under-funding seriously impact student accessibility to post-secondary education and the hope was that the committee could make recommendations on how to lobby government bodies and identify ways that extra funding could be found. It was pointed out that this task differed from the activities the committee was expected to engage in and the steering committee was not the appropriate body to deal with this issue.

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

Motion 2

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate direct the Ad Hoc Steering Committee on Course Accessibility to develop a scheduling policy for the approval of Senate that will make greater use of currently unpopular times and days, and the summer semester, with implementation of this recommendation to being Fall 2004 or earlier"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 3

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate direct that all programs, in consultation with the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS), review program regulations and prerequisite requirements and modify or delete any with weak justification that create barriers to course access"

As a point of clarification, Senate was advised that only undergraduate programs were addressed by this motion.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 4

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate encourage the Vice-President, Academic to seek resources for additional base-budgeted resources for CFL positions and TA funding"

Since it was not clear how the Vice-President intended to seek additional resources, suggestion was made that it would be better to discuss this directly with the Vice-President, Academic at a future meeting.

Moved by C. Giacomantonio, seconded by R. Yoo

“that the motion be tabled until the Vice-President Academic was present to discuss this issue”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED

Motion 5

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate express deep concern about the increasing shortage of classroom facilities and advise the Board of Governors that the construction of additional instructional space be given high priority in future capital planning for the University and that conversion of existing classroom space to other uses be resisted”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.03-68 – Great Northern Way Campus Academic Vision document

Ron Marteniuk and Laurie Summers were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate approve in principle the Great Northern Way Campus Academic Vision document with the following caveats:

That before SFU participates in or offers any academic courses or programs at the Great Northern Way Campus due diligence is undertaken to ensure that the proposed offerings:

- Do not compete with existing and proposed SFU academic course/program offerings;
- Will not seek FTE funding and will target non-traditional learners;
- Have a targeted labour market and identified student demand;
- Are financially viable;
- Have appropriate human, fiscal and physical resources;
- Enhance and contribute to the overall University mission and strategic plan;
- Have been reviewed and approved through the regular academic approval channels of the University culminating in approval by Senate prior to their offering”

Questions arose with respect to current costs associated with the existing land and the maintenance/demolition of existing buildings. Senate was advised that some of the space in the existing buildings was rented out and that the rental income fully covered the costs of the land and maintenance. Expectations were that the existing buildings would have to be replaced within the next three to ten years. FTE funding from the Government would not be sought so the full costs of programs as well as buildings would have to be found through special fund raising initiatives.

In response to questions about planning, Senate was advised that a search was underway for a Director of Planning and Development. Currently there is a Board of Trustees with equal representation from the institutional partners, and a Steering Committee under the Board of Trustees composed of the Vice Presidents Academic and Vice Presidents Finance. Under the Steering Committee, there were two planning committees, academic planning and financial planning. An external advisory committee was envisaged to advise the Steering Committee, and the new Director of Planning and Development would be responsible for and become a member of each committee.

Discussion took place with respect to program development. Senate was advised that decisions were made by majority vote and if the University were to disagree, SFU could simply not participate in the program or could withdraw from the consortium and forfeit its share of the property. Senate was advised that SFU had pressed hard to have a more open ended vision statement and that the document before Senate was a compromise. However, it was noted that the opportunity to collaborate in other areas was available provided there was majority agreement between partners.

The following concerns were expressed in relation to the academic vision for the GNWC:

- Possibility of a funding conflict at a time when SFU was struggling to adequately fund activities on its own campus as well as its two other campuses - Harbour Centre and Surrey;
- Without FTE funding, a significantly different type of service would take place which may infringe on principles that SFU stands for;
- Activities in the vision document have no significant benefit to the university;
- The research vision of the GNWC was industry driven and infringed on the founding principles of SFU;
- There was nothing in the vision statement that was not already being done at the existing institutions and universities should not be trying to do the same things at the GNWC.
- Reference was made to bullet one and two and concern was expressed that opportunities for traditional students were discarded by virtue of the fact that non-traditional learners would be targeted. At the very least, it was suggested that proposed offerings complementary to existing courses/programs should not be ruled out.

It was noted that the other three institutions had approved the vision statement and inquiry was made as to what would happen if SFU did not approve the document. The Chair felt that non-approval would be seen as rejecting the general intentions for the development of the GNWC and there would likely be a very uncomfortable continuance in the consortium if not a strong pressure for SFU to withdraw. Some Senators expressed the view that it was too much of a gamble to approve the document when there were so many reservations and if autonomy could be exercised at any point, SFU should be able to do that at the start by sending the document back.

Opinion was expressed that although SFU was not completely satisfied with the vision document, it was in the University's long term interest to remain a partner in the consortium in view of the strategic importance of the location of the property and the opportunities for collaboration which the location presents. It was stressed that the consortium provided the potential for doing some very productive initiatives. The explicit qualifiers contained in the motion gave a clear signal with respect to the conditions under which the University would move forward, and opinion was expressed that it was better to approve the motion with qualifications than to reject the document.

Brief discussion ensued with respect to the timeline of the approval process, whether the other institutions had any reservations, and the internal consultation process with regard to the proposed areas of interest for collaboration.

Amendment moved by S. Atkins, seconded by R. Cameron

'that bullet two be deleted, and that in the wording of bullet one, the words "Do not compete with" be changed to "Are complimentary to..."

It was suggested that the amendment emphasized positive aspects rather than negative and did not eliminate the potential of offering traditional undergraduate programs if deemed appropriate.

In addition to discussion on the amendment, the Chair indicated that debate on the motion as a whole would continue before taking a vote on the amendment. In response to a question about time constraints, Senate was advised that when the consortium was set up there was agreement that a jointly written academic vision statement would be established and passed through institutional bodies of governance. The other parties have signed off and there was a sense that it was important to bring this phase of the consortium's development to conclusion. The Chair advised Senate that UBC's motion also had some qualifications attached to it albeit not as strongly worded as the SFU motion. The Chair felt it would be very difficult to get agreement on another document but felt that the qualifications attached to the motion put the consortium on notice with respect to principles under which the University would be inclined to consider future proposals.

Brief discussion followed with respect to the funding and operation of the GNWC versus SFU. Senate was informed that the consortium was a separate

legal entity of which SFU was a partner and no funds, capital or operational, were expected to be diverted from SFU monies.

Question was called on the amendment,
and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Question was called on the main motion,
and a vote taken.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED
(16 in favour / 12 opposed)

ii) Paper S.03-69 – External Reviews for 2003-2004 (For Information)

Senate received information that the following external reviews will be initiated for the 2003/2004 academic year: Earth Sciences, Kinesiology, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, and the Secwepemc Cultural Education Society (SCES) Program.

D) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.03-70 – Changes to Graduate General Regulations resulting from new tuition fee rules

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by M. Fizzell

“that Senate approve the changes to Graduate General Regulations 1.4, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 1.4.7, 1.8.4, 1.8.5, and 1.12.2 described in Senate paper S.03-70, and that Senate approve any renumbering of regulations required by these changes”

Since the Dean of Graduate Studies was not present, the Chair suggested that if there were concerns with respect to any of the details, that the motion should be referred. A concern was expressed with regard to 1.4.5 on part-time study.

Moved by C. Sears, seconded by A. Horvath

“that the motion be referred to the next meeting at which the Dean can be present”

Question was called on the motion to refer,
and a vote taken.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

E) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.03-71 – Elections

A revised paper showing additions was distributed to Senators along with additional information supplied by candidates. There were insufficient nominations to fill all positions. Vacancies will be carried forward. The following are the results of elections which took place by Senate.

Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS)

One Senator (at-large) to replace Stella Atkins from date of election to May 31, 2005.

No nominations received: Vacant

One Lay Senator to replace James McArthur from date of election to May 31, 2005.

Elected by acclamation: James McArthur

One Faculty Senator to replace Margaret Jackson from date of election to May 31, 2004.

Elected by acclamation: Barry Honda**

* Committee position would take effect on 1 September 2003 co-incident with start of Senate term

Senate Committee on International Activities (SCIA)

One Faculty Senator to replace Larry Weldon from date of election to May 31, 2004.

Candidates: A. Hira, A. Horvath, D. Weeks

Elected: Andy Hira

Senate Committee on University Honours (SCUH)

One Senator (at-large) for term of office to May 31, 2004.

Elected by acclamation: Lynn Copeland

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, September 15, 2003. There is no meeting in August.

Open Session adjourned at 10:00 p.m. and moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat