

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, May 15, 2006 in Room 3210 WMC at 5:30 pm
Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair of Senate

Apaak, Clement
Black, Sam
Breden, Felix
Brennand, Tracy
Budd, James
Dickinson, Peter
Easton, Stephen
Fizzell, Maureen
Gordon, Irene
Grimmett, Peter
Hauerland, Norbert
Hayes, Michael
Horvath, Adam
Javed, Wasseem
Jones, John (representing B. Lewis)
Krane, Bill
LaBrie, John
Love, Ernie
MacLean, David
Mundle, Todd (representing L. Copeland)
Percival, Colin
Percival, Paul
Perry, Tom (representing J. Pierce)
Pinto, Mario
Plischke, Michael
Schellenberg, Betty
Scott, Jamie
Shaker, Paul
Smith, Don
Warner, D'Arcy
Waterhouse, John
Williams, Peter
Wong, Josephine
Woodbury, Robert
Zandvliet, David

Heath, Ron, Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

Absent:

Caufield, Sarah
Corbett, Kitty
Delgrande, James
Dickinson, John
Ester, Martin
Fleming-Saraceno, David
Gordon, Robert
Halpern, Erica
Honda, Barry
Hunsdale, Shawn
Louie, Brandt
Magee, Sean
McArthur, James
Tilley, Kevin
Uhlmann, Sasha
van Baarsen, Amanda
Weeks, Dan

In attendance:

Anderson, Bob
Dawkins, Heather
Kirkpatrick, Ted
MacDonald, George

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of April 3, 2006
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the Minutes.
4. Report of the Chair
The Chair reported on a recent business trip to Australia and Japan, and advised that he had also met with Alumni in Melbourne, Sidney, and Tokyo at several gatherings.
5. Question Period
There were no questions.
6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.06-59 – Bill Reid Centre for Northwest Coast Art Studies

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by I. Gordon

“that Senate approve the creation of the Bill Reid Centre for Northwest Coast Art Studies”

G. MacDonald, Director, Bill Reid Foundation and Associate Member in the Department of Archaeology was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to University Policy GP 35 in which it states that recommendations for the naming of academic units are to be made to the Board of Governors by the President on the advice of the Vice-President Academic, the Vice-President Advancement, the Dean of the Faculty involved, and the Senate Committee on University Honours. It was noted that the document had not been to SCUH and the following motion was made.

Moved by C. Percival, seconded by C. Apaak

“that the proposal be referred back to the Senate Committee on University Honours for consideration”

The Vice-President Academic explained his interpretation of the policy and stated that he did not feel that the designation of the Centre’s name fell under GP 35. It was noted by another Senator that Senate could, if it wished, deal with the issue directly since SCUH is a subcommittee of Senate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

Reference was made to the governance structure on page 5. A question was raised as to why there was no provision for student representation on the steering committee, especially since the University has a very active First Nations Student organization. G. MacDonald pointed out that although student representation was not specifically designated, there was allowance for First Nations representation that could be filled by a student. Senate was advised that the steering committee was set up very much like the Bill Reid Foundation itself where approximately half the members are First Nations people. G. MacDonald felt there would be no objection to having a First Nations student representation designation and advised that the issue would be given serious consideration.

Referring to Policy GP 35, it was noted that the creation of a Centre requires approval by the Board of Governors, and a suggestion to amend the motion to include a reference to the Board was accepted as a friendly amendment as follows:

“that Senate approve, and recommend to the Board of Governors, the creation and naming of the Bill Reid Centre for Northwest Coast Art Studies”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDED MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.06-60 – Dialogue Minor in Communication

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Fizzell

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the Dialogue Minor in Communication, in the Faculty of Applied Sciences”

R. Anderson, School of Communication, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.06-61 – New Program: Certificate in Explorations in the Arts and Social Sciences

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by D. Smith

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the Certificate in Explorations in the Arts and Social Sciences at SFU Surrey, in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences”

H. Dawkins, Associate Dean for FASS programs at SFU Surrey, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Senate received information that the following new courses were associated with this new program: EXPL 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 160, 170, 310, 320.

iv) Paper S.06-62 – Amendments to the Senate Guidelines for Academic Plans

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Krane

“that Senate approve the proposed amendments to the Senate Guidelines for Academic Plans”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Secretary's note: Two minor corrections to this document were approved by SCUP but were not incorporated into the document that was circulated to Senate as part of S 06.62. These revisions deal with clarification about which parts of the guidelines apply or do not apply to non-departmentalized faculties. The complete document can be found on the web at: http://www.sfu.ca/vpacademic/Academic_Planning/Academic_Plans/

v) Paper S.06-63 – Centres and Institutes Report, 2004/2005

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Pinto

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the Status Report for Centres and Institutes, 2004/2005”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

vi) Paper S.06-64 - SCUP Annual Report (For Information)

Senate received the Annual Report for the period of April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006 of the Senate Committee on University Priorities for information.

vii) Paper S.06-65 – External Review Schedule for 2006/2007 (For Information)

Senate received information that the following programs or departments are scheduled for External Reviews in the 2006/2007 academic year: Gerontology, Humanities, and Political Science. In addition, arising from the report of the Language Instruction Committee, a joint review of the Language Training Institute, the English Bridge Program, and the English Language and Culture Program will be conducted.

B) Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning

i) Paper S.06-66 – SCUTL Annual Report (For Information)

T. Kirkpatrick, Chair of the Committee, was in attendance in order to respond to questions. Senate received the Annual Report (September 2005-April 2006) of the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning for information.

- C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
- i) Paper S.06-67 – WQB Requirements for second degree students (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved that for the 2006/2007 academic year only, students admitted to a second degree be deemed to have met the breadth requirements, and one each of the Q and W requirements.

Disappointment was expressed with regard to the Committee's decision to impose WQB requirements on second degree programs. It was noted that the rationale for having W and Q requirements was largely based on the need to assure that students have adequate academic preparation if not on entry, then in their early years of study at the University. The attainment of a Bachelor's degree already demonstrates a student's ability, and imposing additional WQB requirements calls into question the quality of the first degree. It was also suggested that the specific requirements of a curriculum should be left to individual Faculty programs to consider rather than having university-wide requirements with additional credit hours which could be a serious impediment to a second degree for some students.

Senate was advised that the issue of WQB requirements for second degree students received considerable discussion with strong feelings on either side of the issue. It was pointed out that WQB requirements were graduation requirements, not admission requirements, and although SCUS waived further breadth requirements for second degree students, the Committee felt that students should be required to take at least one W and one Q course as part of their second degree program. It was stressed that the proposal is for one year only during which time further input and further discussion will be undertaken with comments and input welcomed from Senators and the University community in general.

- D) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- i) Paper S.06-68 – Policy Revision – R20.01 Research Ethics Review Policy

Moved by M. Pinto, seconded by S. Easton

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the revisions to Policy R20.01 – Research Ethics Review Policy”

Reference was made to Section 8.2.f relating to the use of secondary data and identifiable communities. Concern was expressed that having to secure the approval of identifiable communities creates a double standard between ordinary Canadians and Canadians who happen to be members of a particular community. A suggestion was made that the sentence referring to communities in Section 8.2.f, as well as Section 7.3.e which also references harm to communities, should be deleted so that the analysis of risk assessment was only relevant to individuals.

The Vice-President, Research stated he would prefer to take the suggestion back to the committee for consideration. The Chair indicated that a vote on the motion would be deferred but felt it would be useful to continue discussion to see if other concerns were raised.

The following comments were raised in subsequent discussion:

- the wording of Section 1.7 was too ambiguous to base decisions on; i.e. too many conditions, to many either/or, etc.;
- some funding agencies define the age of consent differently from the age defined in the SFU policy - there was no reference in the policy to indicate how that issue would be handled;
- concern that the wording of Section 9 was not flexible enough to take into account the use of available data sources already collected and the impact of Memoranda of Understanding signed with universities in other countries dealing with research.

Following discussion, the Chair reiterated that the motion would be deferred to a future meeting of Senate following reconsideration by the committee of the points raised in discussion.

ii) Paper S.06-69 – Policy Revisions – R20.02 Biosafety Policy (For Information)
The proposed revisions to Policy R20.02 were received by Senate for information.

7. Other Business

i) Paper S.06-70 – Election Report (For Information)

A report on the results of faculty and student elections to Senate and the Board of Governors was presented to Senate for information.

ii) Thanks to outgoing Senators

The Chair presented certificates to those senators who were attending their last meeting of Senate, and thanked outgoing Senators for their contribution to the governance of SFU: C. Apaak, J. Budd, J. Dickinson, D. Fleming-Saraceno, P. Grimmett, S. Magee, J. Scott, K. Tilley, S. Uhlmann, R. Woodbury,

8. Information

The date of the next regular meeting of Senate is Monday, June 5, 2006.

The Open Session adjourned at 6:15 pm, and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.