

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Amended by Senate

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on *12 May 08*

Monday, April 7, 2008 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenon, Michael, President and Chair of Senate

Brebner, Sarah
Brennand, Tracy
Collinge, Joan (representing J. LaBrie)
Copeland, Lynn
Cormack, Lesley
Dagenais, Diane
Dickinson, Peter
Driver, Jon
Easton, Stephen
Fizzell, Maureen
Francis, June
Gençay, Ramo
Gordon, Robert
Hannah, David
Harding, Kevin
Hemingway, Alex
Krane, William
Laba, Martin
Lee, Benjamin
Lein, Adam
Letourneau, Michael
Lewis, Brian
Liljedahl, Peter
Malcoe, Lorraine Halinka
O'Neil, John
Paling, Joe
Percival, Colin
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pinto, Mario
Plischke, Michael
Shaker, Paul
Shapiro, Daniel
Shermer, Thomas
Smith, Don
Thompson, Steve
Tiffany, Evan
Tse, Karen
Vaid, Bhuvinder
van Baarsen, Amanda
Warner, D'Arcy
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Daniel
Williams, Tony

Absent

Abdulwahab, Kamal
Atkins, Stella
Corbett, Kitty
Fox, Amy
Harder, Derrick
Hayes, Michael
Javed, Waseem
Li, Paul
Louie, Brandt
McArthur, James
Popadiuk, Natalee
Russell, Robert
Wakkary, Ron
Williams, Peter

In attendance:

Anderson, Robert
Bendell-Young, Leah
Blazenko, George
Glackman, Bill
Glässer, Uwe
Gotfrit, Martin
Harestad, Alton
Hickin, Ted
Janes, Craig
Laycock, David
Lertzman, Ken
Lorimer, Rowland
MacAlister, David
Paterson, David
Ruben, Peter
Saif, Merhdad

Ross, Kate, Registrar & Senior Director Student Enrolment
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

1. Approval of the Agenda

A suggestion to change Item 6.A vii to item 6.A.ix and move items (viii) and (ix) forward was accepted. Following this revision, the Agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of March 3, 2008

Under Item B.i) on page 6, the first sentence of the last paragraph was changed to read: "Reference was made to the large increase in the target for international students in Business Administration and the simultaneous lowering of the target for domestic students, and concern was expressed about how the Faculty can reach these targets without imposing different admission GPA cut-offs for the two groups." Following this amendment, the Minutes were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

4. Report of the Chair

The Chair provided background information with respect to the Government's recent cuts to funding to post-secondary institutions which represents for SFU a 6.3 million dollar reduction to the planned operating budget for 2008/09. The timing of the announcement was very distressing since the new fiscal year was only two weeks away and budgets for the forthcoming year were already in the final stages of approval. Discussions with the Government to seek relief from the impact of these cuts continue but there have been clear signals from the Government that the decisions are final and that there will be no adjustments within this coming year. In the short run, the cuts are not so severe as to destabilize operations. One of the recommendations that will be made to the Board is that no additional cuts to academic programs will take place in the 08/09 academic year since the majority of new faculty have already been hired and searches for new academic appointments are in motion or nearly completed and admission offers have already been made. The University is therefore looking at non-academic operating budgets for ways to find savings to help reduce the amount of deficit. The Chair summarized the kinds of recommendations that were likely to be made to the Board of Governors and indicated they range from trivial items such as the elimination of contracts for bottled water to reductions in debt servicing through improved fundraising. This is expected to eliminate approximately 4 ½ million dollars with the remaining 1.8 million to be deficit financed or to be handled by calls on cash. Commitments to the previous enrolment and appointment plans will mean additional pressure on the 2009/2010 fiscal year and plans are to commence that budget cycle early. Last year's Budget Task Force has been re-established and, as was done previously, will initiate consultation and a high degree of communication with all sectors of the University. It will be important to show the Government what impact these cuts over time will mean in terms of pressure on academic complements and staffing, on non-academic complements and staffing, and to show that the kinds of measures taken with respect to non-salary operating budgets have reached a limit and there is essentially nothing else that can be curtailed for any appreciable improvement in cost reduction.

Questions were raised with regard to improvements in capital financing, reduction of the scholarship budget, research funds, and carry-forwards. Senate was advised that SFU received an additional sum of money for capital expenditures related to the build out of the Surrey campus which writes down some pressure on the operating budget. With respect to the scholarship budget, Senate was advised that the scholarship budget had been under spent for several years and the intent is to remove the unspent portion. However, if there is improvement on the acceptance rates for scholarship offers, the projected cut would not be realized. Senate was assured that the Administration has not contemplated targeting any existing program of research funding but there may be impacts as a result of decisions at the granting council level. The Vice-President Research indicated that every effort will be made to preserve funding but any cuts to the VPR budget which funds internal research expenditures would have to be looked at very closely. With respect to carry-forwards, the University has drawn down on cash resources to buffer previous cuts and is expecting to rely still further on these reserves which are near a dangerously low level.

In response to an inquiry about whether there was any consideration given to the University doing an outreach to the public to explain the financial situation and the impact of these cuts on the post-secondary education system, Senate was advised that TUPC has requested a meeting with the Premier and the Minister of Finance and it was felt it would be appropriate to meet with those officials before making any official public response. However, it was also made clear to the Government that announcements would have to be made to the University community as to the kinds of actions that will need to be taken as a result of the cuts in funding and there was no control on media pick up of that information.

Referring back to the issue of cuts to the scholarship budget, a member of the Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries believed that the Committee was not aware of this and a request was made for more detailed information to be provided to the Committee for its next meeting. The Chair suggested that the Vice President, Academic follow up on the request, and the Vice-President Academic indicated he would do so.

5. Question Period

Questions surrounding the process and governance with respect to the use of vectors and temporary course changes were submitted by K. Harding. The Associate Vice-President Academic advised that after doing some research, he suggested it would be more appropriate to provide Senate with a written response at the next meeting. There was no objection to this suggestion.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.08-45 – International Cybercrime Research Centre

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by K. Tse

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the creation of the International Cybercrime Research Centre (ICRC) as a Schedule B Centre”

B. Glackman, School of Criminology, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.08-46 – External Review – Department of Political Science

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by S. Easton

“that Senate approve the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the Department of Political Science and the Dean of Arts and Social Sciences on priority items resulting from the External Review”

D. Laycock, Chair, Department of Political Science was present to respond to questions.

Surprise was expressed by a Senator as to the large number of recommendations of the external review which were rejected by the Department. Opinion was expressed that the Department’s response to the review appeared to be somewhat inflexible and support was expressed for SCUP’s recommendation that the Department reconsider some of its decisions. The Chair of the Department indicated that many of the issues were going to be addressed in ways that were expected to be acceptable to the University.

Reference was made to the recommendation concerning the enrolment cap on third year courses. While it was understood that the elimination of the enrolment cap may solve some of the course accessibility problems, concern was expressed that it would fundamentally change the nature of the courses from small seminars into larger lectures.

Clarification was requested with respect to the recommendation to assist students to be eligible for more scholarships. Senate was advised that this likely means offering workshops at the departmental level and coaching students applying for scholarships. J. Driver noted that such a workshop had been presented by Graduate Studies in the past but staff who had run the workshops had been lost and some departments took on the responsibility to run them.

The recommendation to offer all graduate courses annually in fall and spring was noted and a question arose as to whether SCUP intended this recommendation to literally apply to all graduate courses or all required graduate courses. The Chair of the Department indicated it would not be possible to offer all of their courses during Spring and Fall and that some students prefer taking courses during the Summer so he found this recommendation confusing. The Vice-President, Academic advised that SCUP would not intentionally ask Departments to do something they could not do and it was his

understanding that the reviewers were concerned about the offering of required graduate courses. A suggestion to insert the word 'required' prior to the words 'graduate courses' in this recommendation was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- iii) Paper S.08-47 – Faculty of Health Sciences – Degree Name Change: Master of Public Health

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. O'Neil

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the degree name change from Master of Science in Population and Public Health to Master of Public Health in the Faculty of Health Sciences”

C. Janes, Faculty of Health Sciences, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- iv) Paper S.08-48 – Master of Arts in Applied ^{Legal} Liberal Studies in the School of Criminology

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by L. Cormack

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the full program proposal for a Master of Arts in Applied Legal Studies in the School of Criminology in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences”

R. Gordon, Senator and Director, School of Criminology, and D. MacAlister, School of Criminology were in attendance in order to respond to questions. Also in attendance was W. Braid, Executive Director of the Society of Notaries Public BC.

An opinion was expressed that the proposal was well argued and would appear to bring very real benefits to the University but the question was raised as to why SFU was considering program expansion when UBC was winding down their program. Senate was advised that UBC offered a very basic training program and was not interested in developing a graduate program/degree in this area. It was noted that the proposal before Senate was created in consultation with the Society of Notaries Public and would provide greater depth and a higher quality of education for Notaries in the Province of British Columbia.

In response to a concern that this program had already been advertised, Senate was advised that because of the length of time it takes to receive approval for a new degree program from Senate and the Provincial Government, it is common practice for programs to be advertised in advance with a rider that states pending approval of Senate and the Provincial Government, so that programs, once approved, can be launched as quickly as possible.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- v) Paper S.08-49 – Master of financial Risk Management in the Faculty of Business Administration

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Fizzell

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the full program proposal for a Master of Financial Risk Management in the Faculty of Business Administration”

G. Blazenko, Faculty of Business Administration, was present to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- vi) Paper S.08-50 – Bachelor of General Studies (Education) in the Faculty of Education

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by P. Shaker

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the full program proposal for a Bachelor of General Studies (Education) in the Faculty of Education”

D. Paterson, Faculty of Education, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- vii) Paper S.08-52 - Software Systems Major program in the School of Computing Science

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Peters

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the full program proposal for a Software Systems Major in the School of Computing Science in the Faculty of Applied Sciences”

In response to an inquiry as to why this program was not called ‘Software Engineering’, T. Shermer, Senator and Associate Director for School of Computing Science at Surrey advised that there were legal implications involved with the use of the word engineering so in order to avoid any legal problems and also to allow for the possibility of putting forth a software engineering program accredited by the Canadian Engineering Certification Board, it was felt that it was more appropriate to call this program Software Systems.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

viii) Paper S.08-53 – Pfizer/Heart and Stroke Foundation BC & Yukon Chair in Cardiovascular Prevention Research – Terms of Reference

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. O’Neil

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the terms of reference for the Pfizer/Heart and Stroke Foundation BC & Yukon Chair in Cardiovascular Prevention Research in the Faculty of Health Sciences”

A Senator expressed his regret that another Chair was being named after a corporation.

Concern was expressed about the specificity of the terms of reference for the Advisory Committee for the Chair, particularly the need for annual meetings and the level of oversight required for a senior academic position such as a Chair. The level of detail seems to be unnecessary and suggestion was made that when future terms are drafted for similar positions, the implied workload is given careful consideration.

Reference was made to the requirement of the Chair to include financial reporting on the endowment in his/her annual report. A suggestion was made that the holder of the fund – the Vice-President Academic or his/her designate – should be the administrative officer to report on this issue rather than the Chair. It was noted that expectations were that this information would be provided to the Chair by the Vice-President.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ix) Paper S.08-51 – Motions Arising from the Phase 2 Faculty Structure Task Force Report

The following persons whose programs/departments were affected by the proposals before Senate were in attendance in order to respond to questions: Robert Anderson, School of Communication, Alton Harestad, Department of Biological Sciences, Ted Hickin, Department of Geography, Peter Ruben, School of Kinesiology.

Motion 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Lewis

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the revised structure of the Faculty of Applied Sciences, comprised of the School of Computing Science and the School of Engineering Science, effective April 2009”

The Vice-President, Academic introduced the paper by making general comments that applied to Motions 1 – 4 and responding to some of the discussion that took place at the last meeting of Senate. He noted that Senate was facing a strategic choice that would influence the direction of the University for many years to come, and in his view, using the four criteria set out in the report of the Task Force, approval of the new Faculties

would place the University in a much stronger position than it would be otherwise. SFU has always devoted funds to strategic directions and when the University was last reorganized in 1984 there were even more severe financial problems than at present, yet those new programs and units developed at that time have strengthened the University.

In response to arguments that the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences was being asked to bear a disproportionately large burden of the cost of restructuring, Senate was assured that this was not the case. Funding for strategic initiatives comes from the operating budget of the University as a whole and has been directed to all parts of the University over the years. J. Waterhouse, Vice-President, Academic noted that the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS) perceived that the current funding formula disadvantaged that Faculty, and as a result, he has agreed to engage an independent person to examine the equity in Faculty funding and if there is found to be an inequitable distribution of resources across the Faculties, the University will do what it can to redress the issue.

J. Waterhouse noted that some concerns had been expressed that the Faculty of the Environment was insufficiently defined and he drew Senators attention to the motion which includes the establishment of an Interdisciplinary Program Planning Committee which will report to Senate by April 2009. If Senate does not approve the programs, the Faculty would not come into existence. Senate was advised that John Clague, CRC Chair in Earth Sciences, has agreed to Chair the Committee if approved.

Noting that some have drawn a link between the cost of faculty restructuring and the current budget problems in the University, the Vice-President Academic advised that there was no such link. Senate was advised that if the cost of restructuring was distributed evenly over the University budget, the impact on each unit would be 0.15%. The cause of the current funding problem is that the Government operating grant is not growing with inflation and the University is not as competitive as it might be in attracting funds from other sources.

In response to comments that the process of considering faculty restructuring has been rushed without sufficient consultation and has been a top down exercise, the Vice-President Academic reminded Senate that deliberations of this issue have spanned almost three years, have involved two Task Forces, and there has been input from hundreds of faculty members. Open forums have been held and Senate has discussed this issue on at least two occasions. This was a faculty driven, grassroots, community-based process from the beginning that resulted in the recommendations before Senate and that the recommendations reflect the strongly expressed preferences of many faculty and students.

An opinion was expressed that Engineering Science and Computing Science had always felt uncomfortable within the current Faculty configuration, and were constrained by the competing demands of units which were not normally associated with them in any other University. The new configuration has the potential of re-energizing and refocusing these units. It was noted that the costs associated with the first three motions can be supported almost entirely from existing budgets within the Faculty of Applied Sciences itself, and opinion was expressed that the opportunity costs of not moving forward with faculty

restructuring far outweigh the immediate costs. It was also pointed out that this was an significant process of self determination and all of the units within the Faculty of Applied Sciences, and the units in FASS and Science affected by the proposal, voted almost unanimously for these resolutions.

A question was posed about whether visitors to Senate should be allowed to speak. Due to time constraints, the decision was made that visitors would not be allowed to speak but the Chair indicated that if persons in affected programs could provide information on matters under debate, he would ask permission of Senate for them to speak.

Debate turned to the issue of what would happen if some of the motions passed and others failed. This led to an amendment being moved by P. Percival, seconded by K. Harding

“that the words ‘in principle’ be inserted after the word ‘approve’ and the words ‘effective April 1, 2009’ be struck from the motion”

An inquiry was made as to the possibility of considering the motions altogether. Senate was advised that although the motions were linked, the advice of SCAR, as well as the flavour of the discussion from the last Senate meeting, was that Senate preferred to have the motions separated so as to address the particulars of each proposal.

A question was raised about whether it would then be necessary, if the other motions were approved, to return to motion 1 to reinstate the effective date and reiterate approval. Senate was advised that the intent of the motion was to approve the motion in principle and leave the specific date of implementation to be worked out by the Administration.

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

Discussion returned to the main motion. Suggestion was made that all of the motions should be delayed until the budget was finalized and a complete financial picture for the University was known.

A procedural issue related to the timing of these motions coming to Senate was raised. As a result of comments made at the last Senate meeting about a need for more open discussion and response with respect to concerns aired about the projected costs, especially as they were perceived to have an impact on the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, some Senators thought that these issues would be addressed at another open forum in which more detailed information such as that provided by Senator Waterhouse earlier could be digested before voting on the proposals.

A concern was expressed about special consideration being given to boutique programs and Faculties complete with new buildings and research dollars; that other programs and departments felt left out and overwhelmed by increased demands of service teaching with fewer resources and wondered why the interdisciplinary research and teaching which already occurs in existing Faculty and department structures had not been highlighted and celebrated in the Task Force Report.

A suggestion was made that rather than investing strategic funds into new initiatives and moving in new directions, the single most important strategic initiative in the University at the moment was the restoration of its core teaching capacity and tutorials and strategic resources should be used for restoring these core issues.

Views were expressed that the creation of the new Faculties will benefit the University as a whole by highlighting strengths that are currently hidden by structures that are no longer appropriate. The new Faculties have the potential to attract attention, students, and funding. This initiative did not cause the budget problems and delaying it will not solve the budget problems. The University has to do things differently in order to be more attractive and the motions are a step in the right direction.

A point of order was raised that Senators were addressing the motions as if they were all on the table, and the Chair asked Senators to focus their comments to the substance of motion one but recognized that there were definite interrelationships between the motions.

A concern was expressed that a motion with regard to the proposal on Centres and Institutes and the Office of Interdisciplinary Collaboration had not come forward. It was noted that these initiatives would be able to help new and existing Faculties and departments find sources of funding.

It was noted that the documentation provided a fairly good explanation as to where the money would come from to implement the restructuring but it was hard to balance because there were no estimates of expected income. A concern was expressed that issues such as course accessibility, size of classes, tutorials, accessibility of tenure-track versus sessional instructors have not been addressed before these structural changes are contemplated.

In an effort to provide insight into the kinds of things that a new Faculty can bring to the University, the Dean of Health Sciences provided examples from the development of the Faculty of Health Sciences and pointed out that external revenue generation will help to resolve many of the existing problems which have been identified.

Referring to the perception that core values and core programs were being destroyed in favour of boutique programs, a relatively long list of existing boutique programs at SFU were noted. All of the programs mentioned, including innovative programs such as Archaeology, Urban Studies, Gerontology, Women's Studies, Humanities, were developed by faculty members to meet the needs of students and take advantage of research opportunities at the time. The restructuring proposal is an opportunity to do the same – develop new programs that are relevant to students and society and will create research opportunities for current faculty members. It was also noted that funds from contract research help to subsidize funding for the SSHRC program and other grants which are distributed to faculty across the University.

The Dean of Arts and Social Sciences indicated that much of the restructuring was neutral for FASS but it was important to get assurance from the Vice President Academic that the Faculty would not be left behind as restructuring moved forward. A commitment had now been received that the budget for FASS would be reviewed as had been mentioned before.

Senators were advised that as a result of the restructuring exercise, the Schools of Computing Science and Engineering Science had discovered more synergies between them that they thought existed and discussions have begun about the development of joint programs and collaborations.

It was noted that most of the criticisms surrounding restructuring had nothing to do with the content of the proposals, and an opinion was expressed that the exercise of restructuring was designed to address many of the concerns raised.

The Chair indicated that all Senators had had a chance to speak at least once and that the discussion has been detailed and wide ranging and he would like to call the question.

It was noted that Senators were allowed to speak twice to a motion and objection was raised by A. Hemingway who wished to speak to clarify a couple of points. The first point raised was the lack of distinction between sentiments that these initiatives shouldn't move forward today and one that they shouldn't move forward at all which is a position that no one is putting forward. The second point refers to the meaning of the word core, and opinion was expressed that the core that is being degraded at the University is not program related but teaching related in the loss of tutorials and seminars. The suggestion that strategic funds should be allocated to restore those core functions was reiterated.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED:
(2 abstentions)

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Plischke

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the relocation of the School of Kinesiology to the Faculty of Science, effective April 2009”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 3

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Lewis

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the Faculty of Communication, Contemporary Arts, and Design (interim name), effective April 2009, to be comprised of the following programs: the School of Communication, the School for the

Contemporary Arts, the School of Interactive Arts and Technology, and the Master of Publishing Program”

Because this motion involved some costs in the 2008/2009 financial year, it was suggested that it would be more appropriate to delay the creation of the Faculty by six months or less with a change of date to September 2009.

Senate was advised that the date was chosen so that development could begin with regard to student recruitment material and changes to the student information system. A delay of 2 or 3 months would essentially cause a 12 month delay.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED
(3 abstentions)

Motion 4

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Francis

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the Faculty of the Environment, effective April 2009, to be comprised of the following programs: the Environmental Science Program, the Department of Geography, the School of Resource and Environmental Management, the Centre for sustainable Community Development, and the Graduate Certificate Program in Development Studies. The Vice-President Academic will establish a Faculty Interdisciplinary Programming Committee with a mandate to develop new programming for the Faculty, and to report back to Senate regarding this programming before April 2009”

The Vice-President, Academic advised Senate that until Senate approves the programming intended for the new Faculty, the new Faculty would not come into existence. A recommendation was made that this condition should be included in the motion, and opinion was expressed that the process for creating this Faculty seemed to be backwards. It would be more appropriate for the committee to examine the programming, report back to Senate, at which time the Faculty could then be created.

It was pointed out that there was a precedent for proceeding in the order proposed and the creation of Earth Sciences was cited as an example. An opinion was expressed that it would be more appropriate to approve the motion in principle and have the effective date struck from the motion. Senate was reminded that the units comprising this Faculty already offer courses and programs; the motion directs programming towards environment and sustainability which was a missing component in the proposed Faculty.

In response to a suggestion that the words ‘recommend to the Board of Governors’ should be removed from the motion given that Senate would not actually be approving the creation of the Faculty until the programming was in place, Senate was advised that Senate

needs to express a strong commitment to the creation of the Faculty for those on the planning committee to seriously engage in the planning process.

A suggestion, supported by several senators, was made that the Centres and Institutes reform should be brought back to Senate as it would solve a number of the concerns related to the Environmental Science program and a number of concerns within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

A suggestion by K. Harding to include the wording in the motion that this was contingent on Senate approving the new programming developed by the Programming Committee was accepted as a friendly amendment. Wording was discussed and it was agreed that the motion would have the following sentence added at the end. *Only with the approval of this new programming would this Faculty come into existence.*

In response to an inquiry as to the terms of reference of the programming committee, Senate was advised that the terms were as follows:

- 1) Propose undergraduate programming in the field of the environment and sustainability of an integrated nature bringing together knowledge from humanities, social sciences, and sciences into thematic areas in the area of the environment
- 2) Propose graduate programming in the field of the environment and sustainability of an integrated nature bringing together knowledge from the humanities, social sciences and sciences
- 3) Identify how programs currently offered by constituent units of the Faculty at both the graduate and undergraduate level will be included in the suite of programs offered by the Faculty
- 4) In developing program proposals ensure that students from outside the Faculty will have access to Faculty courses and that relevant courses offered by other Faculties are included in Faculty programs wherever feasible
- 5) Develop programs that will enhance the research capacity of the Faculty
- 6) Develop programs that will enhance the capacity of SFU for community engagement

A point of order was raised about the time. It was moved and seconded (B. Krane/D. Warner)

“that the normal completion time of 10 o'clock be extended to 10:30 pm”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO EXTEND MEETING
TIME APPROVED

Concern was expressed about the use of the term ‘sustainability’ in the terms of reference, and a suggestion to change the reference to read “environmental sustainability” was accepted as a friendly amendment.

It was pointed out that external review of the Environmental Science Program resulted in a very strong recommendation from the reviewers that SFU needed more visibility in this area and recommendation was made for the creation of a Faculty of the Environment.

An opinion was expressed that there was no clear rationale for the creation of a Faculty as opposed to the creation of an alternative cost effective option of providing the same opportunities by different means.

With respect to the notion that a Dean was required to provide the necessary leadership, it was pointed out that many interdisciplinary programs currently function quite well across Faculties without the leadership of a Dean. It was noted that there was considerable advantage in having Deans who have an intimate knowledge and identification with the discipline(s) in their Faculty; in addition, from the point of view of external audiences, the title and responsibility associated with the Dean's position means something to society and provides a visible spokesperson to the outside community.

In response to an inquiry about the membership of the planning committee, Senate was informed that membership would include John Clague as Chair, one member from each of Geography, Resource and Environmental Management, Environmental Science, and two other members.

Brief discussion followed with respect to budget implications for the new Faculty.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED
(3 Abstentions)

The Chair thanked members of Senate for the thoughtfulness of the debate which he felt was a credit to the University and Senate's responsibility to make academic policy.

x) Paper S.08-54 – 2008/2009 Faculty Renewal Plan (For Information)

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the May meeting of Senate.

B) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper. S08-55 – Simplification of process for determining FAN X99 requirement for Admission

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved a simplification of process by which the requirement for incoming high school students to take FAN X99 is determined.

ii) Paper S.08-56 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Applied Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses, program changes, and changes to existing courses in the following areas: Communication, Interactive Arts and Technology, Computing Science, Engineering Science, and Kinesiology.

iii) Paper S.08-57 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Health Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved course deletions, new courses, and changes to existing courses in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

iv) Paper S.08-58 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses, and changes to existing courses and programs in the following areas: Biological Sciences, Earth Sciences, Mathematics, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Physics, and Statistics and Actuarial Science.

C) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.08-59 – Revision to Graduate General Regulation 1.8.4 – Application To Go On Leave

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by M. Letourneau

“that Senate approve the changes to Graduate General Regulation 1.8.4 – Application To Go On Leave”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.08-60 – Revision to SGSC Membership

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by A. Lein

“that Senate approve that the SGSC membership be amended to change “Graduate Issues Officer, SFSS (or designate)” to “President, GSS (or designate)”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.08-61 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Applied Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses and changes to existing courses in the School of Engineering Science.

iv) Paper S.08-62 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses and changes to existing courses and programs in the following areas: International Studies, Sociology/Anthropology, Master of Public Policy Program, and History.

v) Paper S.08-63 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Business Administration (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses and changes to existing courses in the Faculty of Business Administration.

vi) Paper S.08-64 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Health Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses and changes to existing courses in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

vii) Paper S.08-65 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved program changes to the Graduate Diploma Program in Bioinformatics in the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry.

D) Senate Committee on International Activities

i) Paper S.08-66 – SCIA/ISEC Annual Report (For Information)

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the May meeting of Senate.

E) Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries

i) Paper S.08-67 – Annual Report (For Information)

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the May 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, May 12, 2008.

The Open Session adjourned at 10:25 pm, and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat