

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

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

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael  
President and Chair of Senate

Andrews, Ian  
Apaak, Clement  
Atkins, Stella  
Beynon, Peter  
Blackman, Roger (representing J. Pierce)  
Cameron, Rob (representing B. Lewis)  
Clayman, Bruce  
Copeland, Lynn  
D'Auria, John  
Davidson, Willie  
Driver, Jon  
Gerson, Carole  
Gordon, Robert  
Heaney, John  
Horvath, Adam  
Jackson, Margaret  
Krane, Bill  
Love, Ernie  
Mauser, Gary  
Percival, Paul  
Peters, Joseph  
Poirier, Guy  
Russell, Robert  
Smith, Don  
Weldon, Larry  
Wessel, Sylvia  
Yerbury, Colin

Absent:

Al-Natour, Sameh  
Aloi, Santa  
Bourke, Brynn  
Brokenshire, David  
Chen, Danny  
Dunsterville, Valerie  
Garcia, Carlos  
Grimmett, Peter  
Gupta, Kamal  
Haunerland, Norbert  
Higgins, Anne  
Hill, Ross  
Jensen, Britta  
Jones, Colin  
Jones, John  
Kemper, Michelle  
McArthur, James  
McFetridge, Paul  
Naef, Barbara  
Phipps, Kate  
Poletz, Taira  
Thandi, Ranbir  
Tyab, Azam  
Vaisey, Jacques  
Van Aalst, Jan  
Warren, Joel  
Waterhouse, John  
Wong, Milton  
Zaichkowsky, Judith

In attendance

Hibbitts, Pat  
Honda, Barry  
Martin, Randy  
McBride, Stephen

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 March 3, 2003

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

Referring to the item on page 4 of the Minutes from the last meeting with respect to the quorum of the Harassment Resolution Board, Senate was advised that inquiries had been made. The practice of the Board has been to ensure that there was at least one representative from each of the constituent groups but it was felt that it would not be appropriate to enshrine this practice in policy.

4. Report of the Chair

Reporting on the current labour dispute, the Chair reiterated previously made public statements concerning the pressures on the budget as a result of employee agreements negotiated under the previous mandate of 2%/2%/2% which the University was committed to pay even though funding had been withdrawn. Not all members of the University were covered under this same mandate and unfortunately the mandate has now been changed by the Government to 0%/0%/0%. Despite the constraints of the new mandate, the University felt there was room to negotiate agreements that would result in improvements to compensation. The Chair briefly outlined the process of the negotiations which had taken place up to the current point which resulted in the existing job action. The Minister of Labour became involved and as a result of meeting with both parties, appointed an Industrial Inquiry Commissioner on April 7, 2003 to help resolve the dispute. The Commission has been given seven days to investigate and help the parties conclude a collective agreement by making non-binding recommendations to the Minister and the parties if they cannot themselves come to agreement. CUPE members are expected to return to work on Tuesday, April 8, 2003.

A question arose with respect to the differences in policy between students and faculty who respect a picket line. Faculty are required to give advance notice while students need only to notify the instructor 96 hours afterward. Senate was advised that faculty were required to give advance notice so that if possible their exams could be administered by someone else. The policy regarding students who miss exams was developed to deal with cases of medical or compassionate grounds and was most likely not meant to cover situations with respect to labour disputes. A suggestion was made that the policy be reexamined. The Chair requested that the Vice-President Academic undertake to review this matter.

5. Question Period

There were no questions.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.03-41 – Investment Governance Policy (For Information)

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

According to the document, it was noted that investments could also cover operating funds. An inquiry was made as to whether Senate would be provided with information about the investment policy relative to operating funds, annual budgets, or accountability. In terms of accountability, Senate was advised that the Finance and Administration Committee of the Board and the Investment Advisory Committee oversee this policy and their reports were presented to the Board of Governors in the open session and were therefore available for review. Reference was made to a line with respect to investment income which was included in the budget information that was presented to Senate and the suggestion was made that it would be appropriate for Senate to seek more detailed information at that time.

The Chair informed Senate that as a result of this policy and the advice from the group of experts described in the policy, and the oversight of these functions by the Board committees, SFU's investments have resulted in a level of performance which is far superior to the record of institutional investments of other institutions.

ii) Paper S.03-42 – Delegated Authority Issue (For Information)

An opinion was expressed that Senate should always reserve the right to make the final decision on academic matters even in cases under delegated authority, and it was unfortunate that the mechanism that allowed Senators to ask for further information/full documentation and consider the matter in detail was no longer available.

Reference was made to the last sentence of the last paragraph on S.03-41 and clarification was requested as to whether this meant that the delegated authority could be revoked for a particular item or whether Senate could only completely revoke its delegated authority. A senator noted that, in his opinion, Senate was generally satisfied with the work of SCUS, but occasionally there could be an item handled under delegated authority which Senate felt should be considered and decided upon by Senate itself. In such a case, it was suggested that Senate could move to direct SCUS to reconsider a particular action and to bring forth a recommendation with documentation for approval by Senate at its next meeting, and inquiry was made as to whether this interpretation of process was acceptable to SCAR. The Chair indicated that he found that interpretation satisfactory. Request was made that the interpretation be recorded in the Minutes for future reference.

- B) Senate Graduate Studies Committee
- i) Paper S.03-39 – Proposed New Regulation: Graduate Regulation 1.6.5 – Co-supervision

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by C. Apaak

“that Senate approve the new Graduate General Regulation 1.6.5 – Co-supervision, as outlined in S.03-39”

Concern was expressed that co-supervision with two faculty members in the same department was only being recommended under exceptional circumstances. Senate was informed that the issue had been extensively discussed by the Senate Graduate Studies Committee. The proposal before Senate was seen as a compromise of the varied opinions expressed by the Committee and would recognize the extraordinary circumstances in which a co-supervisor would be appointed rather than making it the norm for any two faculty members who may be collaborating in research. Opinion was expressed that being a co-supervisor entailed greater responsibility than being a member of a supervisory committee and therefore faculty should be given more credit for it.

Amendment moved by W. Davidson, seconded by R. Russell

“that section (a) of the proposed new regulation be changed as follows: He or she holds an appointment as an adjunct professor (see policy A12.08) at SFU in the same department as the student and senior supervisor; or holds an appointment as an associate member (see policy A12.07) at SFU in the same department as the student and senior supervisor; *or holds a primary appointment as a faculty member in the same department as a student and senior supervisor; and...*”

A suggestion to change the phrase ‘primary appointment’ to ‘continuing appointment’ was accepted as a **friendly amendment**.

Brief discussion took place with respect to the status of Professor Emeritus in relation to the above proposal. It was noted that making detailed changes to policies on the floor of Senate was not always effective and a suggestion was made to the mover/seconded that it would be better for the issue to be referred back to Committee.

Senate was informed that the proposed amendment was the point of view expressed from the Faculty of Science at the SGSC meetings. The Faculty of Arts expressed an equally strong opposing point of view and concern was expressed that if the amendment passed, the views of one Faculty would dominate the policy. Opinion was expressed that in order to satisfy the conflicting views of different Faculties, perhaps the SGSC could consider giving more responsibility to the Faculty Graduate Studies Committees to define the role that co-supervision would play in their Faculty.

The motion to amend was withdrawn on the understanding that the matter be referred back to the Senate Graduate Studies Committee for further consideration, including the status of Professor Emeritus with respect to the issue.

C) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.03-43 – Elections

There were no further nominations received. Senate was advised that Anne Higgins was therefore elected by acclamation to the Senate Committee on University Honours for term of office to August 31, 2003.

D) Senate Committee on International Activities

i) Paper S.03-44 – Annual Report, including report from International Student Exchange Committee (For Information)

R. Martin, SFU International, was in attendance in order to respond to questions. Senate received the Annual Report for information.

E) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.03-45 – Centre for Global Political Economy (CGPE)

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by R. Blackman

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the establishment of the Centre for Global Political Economy as outlined in document S.03-45”

S. McBride, Department of Political Science, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-46 – First Nations Guiding Principles

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by R. Russell

“that Senate approve the First Nations Guiding Principles as outlined in document S.03-46”

R. Russell, Senator and member of the First Nations Advisory Committee was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

In response to an inquiry about current access to grants and scholarships, Senate was informed that while full access to financial support programs was available, it was the support of non-financial programs and the support of social context which was the force of the recommendations to develop and improve relationships with First Nations peoples.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.03-47 – Report of the Task Force on Undergraduate Student Recruitment

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by E. Love

“that Senate approve the Report of the Task Force on Undergraduate Student Recruitment as outlined in document S.03-47”

An inquiry was made about tracking the success rate of students finding employment following graduation and a question posed whether this information could be used as a recruitment tool. Senate was advised that the University regularly surveys and reports on the employment history of graduates two years and five years after graduation, and the success of students getting jobs was part of the assessment in the survey. It was suggested that this information be used in the recruitment of students and the Chair suggested that this advice be passed to the Student Recruitment Office.

Concern was expressed that the principal objective was to recruit students with high academic achievement. Opinion was expressed that the emphasis should be broader and a suggestion made that the phrase be changed from ‘high academic achievement’ to ‘high academic ability’.

Reference was made to the specific goals on page 3 of the document. Concern was expressed about the reference to the 90% or greater high school grade point average (GPA). It was suggested that students having the same average from different high schools may perform quite differently at SFU. It was suggested that the 90% GPA indicator was too simplistic for the basis of a recruiting strategy. It was also noted that the Ministry of Education was developing a graduation profile which ought to be included as a way of identifying students who not only were very good academically but who also had an interest in extra curricular activities. Reference was made to the recently approved curriculum initiative and suggestion was made that foundation skills and breadth should be reflected in admissions.

Senate was informed that SFU lagged behind other universities in the recruitment of students who graduated high school with the highest grade point averages. It was pointed out that one of the major drawbacks was residence availability but 750 new residence spaces would be available shortly and the intent was to promote this feature not only provincially (Interior and Northern BC) but across Canada and internationally as well.

Concern was expressed about the proportion of students admitted from high school with

less than 80% averages. It was pointed out that Senate recently approved changes to the admission process for students with Associate Degrees that addressed an inequity for that type of admission. It was also noted that admissions under diverse qualifications would also account for part of the borderline admissions. Opinion was expressed that the reason for lower GPA's in Faculties such as Applied Sciences and Science might be the result of the GPA being based on a specific set of Science courses required by a particular Faculty.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTIN CARRIED

F) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.03-48 – New Program: Joint Major in Molecular Biology and Computing Science

Moved by R. Cameron, seconded by W. Davidson

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the Joint Major in Molecular Biology and Computing Science, as set forth in S.03-48, effective 2003-3”

B. Honda, Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that this was a very full program with virtually all the credits specified, and an inquiry arose as to why it was not a Joint Honors rather than a Joint Major program. Senate was advised that the program was exactly modeled on the MBB/Business Joint Major that was approved by Senate so there was a clear precedent for such a program. The Department also felt that some students might not necessarily require an honors degree because they wished to immediately proceed into industry and other more applied areas where a research background was not a requirement. Senate was advised that the Department was currently working on proposal for a Joint Honors.

Referring to the University initiative on quantitative writing and breadth skills, inquiry was made as to whether this program had been reviewed in that context. Senate was advised that the program would go through the same review process as other such programs at the appropriate time.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-49 – Proposed Change of DE from Grade to Notation

Moved by R. Blackman, seconded by I. Andrews

“that Senate approve the change of the DE grade to a notation as set forth S.03-49, effective 2003-3”

Senate was provided with a brief background with respect to the rationale for the proposed change. The following revision to the proposed text was accepted as a **friendly amendment**:

**DE Notation**

The DE notation will be given when a physician's certificate or other document substantiating a request for deferment on medical or compassionate grounds is received by the registrar or the chair of the department concerned within four days of the date from which the final examination was to have been written, or when the course instructor wishes to defer submitting a final mark pending completion of further work by the student. The DE notation must be submitted by the instructor with a recommended length of deferral and approved by the chair. All unchanged DE notations will be converted automatically to F after *the fifth day of classes of the semester immediately following the one in which the notation was awarded*. In exceptional cases, an extension may be granted by the department chair upon petition by the student.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.03-50 – Reinstatement of Temporarily Withdrawn Course BUEC 495 (For Information)

Senate received information that SCUS, acting under delegated authority, approved the reinstatement of BUEC 495 from Temporarily Withdrawn status.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting is Monday, May 12, 2003.

Open Session adjourned at 8:40 pm and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt  
Director, University Secretariat