

*As amended by
Senate 1 Dec. 03*

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, October 6, 2003 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Apaak, Clement
Atkins, Stella
Beynon, Peter
Brennand, Tracy
Budd, James
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
D'Auria, John
Driver, Jon
Fizzell, Maureen
Fung, Edward
Giacomantonio, Chris
Gill, Alison
Gordon, Robert
Gregory, Titus
Haunerland, Norbert
Hira, Andy
Honda, Barry
Kaila, Pam
Kalanj, Tiffany
Krane, Bill
Lewis, Brian
Naef, Barbara
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Plischke, Michael
Sears, Camilla
Shaker, Paul
Tombe, Trevor
Vaisey, Jacques
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Dan
Wong, Josephine
Woodbury, Rob
Yerbury, Colin
Yoo, Rick

Absent:

da Silva, Gisele
Dickinson, John
Dunsterville, Valerie
Grimmett, Peter
Gupta, Kamal
Heaney, John
Higgins, Anne
Horvath, Adam
Jones, Colin
Lemay, Joanna
Love, Ernie
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
McFetridge, Paul
Rozell, Sara
Smith, Don
Thandi, Ranbir
Van Aalst, Jan
Wessel, Sylvia
Wong, Milton

In attendance:

Brandhorst, Bruce
Finegood, Diane
Hayes, Michael
Hibbitts, Pat
Kenny, Michael
MacLean, David
Scott, Jamie
Weinberg, Hal
Whittlesea, Bruce
Wong, Ken

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services/Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

On behalf of Senate, the Chair welcomed the following newly elected Senators to their first meeting: Tracy Brennand and Trevor Tombe.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of September 15, 2003

The Minutes of the September meeting were not available and their approval would be carried over to the next meeting of Senate.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

Referring to his response at the last meeting in Question Period with respect to the membership of the Olympic Legacy Committee, the Associate Vice President Academic reported to Senate that he had omitted some of the members and he would like to correct the information for the record. Senate was advised that the Committee would be chaired by the Associate Vice President Academic with the following membership: Warren Gill, A/Vice President University Relations, Cathy Daminato, Vice President Advancement, Michael Murdock representing the Department of Finance, Lee Gavel, Director of Campus Planning and Development, Ron Heath, Dean of Student Services/Registrar, Wilf Wedmann, Director of Recreation and Athletics, David MacLean, Director of IHRE, David Cox, representing the Faculty of Arts, and Wade Parkhouse representing the Faculty of Applied Sciences. Laurie Summers, the Director of Academic Planning will function as Secretary, and there will be three student representatives yet to be named – a student in Athletics, a student in Recreation, and a Student Senator.

4. Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that The University Presidents' Council recently had held its annual general meeting in which four items were discussed. The first item dealt with TUPC's budget submission which was still confidential, but since the Chair previously had described to Senate the general strategy, he explained that TUPC argues that the impending cuts to the operating grants of universities should be cancelled as it was impossible for universities, and the Government itself, to meet current commitments. TUPC also argues that previous reductions to the operating grants need to be restored so that the gaps created by those cuts can be rectified; that support for the BC Knowledge Development Fund which is crucial to applications from universities to Federal granting agencies be supported at the Provincial level; that support in aid of research and the facilitation of research through university/industry liaison offices not be withdrawn; and without additional support to alleviate current problems regarding physical infrastructure and space enrolment growth cannot continue.

The second item on the TUPC agenda dealt with the response of the universities with respect to the Government's Mandates Paper which was discussed at the last Senate meeting. TUPC urges that the Government takes into consideration the input it requested

and hopes the responses received will have influence on the process the Government pursues. The other two items on the agenda were available in hard copy pamphlets or on the TUPC web site. The one document entitled "Will I Get In" deals with the pressures on accessibility in BC and the serious problems concerning the universities in terms of accommodating student demand. The other document "Innovation Equation" deals with research issues, some of which are mentioned in the budget submission. In general, TUPC has come forward with some very clear positions on Government policy and Government budgeting but it will remain a difficult cycle of increased lobbying, advocacy, and pressure on the Government to respond to these issues.

5. Question Period

The following question submitted by C. Giacomantonio was read into the Minutes.

Question

In Dr. Warren Gill's email response to the CAUT report on the Dr. David Noble affair, Dr. Gill states: "The report of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is fundamentally flawed. Central to its claims is a view of academic freedom that is divorced from the employment relationship. We do not subscribe to this view".

Would Dr. Gill, or any other university administration representative, be willing to outline and/or define the view of academic freedom that the university administration does subscribe to?

Response

As Senator Giacomantonio points out, Dr. Gill's comment was specific to the context of a report by the CAUT's Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee investigating a complaint by a tenured professor at another Canadian university who failed to receive a tenured appointment at SFU. Within this context, Dr. Gill goes on to take exception with the Committee's assertion that "A university can violate academic freedom by failing to make an offer of employment to an applicant." If an unsuccessful candidate in any academic search can claim a breach of academic freedom simply because they were unsuccessful in gaining the desired appointment, the meaning of academic freedom is in danger and the liberty and integrity of search procedures and decisions made in such a process becomes potentially chaotic.

No further comments on the specifics of the appointment process in question will be made because the matter is before the Courts. However, the Chair wished to be absolutely clear that not all aspects of academic freedom are embedded in the employment relationship. On the specific question of how the university administration defines academic freedom at SFU, Senators were referred to Section 1.2 of the Framework Agreement between the University and the Faculty Association. Section 1.2 of the Agreement contains a very detailed statement and definition which was reached through negotiation and which is fully supported by the University. The Chair indicated

that Section 1.2 will be appended to the Minutes for greater precision in terms of the historical record.

In response to a question from Senator Apaak about the rumoured closure of the Cashier's Office and the front service counter of the Registrar's Office, Senate was informed that the Cashier's Office was planned to close on or about December 10th but there were no plans to close the front service counter of the Registrar's Office. The functions of the Cashier's Office would be merged with the front counter functions of the Registrar's Office, and the service counter will continue to be open from 9 am to 7:30 pm four days a week and until 4:30 pm on Fridays. The reason for the merger was in part due to the implementation of the new student record system but mainly was done to improve service to students to provide them with 'one stop shopping'.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.03-84 – Motion from Senator Giacomantonio

Moved by C. Giacomantonio, seconded by C. Sears

“Whereas Senate recognized that provincial and federal government underfunding to post-secondary education in Canada is contributing to decreasing quality and accessibility to post-secondary education in Canada; and

Whereas it is desirable that provincial and federal government increase funding to post-secondary education immediately; therefore, be it resolved That Senate denounces the chronic provincial and federal government underfunding of post-secondary education in Canada, and calls on all levels of government to make funding of post-secondary education a priority immediately”

Senate was informed that the motion had originated with the Student Senator caucus and was an attempt to address the problem of underfunding to post-secondary education. Given the comments at the last Senate meeting and from discussions following that meeting, students felt that most Senators agreed that funding from the Provincial Government was lower than it should be. The goal of bringing forth the motion was to seek Senate's support, and Senators were invited to make amendments if they felt that the wording was inappropriate or offer alternative suggestions if they felt there was a better way to address the issue.

Reference was made to the third paragraph and opinion was expressed that the use of the word 'denounces' was simply too strong. It was suggested that the motion would retain

its meaning if the words “denounces the chronic provincial and federal government underfunding of post-secondary education in Canada, and” were deleted. **The suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment.**

Concern was also expressed about the reference to the activities of the Federal Government. It was pointed out that the Federal Government has made a very significant commitment over the past several years to increase Canada’s role in research and development, particularly at universities, and has worked hard to put much more money into post-secondary education by funding research chairs and research scholarships for graduate students.

Amendment moved by B. Krane, seconded by C. Apaak

“that the words ‘and federal’ be deleted from the first and second paragraphs”

Given the comments about the Federal Government’s current support of post-secondary education, opinion was expressed that it made sense to delete the reference from the first paragraph. However, it was suggested that there was no reason to delete the reference from the third paragraph as it would be desirable for the Federal Government to increase funding and to continue to do so. The mover and seconder of the amendment agreed to withdraw the deletion of the reference to the federal government from the second paragraph. It was pointed out that the reference to ‘all levels of government’ could be interpreted to include local municipal governments and a suggestion to change “all levels” to “appropriate levels” was accepted as a **friendly amendment to the amendment**. As a result of the changes, the motion to amend was as follows:

“that the words ‘and federal’ be deleted from the first paragraph and the phrase ‘all levels of government’ be changed to ‘appropriate levels of government’

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

It was noted that the reference to Canada in the first paragraph needed to be changed to BC.

Main motion, as amended, now read

“Whereas Senate recognizes that provincial government underfunding to post-secondary education in BC is contributing to decreasing quality and accessibility to post-secondary education in BC; and
Whereas it is desirable that provincial and federal government increase funding to post-secondary education immediately; therefore, be it resolved

That Senate calls on appropriate levels of government to make funding of post-secondary education a priority immediately”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-85 – Motion from Senator Giacomantonio

Moved by C. Giacomantonio, seconded by E. Fung

“that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that the income from the 2% penalty charged on non-payment of tuition and student fees resulting from the tuition fee boycott, for the Fall 2003 semester, be put directly into the University’s bursaries funds”

Senate was advised that the motion had originated with the Student Senator caucus following discussions about the tuition boycott at the last Senate meeting. Students felt that since the money collected from the penalties would not have been money normally received by the University, putting the funds into bursaries would benefit students who really need the money. It was hoped that Senators would support the motion regardless of their feelings about the boycott.

It was pointed out that any time students fail to pay fees on time there was a cost to the University because the money which likely had been considered and accounted for was not there to spend. It was also noted that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to identify students who did not pay their fees because of the boycott from those who did not pay their fees for other reasons.

It was suggested that individual students need not be identified, merely the extra sum of money received by the University as a result of the boycott needed to be determined. Opinion was expressed that this could likely be done by comparing the difference between tuition income from penalties last year to that of this year. However, it was pointed out that other factors had to be considered in the determination, such as the impact of increased fees and enrolment growth in each year.

Discussion ensued with respect to feasibility of calculating the amount of increased revenue and putting that amount into bursaries rather than into general operating funds. As a result of the discussion, the suggestion that some reasonable amount attributable to the tuition fee boycott could be estimated and transferred to bursaries was accepted as a **friendly amendment**.

Opinion was expressed that there was significant benefit to students and the University in supporting this motion, which raised the profile of the tuition fee issue and benefited students at little cost to the University.

The motion as amended was read as follows:

“that Senate recommends to the Board of Governors that the income from the 2% penalty charged on non-payment of tuition and student fees estimated to result from the tuition fee boycott for the Fall 2003 semester be put directly into the University’s bursaries funds”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

(19 -17)

iii) Paper S.03-86 – Bond Funds Allocation Policy (For Information)

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

Questions were raised about the checks and balances of the process, the reporting structure, and the openness of information. With respect to checks and balances, Senate was advised that any project coming before the committee had to be supported by a Vice-President and the normal procedure would be for the Vice President Finance and Administration and the President to sign off each project before they go to the Board of Governors. It was pointed out that the University had undergone a vigorous and scrupulous investigation by the rating agencies with respect to the financial management and policies of the institution and had received the lowest interest rate of any university in Canada. With respect to openness, the bond allocations will become part of the annual financial report received by Senate each year. In addition, the general prospectus for the bond was a public document and was available.

Following discussion, the policy was received by Senate.

B) Research Ethics Board

i) Paper S.03-87 – Annual Report (For Information)

B. Whittlesea, Chair of the Research Ethics Board, and H. Weinberg, Director of the Office of Research Ethics were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate received the Annual Report of the Research Ethics Board for information.

C) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.03-88 – External Review – Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate concur with the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning the advice to the Department of Sociology and Anthropology on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.03-88”

M. Kenny, Department of Sociology and Anthropology was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-89 – Final Progress Report – Gerontology Program and Research Centre (For Information)

Senate received the final progress report from the Gerontology Program and Research Centre and received information that the Gerontology Program and Research Centre had successfully fulfilled the recommendations put forward by SCUP as a result of the May 2000 external review report.

iii) Paper S.03-90 – Proposal for a Faculty of Health Sciences

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the establishment of a Faculty of Health Sciences at Simon Fraser University effective September 1, 2004 as outlined in S.03-90”

The following members of the Institute for Health Research and Education were in attendance in order to respond to questions: B. Brandhorst, M. Hayes, D. Finegood, D. MacLean, and J. Scott.

Discussion began with a brief introduction of the paper, and the following points are a summary of the lengthy discussion.

- One of the most significant public policy issues in Canada today is that of the funding and delivery of health services, with post-secondary health education and research receiving considerable funding. The proposal before Senate is an attempt to identify a unique role for SFU in the health field. The vision and direction for the proposed Faculty will distinguish SFU from other universities by focussing on programs directed toward the integration of social and natural science research with population outcomes, societal application and policy analysis, rather than clinical programs.

- Since the goals of the proposed Faculty are much the same as the goals of the existing Institute, the transformation to a Faculty was questioned. Institutes can not offer degree programming so having a Faculty would provide students, faculty, and the University with new opportunities to offer graduate and undergraduate programs that focus on health and public policy issues which will be attractive to students who are seeking alternatives to the traditionally based clinical health programs. In addition, a Faculty will enable SFU to more fully participate in the funded research opportunities available in the health field. Having an academic home for a program provides a core group of faculty members with whom students can interact on a consistent basis, a set of regularly taught courses, and students and faculty can interact with each other as a group rather than being spread across departments.
- Reference was made to the proposed development of a M.Sc. Program in Public Health and a question was raised as to why such a program would not be housed in the Faculty of Science. It was pointed out that the new Faculty would encompass a very broad, multidisciplinary focus on health and that vision would be reflected in its programs. If the program were housed in the Faculty of Science, or any other existing Faculty, the program would be much more narrowly defined and lose the proposed interdisciplinary aspect.
- Senate was advised that the School of Kinesiology has expressed concerns about the creation of a new Faculty. There are concerns that students will be confused between the new Faculty and the School which also has the study of health as part of its mission. They had questions about the structure, resources, and the demands that a new Faculty would place on the University, and arguments that there was inadequate rationale for the development of a new Faculty. Fears were expressed about the risk of competing undergraduate programs in the health area, and finally, there was a feeling that the existing IHRE could support the expansion of health studies at SFU and that a new Faculty, while being a worthwhile goal, was unnecessary and premature in its current form.
- In response to concerns about the lack of documentary evidence regarding support from other departments interested in the health area, Senate was advised that Gerontology, Sociology and Anthropology, Geography, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, and a good proportion of the members of the IHRE are supportive. The Dean's Advisory Committee of the Faculty of Science met to discuss an earlier version of the proposal and the vast majority were strongly in favour. The Department of Psychology's support fell somewhere in the middle and was described to Senate as somewhat skeptical but cautiously optimistic. The Steering Committee for IHRE which is comprised of approximately 20 faculty members voted unanimously in favour of the new Faculty and, with the exception of some concerns from Kinesiology and Psychology, there was felt to be broadly based support within the university.

- With respect to question of costs, it was agreed that over the long term a Faculty would cost the University money, but it was pointed out that there would be no additional costs to establish the Faculty over and above the cost that has already been budgeted for IHRE.
- Concern was expressed that there may be insufficient faculty members interested/available to constitute a Faculty, and questions arose about the process for faculty appointments, whole departments moving into a new Faculty, and expected growth for the Faculty. D. Finegood and J. Scott provided Senate with their views of the interest in participating in the new Faculty. Senate was also assured that any movement of a department or program from an existing Faculty to the new Faculty would have to go through the normal committee process and receive approval from Senate and the Board of Governors. With respect to the joint appointment process, departments would not lose half the teaching services of a faculty member as faculty members ^{could} ~~would~~ be similarly cross-appointed from the new Faculty to existing departments/schools, *or funds for teaching buy-outs could be provided.*
- In order to attract very good faculty members and populate the new Faculty, a clearly identified Faculty home is necessary as it indicates a clear commitment on the part of the institution to provide the infrastructure and support in that field of study.
- The proposal will move the university in a new strategic direction, an area that has been identified as an important emerging field of study where funding is available, and it is important for the university to make its move at this time. The motion establishes a structure for future development and details of the organization should be developed by the faculty members within the Faculty.
- A Faculty has to be more than just a research institute. It must have a significant minimum body of faculty members and a significant number of instructional programs, and the proposal is insufficient to support the creation of a new Faculty.
- It was pointed out that the next Board of Governors meeting was not scheduled until the end of November. Since there were many concerns expressed about the vagueness of the documentation and the lack of documentary evidence of support, as well as email documentation that some Senators received and others did not, it was suggested that it might be better to postpone the issue to the next meeting of Senate so that everyone would have the same information and could come to the meeting better informed and be prepared to vote on the motion.

Moved by C. Sears, seconded by R. Yoo

“that the motion be postponed to the November meeting of Senate”

Senate was advised that the intent of the motion to postpone was to seek answers in as much detail as possible to the questions and concerns raised and to provide documentary evidence surrounding the support or opposition regarding the creation of a new Faculty.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO POSTPONE FAILED

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

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

(27 – 5)

The Chair noted that it had been the kind of debate expected of a university Senate – articulate and impassioned, and he thanked the resource people for attending. In view of the concerns, especially in units whose mandates were very closely connected to the mandate of the new Faculty, the Chair expressed his hope that the administrators responsible for further action see that the sensitivities of these other interests are addressed when bringing forward follow up motions to Senate and the Board.

Moved by P. Percival, seconded by T. Gregory

“that the Rules of Senate be suspended to allow the meeting to continue past 10 p.m. in order to continue business”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Suggestion was made that the remaining agenda items be considered out of sequence so that all of the items requiring action were dealt with prior to the items on the agenda for information. There were no objections to this suggestion.

- D) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
- i) Paper S.03-92 – DQAC recommendation to extend the Diverse Qualifications Admission Policy for five years

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by D. Weeks

“that Senate approve the recommendations in the DQAC review of extending the Diverse Qualifications Admission Policy by five years to Fall Semester 2009 with a review to occur in 2008, as set forth in S.03-92”

K. Wong, Secretary to the Diverse Qualifications Adjudication Committee was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

7. Other Business

i) Paper S.03-101 – Research Ethics Board – Short-term appointments

Moved by P. Percival, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve a revision of the membership selection process for the Research Ethics Board contained in Policy R20.01 as follows:

3.7.f In the event that a member of the Research Ethics Board is unable to attend its meetings, the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules has the authority to appoint a temporary replacement to act in place of the regular member until the regular member returns or until an election can be held”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

6. F) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.03-100 – Elections – Senate Committee Vacancies

Senate was advised that two nominations had been received resulting in the election by acclamation of Adam Horvath to the Senator at-large position on the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies for term of office to May 31, 2005, and the election by acclamation of Sara Rozell to the Senator at-large position on the Senate Library Committee/Library Penalties Appeal Committee for term of office to May 31, 2005. No nominations were received for the Faculty member (Arts) position on the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning and that vacancy would be carried forward.

The following Senate papers were on the agenda for information, and Senators were asked if there were any questions or comments on the information presented. There were no questions. The items were dealt with as follows.

Paper S.03-91 – CFI and CRC Strategic Research Plan (For Information)

Senate received the CFI and CRC Strategic Research Plan for information.

Paper S.03-93 – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Arts

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved revisions to existing programs and courses in Archaeology, Contemporary Arts, Criminology, and Geography.

Paper S.03-94 – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved revisions to existing programs and courses in Biological Sciences, Earth Sciences, Statistics and Actuarial Science. *Biology & Biochemistry*

Paper S.03-95 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority approved that all graduate courses identified as comprehensive exams, extended essays, projects or theses that formerly lacked any associated credit hours, now have credit hours attached. SGSC also approved that in graduate programs that will be collecting fees on a 'per credit' basis, students will register in all 'capstone' requirements (theses, projects, exams, etc) for one semester. If subsequent semesters of registration are required, students will register for a 'completion' course, and such courses will have half the credit value of the capstone. This change requires the creation of completion courses for all capstone requirements in all graduate programs that collect fees on a per credit basis.

Paper S.03-96 – Graduate Curriculum Revision – Faculty of Applied Sciences

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved changes to the Comprehensive Doctoral Examination procedure in the School of Communication.

Paper S.03-97 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Business Administration

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved revisions to existing courses in Business Administration.

Paper S.03-98 – Graduate Curriculum Revision – Faculty of Education

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved changes to the requirements for the doctoral program in the Psychology of Education.

Paper S.03-99 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science

Senate received information that that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses in Earth Sciences.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 pm. The agenda for the Closed Session was deferred to the next meeting of Senate.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat

TO: MEMBERS OF SENATE

PLEASE ATTACH THIS PAGE TO THE OPEN MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2003 MEETING OF SENATE (REFERENCE ITEM 5, PAGE 3-4).

Extract from the Framework Agreement between SFU and SFUFA

1.2 Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is the freedom to examine, question, teach and learn, and it involves the right to investigate, speculate and comment without reference to prescribed doctrine, as well as the right to criticize the University, Faculty Association and society at large. Specifically, academic freedom ensures:

(a) freedom in the conduct of teaching;

(b) freedom in undertaking research and publishing or making public the results thereof;

(c) freedom from institutional censorship.

Academic staff shall not be hindered or impeded in any way by the University or the Faculty Association from exercising their legal rights as citizens, nor shall they suffer any penalties because of the exercise of such rights. The parties agree that they will not infringe or abridge the academic freedom of any member of the academic community. Academic freedom carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a manner consistent with the scholarly obligation to base research and teaching on an honest search for knowledge.

As part of their teaching activities, teachers are entitled to conduct frank discussion of potentially controversial matters which are related to their subjects. This freedom of expression shall be based on mutual respect for the opinions of other members of the academic community.

Librarians have a duty to promote and maintain intellectual freedom. They have a responsibility to protect academic freedom and are entitled to full protection of their own academic freedom. This includes the right to express their academic judgement in the development of the Library collection within the context of Article 1.3.2 and to make the collection accessible to all users in accordance with the University Library policies, even if the materials concerned are considered controversial.

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held
Monday, November 3, 2003 at 5:15 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Apaak, Clement
Beynon, Peter
Cameron, Rob (representing B. Lewis)
Clayman, Bruce
da Silva, Gisele
D'Auria, John
Dickinson, John
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Fairey, Elaine (representing L. Copeland)
Fizzell, Maureen
Fung, Edward
Giacomantonio, Chris
Gill, Alison
Gillies, Mary Ann (representing J. Pierce)
Gregory, Titus
Grimmett, Peter
Hauerland, Norbert
Heaney, John
Higgins, Anne
Hira, Andy
Horvath, Adam
Krane, Bill
Lemay, Joanne
Love, Ernie
McFetridge, Paul
Percival, Paul
Plischke, Michael
Rozell, Sara
Sears, Camilla
Shaker, Paul
Thandi, Ranbir
Tombe, Trevor
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Dan
Wessel, Sylvia
Wong, Josephine
Yerbury, Colin

Absent:

Atkins, Stella
Brennand, Tim
Budd, James
Gordon, Robert
Gupta, Kamal
Honda, Barry
Jones, Colin
Kaila, Pam
Kalanj, Tiffany
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
Naef, Barbara
Peters, Joseph
Scott, Jamie
Smith, Don
Wong, Milton
Woodbury, Rob
Yoo, Rick

In attendance:

Brandhorst, Bruce
Brohman, John
French, Charlotte
Gupta, Arvind
Kenny, Michael
Smith, Michael

*file in
Nov Mtg
in
Senate Minutes
Book*

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services/Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

Following the announcement by the Chair of the very sad and sudden death of Senator Jacques Vaisey, Senate held a minute of silence in his memory.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Chair gave notice that in closed session there would be a motion to amend the agenda in order to add an important item. The agenda for the open session was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of September 15, 2003

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of October 6, 2003

Reference was made to the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 10 of the minutes. The option of teaching buy-outs was also mentioned as a possibility and suggestion was made that reference should be included in the minutes, and the last sentence was amended as follows:

“With respect to the joint appointment process, departments would not lose half the teaching services of a faculty member as faculty members *could* be similarly cross-appointed from the new Faculty to existing departments/schools *or funds for teaching buy-outs could be provided.*”

Following this amendment, the Minutes were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from either set of Minutes.

4. Report of the Chair

i) Paper S.03-102 – President’s Agenda (For Information)

The President’s Agenda which included a statement of objectives for the coming year was received by Senate for information.

The Chair reported on meetings in Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal with the Association of Universities and Colleges (AUCC) regarding issues related to the financing of universities, and with various Government representatives with respect to federal policy related to the funding of capacity and accessibility with respect to post-secondary education across Canada. Meetings were also held in Vancouver with the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance respecting the need for a new federal-provincial partnership to address questions of accessibility nationwide and in British Columbia particularly. In addition, a meeting with the new Provincial Deputy Minister of Advanced Education to discuss questions of financing and Government commitments that were not adequately covered in the current budget letters had also taken place. The Chair believed that issues of quality and accessibility in universities was now better understood at both levels of Government and there appeared to be a more positive attitude towards issues surrounding post-secondary education, especially at the federal level.

5. Question Period

There were no questions submitted.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.03-103 – External Review – Latin American Studies Program

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M.A. Gillies

“that Senate concur with the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning the advice to the Latin American Studies Program on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.03-103”

J. Brohman, Director, Latin American Studies Program and M. Kenny, Department of Sociology and Anthropology were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-104 – Graduate Diploma in Bioinformatics

Prior to the formal motion, Senate was advised that since the use of the numbers 601, 602, and 603 for the new courses in MBB would create difficulty with the cross listing of in Computing Science, both departments had agreed to change these numbers to 611, 612, 613.

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by P. Percival

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the proposal for a Graduate Diploma in Bioinformatics as outlined in S.03-104, including new courses MBB 505, 506, 611, 612, 613, 659, 669, 679”

B. Brandhorst and M. Smith, Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, and A. Gupta, School of Computing Science were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

A question was posed as to how much more work was required for a Master’s degree and why students would want the diploma versus a master’s degree. Senate was advised that the diploma was designed as part of the master’s program but did not require a thesis and would attract students who were already in the industry and wanted to come back for updating and some additional advanced education.

A Senator asked how the new courses being introduced for this program would be offered without the addition of new faculty. Senate was advised that since the diploma program

was a subset of the existing Master's program, many of the new courses were already offered as special topics courses so that resources were already in place.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.03-105 – Final Update Report External Review – Faculty of Business Administration (For Information)

Senate received the final update report from the Faculty of Business Administration and received information that the Faculty had successfully fulfilled the recommendations put forward by SCUP in September 2001 as a result of the February 1999 external review report.

B) Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries

i) Paper S.03-106 – Annual Report (For Information)

J. D'Auria, Senator and Chair of SPCSAB, and C. French, Director, Academic Resources, Registrar's Office were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that the value of the Open Scholarships was less than the cost of a credit hour and inquiry was made as to when the value was decreased from an exact match. Senate was advised that the dollar value of the Open Scholarship had started to decrease in 2000/2001 in order to stay within the budget allocated for scholarships. A follow-up question asked why it had been decided to adjust the value per credit hour rather than adjust the GPA requirement which has been maintained at 3.70. Senate was advised that although there was no set policy, the Committee tried to maintain a reasonable GPA and tried to balance the funds between the different types of scholarships and bursaries so that as many students as possible received something.

Reference was made to statistics on page 35 and inquiry was made with respect to the balance remaining for graduate fellowship allocations in Business Administration. Senate was advised that this particular table was produced in Fall of 2002 and was intended to show the allocation to departments, not the total number of awards given. Most departments award their graduate fellowships during the Spring but Business Administration awards their fellowships in the Fall so the table reflected the difference in the way graduate enrolment and award disbursement was done in different Faculties.

A question arose as to whether there was a minimum bursary amount for students in need and reference was made to students who had applied for approximately \$1000-\$1500 and only received \$50. Senate was advised that the needs assessment not only takes into consideration what the student has requested, it also includes a reasonableness factor used to make adjustments up or down and an expectation of a minimum contribution from the student. Amounts allocated also depend on what the total assessed need is in any given semester and what the budget allocation is in any given year. It was pointed out that there was no difference between assessments for international and domestic students.

In response to a question as to how SFU compared to other universities in terms of scholarships and bursaries, Senate was advised that in terms of Entrance Scholarships SFU was competitive with UBC, slightly better than University of Victoria and the University of Calgary, but slightly behind some of the schools in Ontario where, over the past several years, there have been significant fee increases with a proportion of the money directed to scholarships. However the \$3000 value of the Entrance Scholarship at SFU is better than the average range which is usually between \$2000-\$2500. The Open Scholarship at SFU is one of the best supports for in-course students at any university in Canada.

C) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.03-107 – Membership – Senate Committee on University Honours

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

“that the Chair of the Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries be added as an *ex officio* member of SCUH with voting privileges”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

D) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.03-108 – Elections – Senate Committee Vacancies

Senate was advised that two nominations had been received resulting in the election by acclamation of Derrick Harder to the Undergraduate Student (at-large) position on the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies for term of office to May 31, 2004, and the election by acclamation of Trevor Tombe to the Undergraduate Student (at-large) position on the Senate Library Committee and the Library Penalties Appeal Committee for term of office to May 31, 2005. No nominations were received for the outstanding positions on the Senate Appeals Board, the Senate Committee on University Teaching, and the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies and those vacancies would be carried forward.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting is Monday, December 1, 2003.

Open Session adjourned at 5:55 pm and Senate moved into Closed Session following a short break.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, November 3, 2003 at 5:15 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Closed Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Apaak, Clement
Beynon, Peter
Cameron, Rob (representing B. Lewis)
Clayman, Bruce
da Silva, Gisele
D'Auria, John
Dickinson, John
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Fairey, Elaine (representing L. Copeland)
Fizzell, Maureen
Fung, Edward
Giacomantonio, Chris
Gill, Alison
Gillies, Mary Ann (representing J. Pierce)
Gregory, Titus
Grimmett, Peter
Haunerland, Norbert
Heaney, John
Higgins, Anne
Hira, Andy
Horvath, Adam
Krane, Bill
Lemay, Joanne
Love, Ernie
McFetridge, Paul
Percival, Paul
Plischke, Michael
Rozell, Sara
Sears, Camilla
Shaker, Paul
Thandi, Ranbir
Tombe, Trevor
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Dan
Wessel, Sylvia
Wong, Josephine
Yerbury, Colin

Absent:

Atkins, Stella
Brennand, Tracy
Budd, James
Gordon, Robert
Gupta, Kamal
Honda, Barry
Jones, Colin
Kaila, Pam
Kalanj, Tiffany
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
Naef, Barbara
Peters, Joseph
Scott, Jamie
Smith, Don
Wong, Milton
Woodbury, Rob
Yoo, Rick

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services/Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

1. Approval of the Agenda

Senate's attention was directed to the additional material – Senate Paper S.C.03-31 - which had been distributed to Senators.

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by P. Grimmett

“that the Rules of Senate be suspended to allow consideration of the motion to award Honorary Degrees as set out in S.C.03-31, to be added under Item 6 – Other Business”

There was no objection to a suggestion to add the paper as the missing Item 5 of the agenda.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

The Agenda was approved accordingly.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Closed Session of September 15, 2003

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Report of the Chair

There was no report from the Chair.

4. Reports of Faculties with regard to Graduating Students and Others who have met requirements for Certificates and Diplomas

- i) Paper S.C.03-30 – Adjustments – Graduands and others who have met requirements for Certificates and Diplomas (Summer 2003-2 Candidates)

Moved by P. Percival, seconded by A. Horvath

“that Senate approve changes and the award of the appropriate degrees, certificates, and diplomas as recommended by the Faculty of Applied Sciences, the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Business Administration, the Faculty of Education, and the Faculty of Science”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

5. Senate Committee on University Honours

- i) Paper S.C.03-31 – Honorary Degrees

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by C. Apaak

“that Senate approve the award of the degree Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*, on His Holiness the Dalai Lama, past recipient of the Nobel Prize for Peace, and on Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States of America, past recipient of the Nobel Prize for Peace, and that Senate reaffirm the award of the degree Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*, on Vaclav Havel. The degrees would be awarded in April 2004 at the special ceremony to be held in Christ Church Cathedral, Vancouver”

The Chair briefly provided background information to Senate by explaining that originally SFU had been approached to join UBC in a city-wide ceremony honoring the Dalai Lama. At the time it was suggested that in a joint ceremony at Christ Church Cathedral, SFU would award an honorary degree to Archbishop Desmond Tutu and UBC would award an honorary degree to the Dalai Lama. A motion with respect to Desmond Tutu was brought forward and duly approved by Senate. Subsequently, plans have changed to include Vaclav Havel and Jimmy Carter and UBC now wishes to have separate ceremonies with the UBC ceremony taking place at the Chan Centre. Senators were advised that the ceremonies would take place on separate days prior to the dialogue that will take place at the Wosk Centre following SFU's ceremony. It was noted that this was a special ceremony completely separate from the June/October Convocations and the current call for honorary degree nominations.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

The Meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat