

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, June 2 , 2008 at 5:30 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair of Senate

Arsenault-Antolick, Haida

Bains, Aman

Bart, Brad

Bocking, Natalie

Chapman, Glenn

Copeland, Lynn

Cormack, Lesley

Dow, Greg

Driver, Jon

Easton, Stephen

Fergusson, Andrew

Fizzell, Maureen

Francis, June

Hannah, David

Harding, Kevin

Haunerland, N. (representing M. Pinto)

Hayes, Michael

Janes, Craig

Joffres, Michel

Jones, John (representing B. Lewis)

Krane, Bill

LaBrie, John

Lee, Benjamin

Letourneau, Michael

Leznoff, Daniel

MacDonald, Camille

Mathewes, Rolf (representing M. Plischke)

O'Neil, John

Paling, Joseph

Patel, Ravi

Pavsek, Christopher

Percival, Colin

Percival, Paul

Peters, Joseph

Popadiuk, Natalee

Shapiro, Daniel

Tapia, Earl Von

Tiffany, Evan

Van Baarsen, Amanda

Wakkary, Ron

Warner, D'Arcy

Waterhouse, John

Williams, Tony

Absent:

Brennand, Tracy

Gençay, Ramo

Golnaraghi, Farid

Gordon, Robert

Laba, Martin

Liljedahl, Peter

Louie, Brandt

McArthur, James

Russell, Robert

Shaker, Paul

Shermer, Thomas

Thompson, Steve

Vaid, Bhuvinder

van der Wey, Dolores

In attendance:

Johnston, Nancy

Khan Hemani, Rummana

Kiai, Mehran

MacLeod, Richard

Ross, Kate, Registrar & Senior Director Student Enrolment

Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat

Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of May 12, 2008
Reference was made to the note on page 5 at the end of the Minutes concerning retiring Senators. Following clarification that M. Letourneau had in fact 'retired' as a Student Senator but was now on Senate in another position, the Minutes were approved.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
Reference was made to page 2 under 6.b.1 concerning a question which arose as to whether there was a place of reference to find out what standard was required for medical documentation. Senators were referred to the Student Services Web site (www.students.sfu.ca/forms) where a specific 'Health Care Providers' form was available.
4. Report of the Chair
On behalf of Senate, the Chair welcomed guests from Kwantlen University College who were present to observe the operation of a University Senate.

The Chair also welcomed and thanked the newly elected and re-elected Faculty Senators, Convocation Senators and Student Senators for undertaking service to the University and acknowledged the following individuals: Faculty Senators – Glenn Chapman, Christopher Pavsek, Greg Dow, Dolores van der Wey, Craig Janes, Daniel Leznoff; Tracy Brennand, Robert Gordon, Michel Joffres, and June Francis; Convocation Senators – Michael Letourneau, James McArthur, Colin Percival, and D'Arcy Warner; Student Senators – Haida Arseneault-Antolick, Aman Bains, Natalee Bocking, Andrew Fergusson, Camille MacDonald, Ravi Patel, Earl Von Tapia; Kevin Harding, Benjamin Lee, Joseph Paling, Bhuvinder Vaid, and Amanada van Baarsen.

The Chair reported that the recent Open House had been excellent with good attendance, and he particularly wanted to express thanks and appreciation to the large number of student volunteers and the many members of Faculty and Staff for their efforts in making the event such a success. With regard to criticisms about the timing of the event at the same time as the Congress of the Academic Societies and so close to Convocation, Senate was advised that the event was planned so that some of the costs associated with preparation of the campus for Open House and Convocation could be combined.

Senators were reminded of upcoming Convocation Ceremonies and were encouraged by the Chair to participate.

Referring to a recent email to Senate from a former Senator expressing distress at the legislative change to the University Act with respect to the selection of a Chancellor, the Chair informed Senate that the change resulted from a unanimous recommendation by The University Presidents' Council quite some time ago. The recommendation, which also included appointment of Convocation Senators, was based on consideration of factors such as the high costs of conducting an election, notifying all members of Convocation of

the candidacies, staff time and logistics required for the electoral process, and the limited democratic participation by eligible voters. In addition, there was not much effective involvement of the Alumni Association in the current process and the revised legislation empowers the Alumni Associations to mobilize interest in Convocation elections and to make strong recommendations. The consultation with Senate was also recommended due to the importance of the shared responsibilities in the governance of the University. It was noted that the change from election to appoint only applied to the Chancellor; Convocation Senators will still be subject to election.

5. Question Period

A question arose with respect to the results of the recent election of students to Senate. It was noted that one of the Student Senators was elected as representing the Faculty of Science when in fact they should have been elected as a member of the Faculty of Applied Sciences. It was noted there were currently two vacant positions – one for a student from Applied Sciences, and one for a student from Business Administration. Suggestion was made that this issue be reviewed and if a mistake had been made the student in question be declared as representing Applied Sciences and the additional vacancies be filled by the appropriate Faculties. The Registrar was asked to review the situation.

Registrar's Note: The Faculty designation was correct at the time of election. As normal practice, review will be made prior to the call for nominations in the Fall term to fill the remaining positions to see if any changes are warranted.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Teaching

i) Paper S.08-78 – Annual Report (For Information)

P. Neufeld, Chair of the Committee, was in attendance in order to respond to questions. The Annual Report of the Senate Committee on University Teaching was received by Senate for information.

B) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.08-79 – Course Scheduling Policy

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Paling

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the revised Course Scheduling Policy T 30.01”

K. Ross, Registrar and Senior Director Student Enrolment, and R. MacLeod, Associate Registrar, Information, Records and Registration were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

The Registrar, Associate Registrar and staff in Student Services were commended for the open and consultative process and the large amount of work which went into revising the document.

An opinion was expressed that the revised document was an important step forward towards solving at least part of the course accessibility problem facing the University.

It was noted that concerns were raised at the open forum that the revised policy may in fact create more conflicts than the current scheduling process and the issue of modeling the proposed changes was discussed. If the intent was to model the changes, a suggestion was made that it would seem more prudent to table the motion until the results of the modeling exercise were known. Senate was advised that at the open forum the Registrar and the Vice President Academic undertook to request from departments the proposed timetable for Spring 2009 term which would permit a mock up to be done to test the hypothesis of whether the number of conflicts would be increased or decreased. However, rather than tabling the motion it was suggested that if problems were observed with the mock up, amendments could then come forward. Tabling the motion at this point would delay scheduling for Spring whereas if the motion passed with the understanding that amendments could be made if necessary, departments would be able to move forward with Spring 09 timetables.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.08-80 – Timelines for Consideration of Remaining Recommendations from the Report of Phase 2 Faculty Structure Task Force (For Information)

A concern was expressed that this was before Senate for information because it sets in motion the implementation of the remaining recommendations in the report, some of which have implications for funding. It was noted that the units responsible for developing whatever next steps were necessary will move forward in such a way as to take into consideration the financial constraints of the university. It was pointed out that some of the next steps are not costly and in some cases only involve policy changes. Senate was also advised that this process was discussed at length by SCAR and that SCAR felt that since the document referred to timelines rather than specific recommendations, it should be forwarded to Senate for information.

Reference was made to Recommendation 18 concerning the Tech One program and opinion was expressed that the proposed timeline was not possible. The suggestion is that the Steering Committee put forward a recommendation by December and mentions involvement of three Deans, two of which were not even appointed yet because the Faculties would not be in place until April 2009. It was pointed out by the Vice President Academic that there were pressures to deal with this issue before the full administrative structure of the new Faculties were in place because a number of areas appeared to be interested in having Tech One under their purview, and this needed to be sorted out soon.

When the original report of the Task Force was discussed, there was a lot of opposition by a lot of people about the need for the College of Lifelong and Experiential Learning yet Recommendation 9 proposes that this item move forward as if everyone is happy with it. A suggestion was made that this particular aspect needs further discussion and consultation with the University community before it proceeds any further. Senate was advised that nothing specific was being proposed, only that discussions and planning would begin in September 2008.

In response to an inquiry about when the names of the new Faculties would be discussed, Senate was advised that the proposal for the new Faculty that includes Contemporary Arts, Communication and SIAT would come forward soon; the new Faculty that includes Engineering and Computing Science would remain as the Faculty of Applied Sciences; and the proposed Faculty of the Environment would determine a name as it proceeds through the program planning process over the next several months.

- C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
i) Paper S.08-81 – Extension of Student Success Program

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by K. Harding

“that Senate approve the extension of exemptions made to existing Standing and Continuance policies, as related to the Student Success program, for two years; from April 2008 to August 2010, and approve the expansion of target groups to the Faculty of Science”

R. Khan Hemani, Director, Academic Advising and Student Success, and N. Johnston, Senior Director, Student Learning and Retention were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that the current motion includes two distinct issues and it may well be that some Senators support one part of the motion but not the other. A suggestion was made that it would be helpful if the motion were divided.

Moved by P. Percival, seconded by D. Leznoff

“that the motion be divided”

Question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION TO DIVIDE CARRIED

The following motion was first on the floor for discussion.

Motion 1:

“that Senate approve the extension of exemptions made to existing Standing and Continuance policies, as related to the Student Success program, for two years; from April 2008 to August 2010”

A concern was expressed about the inclusion of students still on academic probation in the statistics of those who achieved success. It was pointed out that those students, in their first term of the program, achieved a 2.0 GPA and were actually meeting satisfactory academic standing in that semester. It was also pointed out that the goal of the program was for students to achieve good academic standing after two semesters but these students were actually going into good academic standing after one semester which implied success. Brief discussion ensued with respect to the definition of success and how the percentage figures were determined.

It was acknowledged that this program would be very useful to students coming from other cultures and other academic systems and the statistics for international students look very encouraging. However, in view of the small number of overall statistics, concern was expressed at extending the program for two years rather than the one year which was originally requested. Senate was advised that SCUS had discussed this issue at length and felt that there would not be sufficient data available at the end of a one year period to come to meaningful conclusion about whether the program was working or not and therefore changed the recommendation to two years.

Concerns were raised about the financing and the budget of the Student Success program. In response to a suggestion that this type of program should be able to fully recover its costs, it was pointed out that the tuition that students pay after successfully completing the program more than covers the program costs. It was also noted that the \$250 tuition credit was being eliminated. A question arose as to whether the considerable cost per student for this extra assistance might be better spent in other areas of the university in helping a wider population of undergraduate students, particularly in light of the reduced funding from the Government.

An opinion was expressed that it would be useful to see how well students in this program were doing relative to students in the same circumstances who were not in the program. It was pointed out that since students on R.TW were no longer at SFU a comparative figure was not possible. An inquiry arose as to what percentages of students who are put on academic probation manage to get back to good academic standing on their own. Senate was advised that this data could be produced but was not available for the meeting.

Brief discussion ensued with respect to possible success and retention programming for other groups of students (scholarship, undeclared, 3.0+) that are also part of SFU's attrition rate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 1 CARRIED

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by K. Harding

“that Senate approve the expansion of target groups to the Faculty of Science”

A concern was expressed about introducing another variable of students from a different Faculty and suggestion was made that the pilot project should be carried on with the current set of students.

It was noted that the pilot program was originally proposed for the Faculty of Applied Sciences because that Faculty had a problem with retention. Since some units currently in the Faculty of Applied Sciences will be moving to other Faculties, suggestion was made that instead of expanding to the Faculty of Science, the expansion should include those departments which are not going to be in the Faculty of Applied Sciences in the future.

Senate was reminded that the request was for a policy exemption to allow the pilot to continue without having to seek permission at the end of April where there was a really small time frame to catch students that are RTW and invite them into the program. Next to Applied Sciences, Science had the highest percentage of students in academic difficulty and based on determination of what the program could handle, decision was made to recommend expansion to Science. It was pointed out that some of the curriculum already developed for Applied Sciences could also be used for Science students which was another reason why it was decided to expand to Science. The addition of Science would increase the program from approximately 200 to 300 students. A question was posed about expanding to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in order to get a larger cross section of students in the program but the size of that group would overwhelm the resources that were available to run the program so that was not feasible at this time.

In response to an inquiry about whether costs would rise if expanded to Science, Senate was advised that the total cost increases but the cost per student starts to decrease at around 300 students. Student Services was also looking at other retention initiatives around students on probation and entrance scholarship students experiencing difficulties. Without a more careful costing and some increase in revenue from the students a concern was expressed about expanding the program. It was stressed by the Registrar that it costs more to recruit a new student than to retain a student and if more students can be retained that helps to increase admission averages which in turn may affect the retention rate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 2 CARRIED

- ii) Paper S.08-82 – Admission Requirement Revision – English 12 First Peoples (EFP 12)

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by K. Harding

“that Senate approve English 12 First Peoples (EFP 12) as equivalent to English 12 for admission purposes”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.08-83 – Exchange Credit Proposal

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by R. Patel

“that Senate approve that the residency requirement for completing a credential at SFU may include up to 15 exchange credits”

M. Kiai, Director, Enrolment Services, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

D) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.08-84 Revised – Elections

Senate’s attention was drawn to Senate Paper S.08-84 Revised which was distributed at the meeting and showed all positions which were elected by acclamation and those positions which required balloting. Senators were reminded that voting would take place on-line. Senators would receive an email with information and links to both the ballot and the candidate statements that are on-line. A copy of S.08-84 Revised would also be attached to the email so Senators have complete electoral information. To access the on-line ballot, Senators were reminded that they must use their SFU Computing ID. It was pointed out that balloting was required for some committees to determine Regular versus Alternate positions in which case the candidate receiving the higher number of votes holds the Regular position, the runner-up the Alternate position. Voting on-line would be accessible for approximately two days and all Senators were encouraged to vote.

Names of candidates elected by acclamation can be found on Senate Paper S.08-84 Revised. The results of on-line voting are as follows.

Calendar Committee (CC)

One Student for term of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Amanda van Baarsen

Research Ethics Board (REB)

Two members of the University Community for terms of office to May 31, 2011:

Elected: Kim Bartholomew
Earl Von Tapia

Two Student members (1 Regular, 1 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2010:

Elected: Bhuvinder Vaid (Regular)
Sean Robertson (Alternate)

Senate Appeals Board (SAB)

Two Faculty Members (1 Regular, 1 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2010:

Elected: Peter Liljedahl (Regular)
Richard Yates (Alternate)

Two Undergraduate Students (1 Regular, 1 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Ali Godson (Regular)
Natalie Bocking (Alternate)

Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning (SCEMP)

Two Faculty Senators for terms of office to May 31, 2010:

Elected: Greg Dow
Maureen Fizzell

Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals (SCODA)

Two Faculty Members (Alternates) for terms of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Luis Goddyn
Jodi Viljoen

Five Students (3 Regular, 2 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Aman Bains (Regular)
Kathy McKay (Regular)
Ravi Patel (Regular)
Natalie Bocking (Alternate)
Thomas Unsoeld (Alternate)

Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS)

Three Undergraduate Students (2 Regular, 1 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Haida Arsenault-Antolick (Regular)
Kevin Harding (Regular)
Joe Paling (Alternate)

Senate Committee on University Honours (SCUH)

Two Convocation Senators for terms of office to May 31, 2011:

Elected: Colin Percival
D'Arcy Warner

Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)

Four Student Senators (3 Regular, 1 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Haida Arsenault-Antolick (Regular)
Kevin Harding (Regular)
Amanda van Baarsen (Regular)
Natalie Bocking (Alternate)

One Convocation Senator for term of office to May 31, 2010:

Elected: Michael Letourneau

Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)

One Undergraduate Student for term of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Benjamin Lee

Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)

Three graduate students (1 Regular, 2 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Ursula Arndt (Regular)
Eli Gibson (Alternate)
Graham Lyons (Alternate)

Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries (SPCSAB)/Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee (SUAAC) – dual position

Two Undergraduate Students (1 Regular, 1 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2009:

Elected: Haida Arsenault-Antolick (Regular)

Balloting resulted in a tied vote between J. Paling and R. Patel for the Alternate position. The Rules of Senate state that “In elections at Senate if there is a tied vote between two candidates for one position, the winner shall be determined by a toss of the coin conducted by the Registrar at a time set by the Registrar and in the presence of the affected candidates or their representatives”. Prior to the toss of the coin, R. Patel was designated as ‘heads’ and J. Paling was designated as ‘tails’. The coin was tossed and landed ‘heads’.

Elected: Ravi Patel (Alternate)

7. Other Business

i) Paper S.08-74 – Senate Time and Senate Dinner

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Patel

“that Senate approve that Senate dinners be eliminated and that the normal meeting time for Senate be changed from 7:00 pm to 4:30 pm, effective July 2008”

Amendment moved by J. Paling, seconded by A. van Baarsen

“that the meeting time for Senate be changed from 7:00 pm to 5:30 pm”

Opinion was expressed that since Senators were already used to meeting at 5:30 pm it was more appropriate than 4:30 pm because many Senators would find it easier to arrive by 5:30 pm rather than 4:30 pm, especially if coming from off campus.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

The rationale that moving Senate to an earlier start time would make Senate more accessible was questioned. It was noted that there was no argument to support this and

opinion was expressed that it was likely that more faculty and students were available at 7:00 pm than at 4:30 or 5:30 pm. The main rationale for an early start time appeared to be the question of reducing costs by removing Senate dinners. It was noted that the savings would be purely symbolic and the symbolic gesture would likely go unnoticed. Senate should be allowed adequate time to debate and reflect on the matters coming before it and having a 7:00 o'clock meeting after dinner provides sufficient opportunity for this to occur. Having an early start time without dinner would likely result in shorter meetings with less time for debate and discussion. Senate dinners provide networking opportunities and opportunity for informal interaction between administrators, faculty and students to share information, discuss issues, and to get to know one another. The cost is a small price to pay for the congeniality and interaction of those who have volunteered service to the University. Brief discussion followed with respect to the specific costs associated with Senate dinners.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION AS AMENDED FAILED

ii) Paper S.08-76 – Revisions to the Rules of Senate

Motion 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Letourneau

“that Senate approve the revision to the Rules of Senate, Section E.1
(Students; Student Association), sub-sections (a) and (c)”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 1 CARRIED

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Patel

“that Senate approve the revision to the Rules of Senate, Section E.1
(Students; Student Association), sub-section b.ii”

In response to an inquiry, the Registrar confirmed that this change makes it impossible for a student who took courses in the summer and fall but was not registered in the spring to stand for Senate elections. It was pointed out that the University Act in regards to Senate elections requires students to be part of the Student Society, so if students not registered for the Spring were to be included, the Act would have to be revised.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 2 CARRIED

Motion 3

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Patel

“that Senate approve the revision to the Rules of Senate, Section D.3
(Nominations)”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION 3 CARRIED

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, July 7, 2008.

Since this was their last meeting of Senate, the Chair wished to recognize J. LaBrie, Dean of Continuing Studies and J. Waterhouse, Vice-President Academic.

The Chair noted that J. LaBrie's considerable experience and understanding of continuing studies and lifelong learning has been beneficial to the University and the innovation in terms of new programs such as the Weekend University was acknowledged. On behalf of Senate and the University, the Chair extended thanks and appreciation to the Dean for his service at SFU.

J. Waterhouse's second term as Vice-President Academic and Provost ends in August 2008. The Chair noted that he leaves a great legacy of academic innovation and organizational change ranging from the systematic and far ranging curriculum review that repositioned SFU at the lead in terms of providing a liberal education and more recently the very ambitious and comprehensive review on the structure of the University resulting in very significant changes. In between there have been a host of initiatives which have transformed not only the Burnaby campus but the Vancouver campus downtown and resulted in the addition and expansion of the Surrey campus. The Chair recognized that these initiatives have been well managed under the leadership of J. Waterhouse and that he has been a great colleague to members of the senior administration, faculty and students. On behalf of Senate and the University, the Chair extended sincere thanks for all he has done for SFU.

The Open Session adjourned at 7:15 pm, and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat