

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, February 2, 2009 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Easton, Stephen, Vice-Chair

Agnes, George (representing W. Parkhouse)
Bains, Aman
Bocking, Natalie
Brennand, Tracy
Chapman, Glenn
Collinge, Joan
Collins, Colleen (representing D. Shapiro)
Copeland, Lynn
Cormack, Lesley
de Castell, Suzanne
Dow, Greg
Driver, Jon
Fergusson, Andrew
Fizzell, Maureen
Francis, June
Gençay, Ramo
Gibson, Eli
Harding, Kevin
Joffres, Michel
Jones, John (representing C. Jones)
Krane, Bill
Laba, Martin
Lee, Benjamin
Letourneau, Michael
Leznoff, Daniel
O'Neil, John
Paling, Joseph
Patel, Ravi
Pavsek, Christopher
Percival, Colin
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pinto, Mario
Plischke, Michael
Scott, Jamie
Seal, Brent
Shermer, Thomas
Tapia, Earl Von
Thompson, Steve
van der Wey, Dolores
Williams, Tony

Absent:

Arsenault-Antolick, Haida
Bart, Brad
Golnaraghi, Farid
Gordon, Robert
Hannah, David
Janes, Craig
Liljedahl, Peter
Louie, Brandt
MacDonald, Camille
McArthur, James
Popadiuk, Natalee
Russell, Robert
Stevenson, Michael
Tiffany, Evan
Vaid, Bhuvinder
Wakkary, Ron
Warner, D'Arcy

In attendance:

Popowich, Fred
Dench, Sarah

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 January 12, 2009
The Minutes were approved.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising
4. Report of the Chair
There was no report from the Chair.
5. Question Period

First question from C. Pavsek. *This past year the tuition waiver for senior students was removed. Can the President, or the appropriate party, please provide an accounting of the cost savings that this cut has provided and is expected to provide?* J. Driver responded that the estimated increased revenue from the removal of the tuition waiver for seniors was about \$300,000. He noted that a bursary fund had been established to assist seniors in need, and 14 awards had been provided in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 semesters, totalling \$8,000. *A follow-up question was asked about whether the same number of seniors had continued to enroll.* J. Driver responded that he did not have that data available, but that the University had exceeded its undergraduate enrolment targets for Spring 2009. J. Paling asked whether seniors have to qualify for government assistance to take advantage of the bursary program. J. Driver responded that the bursary program is administered in the same way as other bursary programs. Commenting on this issue, C. Pavsek stated that he felt that this was a false economy, and noted anecdotally that his large class in cinema history had a number of senior students in the past, and now only one senior is enrolled – a person who used to enroll in 2-3 classes a semester and now can only afford one.

Secretary's Note: A clarification about the senior's bursary was provided by J. Driver under Business Arising at March Senate 2009.

Second question from C. Pavsek. *Can a detailed list and accounting of all cuts that have been made, or will soon be made, to programs and services at SFU be provided? Can this list please specify which programs, and what amounts, have been cut? I understand that the cuts for 2008/2009 have been applied equally to all budgets, but can a list of the specific program cuts be provided? I realize that funding is to a degree decentralized and that faculties have some autonomy in deciding how to administer funds, but there must be some centralized accounting of the specific cuts that have been made. Or, to put it another way: in his update on the University budget process distributed in the middle of December 2008, Vice-President Academic Jon Driver stated that the University "will attempt to fund activities that have the highest priority, and we will decline to fund activities that have a lower priority." Which activities, specifically, are of the "highest priority" and which are of "lower priority"?* J. Driver responded that he was not able to provide the detailed information requested because the University was still currently constructing the budget which will first go to the Senate Committee on University Priorities which will provide advice to the President, and will then go to the Board of Governors for approval.

Following approval of the budget, the major changes in the budget will be known. Turning to the issue of priorities, J. Driver indicated that after consulting the deans, the high priority areas had been defined as the Surrey campus and its programs, areas that had projected undergraduate growth, areas of high research quality and high demand areas – particularly those areas where student faculty ratios were under stress. In answer to a follow-up question regarding when information about the budget would be known, J. Driver noted that the budget is a plan, which may be affected by later decisions and possible changes in last-minute funding, but that the budget that goes to the Board is expected to provide an overview of the priority allocations and cuts, and more detailed information could be obtained from specific faculties and departments.

Third question from C. Pavsek. *Last year Policy B 10.08 was revised to standardize the merit award pool for senior administrators at 1.5 steps. Is it the case that senior administrators did receive 1.5 steps on average in the last round of salary reviews? Has there been any reduction in this amount, or alterations made to this policy, in light of the current financial situation?* A. Watt responded that the policy allowed the President to allocate funds equivalent to 1.5 steps and 96.5% of these funds had been distributed. She indicated she was unaware of any proposed policy changes.

Fourth question from C. Pavsek. *In his update on the University budget process distributed in early December, 2008, Vice-President Academic Jon Driver stated that "There are no plans to eliminate funded continuing faculty positions that are currently filled, except through the recently announced Voluntary Faculty Exit Incentive Program." Has this plan changed at all? That is, are plans now being considered for the elimination of such positions, that is filled continuing faculty positions? Has the Voluntary Faculty Exit Incentive Program been as successful as was hoped for? Or has its success necessitated a rethinking of earlier plans?* J. Driver responded that his statement remained correct and there are no plans to lay-off faculty members. The Incentive plan was initiated and has now been completed and a number of applications from faculty members were received and approved, resulting in savings to the budget.

A question from K. Harding: *Student Senators recently received an email effectively announcing the demise of the Canadian Studies program. Students are concerned about what appears to be a closure of a program before any procedures have been undertaken at Senate or the Board of Governors. What arrangements have been made for currently declared students, and when might Senate make the decision to close the program?* L. Cormack responded that she was suspending declarations for Canadian Studies pending a re-evaluation of the program so that students who have already entered can complete their degrees. Funding has been decreased and redeployed. Furthermore, the process of considering the closure of Canadian Studies would be first considered by the Faculty's Curriculum Committee and if approved, would then proceed to Senate. In a follow-up question, K. Harding suggested that the majority of students who might consider entering the Canadian Studies program are in Political Science, and these students had not received any notice of this potential closure. L. Cormack noted that there are 10 declared students (5 majors, 4 joint majors and 1 minor) and 1 intended major; she also noted that the enrollment pattern over the past decade had been an average of 10 students per year. There are 6 active Canadian Studies courses and 156 cognate courses available for students to fulfill their programs. No notice had been provided

because there has been no decision to close but she indicated that she would take suggestions about avenues to notify students of the suspension of admissions.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.09-13 - External Review - Cognitive Science Program

F. Popowich, Director of the Program was in attendance in order to respond to questions:

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by M. Fizzell

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

After noting the very positive review of the program, P. Percival pointed out that the report argued that the Cognitive Science program is under-resourced. This reinforced a view he held that resources appear to flow to new programs and existing units are continually cut back. K. Harding also commented on the strength of the program, and noted that one concern highlighted by the review is the issue of how contributions of cross-appointed faculty are recognized. J. Driver agreed that this matter needs attention, particularly as the university expands with the creation of the three new faculties, and engages in more interdisciplinary programming.

The question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.09-14 - Report on Academic Operations at Fraser International College September 2007-August 2008 (For Information)

S. Dench, Director, University Curriculum and Institutional Liaison was in attendance.

C. Percival complained that the report showed that there had been no improvement in the diversity of country of origin of the FIC students, that an even greater percentage of students were taking business courses, and that the quality of the students was no higher than students coming to SFU directly from abroad. In his view, FIC had been a failure. G. Chapman agreed that the diversity of students was not as promised and noted that IBT (now Navitas) was an experienced organization which didn't appear to be able to recruit students from significant markets in India and the Middle East. M. Fizzell indicated that her view was completely opposite and that FIC had been a resounding success. She went on to note that SFU had more control and involvement in the programming than in any other college, that more students transferring to SFU are moving into Arts and Social Sciences and not Business Administration, and that it was unfair to expect FIC to recruit

significantly more students from a wide array of countries within a one year period. J. Driver reminded Senate that the FIC program is intended to develop long-term recruiting relationships and there is evidence that there has been success in recruiting students from a more diverse range of countries, but that the reality is that most international student populations in North America are dominated by a few Asian countries.

J. Paling asked questions about student committee representation and the possibility of formalizing arrangements so that FIC students might take advantage of the services offered to students at SFU, such as the U-Pass. J. Driver indicated that FIC students have been invited to serve on the Academic Advisory Committee and have, so far, declined. FIC students are entitled to organize themselves, but they are not SFU students.

Another question was posed about the fact that Navitas is applying (with SFU's support) to the BC Government for permission to offer an associate degree. S. Dench noted that some students have difficulty in getting a student visa if they are not studying directly in a program that results in a credential. Furthermore a credential would be of assistance to those students who complete the Navitas program but who do not meet the threshold for transfer to SFU.

iii) Paper S.09-15 – Centres and Institutes Report 2007/2008 (For Information)
Senate received this report for information. In response to a question Vice-President Research Pinto indicated that a review of the policy was being initiated under the guidance of the Associate Vice-President Research Dr. N. Haunerland.

B) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.09-16 – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Applied Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved six new courses and changes to courses and course descriptions and requirements in Kinesiology.

ii) Paper S.09-17 – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Business Administration (For Information)

Minor editorial revisions were made to the wording of the motion.

i) New Concentration: Management of Innovation

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by M. Fizzell, and amended:

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Management of Innovation Concentration in the Bachelor of Business Administration in the Faculty of Business Administration”

The question was called, and a vote taken. AMENDED MOTION CARRIED

ii) New courses (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved four new courses.

iii) Paper S.09-18 – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions – Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to existing courses and revisions to the requirements of the Minor in Early Childhood Education.

iv) Paper S.09-19 – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the deletion of one course, and revisions to courses in Biological Sciences, and approved four new courses and changes to existing programs and courses in Mathematics.

C) Senate Committee on Graduate Studies

i) Paper S.09-20 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Applied Sciences (For Information):

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a new course in Resource and Environmental Management.

ii) Paper S.09-21 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (For Information):

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved one new course and revisions to grading for two courses in International Studies, and approved one new course in Urban Studies, and revisions to programs in Political Science, and Psychology. The Graduate Certificate in Latin American Studies, listed on Paper S.09-21 in error will be forwarded to SCUP for review before proceeding to Senate.

iii) Paper S.09-22 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Business Administration (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved revisions to grading in the MBA Internship.

iv) Paper S.09-23 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved program changes to core and elective courses in the Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL) Program.

v) Paper S.09-24 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Health Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses and program changes to core, electives and credit hours for the Master of Public Health program.

vi) Paper S.09-25 – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved course revisions and two new courses in Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, and program revisions (grading/calendar changes) in Physics.

D) Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries

i) Paper S.09-26 – Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships Awards & Bursaries for the fiscal year 2007-2008 was received by Senate for information. There were no questions.

E) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Elections

Senate was advised that no further nominations had been received. Ravi Patel was therefore elected by acclamation to the Student member position on the Calendar Committee (CC) and the Student Senator Alternate position on the Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules (SCAR), and Joe Paling was elected by acclamation to the Student Senator position on the Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP). The remaining vacancy for the Senate Committee on University Honours (SCUH) will be held in abeyance until the spring committee elections as the principal work of SCUH has concluded for the year.

7. Other Business

There was no Other Business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, March 2, 2009.

The Open Session adjourned at 7:55 pm, and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat