

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD
ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1991 KLAUS RIECKHOFF HALL, 4:30 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present: Saywell, W., Chair

Barrow, R.
Blackman, R.
Blaney, J.
Boland, L.
Bowman, M.
Bukovac, S.
Carlson, R.
Chan, B.
Choquer, K.
Clayman, B.
Covell, M.
Dobb, T.
Etherington, L.
Evenden, L.
Gee, E. (replacing R. Brown)
Giffen, K.
Haje, P.
Heinrich, K.
Hoegg, J.L.
Jespersen, J.
Jones, C.
Leiss, W.
Marteniuk, R.
McKeown, B.
Menzies, R.
Morrison, T.
Munro, J.
Myers, T.
Nicol, I.
Palmer, E.
Palmer, L.
Percival, P.
Pinfield, L.
Reilly, N.
Rieckhoff, K.
Saunders, R.
Shannon, D.
Shapiro, S.
Soheili, A.
Stewart, M.L.
Thomson, K.
Verdun-Jones, S.
Wade, S.
Winne, P.

Absent: Cercone, N.
D'Auria, J.
Dahl, H.
Delgrande, J.
Dill, L.
Lindberg, T.
Luk, W.S.
Mauser, G.
Nielsen, V.
Rae, B.
Walker, R.
Warsh, M.
Wotherspoon, A.

In attendance:

N. Heath
S. Probst
S. Thomas

Heath, W.R., Secretary
Grant, B., Recording Secretary

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was approved as distributed.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION OF JULY 8, 1991

Referring to Item 6 on page 4, K. Rieckhoff requested that the Minutes show that his offer to move the motion was not acceptable. The Chair indicated that the Minutes would reflect this amendment, following which the Minutes were approved.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

In response to a concern about the early start time of the last meeting, Senate was reminded that this issue had undergone extensive review and that the consensus was that meetings would normally be held in the evening except when the agenda was deemed by SCAR to be light enough to warrant a late afternoon meeting as was the case on July 8th.

4. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

i) The Chair acknowledged the following new appointments and extended congratulations on behalf of Senate: Dr. R. Marteniuk, Dean of Applied Sciences, and Dr. R. Barrow, Acting Dean of Education.

ii) Senate was informed of the resignation of Convocation Senator S. Duguid and advised that steps were being taken to seek a replacement.

iii) The Chair advised that the University received a request from the Government to appoint a representative from Simon Fraser University to sit on the recently established Committee looking into the possibility of creating a new university in the Fraser Valley. Recommendation has been made but the Chair did not wish to release the name until a public announcement of the Committee had been made.

iv) Referring to the university-college initiative with regard to Fraser Valley College, the Chair advised that although the University had offered its assistance, Fraser Valley College has not as yet made a request to SFU in this regard.

v) Commenting on the new layout of Senate Chambers, the Chair advised that the continued growth of the University has resulted in renovations to Klaus Rieckhoff Hall and until the completion of the West Mall Complex, which will have very good facilities for Senate meetings, Senate will have to continue meeting in the present Chambers.

vi) Since he was out of town last May when it was traditional for he and his wife to host a reception for new and retiring Senators, the Chair advised that the reception would be held following the special meeting of Senate on September 23rd. Senators, including those who retired from Senate last June, would receive written invitation and confirmation of the time and location.

vii) Senate was informed that preliminary figures indicated that undergraduate enrolment has increased by approximately 8%. Final enrolment figures will not be known until the end of the third week of classes at which time the Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning, under delegated authority from Senate, will review admission targets for the Spring semester to decide whether they should be amended. A report will be provided to Senate at the October meeting.

5. REPORT OF COMMITTEES

i) Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board
Paper S.91-40 - Duplicate Transfer Credit

Moved by R. Saunders, seconded by L. Boland

"that the proposed duplicate transfer credit regulations, approved by the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board, be considered and approved by Senate, as set out in the enclosed document, SUAB 211 (2nd Revision)"

N. Heath, Director Admissions was in attendance to respond to questions.

Opinion was expressed that the last item on page 3 appeared to be contradiction of itself and clarification was requested. Clarification was also requested as to exactly what was meant by departmental approval. Senate was informed that the intent of the last statement on page 3 was to allow a department to permit credits to count for both a transfer course and for a course which had been previously articulated as being equivalent to a given SFU course. Usually, this situation would only arise if a student's transfer credit was very old and the student was able to successfully argue that the content of the older course taken elsewhere was now sufficiently different from the current SFU course. Normally, departmental approval relates to authority delegated by the Chair of a department to an individual in the department such as the Undergraduate Program Chair or the Departmental Assistant who would normally be responsible for registration anomalies and other registration functions. The wording of the statement would be changed by the Secretary of Senate to provide better clarification.

Reference was made to the third point on page 2 with respect to registration anomaly reports and inquiry was made as to whether or not these reports will include grades/courses from the Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Program. Senate was informed that the reports will include this information provided that the grades from these two programs are received in time. However, it was pointed out that there are currently some problems with timing in this regard.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Senate Library Committee
Paper S.91-41 - Annual Report

S. Thomas, Head of Collections, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

As Chair of the Senate Library Committee, J. Munro introduced the report by drawing Senate's attention to the major issues addressed in the report such as the acquisitions budget; the existence of an ongoing external review; the collections policy, particularly with regard to journal subscriptions; collection expenditures by account; and finally the Library's own internal strategic planning exercise.

Appreciation was expressed for the thoroughness of the report and a hope was expressed that future reports would continue to provide the same level of information. A

suggestion was made, however, that future reports contain a more detailed breakdown of the collections expenditures by account by identifying specific expenditures for monographs and journals.

It was noted that when new programs/courses are presented for Senate approval in many cases additional funds are indicated in order to support the offering of these new initiatives and Senate usually receives assurances that the funding will be made available. Inquiry was made as to whether or not such funds were in fact forthcoming. Senate was informed that in the cases of new programs implemented this year in which library funds were identified, the Library did receive funding albeit not at the same level that was identified. However, it was pointed out that the programs themselves were not funded at the requested level. Opinion was expressed that Senate should keep this information in mind and perhaps be somewhat more careful with regard to approving new programs/courses in the future.

Surprise was expressed that allocations appeared to be much greater for the Faculty of Science than for the Faculty of Arts and inquiry was made as to how the allocations were determined. Senate was informed that allocations were based solely on the relative cost of materials. The average cost for a book is now approximately \$55, ranging from approximately \$25.00 to approximately \$137.00. The discrepancy is even greater with respect to journals. The average cost per journal is approximately \$100 per annum, ranging from approximately \$25.00 in the Faculty of Arts to approximately \$1,000 in the Faculty of Science. Senate was advised that for the past several years the only way the Library has been able to obtain new subscriptions is by cancelling old ones of equal value. It was pointed out that there is a problem in departments which do not have a solid base of journal subscriptions and there are now existing departments unable to purchase new journals.

Discussion turned to the question of space and clarification was requested with respect to the additional space which would become available to the Library in 1994 and the alternatives alluded to in the report. Senate was informed that the space referred to in 1994 was the 7th floor of the Library and the alternative alluded to in the report was the possibility of leasing space off-campus to house some of the low usage materials which would free up some space for seating. However, it was pointed out expectations are that due to the growth of the collections between now and 1994, the addition of the 7th floor of the Library would not ameliorate the space problem and available seating space would stay at much the same level as it is now. Suggestion was made that having the Library open on a 24-hour basis would perhaps help to alleviate some of the existing space problems. Senate was reminded that the Library had already experimented with a 24-hour opening some years ago and the necessity of having other services also available on a 24-hour basis was stressed.

Following discussion, the annual report of the Library was received by Senate.

6. Other Business

i) Paper S.91-42 - Search Committees - Faculty Deans, Dean of Graduate Studies; Dean of Continuing Studies; Associate Vice-President Academic

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by D. Shannon

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of

Governors the memberships and terms of reference for the: Search Committee for Faculty Deans; Search Committee for Dean of Graduate Studies; Search Committee for Dean of Continuing Studies; and Search Committee for Associate Vice-President, Academic"

A request by J. Munro to delete 4.3 from the comments relating to the changes to the Search Committee for the Associate Vice-President, Academic (which would have the effect of retaining the President of the Faculty Association as a member of the committee) was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Referring to the clause about gender representation, opinion was expressed that given SFU's historical record of ensuring the participation of women faculty members in such matters, it was suggested that it was unnecessary to introduce this legislation. If introduced, it was felt that selection of committee members by the Vice-President was inappropriate and that it would be more appropriate if a senior academic from the gender that was not appropriately represented made the selection. The response to these arguments was that Simon Fraser's record in these matters could be improved and that there was symbolic value in introducing this change because of the University's general commitment to gender equity. Since the purpose of naming additional members to search committees was made very clear, it was unlikely that the power would be abused.

Amendment moved by A. Soheili, seconded by T. Morrison

"that on all committees referred to in S.91-42, the selection of students by the Student Society be changed to the election of Student Senators by Senate"

It was pointed out that the amendment would present an administrative problem in that some Faculties are not represented by two students. Therefore, consideration should also be given to changing the Rules of Senate to procedurally accommodate the amendment.

In reply to an inquiry as to current procedures, Senate was informed that the Registrar's Office requests names of student representatives from the Student Society. The Student Society, where possible, encourages Student Unions to meet and put forward student names for recommendation to Forum. However, it was acknowledged that this process proved difficult in large faculties such as the Faculty of Arts. Names are then ratified by Forum and forwarded to the Registrar's Office for submission to the Vice-President, Academic's office.

The following suggestion by A. Soheili (with the agreement of the seconder) was accepted as a friendly amendment to the amendment:

"If there are not enough Student Senators to fill the positions on the search committee, the Student Society will be asked to provide names to ensure full student representation"

A lengthy discussion ensued. The following is a brief summary of opinions which were expressed in favour and against the amendment. In favour - there are now an adequate number of students on Senate to fill the positions as opposed to when the committees were first formed when the number of Student Senators was limited; Student Senators are duly elected and therefore represent the student body more so than students appointed through Forum; the current process is undemocratic and the amendment is a

move towards a fairer and more democratic process; these are Senate Committees and Senators should have the right to representation. In opposition - amendment concentrates power much more exclusively to Student Senators; faculty appointments are not limited to Faculty Senators so student appointments should not be limited to Student Senators; amendment would require a constitutional change to the Rules of Senate; currently student positions are potentially open to every student on campus whereas the amendment limits access to the committees to fourteen Student Senators; amendment would not ensure adequate representation of graduate students; these are not committees of Senate and therefore should be open to a wider representation.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

In response to an inquiry as to why the normal mechanism, i.e. nomination and ballot was not being used in regard to the gender equity appointments, Senate was informed that it would take too long to form a search committee if the election process was used for the two additional faculty members since this would occur after conclusion of the first elections.

Concerns were expressed that with the addition of two Directors to the Associate Vice-President Academic Search Committee, the majority of the committee would be made up of administrators rather than faculty members.

Amendment moved by P. Percival, seconded by L. Palmer

"that the Search Committee for the Associate Vice-President Academic be changed from two directors who report to the Associate Vice-President Academic to one director who reports to the Associate Vice-President Academic.

Brief discussion followed.
Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Amendment moved by K. Rieckhoff, seconded by A. Soheili

"that the changes regarding gender representation outlined under 1.4, 2.2, and 4.4 be deleted"

Brief discussion followed.
Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Returning to the general issue of gender equity appointments, it was noted that the selection process was not limited to selection from within the Faculty concerned. Senate was informed that this provision was worded that way in order to allow the Vice-President Academic the discretion of going outside the Faculty concerned if the underrepresented gender was in short supply. However, the Vice-President Academic assured Senate that the intent of the provision was to appoint from within a Faculty if it were possible.

Amendment by S. Wade, seconded by A. Soheili

"that in each of the committees the process of students selected by the Student Society be changed to read elected from students at-large (In

the case of Faculty Deans it would read by and from the students at-large within the Faculty; in the case of the Dean of Graduate Studies it would read by and from the graduate students at-large; in the case of the Dean of Continuing Studies it would read by and from students at-large; and in the case of the Associate Vice-President Academic it would read by and from students at-large.) Failing enough candidates putting their names forward for election, the Student Society would be asked to submit names for approval. Representation should normally be balanced between undergraduate and graduate students."

It was pointed out that this proposal had already been previously discussed at length and that while democratically ideal, the probable participation of students in the electoral process did not warrant holding general elections. Past experience has shown that the best way to get effective student representation on search committees has been to contact the Student Society.

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

QUESTION WAS CALLED ON THE MAIN MOTION (AS AMENDED), AND A VOTE TAKEN. MAIN MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

ii) Paper S.91-43 - Notice of Motion re Student Representation on Senate Appeals Board and the Senate Committee on Academic Discipline

Moved by K. Giffen, seconded by K. Rieckhoff

"that Senate approve that student representation on the Senate Committee on Academic Discipline and the Senate Appeals Board be changed as follows:

Senate Committee on Academic Discipline

From: 3 students and 1 student alternate selected by the Student Society
To: 2 students and 1 student alternate selected by the Student Society, and 1 Student Senator, elected by and from Senate.

Senate Appeals Board

From: 2 students and 2 student alternates selected by the Student Society
To: 1 student and 1 student alternate selected by the Student Society, and
1 Student Senator and 1 Student Senator Alternate elected by and from Senate"

The following suggestion by T. Morrison was accepted as a friendly amendment:

"that all student members on SCAD and SAB be elected by and from Senate and, in the event that not enough Student Senators accept nomination, the Student Society be asked to appoint students in order to assure full student representation"

S. Probst, Graduate Student Officer from the Student Society was in attendance to respond to questions.

It was pointed out that both SCAD and SAB are Senate committees and having students on them who are members of Senate would improve communications between the committees and Senate itself. Concern was also expressed that appointments made through the Student Society were not accountable to, and did not represent, the student body in the same way elected Student Senators did. In response to these concerns, it was pointed out that due to the confidential nature of the committees concerned it was very difficult to discuss specific details of committee work. It was also pointed out that Student Forum is designed to represent all students on campus by having a seat, in some cases more than one seat, per Faculty or Department and therefore adequately represents the student body. Opinion was expressed that the current process of appointment was not as fair and democratic as having an election by Senate of Student Senators. In response to an opinion that Senate should have the autonomy and authority to select the membership of its committees, it was pointed out that there are many Senate committees that have members on them that are not members of Senate and are not selected or elected by Senate itself. Objection was made to the fact that the amendment restricts access to this committee from potentially every student on campus to fourteen Student Senators who already have access through the present process if they so wish.

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

MOTION FAILED

7. Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.

8. Information

- i) A special meeting of Senate will take place on Monday, September 23, 1991 for the sole purpose of considering the graduands for the Fall Convocation.
- ii) The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, October 7, 1991.

The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session at 9:25 p.m.

W.R. Heath
Secretary of Senate