

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, December 4, 2006 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present:

Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair of Senate

Absent:

Breden, Felix
Brennand, Tracy
Caufield, Sarah
Copeland, Lynn
Corbett, Kitty
Dagenais, Diane
Delgrande, James
Dickinson, Peter
Easton, Steve
Ester, Martin
Fizzell, Maureen
Fox, Graham
Gençay, Ramo
Gordon, Irene
Gordon, Robert
Gregory, Titus
Harder, Derrick
Haunerland, Norbert
Heift, Trude (representing J. Driver)
Joffres, Michel
Krane, Bill
LaBrie, John
Lewis, Brian
MacLean, David
Percival, Colin
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Pinto, Mario
Plischke, Michael
Russell, Robert
Schellenberg, Betty
Shaker, Paul
Shermer, Thomas
Smart, Carolyne
Tingling, Peter
Vaid, Bhuvinder
van Baarsen, Amanda
Warner, D'Arcy
Waterhouse, John
Williams, Peter
Wong, Josephine
Zandvliet, David

Black, Sam
Dunnet, Margo
Halpern, Erica
Hayes, Michael
Honda, Barry
Javed, Waseem
Kelly, Vanessa
Lewis, Glyn
Li, Wei
Liljedahl, Peter
Louie, Brandt
MacKenzie, Christine
McArthur, James
Rebman, Rachelle
Smith, Don
Weeks, Daniel

In attendance:

Cavers, Jim
Dench, Sarah
Friesen, Jane
Hickin, Ted
Hincliffe, Jo
McCarthy, Ian
Roppel, Sue

Angerilli, Nello, Associate Vice-President, Students/International, and Acting Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of November 6, 2006
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the Minutes.
4. Report of the Chair
The Chair announced that the Senate Committee on University Honours had awarded the C.D. Nelson Memorial Prize for 2006 to Bobbie Grant. The prize, established in 1975 in memory of C.D. Nelson, the first Head of Biological Sciences, is given to a current or retired member of faculty or staff for outstanding contributions to the University. On behalf of the University, the Chair conveyed congratulations to Ms. Grant, and the announcement was warmly applauded by members of Senate.
5. Question Period
There were no questions.
6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.06-128 – External Review – Department of Geography

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate concur with the recommendation of the Senate Committee on University Priorities that the Department of Geography and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences be advised to pursue the priority items as set out in Senate paper S.06-128”

T. Hickin, Chair, Department of Geography, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.06-129 – External Review – Integrated Studies Program

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded on J. Pierce

“that Senate concur with the recommendation of the Senate Committee on University Priorities that the Integrated Studies Program and the Deans of Continuing Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Business Administration be advised to pursue the priority items as set out in Senate paper S.06-129”

J. Pierce, Senator and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and J. LaBrie, Senator and Dean of Continuing Studies, were available to respond to questions.

It was noted that the Dean of Business Administration had not responded to the external review. It was noted that the nature of the program had changed over the years from one originally designed to service cohorts in the Business field to an increased intake of students from the general population, and an inquiry was made as to whether it was still appropriate for the Dean of Business Administration to retain an ex-officio position on the Steering Committee. Senate was advised that Business still had the largest block of students beyond Arts and Social Sciences and represented about one-third of the courses in the program. However, since Business does not administer the program, the Faculty felt it would not be appropriate for the Dean to respond formally to the review but it was important for Business to retain a position on the Steering Committee.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.06-130 – Centre for Studies in Global Asset and Wealth Management

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by C. Smart

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the creation of the Centre for Studies in Global Asset and Wealth Management as a Schedule A Centre within the Faculty of Business Administration”

C. Smart, Senator and Dean, *pro tem*, Business Administration was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

A brief discussion took place with regard to funding for the Centre.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iv) Paper S.06-131 – Community Trust Endowment Fund Chair – Terms of Reference

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Pinto

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the terms of reference for the Community Trust Endowment Fund Chair”

M. Pinto, Senator and Vice-President, Research was available to respond to questions.

Questions arose with respect to the search process and whether the Chair holders are tied to the award. Senate was advised that the research of CTEF Chair holders must complement and support the interdisciplinary research plan of the CTEF funded program, and the intent of the program was to increase faculty complement rather than reward internally. Although names of specific candidates would not be attached to proposals, it was advisable to have candidates in mind in order to facilitate the search.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- v) Paper S.06-132 – Proposal for the Deletion of the Physics and Physiology Program in the Faculty of Science

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Plischke

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the deletion of the Physics and Physiology program in the Faculty of Science”

M. Plischke, Senator and Dean of Science, was available to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- vi) Paper S.06-133 – Faculty Structure Task Force Final Report

A motion by J. Waterhouse that Senate move into a Committee of the Whole for one-half hour to allow a broader discussion on the report as a whole was accepted.

Senate moved into a Committee of the Whole.

J. Waterhouse introduced the following members of the Task Force who were in attendance in order to respond to questions: J. Cavers, J. Friesen, D. Harder, I. McCarthy, S. Roppel and A. Watt.

Comments on the report focused on the following issues:

- Would the Phase 2 Task Force ensure that input was solicited and received from across the university?
- There appeared to be a need to identify appropriate procedures for determining the process for approving and amending the academic structure, and overseeing the implementation of the proposals.
- The size of faculties, particularly the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, would be an issue and there needed to be some willingness to contemplate the splitting of a large faculty otherwise the exercise would be doomed to failure.
- Open-mindedness was required as well as unbiased approach for exploring all possible alternatives.
- Membership of the Phase 2 Task Force appeared to be pre-determined.
- All faculties are equal and no faculty should have more than one representative on the Phase 2 Task Force;
- How could the differences and extreme concerns between different groups within faculties be reflected by one representative?
- Is the aggressive deadline for the Phase 2 Task Force workable? November 2007 was felt to be very short, given that departments will have to meet to discuss very complex issues and many people may be off campus during the summer semester.
- It will be important for the Task Force to recognize the importance of interdisciplinary research and design a process to enable graduate students to engage in interdisciplinary studies.

Responses to some of the issues included the following:

- The Terms of Reference of the Phase 2 Task Force call for consultation and input from the community, and the process for approving departmental and faculty restructuring would be handled in the normal way under the powers given to Senate and the Board of Governors in the University Act.
- No optimal size of faculty had been determined and the size of a Faculty was not a critical issue. The Task Force will look within the University for opportunities to bring departments and programs together that share common linkages in teaching and research.
- The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is willing to consider change if change is based on appropriate rationale and a more cogent argument than its size.
- On the issue of equal representation, it was pointed out that some differential representation already exists in some University bodies.
- Working groups would be established to deal with more focused questions and issues, and this would provide a mechanism for additional input.
- Some overlap in the membership between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Task Forces was seen as desirable, but not total overlap. The membership of the Phase 2 Task Force had not been established.
- The timeline, while aggressive, is flexible in that it states that the Task Force shall endeavour to report by November 2007.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chair ruled that Senate move out of Committee of the Whole.

Motion 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by R. Gordon

“that Senate approve a second phase to the faculty structure initiative and create a “Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. LaBrie

“that Senate approve the mandate for the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure as set out in Paper S.06-133”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 3

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by D. Harder

“that Senate approve the procedural framework to guide the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure as set out in Paper S.06-133”

Amendment moved by J. Peters, seconded by J. Delgrande

“that point 1 be changed from ‘seven faculty members’ to ‘six faculty members’ and the following sentence be deleted ‘..with the exception of Arts and Social Sciences which will have two representatives’ ”

The rationale presented in support of the amendment was that since Faculties and Deans are supposed to be equal, representation on committees should also be equal. It was noted that larger departments/schools within Faculties do not have increased representation on Faculty-level committees, and strong opposition was expressed by the continuation of this practice at university-level committees.

A member of the Task Force indicated that there had not been extremely strong feelings one way or the other within the Task Force on this issue but it seemed logical to have two representatives given the size of FASS and the diversity within the Faculty.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

A suggestion to amend point one to include the condition that members of the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure will be appointed by the Vice-President Academic in consultation with SCUP was accepted by Senate.

Amendment moved by T. Gregory, seconded by A. van Baarsen,

“that the following sentence be added at the end of point 3: Each working group shall include student representation”

Opinion was expressed that since restructuring could impact students going through certain streams and programs, it was important to have a student voice on the working group as well as the Task Force itself.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Question was called on the main motion (as amended), and a vote taken

MAIN MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

Motion 4

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by S. Easton

“that Senate approve that the Phase 2 Task Force on Academic Structure be guided by the eight principles of assessment outlined in the final report”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

On behalf of the University and of Senate, the Chair thanked all members of the Phase 1 Task Force for their work on this process.

vii) Paper S.06-134 – Centres and Institutes Report 2005/2006

A motion to approve and recommend the report to the Board of Governors was withdrawn since it was determined that it was not appropriate for Senate to do so. Following a brief discussion with respect to how the University publicizes research

activities to the wider community, the Report for 2005/2006 was received by Senate for information.

B) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.06-135 – Curriculum Revisions - Faculty of Applied Sciences – (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved minor course changes and revisions to programs and requirements in Kinesiology and Computing Science.

ii) Paper S.06-136 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses, and minor changes to existing programs and courses in the following areas: Humanities, Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology, Centre for Sustainable Community Development, and English. Senate also received information that SCUS approved, under delegated authority, a list of Writing, Quantitative and Breadth designations for courses within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

iii) Paper S.06-137 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Business Administration (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved one new course and minor course revisions, and a minor revision to a Concentration in Marketing.

iv) Paper S.06-138 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses and minor changes to existing courses and programs in the following areas: Biological Sciences, Earth Sciences, Mathematics, Physical Geography, Physics, Statistics and Actuarial Science.

v) Paper S.06-139 – Nunavut Courses for Admission (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the inclusion of Nunavut courses for admission.

vi) Paper S.096-140 – Annual Report – Diverse Qualifications Adjudication Committee (For Information)

Reference was made to the 10 year historical information on page 3 and the data comparing the progress of DQAC students and students in the general SFU population regarding completion of 30 credits and graduation rates. The data appeared to show contradictory information and the Chair requested the Associate Vice-President Academic to review the data and report back to Senate.

The data in the second bullet from the bottom on page 3 indicated that almost 40% of SFU students are on academic probation within two years of admission. The Associate Vice-President Academic confirmed this was a fact, and was asked to review this data with the appropriate committee and provide a report on this matter to Senate.

Discussion turned to data on page 4 that showed that 18 students had entered the Faculty of Science through the DQ process. It was pointed out that the Faculty of Science had opted out of this process. Senate was advised that on occasion when there are extenuating circumstances and students deserving consideration, the Registrar has appealed directly to the Dean of Science with a request for admission. The Dean through some process considers the requests and 18 cases have successfully gone through this procedure and been granted admission.

Following discussion, the report was received by Senate.

vii) Paper S.06-141 – Revision to the Literacy Admission Criteria

B. Krane informed Senate that the motion as outlined on the Senate paper required a minor amendment as follows.

Moved by B. Krane, seconded by N. Hauerland

“that Senate approve the proposed revisions to the literacy admissions criteria as follows:

B+ and above (75%+) English 12/English Lit 12: admitted

B to C (74% - 60%) English 12/English Lit 12: admitted, register in Foundations of Academic Literacy course (FAL), or submit an

acceptable LPI score (LPI 4/50% or higher) to obtain FAL equivalency

Below C (<60%) English 12: not admitted”

These revisions would take effect for Spring 2007 admissions.

B. Krane, Senator and Associate Vice-President Academic, and Sarah Dench, Director, University Curriculum and Institutional Liaison were available to respond to questions.

The committee was commended for this attempt to streamline the admission requirements but it was felt that due to the dynamic nature of the student market, a review every three years was not sufficient. In response to a suggestion that the review should be more frequent, Senate was advised that an annual review would be inappropriate as there might not be that much change in such a short period. However, if there was some significant change in admissions behaviour, a review could be initiated at that time.

Concern was expressed about the reduction of the 80% threshold and a suggestion was made that a better way would be to admit eligible students and then administer the LPI to stream students to appropriate courses.

Senate was advised that some members of SCUS were in favour of not requiring the LPI at all and instead requiring students take the FAL course. Some members felt the LPI was useful for placement testing but the FAL course was a much better measure to test their literacy skills.

In response to a concern about the impact of the proposed change on the number of students taking FAL, Senate was advised that although there likely would be a slight increase in the number of students registering in FAL, the Faculty of Education has indicated it would be able to accommodate this anticipated increase.

In response to an inquiry about why 75% or greater was chosen, Senate was informed that there was strong evidence that more than 80% of students with 75%+ in English 12 will be successful in English language courses; at 74% the success rate drops to 17%.

It was pointed out that further studies have indicated that using English 12 scores to predict success is as good as or better than the LPI. LPI was never designed to be used as a basis for admission so the proposal before Senate promotes the use of English 12 scores for admission and relegates the LPI as a tool for placement.

A suggestion to change the second sentence from 'B to C (74%-60%)' to 'B to C (<75%-60%)' was accepted by Senate.

The feasibility of implementing this change for Spring 2007 was questioned. Senate was assured that the implementation for Spring 2007 was possible.

While it was understood that the actual policy might not be reviewed for three years, a suggestion to report to Senate on the effectiveness of the revised policy after three or four semesters was agreed to by the Associate Vice-President, Academic.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.06-142 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Education (For Information)
Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a new stream to the PhD program in Curriculum Theory and Implementation; and minor changes to existing courses.

ii) Paper S.06-143 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)
Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a minor prerequisite change to an existing course.

D) Senate Committee on Academic Integrity in Student Learning and Evaluation

i) Paper S.06-144 – Annual Report (For Information)

R. Gordon, Senator and Chair of the Committee, and J. Hinchliffe, Secretary to the Committee were in attendance in order to respond to questions. The Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Integrity in Student Learning and Evaluation was received by Senate for information.

E) Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries

i) Paper S.06-145 – Annual Report (For Information)

S. Easton, Senator and Chair of the Committee, and J. Hinchliffe, Secretary to the Committee were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Brief discussion took place with respect to reasons for the decline in graduate funding which fell from 4.7 million to 4.3 million. Senate was assured that this was not the result

of a change in policy but was due in part to a carryover in the previous year's budget and the fact that the annual report is based on the fiscal year, while scholarships are allocated on the academic year, so students receiving awards in the summer would not be included in this data.

Following discussion, the report was received by Senate for information.

F) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.06-146 – Elections

Senate was advised that one further nomination had been received - Kora Paciorek - was elected by acclamation to the Senate Appeals Board. Derrick Harder was elected by acclamation to the Senate Nominating Committee. The remaining vacancies will be carried forward to the next meeting.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, January 8, 2007.

The Open Session adjourned at 8:35 pm and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat