

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on  
Monday, March 3, 2008 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

*As amended by  
Senate 7 Apr 08*

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair of Senate

Abdulwahab, Kamal  
Atkins, Stella  
Brennand, Tracy  
Copeland, Lynn  
Corbett, Kitty  
Cormack, Lesley  
Dagenais, Diane  
Dickinson, Peter  
Driver, Jon  
Easton, Stephen  
Fizzell, Maureen  
Francis, June  
Gençay, Ramo  
Gordon, Robert  
Hannah, David  
Harder, Derrick  
Harding, Kevin  
Hemingway, Alex  
Krane, William  
Laba, Martin  
Lee, Benjamin  
Lein, Adam  
Letourneau, Michael  
Lewis, Brian  
Li, Paul  
Malcoe, Lorraine Halinka  
Nesbit, Tom (replacing J. LaBrie)  
Paling, Joe  
Percival, Colin  
Percival, Paul  
Peters, Joseph  
Pinto, Mario  
Plischke, Michael  
Popadiuk, Natalee  
Russell, Robert  
Shaker, Paul  
Shapiro, Daniel  
Smith, Don  
Thompson, Steve  
Tiffany, Evan  
Tse, Karen  
van Baarsen, Amanda  
Wakkary, Ron  
Warner, D'Arcy  
Waterhouse, John  
Weeks, Daniel  
Williams, Peter  
Williams, Tony

Absent

Brebner, Sarah  
Fox, Amy  
Hayes, Michael  
Javed, Waseem  
Liljedahl, Peter  
Louie, Brandt  
McArthur, James  
O'Neil, John  
Shermer, Thomas  
Vaid, Bhuvinder

In attendance:

Budra, Paul  
Chu, Jonathan  
Dean, Charmaine  
Gobas, Frank  
Janes, Craig  
Krider, Robert  
Liotti, Mario  
Martin, Jack  
Roppel, Sue  
Truong, Van

Ross, Kate, Registrar and Senior Director Student  
Enrolment  
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

1. Approval of the Agenda  
Senators had received advance notice that the agenda would be amended to add Senate paper S.08-44 (informational item from SCUS) to the agenda as item 6.C.iv. The Agenda was approved following this change.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of January 7, 2008  
Following an amendment to add the name of D. Dagenais to the list of Senators present, the Minutes were approved.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes  
There was no business arising from the Minutes. The Chair thanked S. Easton for his admirable chairing of Senate during his absence.
4. Report of the Chair  
There was no report from the Chair.
5. Question Period  
There were no questions.
6. Reports of Committees
  - A) Senate Committee on University Priorities
    - i) Paper S.08-27 – Bachelor of Science in Behavioural Neuroscience, Major and Honors Program in the Faculties of Applied Sciences and Arts and Social Sciences

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by K. Harding

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Behavioural Neuroscience, Major and Honors Program in the Faculty of Applied Sciences and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences”

M. Liotti, Department of Psychology, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- ii) Paper S.08-28 – Faculty Structure Task Force Final Report (For Discussion)  
Senators were reminded that the report was before Senate for discussion. The Chair reported that SCAR felt that Senate should move into a Committee of the Whole in order to allow more open discussion, and that the Vice President Academic intended to bring forward pieces of the report for formal consideration at future meetings.

Moved by S. Easton, seconded by M. Letourneau

“that Senate move into a Committee of the Whole to discuss this item”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

The Chair suggested that a one and a half hour time limit be considered for the discussion.

Before providing Senate with background on this item, J. Waterhouse acknowledged the work of the Task Force and extended thanks to all members of the Task Force for the development of the report and for service performed to the community far beyond normal expectations. Senate was advised that as a result of the Task Force soliciting proposals from the university community, 25 proposals were received. Because of the significant number of proposals, the Task Force broke into working groups that included members of the Task Force and other members of the university community. The working groups met with interested people throughout the university and held five open forums which were well attended. The Final Report was developed and another four open forums were held within the university community. Based on the discussion and feedback from Senate, the Vice President Academic indicated his intent to bring forward parts of the report through the various policy-making bodies of the University. Some parts require action of Senate and the Board of Governors, other recommendations involve negotiation between the administration and the Faculty Association. Matters requiring revision to existing university policies will be undertaken in the normal matter in which the University revises its policies. Senate was provided with brief background information concerning the reasons and motivation for striking the Task Force and a brief summary of the three main areas where change has been recommended. It is recognized that the total cost of all of the Task Force's recommendations is beyond the financial capacity of the University to fund in one year so priorities have been established and suggestions made for different sources of funding for different recommendations.

A summary of the concerns, comments, questions, and suggestions raised during the discussion of this issue follows.

#### *General*

- There was a concern that too many changes were being proposed, too quickly.
- The process was comprehensive and thoughtful with initiatives coming from faculty members and departments. The bottom up process was complimented but care was needed to safeguard the rights of individuals and to treat people fairly who may not support the new structure.

#### *Faculty of Communication, Arts and Design*

- Communication, Arts and Design seems like a reasonable approach for a Faculty but concern was expressed about the cost.

#### *Kinesiology moving to Science*

- Some disappointment was expressed that Kinesiology would be moving to Science rather than Health Sciences.

#### *New Faculty of the Environment*

- Was the new Faculty of the Environment being created to provide a home for Resource and Environmental Management?

- Why was a Faculty [of the Environment] being created as opposed to an Institute or even a certain number of University Professorships in the environment, especially at a time when budgets have been cut. No other options appear to have been considered.
- The Faculty structure was being recommended to provide students with a coherent series of programs that integrate issues around the environment from science, social sciences and humanities to deal with a current lack of focus for research and teaching concerning environmental issues. An institute would not be capable of providing such a focus because the teaching capacity of institutes is limited. The Task Force received significant feedback that the time was right for SFU to do something with regard to the environment and the creation of a new Faculty would provide the leadership necessary to move this area forward.
- A lot of expertise is available among faculty members across Faculties and separating some of them in a distinct Faculty of the Environment will erode the strong disciplinary core that the report itself mentions is important to retain and is needed if interdisciplinarity is going to work. Bringing a small number of faculty members into one Faculty will not optimize what SFU can accomplish. Perhaps it would be better to start by bringing all interested faculty together into a research centre or institute to work on issues and programs which then may evolve into a Faculty rather than creating a new Faculty from the start.
- There would be difficulties of integrating science-based programs (from Science) with social science type programs. This difficulty had been recognized and resulted in the recommendation to establish the Faculty Interdisciplinary Program Planning Committee which will report to Senate before the Faculty becomes operational.
- The report contains many good ideas, and Government and private funding is currently available for environmental issues. Good opportunity to create new academic units that will position SFU for the future. However universities are currently underfunded, departmental budgets are being cut, and course/program accessibility is a problem.

*Faculty of Applied Sciences with Engineering Science and Computing Science*

- Ties between Mathematics and Computing Science are strong and the recommendation to put Computing Science and Engineering Science together rather than include Computing Science in the Faculty of Science was questioned. It was noted the School of Computing Science voted on this issue and the majority voted to associate itself with Engineering Science.

*Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences*

- Only growth is contemplated, and there was no discussion about maintaining current position. There is a need to preserve disciplinary foundations in the University, especially core areas such as Arts, Sciences, and Social Sciences.
- Concerns within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences have not been addressed – specifically that the growth of the new structures will be at the expense of FASS.
- Many excellent things being done in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences but the document is silent on much of that and faculty, staff and students in FASS would be much happier with the report if they felt the changes were enhancing their studies, teaching and research.

*College of Life Long and Experiential Learning*

- The need for the College was questioned. Continuing Studies does a lot of interdisciplinary work already and with a slight change in mandate could do more, without creating a whole new structure
- The College was an attempt to deal with proposals that were brought to the working group that included issues around the future changing demographic of the student body. It was viewed as a good opportunity for life long learning to be an enriching experience for a different population of students and to provide a different kind of experiential component to learning such as the Semester in Dialogue, and to provide a variety of ways in which the SFU student experience might be something exceptional, and unique in Canada.
- It was suggested that the College is being driven by the need to find a home for the Semester in Dialogue and has resulted in artificial joining of various other work related experiences. Co-Op Education and Continuing Studies already work well and there is no need to restructure them by adding an unnecessary level of administrative complexity.

*Other issues*

- The Centres and Institutes revisions appeared to be too bureaucratic.
- A suggestion was made that a separate forum be held to deal with any leftover questions or concerns from Senate prior to formal consideration by Senate.
- Part of the report seem motivated by the complexity of SFU's programming and that is not a good reason to create a new structure. Changes in advising need to take place. Restructuring should be based on reasons that are intellectually exciting and important.
- Restructuring will help to create a more attractive environment to students and attract students throughout their life. By maintaining the status quo the university becomes less attractive and less competitive to other institutions.
- Task Force was commended for its attempt to address obstacles to interdisciplinarity, both in teaching and research, but disappointment was expressed about the lack of incentives to encourage faculty members to engage in interdisciplinary work. Needs more conceptualization and development to make interdisciplinarity useful and workable.
- In the current budget reality, it would be helpful to see the financial aspect of the proposals linked to other components of the budget.
- Although a cost summary is given and priorities established, no 'balance sheet' is available with respect to the impact on the current fiscal situation and it is difficult to support restructuring without knowing the total cost to the university. A request was made for the details on the actual total cost of the proposed structure including the first year costs. These were summarized by the Vice President Academic.

Every Senator having had an opportunity to speak at least once, the Chair indicated that the time limit for discussion had expired. The Chair summarized that much of the discussion revolved around issues of budget and its impact, especially on the Faculty of

Arts and Social Sciences. He felt that many assertions with respect to presumed unfairness of the funding for FASS, and questions surrounding the tutorial system and funding for graduate students, all need open discussion and response. The budget has not yet been formulated but, as President, the Chair committed to an open discussion of the budget and its implications on the University. The Chair also suggested that the Vice President Academic and SCUP give careful consideration to the substance of Senate's discussion before bringing forward recommendations, especially with respect to providing a financial rationale with greater detail about the budgeting and costs of the proposals.

Moved by S. Easton, seconded by J. Driver

“that Senate move out of Committee of the Whole”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

On behalf of Senate, the Chair reiterated thanks and appreciation to members of the Task Force for their extraordinary service to the University and for their thoughtfulness in the development of the report.

B) Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

i) Paper S.08-29 – Undergraduate Enrolment Plan 2008/2009

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by M. Fizzell

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the 2008/09 enrolment plan as laid out in the document *Enrolment Plan, February 13, 2008*

In response to a question about how to interpret the data, the Associate Vice President Academic provided a detailed analysis of Senate paper S.08-29 Enrolment Plan, and S.08-30 Undergraduate Admission Targets for 2008/09, and explained how the Government targets are set.

See  
approval of  
mins  
7 Apr 08  
mtg for  
amendment.

~~Reference was made to the large proportion of international students in Business Administration and concern was expressed about how the Faculty will manage such numbers.~~ It was pointed out that historically Business Administration has always had the largest proportion of international students and the 2008/09 targets for domestic and international reflected a rollover from enrolment experienced by Business last year. The Associate Dean of Business Administration provided a brief explanation as to why it will be difficult for Business Administration to meet the international target. A suggestion was made that if Faculties are having difficulties meeting targets the model used to set the targets should perhaps be reviewed. It was noted that the targets are monitored very closely and adjustments are constantly being made during the admission process through discussions between the Registrar and the Faculty Deans.

The Associate Vice-President Academic reiterated that the targets were simply planning devices and as enrolment experience developed over the next several semesters, adjustments would have to be made.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.08-30 – Undergraduate Admission Targets for 2008/2009

Motion 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by D. Smith

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the 2008/09 Domestic undergraduate admission targets to each Faculty, by semester and basis of admission category as indicated in Table 1”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by D. Smith

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the International undergraduate admission targets to each Faculty and to each semester as indicated in Table 2”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.08-31 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Applied Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses, program changes, and changes to existing courses in the following areas: Computing Science, Kinesiology, Engineering Science, and Interactive Arts and Technology.

ii) Paper S.08-32 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved changes to program requirements and changes to existing courses in the Faculty of Education.

iii) Paper S.08-33 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved deletion of courses, new courses, program changes,

and changes to existing courses in the following areas: Management & Systems Science, Biological Sciences, Mathematics, Physics, Earth Sciences, and Statistics and Actuarial Science.

iv) Paper S.08-44 – Revision to Admission Process for BC 12 (For Information)

Senate received information with respect to a revision to the Admission Process for BC 12. The process was revised in order to recruit more top students to the university and to provide all other applicants with a greater measure of certainty. The Admission office will strengthen offers made to high school students and introduce a separate process for two cohorts of students: Cohort A: Top Students, 90%+, Major Entrance Scholarship Applicants, and Cohort B: General Admission.

D) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.08-34 – Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee for 2007 was received by Senate for information.

ii) Paper S.08-35 – Revisions to Graduate Regulations

Senate was informed that items 5, 6 and 7 concerning graduate fee administration were not to be included in the motion and should be deleted from the paper.

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by M. Letourneau

“that Senate approve changes to the following Graduate General Regulations: 1.4.3 Continuity of Enrolment; 1.4.6 Course Audit; 1.7.6 Courses in Master’s and Doctoral Programs; and 1.12.4 Graduate Regulation”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii.a) Paper S.08-36 – Curriculum Revisions – Political Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a course deletion, new courses, and changes to existing courses.

iii.b) Paper S.08-37 – Curriculum Revisions – Urban Studies (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a new course.



iv.a) Paper S.08-38 – Curriculum Revisions – Computing Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved course deletions, new courses, breadth and course requirements, and changes to existing courses.

iv.b) Paper S.08-39 – Curriculum Revision – Resource and Environmental Management (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a change to an existing course.

iv.c) Paper S.08-40 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Applied Sciences (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved course deletions, new courses, changes to program requirements, and changes to existing courses in the following areas: Communication, Kinesiology, and Interactive Arts and Technology.

v) Paper S.08-41 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved changes to existing courses.

vi) Paper S.08-42 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses in the Department of Mathematics.

E) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.08-43 – Elections

Senate was advised no nominations were received thus the vacancy on the International Student Exchange Committee for the Faculty of Applied Sciences remains unfilled.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

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

The Open Session adjourned at 9:20 pm, and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Kate Ross  
Registrar and Senior Director, Enrolment Services