

*As amended by
Senate Apr 6/98*

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, March 2, 1998 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC
Open Session

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair

Barrow, Robin
Bawa, Parveen
Beattie, Suzan
Boland, Larry
Bowman, Marilyn
Chan, Albert
Clayman, Bruce
Coleman, Peter
Dunsterville, Valerie
Emmott, Alan
Etherington, Lois
Gagan, David
Gillies, Mary Ann
Jones, Colin
Jones, John
Kanevsky, Lannie
Kirczenow, George
Marteniuk, Ron
Mathewes, Rolf
McInnes, Dina
Morris, Joy
Naef, Barbara
Percival, Paul
Peterson, Louis
Pierce, John
Reed, Clyde
Russell, Robert
Selman, Mark
Tam, Lawrence
Warsh, Michael
Waterhouse, John
Winne, Phil
Wong, Tim
Wortis, Michael
Yagi, Ian

Absent: Baert, Jessica
Berggren, J. Len
Blazenko, George
Cleveland, William
D'Auria, John
Dobb, Ted
Giffen, Ken
Hassan, Nany
Lewis, Brian
Mauser, Gary
Nip, Harry
Ogloff, James
Osborne, Judith
Overington, Jennifer
Parmar, Neelam
Sanghera, Balwant
Segal, Joseph
Wickstrom, Norman

In attendance:

Collinge, Joan
French, Charlotte
Knockaert, Joe
Yerbury, Colin

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services and Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, Secretariat Services
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 February 5, 1998
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
With the exception of a report concerning a meeting between the Chair of Senate and the Chair of SCUB which is dealt with under 'Other Business', there was no further business arising from the Minutes.
4. Report of the Chair
The Chair presented a brief video of the SFU Pipe Band's trip to New York city to play at Carnegie Hall. He reported that the Band played to an audience that was almost a full house and they had received a standing ovation for their performance.
5. Reports of Committees
 - a) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Continuing Studies
 - i) Paper S.98-22 - Non-Credit Certificate Program: Certificate in Distance Learning

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by M. Selman

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.98-22, the proposed Non-Credit Certificate Program: Certificate in Distance Learning"

Colin Yerbury, Director of the Centre for Distance Education, and Joan Collinge, Program Director of the Centre were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Concern was expressed that the program would add a considerable number of new students to an already over crowded campus stretching the University's limited resources even further. Senate was advised that the Centre, which has a very well established international reputation in this area, regularly receives requests from individuals and delegations to tour SFU's facilities and learn about how SFU delivers distance education internationally. Since the Centre is already dealing with this on a regular basis it was felt that it would be very helpful to develop a programmatic approach to the orientation and a cost recovery program was designed.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- b) Senate Committee on International Activities
- i) Paper S.98-23 - Annual Report (For Information)

Joe Knockaert, Director of the Office of International Cooperation, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that Senate had previously been advised that the Eastern Indonesia University Development Project was to be completed in 1998, and an inquiry was made as to why this report showed the end date as being 2000. Senators were reminded that the report last year indicated that the project would not be extended beyond 1998 but would be phased out slowly with some activities continuing to the year 2000. This has not changed and it is expected that most of the activities after 1998 will be managed from the project office in Burnaby rather than in Indonesia. It was also pointed out that PhD and Masters programs for a few Indonesian Fellows would take until the year 2001 to be completed.

In response to an inquiry for further information about the President's Advisory Committee on International Activities, Senate was informed that the correct title for this body was Presidential Task Force on International Strategy and its specific task was to examine the operation of the Office of International Cooperation, review the university policy on international activities, and to review the role of the Senate Committee on International Activities. A report was produced which recommended that the Office of International Cooperation be made a central clearing house for information about international activities in the University, and changes were recommended to the university policy on international activities and the role of SCIA. These will be brought to Senate for discussion likely in May.

Concern was expressed about the lack of information in the report with respect to the rationale for decisions being made about projects. Senate was advised that SCIA currently is advisory to the President and receives full documentation of projects prior to providing its advice to the President. There will be a change in this process once the new policy recommendations are brought to Senate and it will be easier for people to access more detailed information once the role of the Office of International Cooperation has been changed.

Reference was made to a recent news release about a joint project between Malaysia, Nortel and Simon Fraser University and inquiry was made as to why this project did not appear in the annual report before Senate. Senate was advised that the project is at the discussion stage among Nortel, the Faculty of Applied Sciences and the Multimedia University in Malaysia. If a Memorandum of Agreement can be reached, SCIA would consider it at that time.

The following Notice of Motion was submitted by R. Russell for the next meeting of Senate:

“that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that an external review of the Eastern Indonesia University Development

Project be undertaken. Senate further recommends that this review be completed by March 1, 1999"

ii) Paper S.98-24 - IUSEC Revisions (For Information)

Following a brief discussion about the number of students participating in exchange programs, and the membership of IUSEC in relation to SCIA, the report with respect to revisions to membership and terms of reference was received by Senate.

c) Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards & Bursaries

i) Paper S.98-25 - Annual Report (For Information)

John Pierce, member of Senate and Chair of SPCSAB, and Charlotte French, Director, Student Academic Resources were in attendance in order to respond to questions. J. D'Auria, current Chair of SPCSAB was also in attendance. ^{during the period covered by the annual report}

Reference was made to the Graduate Scholarship Program and concern was expressed about students who hold scholarships being allowed to work part-time. Senate was advised that students were originally prohibited from working while they held scholarships on the theory that they should concentrate full-time on their studies. However, the value of the award has not been able to provide students with the assurance of full time support and allowing part-time employment was a suitable compromise.

Concern was expressed about the scholarship funds being reduced by an amount equal to donations and it was suggested that the scholarship fund should remain fixed. The Chair advised that he had agreed to a request from SPCSAB that there be a moratorium on such reductions for five years.

In response to an inquiry about the relationship between offers accepted and offers declined on page 7 of the report, and whether these have changed over time, Senate was advised that the numbers are very consistent with past statistics.

d) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.98-26 - Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions - Faculty of Science (For Information)

Senate received information that SCUS, acting under delegated authority, approved minor changes to the Environmental Science Program, changes to existing courses in Biological Sciences and Earth Sciences; and vectors in various Chemistry and Physics courses were re-written so that the nominal hour of open workshop is designated as tutorial rather than laboratory.

- e) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Enrolment Management/Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
- i) Paper S.98-27 - Admission to Faculty

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by P. Bawa

“that Senate approve, and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.98-27, the principle of admitting students directly to Faculties for 98-3 and subsequent semesters”

D. Gagan provided Senate with a brief introduction in which he pointed out that the proposal does not preclude students from the opportunity to experiment with and investigate various disciplines and subjects before deciding on a specialization or program. Faculties will be unable to assign all available spaces in specializations to new entries and consequently students will be able to apply to move into those specializations when they are qualified to do so. Similarly, students will not be restricted from applying to transfer to another program (if qualified) should their aspirations change. From an academic perspective, the establishment of specific admission requirements germane to a program's requirements will allow students to be better prepared for entry - and for faculties to select new students on the basis of appropriate academic preparation. From an administrative perspective, having defined enrolment targets and quotas for programs and Faculties will assist in the planning of course spaces and the corresponding assignment of teaching resources.

L. Boland read a prepared statement to Senate strongly opposing the proposal because he felt it would not solve any of the problems that are alleged to exist and it would have an adverse affect on the long standing and successful liberal pedagogy traditional to SFU. SFU students have been given the opportunity to shop around the university before committing to a specific major or Faculty in order to learn what kind of education they might be most interested in pursuing. Opinion was expressed that direct admission will have a negative impact on these students and will constrain their choices.

Concern was expressed by several Senators that barriers would result in transfers between Faculties. It was pointed out that spaces would always be kept available for transfers and it should not be difficult for Faculties to handle students wishing to transfer in. Concern was also expressed that priority for course registration will be extended to the first and second year courses thus restricting opportunities for students to get into courses needed to qualify for transfer to another Faculty. Opinion was expressed that should barriers start to arise, Senate should be consulted about the problem as opposed to setting up an administrative procedure to handle the issue without Senate's input/approval. Inquiry was made about whether or not there would be enrolment space for students not admitted to the Faculty in a course offered at the 100-level which was a requirement for the major program. Senate was assured that sufficient space would be left available for students who may wish to transfer and need the course to qualify.

Inquiry was made about the impact of this proposal on academic advising and the existing admission procedure which is now centrally handled by the Registrar's Office. Senate was informed that students who are admitted directly to a Faculty or program will generally be advised by that Faculty/Department, students who are still considering a number of options will continue to get assistance from the Academic Resource office. With respect to admissions, the Registrar's Office (Admissions) will work cooperatively with departments on selecting students but admission decisions will rest with the Faculty. Approval of majors now rests with each Faculty and this proposal just moves the process back a step and spreads out the workload.

In response to an inquiry as to what would happen if a Faculty did not meet their admission target, Senate was informed that SFU currently has more applications than can be admitted so this not expected to be a problem. However, if it should occur then the relationship between a Faculty's enrolment pattern and its resources would have to be addressed over a period of time.

Opinions expressed in favour of the proposal included the ability to better balance workload and resources, the ability to attract high quality students, especially into highly competitive programs, stability for students in the planning of their course of study, and the ability to better inform students as to their chances of gaining acceptance into programs of their choice.

Discussion turned to the issue of managing the direct admission process, and inquiry was made as to how specific Faculty targets would be set and how growth for each Faculty determined. It was pointed out that growth now is the result of either competitive planning through the Academic Enhancement Fund or new funding being received from the Ministry which, at the present time, is not forthcoming. At some point, universities might not only be given enrolment targets but they might be required to admit specific numbers of students into specific programs/faculties. However, expectations are that universities will continue to have what are now called productivity FTEs and if there is no funding for them, direct admission provides some control so that the burden is shared equitably across all Faculties. It was also noted that the Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning which has representatives from all Faculties, sets and recommends enrolment targets to SCAP and Senate.

Brief discussion continued in which the issue of transferability was again raised and suggestion was made that the model in Business Administration be followed so that a smaller fraction of students could be admitted directly while leaving a much greater space for other students.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- f) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

i) Paper S.98-28 - Undergraduate Admission Targets for 1998/99

Motion #1:

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the undergraduate admission targets for each basis-of-admission group and for each semester in 1998/99 as set out below and that SCAP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall enrolment targets and based on actual enrolment experience in 1998-2 and 1998-3.

	Admission Targets for New Students			
	<u>1998-2</u>	<u>1998-3</u>	<u>1999-1</u>	<u>Total</u>
B.C. Gr. XII	50	1,650	50	1,750
B.C. College	375	675	350	1,400
Other	<u>250</u>	<u>775</u>	<u>325</u>	<u>1,350</u>
Total Intake	675	3,100	725	4,500"

In order to match the provincially funded FTE target, the intake of new students would have to be reduced from 5,072 admitted last year to 4,250. The Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning felt that this reduction in the number of new students was too steep and would significantly raise admission averages and would induce an enrolment perturbation that would take several years to move through the year levels. The Committee therefore moved to raise intake targets to 4,500 students. The 250 additional students would be admitted in 1998-3 and would be allocated to the Faculties by the Vice-President Academic in consultation with the Deans.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion #2

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by P. Percival

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the undergraduate admission targets to each Faculty as set out in the table below and that SCAP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall enrolment targets and based on actual enrolment experience in 1998-2 and 1998-3.

<u>Faculty/BOA</u>	<u>1998-2</u>	<u>1998-3</u>	<u>1999-1</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Applied Science</u>				
B.C. Gr.XII	5	154	15	174
B.C. College	20	39	35	94
Other	<u>15</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>93</u>
Total	40	246	75	361

<u>Faculty/BOA</u>	<u>1998-2</u>	<u>1998-3</u>	<u>1999-1</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Arts</u>				
B.C. Gr.XII	40	931	15	986
B.C. College	300	476	280	1,056
Other	<u>205</u>	<u>447</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>862</u>
Total	545	1,854	505	2,904
<u>Business Administration</u>				
B.C. Gr.XII	0	65	5	70
B.C. College	15	15	10	40
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	15	80	15	110
<u>Education</u>				
B.C. Gr.XII	0	0	0	0
B.C. College	0	0	0	0
Other	<u>20</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>200</u>
Total	20	120	60	200
<u>Science</u>				
B.C. Gr.XII	5	400	15	420
B.C. College	40	70	25	135
Other	<u>10</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>120</u>
Total	55	550	70	675
<u>University</u>				
B.C. Gr.XII	50	1,550	50	1,650
B.C. College	375	600	350	1,325
Other	<u>250</u>	<u>700</u>	<u>325</u>	<u>1,275</u>
Total	675	2,850	725	4,250

Note: 250 additional students will be admitted in 1998-3 and will be allocated to the Faculties by the Vice-President Academic in consultation with the Deans."

In response to an inquiry as to why Faculty targets were included for 98-2, Senate was advised that by establishing a total target for the year and targets for 98-3 and 99-1, the residual is the intake for 98-2.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

g) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.98-29 - Annual Report (For Information)

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

6. Other Business

i) Paper S.98-30 - Draft Statement of Purpose (For Discussion)

Introducing discussion on the draft statement, D. Gagan explained that the Government has commenced an accountability program, now called performance management program, for the public sector. Typically, in the public sector performance management means accounting for the productivity - both in terms of quantity and quality - that is generated with the resources provided. A protocol has been signed between the University Presidents' Council of British Columbia and the Ministry which establishes a process whereby the Vice-Presidents Academic will negotiate with the Ministry an acceptable process of accountability for the university system within the Government's performance management requirement. The Board of Governors of each university will be the validating body that reports to the Ministry whether or not the University is achieving its stated purposes. The level of accountability between the Board and the Ministry will be based on each university's unique mission/purpose. The draft statement before Senate has been prepared within this context and consists of objectives (listed on the left hand side of the page) and explanations (listed on the right hand side of the page) of what each of those objectives mean from SFU's unique perspective. The draft was presented to Senate for consideration and input.

Concern was expressed that the wording in Point Five implies that the activities described are perhaps more central to the University than excellence to research. Suggestion was made that the word defined could be changed to 'an institution able to respond to' but it was pointed out that the statement only deals with student accessibility as noted by the words on the left side of the page.

Reference was made to Point Two which, in an earlier version, made reference to the tutorial system when talking about effective and innovative instruction employing a variety of teaching methods, and concern was raised that this reference had been deleted in this new version. Also, in an earlier version several points included reference to the value and support of employees and students. This has been deleted and opinion was expressed that the reference was worth including in some form or another.

J. Morris read a written response submitted by the Student Society to an earlier draft of the Statement of Purpose which included several concerns and questions about specific points and apparent omissions. Specifically, nothing is included about the importance of democratic governance structures, or the significant involvement of all members of the community in decision-making processes. Standards need to be set and enforced in departments across the university on issues such as quality, democracy in governance, and the fair treatment of all members of the university community, and the university should be committed to a high standard of ethics both in its treatment of its own community members and in its involvement with the outside community. While educational technology is emphasized in the draft, it must be restricted to ways that improve and vitalize the research, teaching and learning environments at SFU. Statements

relating to these issues were felt by SFSS to be worthwhile for inclusion in the University's Statement of Purpose.

It was noted that a variety of different verbs were used throughout the document for different paragraphs and the issue was raised as to whether they were used with specific intent. It was suggested that more careful consideration be given to the precise wording.

Several Senators commented positively that the Statement of Purpose begins with a reference to research and teaching being the two main activities of the University. However, concern was expressed about the text to the left of the first statement and whether the word "consolidate" conveys the appropriate sentiment.

The Chair indicated that Senate's comments, concerns, and suggestion will be taken into consideration and expectations are that a revised draft will be presented to Senate in May for further consideration prior to the statement going to the Board of Governors for approval.

ii) Report of meeting with Chair of SCUB

L. Boland, Chair of SCUB, reported that SCUB had met with the President and discussed budget principles and the process and schedule for budget preparation. SCUB will discuss the specific three-year plans of VPs and Deans and then provide advice to the President.

The Chair wished to add that he had undertaken to provide SCUB with all the same questions and items sent to VPs and Deans for advice on both the recurring and non-recurring budget.

iii) Paper S.98-31 - G. Kirczenow motion re SCUB

Moved by G. Kirczenow, seconded by A. Chan

"that the Senate Committee on University Budget establish guidelines to be followed by the administration in communicating budgetary information to SCUB"

G. Kirczenow explained that the motion was before Senate because of the apparent communication barrier between SCUB and the administration and he felt it would be useful if some kind of framework could be established for communicating information to SCUB.

Opinion was expressed that the motion contravened the intention of the University Act for establishing a budget committee which the Act defines as being advisory to the President. The committee therefore is not a regulatory body and does not have the power to dictate to the administration what information it receives. It was pointed out, however, that SCUB's terms of reference specify that SCUB must maintain an overview and familiarity with the operating and capital

funds of the university and therefore SCUB needs appropriate information in order to do that.

Brief discussion ensued with regard to SCUB's role in relation to decentralization of the budget. Opinion was expressed that SCUB should have access to the budget as a whole so that they can obtain an overview of the budget and can offer advice on important financial matters which may impact the University as a whole.

A suggestion to change the motion as follows was accepted as a friendly amendment:

"that the Senate Committee on University Budget develop guidelines to be negotiated with the administration about communicating budgetary information to SCUB"

The Chair reiterated his intent to share fully with SCUB all matters for which he requests advice from Vice-Presidents and Deans and, if SCUB wished to provide advice on other matters within the President's jurisdiction, they were welcome to do so.

Question was called, and a vote taken. MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

iv) G. Kirczenow presented the following Notice of Motion for the next meeting of Senate:

"that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that the procedures for the recommendation and selection of candidates for president of SFU be reviewed and that a revised version be brought to Senate for discussion and approval at least twelve months before the next presidential search begins"

v) In response to a concern about process and an inquiry with regard to a review of the existing policy on research ethics, Senate was advised that the Vice-President Research is no longer Chair of the Research Ethics Review Committee. That responsibility has been delegated to a member of the Committee. It was also noted that once the Tri-Council policy has been established (probably in April) universities in general, including SFU, will be reviewing their policy on research involving human participants. Expectations are that the review process will include wide consultation, including Senate, in the hope of arriving at a much better policy.

7. Information

The next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate will take place on Monday, April 6, 1998.

The Open Session adjourned at 9:50 pm and moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, Secretariat Services