

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on Monday, April 6,
1998 at 5:30 pm in Room 3210 West Mall Centre

Open Session

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair

Absent:

Bawa, Parveen
Beattie, Suzan
Blackman, Roger (representing J. Pierce)
Boland, Larry
Bowman, Marilyn
Chan, Albert
Clayman, Bruce
Cleveland, William
D'Auria, John
Emmott, Alan
Jones, Colin
Kanevsky, Lannie
Kirczenow, George
Lewis, Brian
Marteniuk, Ron
Morris, Joy
Osborne, Judith
Overington, Jennifer
Parmar, Neelam
Percival, Paul
Peterson, Louis
Russell, Robert
Sanghera, Balwant
Selman, Mark
Tam, Lawrence
Waterhouse, John
Winne, Phil
Wortis, Michael

Baert, Jessica
Barrow, Robin
Berggren, Len
Blazenko, George
Coleman, Peter
Dobb, Ted
Dunsterville, Valerie
Etherington, Lois
Gagan, David
Giffen, Ken
Gillies, Mary Ann
Hassan, Nany
Ho, Lawrence
Jones, John
Mathewes, Rolf
Mauser, Gary
McInnes, Dina
Naef, Barbara
Nip, Harry
Ogloff, James
Reed, Clyde
Segal, Joseph
Warsh, Michael
Wickstrom, Norman
Wong, Tim
Yagi, Ian
Wong, Tim

In attendance:

Knockaert, Joseph
Rieckhoff, Klaus
Tammings, Philip

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services/Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, Secretariat Services
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

The Chair noted the election of Lawrence Ho to Senate as a Student Senator to fill an existing vacancy until May 31, 1998; and recognized the presence of Klaus Rieckhoff, former Senator and former Board member.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Due to time constraints of the resource person attending to speak to item 6-c, the Chair suggested that 6-c be dealt with prior to 6-a and 6-b. Following this minor adjustment, the Agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of March 2, 1998

Referring to page 4, Senate paper S.98-25, J. D'Auria requested that the Minutes clarify that J. Pierce was Chair of SPCSAB during the period covered by the annual report and that the present Chair of the committee is J. D'Auria. The Chair noted that the Minutes would be amended accordingly.

Referring to the discussion in the second paragraph on page 9, concern was expressed that the Minutes did not accurately reflect discussion wherein it was suggested that the word 'defined' should be replaced. Senate was advised that all of the concerns and comments raised by Senate were considered. The revised Statement of Purpose will be brought back to Senate for further consideration in May.

Following the above amendment/clarifications, the Minutes were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the Minutes.

4. Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that although the general nature of the budget has been announced, the actual budget letter which activates the process of discussion and allocation has not yet been received.

5. Reports of Committees

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

i) Faculty of Applied Sciences
Paper S.98-32 - Computing Science Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that SCUS, acting under delegated authority, approved a proposal for a two-year pilot project designed specifically for non-computing students to allow them to obtain essential software knowledge and skills. The project consists of two existing courses and the following new course: CMPT 118 which was also approved for addition to the list of elective courses for the Certificate in Computing Studies.

- b) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Graduate Studies Committee
- i) Paper S.98-33 - Senate Graduate Studies Committee - Revision to Membership

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve the recommendation that the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies be added as an ex-officio voting member of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee"

Amendment moved by L. Boland, seconded by G. Kirczenow

"to insert the word 'non' before the word 'voting'

B. Clayman briefly explained the organization of the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and advised that the position of Associate Dean of Graduate Studies is a position of significant responsibility in the University. He felt it was appropriate for a person holding this position to be a voting member of the SGSC, and advised that the SGSC overwhelmingly supported the motion. Opinion was expressed that it was inappropriate to give administrators votes on committees making decisions on behalf of academic units.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

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

MOTION CARRIED

- ii) Faculty of Applied Sciences

- i) Paper S.98-34 - Communication Graduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the SGSC, acting under delegated authority, approved the following new courses: CMNS 891 and 892; changes to the Comprehensive Exams; and minor changes to existing graduate Communication courses.

- ii) Paper S.98-35 - Resource and Environmental Management Graduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the SGSC, acting under delegated authority, approved changes to Required and Elective course requirements; change in wording for the Ph.D. degree requirements; and minor changes to existing graduate REM courses.

iii) Faculty of Artsi) Paper S.98-36 - Economics Graduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the SGSC, acting under delegated authority, approved revisions to the Ph.D. dissertation procedures.

ii) Paper S.98-37 - Master of Publishing Program Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the SGSC, acting under delegated authority, approved new courses: PUB 605, 606, 607, 898; an increase in course work for the degree from 40 credit hours to 43 credit hours; and minor revisions to existing graduate Publishing courses. Brief discussion took place with respect to the increase of credit hours for course work. Senate was advised that the increase resulted from the introduction of the new courses and a rearrangement of credits of existing courses to better suit the needs of the program.

6.

Other Businessc) Paper S.98-40 - Motion re CJSF Radio

Moved by J. Morris, seconded by A. Chan

"that Senate supports CJSF Radio's application to the CRTC for an FM license"

Philip Tamminga, Program Coordinator, CJSF Radio was in attendance in order to respond questions.

In response to questions about the operation of the radio station and how the expanded license will impact students, Senate was advised that funding for the radio station comes primarily from the Student Activity fee, a proportion of which is dedicated to CJSF. Additional funding will not be requested from students or from the University. CJSF is operated by the Simon Fraser Campus Radio Society, a non-profit registered society under the Societies Act in BC. The station is currently designated and licensed by the CRTC as a campus community radio station with a mandate to provide services to students and the SFU community. Policy is determined largely through the membership which is a volunteer organization (with the exception of two paid staff) and conforms with the policies of the CRTC. Programming in terms of music emphasizes local musicians, particularly SFU artists, and public affairs and news programming emphasizes SFU's academic achievements. The radio station is seen as a link between Burnaby mountain and the surrounding community and provides opportunities for students and community members to gain media access and media training skills.

The Chair informed Senate that he had personally written a letter of support which did not include any implication or expectation of financial support.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY
CARRIED

- a) Paper S. 98-38 - R. Russell motion re Eastern Indonesia University Development Project

Moved by R. Russell, seconded by L. Peterson

"that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that an external review of the Eastern Indonesia University Development Project be undertaken and completed by March 1, 1999. The purpose of the review is three-fold:

1. To determine what academic benefits SFU has accrued as a result of the EIUDP
2. To see if the Simon Fraser University Policy on International Activities has been adhered to by the EIUDP
3. To see if the stated goals of the EIUDP have been met"

J. Knockaert, Director of the Office of International Cooperation, and K. Rieckhoff, former Senator and past member of the Board of Governors, were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that the EIUDP is a CIDA funded international development project which was awarded to Simon Fraser University in 1988 and was reviewed and renewed in 1993. The mandate of the project was to strengthen the teaching programs, primarily in the basic sciences, in a number of Eastern Indonesia universities and to promote the establishment of long term linkages between SFU and Indonesian campuses. There were five universities in Indonesia and SFU was actively engaged in partnerships with a number of other Canadian universities who assisted SFU in the project. The EIUDP is one of the largest CIDA funded development projects to be operated through a university and SFU's role was to coordinate activities such as sending faculty to Indonesia to give seminars/workshops and short courses and placing Indonesian graduate students from the project in Canadian university programs.

R. Russell emphasized his view that the people who have worked on the project have all been well intentioned. However he felt an external review was necessary because of the concerns many other people have about the project and about the way it has been run, including concerns about the previous internal review by SCIA, and SFU's involvement with the Indonesian Government. Questions have also been raised about whether or not academic standards in the program were being met in accordance with university policy, and what long term benefits were being accrued to the university.

It was noted that the issue of SFU's involvement with governments such as the one in Indonesia was an issue more fittingly concluded in a discussion of SFU's policy

on international activities. Expectations are that Senate will be receiving a revision of this policy soon.

Several members of SCIA expressed opinion that the questions raised in the motion were sound and deserved to be addressed, but concern was raised about the appropriateness of referring this matter to the Board of Governors. Suggestion was made that referral to SCIA would be more appropriate since at least two of the questions fell within the academic jurisdiction of Senate. It was noted that while SCIA did not have the resources or the depth/breadth on its membership to conduct the review itself, it could arrange for a review by selecting a committee with an appropriate membership which could include both internal and external members.

Senate was provided with a history of the project by K. Rieckhoff who indicated that at the time of the review in 1993, concerns were raised about the academic qualifications of the Indonesian participants in the program, the lack of information/consultation with the Board and the university community, and the review processes conducted both by CIDA and internally. Many people felt that members of SCIA who reviewed the project had conflicts of interest with the project, and that the positive ranking by CIDA of the project was flawed because participants who were receiving considerable funding from the project were not likely to criticize the program when consulted during the review process.

The following motion was moved by J. Overington as an amendment but the Chair ruled against it because it was not germane to the main motion and suggested that it be presented as a notice of motion for a subsequent meeting:

"that Senate recommend to the Senate Committee on International Activities that procedures through which international projects are developed and approved are reviewed and are amended to include more input from the campus community"

Senate was advised that CIDA itself will be undertaking a monitoring of the project in May 1998 and will be organizing a final review of the project in the year 2000. Opinion was expressed that although it was important that the questions in the motion be addressed, an external review conducted by the University would be expensive and might not be the best process. CIDA is not likely to be convinced to include questions of particular interest to SFU, although it might be prepared to look at the issue of academic benefits. Opinion was expressed that a CIDA review would not serve the same needs of the University and an external review should be independent of both CIDA and SCIA. Concern was expressed that the motion spoke against Senate and its subcommittee process and that if broader input for every project were to be undertaken the process would become unworkable.

Opinion was expressed that the main motion, if passed, concedes Senate's jurisdiction to the Board of Governors, implies a lack of confidence in one of Senate's subcommittees, and sets a dubious precedent.

Amendment moved by J. Osborne, seconded by A. Chan

"that Senate review the Eastern Indonesia University Development Project to be completed by March 1, 1999.... "

It was noted that the rest of the motion would remain. SCAR would then decide the appropriate subcommittee structure, and the external review process and membership issues.

Suggestion was made that the composition and terms of reference of the review committee be subject to the approval of Senate. Since the amendment specified that Senate undertake the review, the Chair assured Senate that this was implicit in the amendment.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Opinion was expressed that point three was too broad in scope and should be curtailed to focus on SFU's interest.

Amendment moved by P. Winne, seconded by B. Sanghera

"that the words 'with respect to Simon Fraser University's interest' be appended to the end of point 3"

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Suggestion was made that it would be appropriate for the reviewers to consider how such projects in the future might be improved to enhance the university, its mission and benefits to the institution. The Chair advised that Senate's comments concerning a review and a review committee will be taken under consideration by SCAR.

In response to an inquiry as to whether CIDA could provide funding for a review, Senate was informed that CIDA would not pay for a review initiated by the university. If the University were interested, however, it might be willing to include a representative appointed by SFU as part of their evaluation team.

In response to previous comments that implied that the program had deficiencies, J. D'Auria noted that the Chemistry Department was a strong contributor to the program and he personally had been in Indonesia and felt that the program was a success and faculty members had achieved good results.

On the assumption that the purpose of the current motion was to look at the University's involvement and to determine whether its stated goals had been met and to use the experience from this program as a guideline for future projects, it was suggested that the timing is inappropriate. Opinion was expressed that the

deadline date should be after CIDA has done the data gathering and completed its review. The University review committee would then benefit from the work done by CIDA and have this information available in order to make a better decision as to whether the project was successful, whether it was run in a responsible manner, and what, if any, lessons can be drawn from it.

Amendment moved by M. Wortis, seconded by C. Jones

"that the deadline date be changed from March 1, 1999 to a time following the final CIDA evaluation of the project"

It was noted that the costs for an external review for a project of this size would be considerable and in view of the current budgetary situation, it made better sense to minimize costs to the university by benefiting from the data in the CIDA review. Although there would be some beneficial material, opposition was expressed with regard to waiting and using information from an international development agency. The University needs to be responsible and review its own academic standards and policies.

In response to an inquiry as to how long CIDA reviews traditionally take, Senate was advised that the process could take six months.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

The main motion, as amended was read

"that Senate review the Eastern Indonesia University Development Project following the final CIDA evaluation of the project. The purpose of the review is three-fold:

1. To determine what academic benefits SFU has accrued as a result of the EIUDP.
2. To see if the Simon Fraser University Policy on International Activities has been adhered to by the EIUDP.
3. To see if the stated goals of the EIUDP have been met with respect to SFU's interests."

The Chair noted that it was also understood that the terms of reference of the review will come back to Senate for approval.

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

MAIN MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

b) Paper S.98-39 - G. Kirzcenow motion re Presidential Search Procedures

Moved by G. Kirzcenow, seconded by R. Russell

"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"

Concern was expressed about the size and the membership make up of the search committee. Opinion was expressed that it would be difficult for a committee of this size to function properly and the majority of the members were non-academic. Since the current Chair of the Board promised to follow procedures to the letter when making the next Presidential appointment, it was felt that the membership and the terms of reference should be reviewed prior to that time.

Background information was provided to Senate with respect to process and rationale of the previous joint Board/Senate committee decisions which had established the current committee and terms of reference. It was stressed that the search committee was intended to be representative of the campus community, and it was noted that the academic community formed the largest proportion on the committee.

Opinion was expressed that any review should be a joint review by Senate and the Board of Governors, and any revisions would have to be approved by both bodies.

Amendment moved by P. Percival, seconded by R. Marteniuk

"that the word 'jointly' be inserted in the third line before the word 'reviewed', and the words 'and the Board of Governors' be inserted in the fourth line following the word 'Senate'

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

It was pointed out that the current set of terms of reference and procedures have never been used and opposition was expressed about revising the committee at this point.

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

MAIN MOTION (AS AMENDED)
FAILED

7. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, May 11, 1998.

The Open Session adjourned at 7:00 pm and moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, Secretariat Services