

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on  
Monday, November 5, 2001 in Room 3120 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair

Aloi, Santa  
Atkins, Stella  
Bawa, Parveen  
Chan, Albert  
Clayman, Bruce  
Collins-Dodd, Colleen  
Copeland, Lynn  
D'Auria, John  
Driver, Jon  
Dunsterville, Valerie  
Gerson, Carole  
Gill, Alison  
Grimmett, Peter  
Jackson, Margaret  
Krane, Bill  
Lewis, Brian  
Mathewes, Rolf (representing W. Davidson)  
McFetridge, Paul  
Muirhead, Leah  
Percival, Paul  
Peters, Joseph  
Pierce, John  
Reich, Blaize (representing E. Love)  
Russell, Robert  
Sekhon, Devinder  
Steinbach, Christopher  
Stephenson, Brock  
Tansey, Caralyn  
Van Aalst, Jan  
Waterhouse, John  
Weldon, Larry  
Wessel, Sylvia  
Wortis, Michael  
Yerbury, Colin

Absent: Barrow, Robin  
Budra, Paul  
Chang, Jack  
Delgrande, James  
Dempster, Peter  
Gupte, Jaideep  
Hauerland, Norbert  
Heaney, John  
Hill, Ross  
Jensen, Britta  
Jones, John  
Klymson, Sarah  
Mauser, Gary  
McArthur, James  
McInnes, Dina  
Naef, Barbara  
Paterson, David  
Sirri, Odai  
Smith, Michael  
Thandi, Ranbir  
Warren, Joel  
Wong, Milton

In attendance:  
Khan Hemani, Rummana  
Winston, Mark

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

On behalf of Senate, the Chair welcomed the following new student members to Senate: Christopher Steinbach and Brock Stephenson.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of September 17, 2001

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

In response to a question raised at the last meeting with respect to declining scholarship funding, Senate was advised that the budget for scholarships, awards and bursaries had increased regularly except for a two year period 1998-2000 when it remained the same. The fluctuation in the report reflected an overspending at the graduate level in one year and a reduction in the subsequent year to compensate for the over expenditure. It was pointed out that the budget was based on the fiscal year whereas scholarships, awards and bursaries were handed out on the academic year. Therefore, it was difficult to reconcile the two budgets. In addition, there is one award which is available to every graduate student and since students may accept the award at any time during their studies, there was no way to accurately determine how much would be spent in any given year.

An update on the status of the process with respect to the Woodsworth Chair was requested. Senate was informed that a recommendation from the Department of Humanities had been submitted to the Dean of Arts. The Dean forwarded the recommendation together with comments to the Office of the Vice President Academic who in turn added comments and forwarded the file to the University Appointments Committee. The UAC was scheduled to meet shortly to consider the case.

4. Report of the Chair

Following up on his report from the last meeting with respect to Government relations and the impact of the New Era document, the Chair reported that a budget preparation framework was announced by the Minister of Finance which favoured Health and Education in that their budgets would remain the same for three years while other Ministries faced very major cuts. The Chair stressed that this still caused serious operational difficulties for universities since zero percent increases did not take into account the annual rate of inflation and compensation commitments already made with employee groups under a mandate set up by the previous Government. Another serious issue for the universities was research infrastructure costs that needed to be covered on an ongoing basis. Senate's attention was drawn to two possible ways of accommodating these pressures – draconian cuts within the Ministry itself and within the University system in areas deemed not to be financially sustainable, and increased tuition fees. However, there had been no indication from the Ministry as to how they intend to address these issues.

5. Question Period

A question was submitted by P. Percival about specifying meeting times in the call for nominations for the University Tenure Committee and Search Committee for the Associate Vice President Academic. He noted that the Friday time automatically excluded a significant number of faculty members, especially from the Faculty of Science, who had classes on Fridays. It was pointed out that departments in the Faculty of Science have a structured sequence of course offerings with no flexibility to readjust teaching times.

Senate was advised that the practice dated back to 1995/96 and was necessary, particularly in the case of the University Tenure Committee, to complete its schedule of activities on time according to policy, and in the case of large search committees, to reduce the amount of administrative time necessary to schedule meeting times for such a large group of people. Fridays was believed to be the lightest day for scheduled classes and would therefore exclude the least number of faculty members.

The Vice President Academic stated that he was prepared to review the frequency of class commitments by half days during the week and if a day was found to better accommodate the teaching schedules of more faculty members, he would be prepared to take a look at it. Opinion was expressed that the original wording of the statement was less severe than current wording. Senate was informed that the wording had likely been changed to provide clarification.

Further questions were posed about tuition fees. The Chair answered that SFU had not considered a task force to deal with the budget prediction. Furthermore, the University had not explicitly advocated for tuition increases.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.01-61 (Revised) – Elections

The following are the results of elections to Senate Committees. There were insufficient nominations to fill all positions; vacancies will be carried over and brought forward to the next meeting of Senate.

International Student Exchange Committee (ISEC)

One student to replace W. Gerwel for term of office to May 31, 2002.

Candidates: M. Esmail, R. She

Elected: Rong She

Research Ethics Board (REB)

Three Faculty or Staff members for the period to May 31, 2004.

Elected by acclamation: Adrienne Drobnies

One Student for the period to May 31, 2003.  
Candidates: W. Gibbons, J. Perry

Elected: Wendy Gibbons

Senate Appeals Board (SAB)

One (at-large) Faculty Member (Alternate) to replace M. Hahn for term of office to May 31, 2002.

Elected by acclamation: John Bechhoefer

Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals (SCODA)

One Student (Alternate) to replace W. Gerwel for term of office to May 31, 2002.  
Candidates: M. Marchand, R. Peters, H. Yang

Elected: Randy Peters

Senate Graduate Awards Adjudication Committee (SGAAC)

One (at-large) Faculty Member to replace C. Kenny for term of office to August 31, 2002.

Elected by acclamation: Colin Jones

Senate Library Committee (SLC) and Library Penalties Appeal Committee (LPAC)

One Graduate Student (Alternate) for term of office to May 31, 2002.

Elected by acclamation: Jennifer Perry

Senate also received information that the October elections to Senate Committees proceeded along the announced timelines despite the cancellation of the October Senate meeting. All candidates were declared elected by acclamation on October 1, 2001 as shown in Senate paper S.01-61 Revised.

B) Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries

i) Paper S.01-62 – Annual Report (For Information)

Rummana Khan Hemani, Acting Director, Student Academic Resources, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Concern was expressed that SFU students appeared to be amongst the highest users of financial assistance programs even though SFU's tuition fees were amongst the lowest in the country. Opinion was expressed that financial demand increased when students were unable to find employment so this might be a reflection of the local economic situation.

A question about increases in scholarship funding led to the clarification that there had been a gradual increase reflecting the increase in enrolments but more funding was required, especially for bursaries.

Reference was made to graphs on pages 7 and 8, and questions posed as to whether non-university contributions in financial aid were included. Senate was

informed that the information reflected the operating budget and did not include endowments.

C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.01-63 – Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue Undergraduate Semester

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate approve the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue Undergraduate Semester program on a pilot basis for a two-year period”

Mark Winston, Department of Biological Sciences, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Questions were raised about the day to day operation of the program. Senate was advised that the program would follow the normal system of letter grades. Since the program would likely be connected administratively to Continuing Studies, students would have access to appeal mechanisms. The role of the Advisory Board was primarily advisory but the Board may also be involved in student selection and other matters.

Reference was made to the workload of the Director and concern was expressed about the balance between teaching and fundraising responsibilities. It was pointed out that the Director was scheduled to teach a course one semester a year which would leave the other semesters free for fundraising activities.

Senate was reminded that this was a pilot program and many of the day to day mechanics would be worked out over the trial period.

Opinion was expressed that the program, because it was designed for a small elite group of students and faculty, would be very expensive in comparison to other undergraduate programs. In view of the current financial situation, concern was raised whether the cost was justifiable. Senate was informed that the program was not narrowly focussed and would bring students with diverse roles and interests from all Faculties together. The cost of the program in the long term was not justified unless outside funding was found. The pilot stage would provide opportunity to secure outside funding which was already being aggressively pursued. To be offered beyond the pilot stage, the program must become largely self sustaining. The two year pilot program received non-recurring funding from the Strategic Initiatives Fund.

Reference was made to the course requiring students to prepare an article for publication in a national magazine. It was suggested that most faculty and students were not familiar with this genre and a question was posed as to how that writing component would be taught. Senate was advised that the Publishing Program was closely involved with the Centre for Dialogue and there

was a strong component of skilled people in that program who would be involved with the writing course. The intent was also to bring in a wide range of skilled communicators to help students in this area. The focus on writing and communication skills was suggested to be a very powerful asset for the program.

Questions arose with respect to expansion and offering of the program on the Burnaby campus. Senate was advised that it was hoped that the program would eventually expand and broaden thus becoming much more accessible to more students. The program was not necessarily wedded to downtown and, as additional courses were offered, some courses might be located on campus, particularly during the summer, but it was very difficult to find space on campus. In response to a question about the amount of credit hours, fifteen credits was felt to be appropriate and reflect the fullness and intensity of the program.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.01-64 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Arts (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved curriculum revisions in the following departments/schools/programs: Archaeology, Contemporary Arts, Criminology, Geography, Gerontology, Humanities, Sociology and Anthropology/Latin American Studies, Women's Studies, Asia-Canada Program, Spanish Program, Economics, French, History, and Political Science.

Reference was made to the large number of Spanish courses that were being dropped. Senate was advised that the deletions were the completion of a restructuring plan with regard to Spanish and Latin American Studies which has been ongoing for the past several years. The courses were slated for deletion because of low student demand but were retained so existing students could complete their programs.

Detailed information was requested with respect to the change of credit hour for BUEC 333. It was noted that this course affected both Economics and Business students and question was raised if the change would be the same for both departments. Information was not at hand but the Dean of Arts indicated he would report back to Senate at the next meeting.

Secretary's Note: Section m) iii should be amended to read: Change of prerequisite for all 300 and 400 level History courses, excluding History 370, 375, 470, and 475.

D) Senate Committee on International Activities

i) Paper S.01-65 – Policy Revisions and Administrative Matters

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the revised Policy on International Activities – GP 23 dated September 11, 2001 to take effect immediately upon approval”

Concern was expressed about adding another administrator to the committee and having both the President and the Vice President Academic as ex-officio voting members. It was suggested that the President should not be a member of the committee that developed proposals which he ultimately had responsibility to approve/disapprove. Senate was informed that the inclusion of the President as Chair resulted from the recent reorganization in the area of International Activities. The Committee itself felt that because such a large number of items that it dealt with had direct academic/program implications, that the Vice President Academic should be involved in committee deliberations. The Chair indicated that he would not chair the committee personally but intended to appoint a designate from outside his office, likely a member of the senior administration with strong international interests and experience. In the end it was agreed that the committee membership would remain as presented (with both the President and Vice President as members) and if experience suggested a further revision, that would be done.

Clarification was requested with respect to quorum. Senate was advised that the committee presently has nine voting members so the quorum would be five.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

E) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.01-66 – Centre for Labour Studies

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the reclassification of the Centre for Labour Studies as a Schedule A Centre under the direct authority of the Dean as outlined in S.01-66”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.01-67 – Research Professorships – Faculty of Business Administration

Moved by B. Reich, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve the Terms of Reference for the Dennis F. Culver Executive MBA Alumni Professorship and the Terms of Reference for the Weyerhaeuser Professorship in Change Management as outlined in S.01-67”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- F) Senate Graduate Studies Committee  
i) Paper S.01-68 – Revisions – Graduate General Regulations

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve the revised Graduate General Regulations, as set out in S.01-68, and that these regulations take effect 1<sup>st</sup> September 2002”

Further information was requested with respect to the practice of withholding theses. Senate was advised that the practice almost exclusively related to MBA projects in the Faculty of Business Administration where research projects involved the activities of a company and the company wanted the detailed information to be withheld from public availability for one year. Such requests were frequent and the Dean’s office regularly signs such agreements. After one year the information/thesis was released.

Discussion turned to Section 1.11.3. Senate’s attention was drawn to new wording at the bottom of page 40 that implied that the results of research would be made available freely to the public. This wording was added to ensure that students discuss confidentiality issues with respective collaborators prior to beginning their thesis, and it was hoped it would reduce the number of requests for confidentiality and expedite the movement of theses to the Library. A paragraph with respect to exceptional circumstances had also been added at the end of the same section in order to deal with a problem in the current regulations which required that theses be available to the university community prior to the defence. The intent of this wording was to ensure that the most confidential portions of the document would be withheld from public circulation. The complete version of the thesis would go to the examining committee and that copy would eventually be placed in the Library. The wording simply regularized current practice.

Reference was made to Section 1.3.4 with respect to the GPA requirement for admission to a doctoral program. Senate was advised that the policy established a minimum requirement but graduate programs were able to impose more stringent conditions if they wished.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- ii) Paper S.01-69 – Curriculum Revisions – Graduate Diploma in Advanced Professional Studies in Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved changes to the Graduate Diploma in Advanced Professional Studies in Education and minor changes to a variety of EDPR courses.



iii) Paper S.01-70 – Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved minor changes to EDUC 824 and 825.

G) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.01-71 – Revision to GP 29 – Search Committees for Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents

Alison Gill, Vice-Chair of Senate, assumed the position of Chair.

Moved by M. Stevenson, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the revision of policy GP 29 Search Committees for Vice-Presidents and Associate Vice-Presidents, as set out in S.01-71, and dated 16 October 2001”

Senate was advised that the revisions reflected the recent reorganization within the administration, the need to revise the policy with respect to the addition of new administrative positions, and to streamline the search committees for the Vice President Academic and the Associate Vice President Academic.

Clarification was requested with respect to the eligibility requirements for the representative selected by TSSU. Question was raised as to whether a graduate student ceased to be a member of TSSU when not teaching in a particular semester. Following brief discussion, the following suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment and would be added as a footnote to the policy:

‘Selected from current members of TSSU or from those who have held TSSU appointments within the past year’

In order to clarify that Section 7 referred to two positions, an ‘s’ was added to the word ‘committee’ in the title.

Reference was made to Section 3 (b), and a Senator asked whether the three new Associate Vice Presidents needed to be included. Senate was advised that an academic appointment was not a requirement for those positions and therefore did not need to be included. However, if an applicant for those positions had academic qualifications and wanted a continuing academic appointment the search committee would be free to pursue that issue.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Michael Stevenson resumed the position of Chair.

7. Other Business

i) Paper S.01-72 – President's Agenda (For comment and discussion)

Senate received information with respect to the President's objectives and priorities for the next year. Senate was advised that the document was required under Board policies affecting the appointment and review of the President. The President presented a brief overview of the document touching on academic programming, internationalization, the need for recruitment and retention of the best academic and non-academic staff, space and fundraising.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting is Monday, December 3, 2001.

Open Session adjourned at 8:50 pm. Following a brief recess, Senate moved into Closed Session.

Alison Watt  
Director, University Secretariat