

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, September 15, 2003 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present:

Stevenson, Michael
President and Chair of Senate

Apaak, Clement
Atkins, Stella
Beynon, Peter
Budd, James
Clayman, Bruce
Collinge, Joan (representing C. Yerbury)
Copeland, Lynn
da Silva, Gisele
Dickinson, John
D'Auria, John
Driver, Jon
Fung, Edward
Giacomantonio, Chris
Gill, Alison
Gordon, Robert
Gregory, Titus
Grimmett, Peter
Hauerland, Norbert
Heaney, John
Higgins, Anne
Hira, Andy
Honda, Barry
Horvath, Adam
Jones, Colin
Kalanj, Tiffany
Krane, Bill
Lemay, Joanna
Lewis, Brian
Love, Ernie
Mauser, Gary
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Plischke, Michael
Rozell, Sara
Sears, Camilla
Shaker, Paul
Smith, Don
Thandi, Ranbir
Vaisey, Jacques
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Dan
Wessel, Sylvia
Wong, Josephine
Woodbury, Rob

Absent:

Dunsterville, Valerie
Fizzell, Maureen
Gupta, Kamal
Kaila, Pam
McArthur, James
McFetridge, Paul
Naef, Barbara
Wong, Milton
Yoo, Rick

In attendance:

Anderson, Gail
Berube, Denis
Blackman, Roger
Brantingham, Paul
Dinning, Mike
Gotfrit, Martin
Hibbitts, Pat
Snitz, Ron

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

On behalf of Senate, the Chair welcomed the following newly elected Senators to their first meeting: Andy Hira, Barry Honda, and Dan Weeks.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of July 7, 2003

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

i) Referring to the recent announcement from the Provincial Government with respect to cuts to the operating grant of the university, the Chair explained that it would be a difficult and challenging year with regard to budget decisions. However, he assured Senate that the fullest possible information will be made available to the university community and reiterated his commitment to an intensive consultation process, including an investigation with respect to the impact of tuition increases on accessibility.

ii) Paper S. 03-72 – Annual Financial Statements for the Year Ended March 31, 2003
(For Information)

P. Hibbitts, Vice President Finance and Administration, and D. Berube, Director of Accounting Services, Department of Finance were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to the long term debt and an inquiry was made as to whether the amount reflected the costs of new student accommodation. Senate was advised that the outstanding debt for the new student residences was not reflected in the statement since it fell outside the reporting period and would be included next year's financial statements. In response to a question about the increase in Provincial revenue, Senate was advised that the increase resulted from the activities in Surrey and from the Double the Opportunity funding in which the university was required to admit extra students in Engineering and Computing Science. Clarification was requested with respect to the increase in expenses, especially professional fees. It was explained that salaries had increased and as salaries rose benefits rose and the price charged by the carrier had also increased. Fees such as audit and legal fees had increased. Professional fees had significantly increased mainly due to the implementation of the new student record system.

5. Question Period

The following questions submitted by C. Giacomantonio on behalf of the Student Senator Caucus were read into the Minutes.

Question 1

What is the University's response to the provincial government's "Mandates, Roles and Responsibilities" paper? In particular, what is the response to the possibilities of: changing the University governance structure; shifting accountability measures towards results-based accountability; and a shift from competition between institutions towards inter-university partnerships and what the paper calls "system initiatives"?

Question 2

Now that SFU will be a central development in the upcoming 2010 Olympics, will the University be creating an Advisory Committee to oversee or guide the development of the speed skating oval? When will this committee (or one like it) be created, and will there be student representatives on this committee?

Response to Question 1

The Chair reported that this issue had been discussed by The University Presidents' Council but its official response had not yet been completed and circulated to member organizations. The Chair indicated that he would try to summarize the nature of TUPC's response. The Presidents' Council is concerned about imitative behaviour in BC similar to that in Alberta where the Government is radically restructuring the University Act. The general response of TUPC will be to oppose significant change and argue that the University Act is based on long tradition which has allowed both for autonomy and good governance of universities.

There appears to be an interest on the part of the Government in greater system control and TUPC's response will be that that would not be in the best interest of the universities and would represent a step backward. With regard to shifting accountability measures towards results-based accountability, TUPC has already had considerable debate with the Ministry on that issue and is generally against a process by which the service plans of a Government become the guide to performance measurement in the universities with potential funding and other controls fine-tuned by this kind of performance-based measurement. However, at the same time, TUPC does not want to shirk the responsibility of public accountability with respect to performance. As a result TUPC's response would not be against accountability in principle, but would be opposed to the specification of university priorities through instruments like the Government service plan. With respect to inter-university partnerships and system initiatives, BC has a good record of very successful consortium partnership arrangements amongst institutions and TUPC's response will be that universities are not against such incentives in principle but are opposed to partnerships based solely on savings and system integration.

In general, TUPC has clearly indicated a suspicion of the process and opposes Government intrusion on the autonomy of universities to define their own academic planning priorities.

Response to Question 2

The Chair reported that an Olympic Legacy Committee would be established with representatives from the most affected users of the building. He asked the Associate Vice President Academic to provide more detailed information with respect to the envisioned membership. Senate was advised that Departments that would have an interest in the legacy, such as Kinesiology and Psychology, would be represented. In addition, it was likely that membership would include representation from Finance and Administration, the Director of Campus Planning and Development, the Vice President University Relations, and two student members, possibly a student from Athletics and Recreation and maybe a Student Senator.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.03-70 – Changes to Graduate General Regulations resulting from new tuition fee rules (Referred from July Meeting)

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate approve the changes to Graduate General Regulations 1.4, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 1.4.7, 1.8.4, 1.8.5, and 1.12.2 described in Senate paper S.03-70, and that Senate approve any renumbering of regulations required by these changes”

Moved by C. Sears, seconded by C. Apaak

“that the motion be tabled to the next meeting of Senate”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO TABLE FAILED

Senate was informed that there was considerable concern among graduate students with respect to the elimination of part-time study. Opinion was expressed that students needed to be better informed about the changes and the consequences of the change prior to Senate approval. The Dean of Graduate Studies presented statistics to Senate showing the number of full-time students versus part-time students in each Faculty. The majority of students would be able to continue to register as part-time because of the new way of collecting fees on a per credit basis. However there were a small number of students (9 in Applied Sciences, 24 in Arts, and 10 in Science) that would need to change from part-

time status to full-time status but these students could be dealt with on an individual basis. The effect of the change would therefore potentially disadvantage a very small percentage of graduate students while providing greater flexibility and more advantage to a very large number of students. In response to an inquiry as to why the change was necessary, Senate was advised that part of the reason was the introduction of the new student information system but ultimately the change would be much fairer and less cumbersome than the current system.

In response to an inquiry about the 'on leave' option now available to graduate students and whether the per credit fees would be uniform across the University, Senate was advised that the 'on leave' option would continue to be available and per credit fees would be set in consultation with academic departments/programs.

Moved by T. Kalanj, seconded by C. Giacomantonio

“that the motion be severed to allow each section to be considered seriatim”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO SEVER FAILED

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

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

The Chair suggested that a follow up consultation between the Dean of Graduate Studies and the student caucus take place to clarify the concerns of the students . Senate was advised that such a meeting had already been scheduled.

B) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.03-73 – Emergency Plan (For Information)

P. Hibbitts, Vice-President, Finance and Administration was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was informed that the emergency plan was partially motivated by the new Provincial BCERMS plan and therefore conforms to the standard format.

Following brief discussion, the plan was received by Senate.

ii) Paper S.03-74 – GP 26 Accessibility for Students with Disabilities Policy

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by G. Mauser

“that Senate approve, and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the revised policy GP 26 Accessibility for Students with Disabilities as set forth in S.03-74”

R. Snitz, Learning Specialist from the Centre for Students with Disabilities, and M. Dinning, Associate Dean of Student Services were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Concern was expressed about students having to bear the costs associated with documentation assessment, and opinion was expressed that this requirement may prohibit many students from accessing the services. An inquiry was made as to whether accommodations would be made for students who were not able to afford the tests. Senate was advised that, aside from the testing for learning disabilities, most other tests were covered by medicare plans. In the case of learning disabilities, the Provincial Government had a program in place where students with demonstrated financial need could receive up to 75% of the costs of the assessment as long as they were diagnosed with a moderate degree of learning disability.

Reference was made to Section 4.5, and concern was expressed about the appeal process. It was felt that having a case go from the Director of the Centre to the Associate Dean was problematic because of the reporting structure in which the Director ultimately reports to the Associate Dean. Some senators asked whether a more democratic process could be put in place to deal with appeals such as an advisory committee with student representation. In response it was suggested that a committee within the University might not have the expertise necessary to make qualified evaluations. The role of the Associate Dean was not to adjudicate appeals but to facilitate their resolution. When resolution was not possible, past practice was to refer the appeal outside the University to a third party who had the professional qualifications to evaluate the nature or the extent of the disability and the kind of accommodation that would be required. Students were given the choice of one of three individuals outside the University and all identification, including the University's initial assessment, was eliminated from the file. The University and the student agreed to abide by the external recommendation with the cost of the process borne by the University. In response to a question as to why this procedure was not included in the policy, it was explained that the document was a policy document rather than an operating document and it was felt that the day to day management of the policy process should not be included in a general policy statement. It was also noted that there might be a wide range of solutions available and that the majority of disputes were resolved to the satisfaction of the student without referral to a third party. Third party referral was only necessary in instances where resolution could not be reached.

A suggestion to delete the word 'final' and incorporate the phrase 'who will send the issue for third party resolution if unresolved' at the end of Section 4.5 was accepted as

a **friendly amendment** and the Chair indicated that appropriate wording would be worked out and reported back to Senate.

Secretary's Note: The following wording was substituted for Section 4.5: Where a student is dissatisfied or disagrees with the accommodations recommended by the Centre for Students with Disabilities, s/he should first meet with the Director to review her/his concerns. If the matter is not resolved at this level, the student can appeal to the Associate Dean, Student Services. If the Associate Dean is unable to reach an informal resolution with the student, the Associate Dean will seek a recommendation from an independent and qualified external third party who is mutually acceptable to both the student and the Associate Dean. In the event agreement on the third party cannot be reached between the Associate Dean and the student, the matter will be referred to the Dean of Student Services and Registrar. The Dean may consult as appropriate to determine the selection of the independent third party.

Question arose as to why the current policy was being amended and a lack of rationale for the document was mentioned. It was noted that the proposed policy focussed on policy issues rather than operating procedures and was much clearer and comprehensive and would better serve the needs of students.

It was noted that the policy encouraged faculty members to refer all requests for accommodation to the Centre rather than dealing with the requests themselves. Question rose as to how faculty were being informed of this change in process. Senate was advised that the Director of the Centre is in the process of contacting all academic departments/programs and asking the Chairs/Directors to inform their faculty members directly.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.03-75 – Motion 4, Senate Paper S.03-67 re base-budgeted resources for CFL positions and TA funding

Motion 1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Krane

“that Motion 4 of the SCEMP recommendation from the Course Accessibility Task Force be taken from the table”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate encourage the Vice-President, Academic to seek additional base-budgeted resources for CFL positions and TA funding”

A question was directed to the Vice-President Academic as to where he saw the additional funding coming from and specifically whether it would be taken from existing operating funds. The Vice-President Academic indicated that the motion simply directed him to carry out his responsibility to ensure that the quality of education provided to students was within funding constraints and directed him to ensure that there was an appropriate division of resources between the teaching and support functions of Faculties. The Vice-President Academic also assured Senate that whenever possible he has lobbied, and will continue to lobby, for increased funding for the University, particularly for teaching in academic programs.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.03-76 – Master’s of Pest Management External Review

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by N. Haunerland

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the proposal for a revised Master’s of Pest Management Program in the Department of Biological Sciences in the Faculty of Science as outlined in S. 03-76”

N. Haunerland, Senator and former Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

On behalf of Senate, the Chair thanked the Department of Biological Sciences and the members of SCUP for the successful resolution of the concerns associated with the previous SCUP recommendations.

Senate was advised that the program was off to a good start because of the generosity of one of the Founding Members of the original program, Dr. Thelma Finlayson, who has assured three Entrance Scholarships for graduate students.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to existing courses in Biological Sciences as part of the revision of the MPM program.

iii) Paper S.03-77 – External Review – School for the Contemporary Arts

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate concur with the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning the advice to the School for the Contemporary Arts on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.03-77”

M. Gotfrit, Director, School for the Contemporary Arts, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

The status of the possible development of facilities in downtown Vancouver was discussed. Senate was advised that the City of Vancouver had requested proposals for the future development of the Woodwards site and SFU had submitted a letter of intent which was very similar to previous submissions. Additionally, Chancellor Wong was in the process of assembling a committee to raise funds in support of the proposal. Concern was expressed that if financial support for the downtown campus option was not forthcoming by the end of the 2003/2004 academic year, the project would have to be abandoned. It was noted however that this was only a recommendation that underscored the urgency of getting a resolution, and the passage of the motion would result in a very strong requirement to report to Senate and the School at the end of the academic year, either that real progress was being made with the downtown proposal, or that an alternative solution needed to be found.

Reference was made to Item 15 of the report and opinion expressed that Interactive Arts and Technology in Surrey would also be open to partnership and ongoing collaboration with the School of Contemporary Arts.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iv) Paper S.03-78 – External Review – School of Criminology

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Pierce

“that Senate concur with the recommendations from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the School of Criminology on priority items resulting from the external review as outlined in S.03-78”

R. Gordon, Senator and Director of the School of Criminology, and G. Anderson and P. J. Brantingham from the School, were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that parts of the review had been refuted by the School and discussion ensued in this regard. Senate was advised that the concern of the reviewers about the publication rate in the School was questioned, and Senators attention was drawn to the documentation which shows a breakdown of the publications of faculty members in the School and demonstrates the productivity of the School. The reviewers also suggested a decrease in the number of undergraduate students in favour of an increase in graduate enrolments. The School decided to maintain, and hopefully improve, undergraduate enrolments while increasing graduate enrolment, and this has already been accomplished.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

D) Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

i) Paper S.03-79 – SCEMP Recommendation re Admission GPA for Associate Degree Holders

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by P. Beynon

“that the admission GPA for Associate Degree holders be fixed at least one year in advance, and the information communicated to the Colleges”

R. Blackman was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was noted that the admission GPA for other categories of admission was not fixed in advance and justification was requested for treating this category differently. The change was proposed in response to concerns from the Colleges with respect to students leaving Associate Degree programs before completion in order to transfer to universities. Colleges felt that students would be less likely to leave early if they had more definitive information about admission levels, and the proposed change would also provide students with better advanced information which the Committee felt would be helpful in planning their programs.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

E) Senate Library Committee/Library Penalties Appeal Committee

i) Paper S.03-80 – Annual Reports (For Information)

Following a brief explanation about the decision to delay the external review of the Library, Senate received the Annual Report for information.

7. Other Businessi) Paper S.03-81 – Motion from Senator Giacomantonio

Moved by C. Giacomantonio, seconded by C. Sears

“that Senate request that the Board of Governors waive the 2% penalty for non-payment of tuition and student fees for all students participating in the tuition fee boycott”

Senate was advised that the motion originated from the Student Senator caucus and had the support of the Student Senators. A tuition boycott was organized by the students in order to draw attention to the increases in tuition fees and other issues related to the state of post-secondary education in BC. It was hoped that public awareness would make these concerns issues for the next election. Senators were urged to show their support for the students by approving the motion.

Discussion took place with respect to the purpose of the 2% penalty assessed for non-payment of fees and the impact of the withdrawal of fees on the finances of the university.

Sympathy was expressed for what the students were trying to do but opinion was voiced that to be truly effective participants of a protest must be willing to suffer whatever consequences may result from their action and waiving the 2% penalty detracted from the effectiveness of the action. Comment was also made that waiver of the penalty for late payment went against established policy and would set an undesirable precedent.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

ii) Paper S.03-82 (Revised) – Elections – Senate Nominating Committee –
Senate Committee Vacancies

A revised paper showing additions was distributed to Senators along with information supplied by candidates. There were insufficient nominations received to fill all positions. Vacancies will be carried forward. The following are the results of elections which took place by Senate.

Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS)

One Senator (at-large) to replace S. Atkins for term of office to May 31, 2005.

No nominations received

Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)

One Faculty Senator (Arts) to replace C. Gerson for term of office to May 31, 2004.

Elected by acclamation: Dan Weeks

Senate Library Committee (SLC)/Library Penalties Appeal Committee (LPAC) – Dual Position

One Senator (at-large) to replace C. Gerson for term of office to May 31, 2005.

No nominations received

Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)

One Senator (at-large) to replace C. Gerson for term of office to May 31, 2004.

Elected by acclamation: Titus Gregory

Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules (SCAR)

One Senator (at-large) to replace W. Chan for term of office to May 31, 2004.

Candidates: C. Giacomantonio, A. Gill

Elected: Alison Gill

Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)

One Faculty Member (Arts) to replace T. Grieve for term of office to May 31, 2005.

No nominations received

iii) Paper S.03-80 – Notice of Senate Vacancies (For Information)

Senate received information about outstanding student and faculty vacancies on Senate and was informed that by-elections to seek replacements would be issued in September.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting is Monday, October 6, 2003.

The Chair referred to the Convocation ceremonies scheduled on October 2nd and 3rd, 2003 and encouraged members of Senate to attend and support the graduating students on this very important occasion.

Open Session adjourned at 9:05 pm and moved into Closed Session following a brief recess.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat