

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD
ON MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 1989 KLAUS RIECKHOFF HALL, 7:00 P.M.
OPEN SESSION

Present: Saywell, W.G., Chair

Bains, H.
Barrow, R.
Beedie, R.
Berggren, J.L.
Blaney, J.
Brown, R.
Calvert, T.
Carlson, R.
Clayman, B.
Covell, M.
D'Auria, J.
Dickinson, J.
Di Fonzo, R.
Dobb, T.
Fitzsimmons, C.
Freedman, A.
George, D.
Gill, P.
Goodman, D.
Hoegg, J.L.
Ivany, G.
Jones, C.
Kazepides, A.C.
Kennedy, P.
Maaske, R.
Mauser, G.
Nicol, I.
Nyvik, S.
Palmer, L.H.
Pinfield, L.
Rae, B.
Rashed, S.
Reilly, N.
Rieckhoff, K.
Rudrum, A.
Salter, L.
Saunders, R.
Shannon, D.
Shickele, J.
Strate, G.
Swartz, N.
Tuinman, J.
Verdun-Jones, S.
Warsh, M.
Weldon, L.
Winne, P.
Wotherspoon, A.

Absent: Bedford, B.
Bralic, V.
Cerccone, N.
Cleveland, W.
Djwa, S.
Horn, C.
McGivern, R.
Nielsen, V.
Shapiro, S.
Tjosvold, D.
Weinberg, H.

W.R. Heath, Secretary
Grant, B., Recording Secretary

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Senate had no objection to a request to place Item 5-b after Item 5-e to accommodate the late arrival of a senator wishing to participate in the discussion of the Task Force Report. Following this amendment, the Agenda was approved.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION OF ^{December 5, 1988} ~~NOVEMBER 7, 1988~~

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

In a follow-up report from Business Arising at the last meeting, the Chair informed Senate that the Vice-President Financial Services proposed to submit a separate report concerning expenditure categories and revenue sources for SFU Harbour Centre at the time the University's Annual Financial Statement is presented to Senate for information.

4. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

a) Senate was informed that a recommendation to increase tuition fees by six percent was scheduled for consideration by the Board of Governors on January 19th. An increase of tuition fees of ten percent has been recommended by UBC, and there was a concern that the Ministry might interpret the higher increase at UBC to mean that they are in greater financial need than SFU. Representation to the contrary had been made to the Ministry. Even with the risk of misinterpretation by the Ministry, given the significant tuition increases in recent years at SFU, it was felt fees could not be increased any higher than the proposed six percent.

b) The Chair reported that the University has actively been educating the public about the critical enrolment pressures facing the University and its willingness to respond to the demands of the community provided adequate funding is made available. Discussions with colleges who share similar problems are also underway in an attempt to show Government there is a spirit of cooperation to work together towards a common answer.

c) Senate was informed that the Chair is currently scheduling meetings with all Departments/Faculties/Schools in the University to address issues of size and growth and how the University community sees itself in ten years time.

d) The Chair reported that SFU Harbour Centre opened its doors and offered approximately fifteen courses to students. Only about twenty-five percent of the actual space was available at the present time. The Chair felt the architects and designers, along with the staff of J. Blaney and W. de Vries,

had done a splendid job with the facility. Senators were encouraged to visit the Centre should they be in the area.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

a) Senate Nominating Committee

i) S.89-1 - Elections

The following are the results of elections to fill vacancies on the undernoted Senate Committees:

Electoral Standing Committee (ESC)

One Senator at-large to replace A. Vining for no specified term of office.

No nominations received: Vacant

Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS)

One Faculty Senator to fill an existing vacancy for term of office from date of election to September 30, 1990.

Elected by acclamation: J. Dickinson

c) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) S.89-3 - Change to General Regulations 1.3.11 - English Language Competence

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by K. Rieckhoff,

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.89-3, the following addition to the General Regulations:

Section 1.3.11 English Language Competence

English is the language of instruction and communication in the University. Accordingly, an applicant whose primary language is not English or whose previous education has been conducted in another language must demonstrate command of English sufficient to pursue graduate studies in the chosen field. Applicants normally will be required to achieve a satisfactory score on a standardized English test acceptable to the University. This test must include a writing component. The Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) combined with the Test of Written English (TWE) are acceptable for this purpose. The minimum University requirements for scores on these tests is TOEFL = 570 and TWE = 5; some graduate

programs have higher requirements, as described elsewhere in this Calendar.

Further details about the above tests may be obtained from:

TOEFL and TWE: Educational Testing Service
CN 6151, Princeton, N.J.
O8541-6151 YSA

English Language Proficiency Test:

Director of Admissions
Office of the Registrar, SFU

Other acceptable English tests:

Director of Admissions
Office of the Registrar, SFU"

B. Clayman explained that many departments already have informal TOEFL requirements in place and this would send out a signal to potential graduate students by formalizing and publicizing this regulation. Senate was also informed that the intent of using the word 'normally' was to handle exceptions where departments felt the requirement could be waived, and situations where other means of measuring the student's competence in English could be used. It was also indicated that the Dean of Graduate Studies office intended to monitor the requirement and include such information in the annual report to Senate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.89-4 - Graduate Appeal Procedure

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by K. Rieckhoff

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.89-4, the following Graduate Appeal Procedure:

1. Appeals of decisions involving grades in graduate courses are made through the same mechanism as in undergraduate courses. This mechanism is described in S.F.U. Policy AC-39.
2. Appeals of decisions involving evaluations of progress are made through the mechanism described in graduate regulation 1.8.2.
3. Appeals of other decisions, including the outcomes of thesis defences, are initiated at the level at which the decision was made originally.
4. If satisfactory resolution cannot be reached at a particular level, the appeal may proceed to the level to which a

favourable recommendation would have proceeded. If necessary, this process may be repeated until the level of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee (S.G.S.C.) is reached.

5. Appeals to the S.G.S.C. are directed to the Dean of Graduate Studies, in writing. They must include clear, concise statements of the reasons for the appeal and of the remedy sought. The Dean brings the appeal to the S.G.S.C., only after it is established that all avenues for resolution at the departmental and Faculty levels have been exhausted.
6. The S.G.S.C., in each case, forms a small subcommittee, with appropriate membership, including at least one student member, to hear the appeal.
7. The subcommittee would decide on the appropriate remedial action where it finds that the decision had been arrived at through improper or unfair procedures. The Committee would have no jurisdiction where the sole question raised is an appeal which is based on the exercise of academic judgement.
8. Decisions of the subcommittee are final, with Senate conferring on the subcommittee the authority of making final decisions pursuant to Section 36(b) of the University Act, although the Committee may refer to Senate an unsettled question of policy or procedure of general importance to the University.

B. Clayman introduced the paper by explaining that the proposed regulations incorporate some existing appeal procedures for grades and satisfactory progress, and provide a framework for students to seek reconsideration of decisions that affect their academic lives with a minimum amount of legislation.

Concern was expressed that the vagueness of the composition of the subcommittee might be regarded by an appellant as an opportunity to randomly form a committee prejudicial to the appeal. B. Clayman advised that the intent was to match the membership of the committee as closely as possible to the nature of the appeal in order to bring expertise to bear on the subject area covered by an appeal.

Moved by L. Palmer, seconded by J. Shickele

"that the document be referred back to the Senate Graduate Studies Committee for remedy"

It was suggested that the concerns expressed be forwarded to the SGSC for their consideration and that it might be in order to seek the advice of counsel

on the matter. It was pointed out that the proposed procedure is consistent with existing procedures of Senate in which ad hoc committees are set up to deal with appeals referred to Senate by the President.

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

A lengthy discussion followed with regard to the types of appeals to be covered by this legislation and the mechanisms to be followed in the appeal process. B. Clayman advised that the intent of procedure #7 was to handle appeals based on unfair or prejudiced proceedings; appeals regarding academic judgement would be handled at levels below the SGSC. In reply to an inquiry with regard to who decides whether an appeal is to be considered one of prejudicial and unfair judgement or one of academic judgement, B. Clayman explained that all appeals that students perceive as being unfair will be referred to the appropriate subcommittee who will decide the issue of whether it is based on academic judgement or unfairness.

The following suggestion by R. Brown to change #6 of the procedure was accepted as a friendly amendment:

6. The S.G.S.C., in each case, forms a subcommittee, including at least one student member, to hear the appeal.

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

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

iii) Paper S.89-5 - Enrolment in Graduate Courses

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by K. Rieckhoff

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.89-5, the following:

Special graduate students, Qualifying students and undergraduate students (including Post-Baccalaureate Diploma students) normally may enrol in graduate courses only if their cumulative grade point averages are at least 3.00. In addition, the permission of the instructor is required in each case."

In reply to concerns about requiring permission of the instructor, B. Clayman pointed out that initial responsibility rests with the University with regard to the GPA requirement after which it is the instructors responsibility to ensure that both the quality and quantity of the students in the course is appropriate. In response to a worry that requiring students to seek

permission of the instructor causes hardship on the part of students with respect to the availability of the instructor, B. Clayman noted that this did not apply since course registration at the graduate level is much less formal than at the undergraduate level and students typically enrol in a course at the first meeting of the course with the instructor.

Concern was expressed that qualifying students would be prevented from taking a graduate course in their first semester because they would not have a GPA at that point. B. Clayman noted that GPAs from the previous work of incoming graduate students would be used to meet this requirement.

Opinion was strongly expressed that the motion defeats faculty control over admission to graduate programs and courses, gives too much bureaucratic control to the Dean of Graduate Studies office, and such decisions were best made at the department or faculty level. It was pointed out that the word 'normally' provides freedom to individual departments and faculties and that the requirement of a 3.0 grade point average is not an unreasonable expectation of scholarship.

A further concern was raised that this regulation would eliminate the opportunities for special graduate students and qualifying students who may have something other than a GPA to offer as qualifications to establish themselves; B. Clayman provided definitions of these two categories and indicated the intent of the regulation was to prevent students whose GPAs were not high enough from taking graduate courses until they have proven they can cope with the work.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

b) Senate Committee on Academic Planning

i) Paper S.89-2 - Task Force on University Size: A Report on Undergraduate Enrolment

Moved by G. Ivany, seconded by K. Rieckhoff

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the set of recommendations contained in S.89-2"

G. Ivany introduced the paper by providing background information about Simon Fraser University with respect to its curriculum, access to education and student composition. He stressed that the recommendations are a crisis response to the present situation facing SFU with regard to an increasing demand by students and insufficient financial and space resources to meet these demands. He drew Senate's attention to the fact that this semester 5,000 students in the Faculty of Arts were unable to get the third and four

year courses of first choice needed to graduate with the degree for which they registered four years ago; that many students in the Faculty of Science were unable to get courses because enrolments were controlled by laboratory space; and departments such as Economics are no longer willing to teach 180 students in a third year seminar course. He felt students would lose respect for the University if efforts to remedy the situation were not made and that the proposals of the Task Force were an attempt to relieve the current situation by controlling enrolments and ensuring the quality of academic programs and degrees at SFU.

Speaking as a member of the Task Force, L. Salter felt it was important to point out that the report did not address the question of what the ideal size of the University ought to be. She indicated that the document attempts to tie growth to resources and therefore is a limited and pragmatic document rather than a philosophical document; its purpose is also to introduce some predictability into the system so students in major programs will be able to get the courses they need in their third and fourth year. She felt the document left two problems which would have to be addressed in the future; the first being the notion of a competitive major, and the second being the need for Harbour Centre and Distance Education to grow without having enrolment restrictions imposed on them.

Referring to recommendation C-3-a, inquiry was made as to how this regulation would affect Faculties who only admit students at their 45th semester hour of study. R. Brown indicated that intent was to follow historic precedent with respect to the Faculties of Business Administration and the Education by admitting students to the Faculty of Arts in the first two years with transfer at the third year level into the appropriate Faculty, and that process would be built into the complement of students that would be admitted into the Faculty of Arts in the first year.

Concerns were expressed about D-1-a as to how decisions would be made in terms of allocating resources, especially in areas of high demand, and D-2 as to how the university would respond under this regulation if student demand for one program was much larger than for another. It was noted that the decision-making which decides allocation of resources is already operationally in place but that this regulation would make it a little more systematic and public in seeing where those limits are.

Serious concerns were voiced by N. Reilly that the document lacked good supporting arguments for its conclusions and he felt it would not convince a new reader of the need for this action. Since it would become part of the record for future reference and would perhaps be viewed by outside bodies, he felt a stronger rationale and support statement was needed. A close scrutiny of the document ensued in which areas were pointed out that he felt

required clarification or further detail and resulted in the following discussion.

It was noted that the report proposed reduction of enrolment by approximately 1,200 students and inquiry was made as to the impact of this reduced revenue. G. Ivany explained that the proposal represented about a ten percent reduction of student income and equated to approximately 1.6 million dollars. Intent was to spread this reduction over a period of approximately six years with a maximum reduction in any given year of about \$100,000 which was acceptable to the the administration. However, since financial matters were not normally the concern of Senate, a detailed financial statement was not included with the report.

In reply to a suggestion of capping enrolment at the present level rather than reducing it and creating a potential shortfall in fees, R. Brown made reference to the Faculty of Arts where at the present time between thirty to sixty percent of teaching is carried out with non-tenure track faculty consequently jeopardizing the quality of the education provided by SFU. He explained that expectations that the budget will inflate at no less than five percent over the next six years, that the costs of the deficit which would accrue from the loss of tuition could be built into inflation in the budget, and combined with the fact that the Faculty of Arts has a 'soft-money' budget of two million dollars to hire sessionals and limited term people, would balance out and accommodate the loss of tuition. Senate was informed that students in the Faculty of Arts were lining up on Thursday to get into courses on Friday which they could not get into during the normal registration process, and R. Brown expressed opinion that he was willing to pay whatever necessary to maintain the quality of SFU's academic programs and, in fact, needed this legislation to protect the quality of departments and programs within the Faculty of Arts.

In reply to an inquiry as to why specially funded off-campus programs, SFU Downtown and the DISC program were included in the enrolment quotas, G. Ivany explained that students can currently transfer to campus from any of these programs, and given the current enrolment distribution the proposed figure of 11,500 would generate approximately 10,000 students on campus which the Task Force felt was the limit given current resources. As circumstances change and Harbour Centre and other programs expand, further evaluations and recommendations will be made by the Task Force with report back to Senate.

Reference was made to the complications and treatment of students transferring from faculty to faculty and concern was expressed that students out of high school might not be aware of certain disciplines and what various faculties had to offer and therefore might not make a correct, initial decision.

G. Ivany explained that the Registrar's Office currently assigns students arbitrarily to a faculty depending on their interests and the intent of the proposal was to encourage students to make this choice early in their program in order to provide more opportunities for other students who may otherwise be denied access. Senate was assured that the intent of the proposal was not to place any new boundaries on the transfer of student from one faculty to another, other than what currently exists. It was pointed out that the document is permissive in that it allows faculties the possibility of structuring their own entrance requirements which would have to be approved by Senate before implementation.

Opinion was expressed about implications of delegated authority with respect to recommendations which may require changes to the mandates of some of the Senate committees, including SCAP. Reference was made to the paragraph on page 13 and concern expressed that any such required changes will be tabled to Senate for information rather than approval. G. Ivany explained that certain reviews by SCAP were suggested in the document which were not included in its previous purview but SCAP continues to be a committee of Senate, reportable to Senate, and intent of this paragraph was to acknowledge that. A suggestion to change the last sentence to read - It is understood that in light of Senate actions any required changes will be made and tabled in Senate for information or approval as appropriate in the near future - was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Clarification was requested with reference to Section 3-b on page 4 as to what was meant by 'other evidence of potential success'. G. Ivany explained that it allows departments and faculties to set appropriate criteria for admission to their programs. He pointed out that this is not a change from current University policy and referred to the PDP program as an example.

M. Covell expressed opinion that the recommendations in the report are a significant departure of the principles and ideals of Simon Fraser, they inhibit and restrict more and more the choices of students, and she felt faculties establishing their own enrolment requirements could result in not necessarily well co-ordinated regulations. She therefore wished to state for the record her intent to abstain.

Referring to page 4, Section D-1 question was raised as to whether the Registrar's Office or the Vice-President Academic's Office could over-ride decisions or veto increases at the departmental level due to differences of interpretation. G. Ivany pointed out that approval by Senate was required in each case, and that the whole of Section D was incorporated from Senate documentation previously approved.

A worry was expressed that because the University had in fact designed

procedures to handle the crisis situation facing SFU, this might give the Provincial Government the impression that we had solved the problem. The Chair expressed his opinion that this action would in fact put pressure on the Government to provide adequate resources so such drastic measures were not required and better access to university-level education would be available.

In reply to an inquiry as to what the implications of this action would be should funding be forthcoming now or in the future, the Chair indicated that the University would do its best to accommodate students in such a way as to provide them with adequate opportunities to get the courses they require. He went on to say that there is a supplementary budget request currently before Government for 4.6 million dollars which is judged to be the amount of additional resources required to properly accommodate the present number of students. Senate's attention was also drawn to fact that page 3 states that an annual target shall be recommended to Senate by SCAP in light of available resources.

N. Reilly reiterated his feeling that such a major document should clearly set out all the information and arguments justifying the need for such recommendations especially to outside readers and moved a motion to table the document. There was no seconder for this motion.

Moved by N. Reilly, seconded by T. Kazepides

"that the document be referred back to the Senate Committee on Academic Planning for revision"

Speaking in opposition to the motion, it was pointed out that many of the concerns expressed related to the rationale and support documentation rather than the recommendations themselves and could be dealt with editorially. It was also noted that the document had been before Senators in draft form with opportunity for input, and presumably any such input had already been incorporated in the document; referral back to the Task Force would serve no useful purpose. It was also noted that although it may be useful to augment the report for an outside audience, further information for Senate would be of no further benefit.

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

Turning to the main motion, inquiry was made as to when the recommendations would become effective. R. Heath indicated that since many of the procedures had yet to be developed and would have to come back for Senate approval, implementation would be phased in within the advice of TFUS and SCAP.

Moved by R. Brown, seconded by B. Clayman

"that the open session of Senate be extended past the normal closure time of 10:00 pm"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO EXTEND CARRIED

Particular reference was made as to how recommendation #3 would effect students with two minors going into the elementary education program in the Faculty of Education. R. Brown indicated that the legislation coming forward from departments within the Faculty of Arts will include majors, honors, and minors ensuring that minors will have the same GPA requirements for entry into courses as majors/honors.

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

MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED
(M. Covell and J.L. Berggren wished to have their abstention recorded)

- d) Senate Library Committee
- i) Paper S.89-6 - Annual Report

Referring to the statement that the Library was purchasing FAX equipment to ensure quick access to material in journals that must be cancelled, concern was expressed that copyright would be infringed. T. Dobb indicated that the vendors have already obtained copyright from the publishers. Reference was made to the million dollar donation received by the University part of which was to go towards the development of a Library at Harbour Centre. It was pointed out that the proposed procedures for servicing students at Harbour Centre from the main Library through use of zerox and/or FAX would involve a substantial amount of effort and work on the part of the campus Library. T. Dobb assured Senate that part of the million dollars will be used to defray some of these central expenses. He also went on to provide additional details for the information of Senate with respect to items 2-a-b-c of the report and announced the appointment of Karen Marotz, a graduate of Simon Fraser University, as the Head Librarian of the Library at Harbour Centre.

- e) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- i) Paper S.89-7 - Revision to Terms of Reference - Senate Committee on Academic Discipline, Policy AC 51

Moved by G. Ivany, seconded by K. Rieckhoff

"that Senate approve the following amendment to Policy AC 51,

the Terms of Reference for the Senate Committee on Academic Discipline:

Section B:

2. The Committee is established:

- a) to hear appeals from penalties imposed under 'Procedures for Dealing with Incidents of Intellectual Dishonesty', and
- b) *to hear an appeal by a student from a penalty imposed under the 'University Harassment Policy', and*
- c) to hear such other appeals and deal with such other matters as Senate or the Chair of Senate so directs"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

6. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

7. NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no notices of motion.

8. INFORMATION

The date of the next regular meeting of Senate is scheduled for Monday, February 13, 1989. Senate's attention was drawn to the change of date from of the regularly scheduled meeting on February 6th.

The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session at 10:15 p.m.

W. Ronald Heath,
Secretary of the Senate