

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD
ON MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1990 KLAUS RIECKHOFF HALL, 4:30 P.M.
OPEN SESSION**

Present: Salter, L., Acting Chair

Bedford, B.
Blaney, J.
Bowman, M.
Brown, R.
Calvert, T.
Carlson, R.
Clayman, B.
Cleveland, W.
Covell, M.
Dickinson, J.
Dill, L.
Djwa, S.
Dobb, T.
Faith, K.
George, D.
Giffen, K.
Gill, J.
Gray, P.
Green, C.
Hendrickson, T.
Hoechsmann, M.
Hoegg, J.L.
Jones, C.
Munro, D.
Palmer, E.
Palmer, L.H.
Pinfield, L.
Rieckhoff, K.
Saunders, R.
Shapiro, S.
Sicking, C.
Stewart, M.L.
Swartz, N.
Tjosvold, D.
Tuinman, J.
Verdun-Jones, S.
Vining, A.
Wade, S.
Warsh, M.

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

Absent: Addison, G.
Barrow, R.
Blackman, R.
Cercione, N.
Dahl, H.
D'Auria, J.
Delgrande, J.
Falcon, K.
Freedman, A.
Kazepides, A.C.
Luk, W.S.
Nielsen, V.
Partridge, J.
Rae, B.
Reilly, N.
Rudrum, A.
Saywell, W.
Shannon, D.
Winne, P.
Wotherspoon, A.

In attendance:
N. Heath

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was approved as distributed.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION OF FEBRUARY 5, 1990

Concern was expressed that the past two meetings had been scheduled in the afternoon despite previous Senate discussions with regard to holding Senate meetings in the evening rather than the afternoon. Senate was informed that SCAR had decided that the potential length of the agenda warranted an early start time for this particular meeting. Senate was also informed that an ad hoc committee of SCAR was being formed to investigate current policy with regard to the scheduling of Senate meetings as well as new issues which have been raised since this matter was discussed by Senate. It was hoped that a report from the ad hoc committee would be available for the May meeting of Senate.

Following this discussion, the Minutes were approved.

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Referring to item number two on page 3, inquiry was made if Senate could expect follow-up with regard to the question of security issues. Senate was informed that a report from Security will be presented to Senate at its next meeting.

4. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

i) Although definitive information with regard to the University's budget for 1990/91 was not yet available at the moment, the Chair felt there was no reason to be discouraged about the catch-up component of the proposed budget.

ii) Senate was informed that meetings had taken place with Ministry officials with respect to Fraser Valley initiatives. The University had made it very clear that if SFU were to become involved, resources in addition to those of the University's normal operating budget and catch-up growth were required. The Ministry indicated their intent to clarify their position with regard to this matter within the next month.

iii) Senate was informed that a thorough investigation with regard to the question of scheduling around statutory holidays had taken place. A number of proposals and suggestions had been discussed but each potential solution had significant problems associated with it so it was decided to retain current practice. Departments/Schools will be encouraged to shift from Monday, whenever possible, seminar classes which meet for extended periods. Brief discussion followed in which concern was expressed that administrative problems associated with changing current policy were being given priority over academic problems. Senate was assured that the problems associated with proposed resolutions were not just administrative.

5. REPORT OF COMMITTEES

i) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

Paper S.90-22 - 1990/91 Admission Targets

Moved by R. Saunders, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate approve, and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, that the targets for admission to Simon Fraser University in 1990/91 be set as follows:

Fall Semester, 1990	3100 new students
Spring Semester, 1991	1100 new students
Summer Semester, 1991	<u>600</u> new students
Total	4800 new students

and, further, that for Fall Semester, 1990, the admission targets for the major admission groups be as follows:

B.C. Grade XII	1400 new students
B.C. College Transfer	1100 new students
'Other' Admission Groups	<u>600</u> new students
Total	3100 new students"

N. Heath, Director of Admissions, was in attendance as a resource person.

Reference was made to the fact that past practice has been to retain the historical mix for the three distinct groups and concern was expressed over the proposed decrease from previous years in the 'Other' Admission category.

R. Saunders explained that although last year's targets were reasonably accurate in terms of predicting new FTEs, the retention rate had increased considerably, generating 300 additional FTEs which had not been anticipated. These additional FTEs were unfunded for the 1989/90 fiscal year and, with the approval of the Ministry, were carried over into this year's target. As a result, this year's target, which had been set at 495, would have to be reduced to 195. SCEMP felt that the point of admission was the only place control over numbers could be exercised and a variety of alternatives had been considered. SCEMP decided that should the historical proportions be adhered to a considerable number of high school and transfer students would be disenfranchised and SCEMP chose to recommend a decrease in the 'other' admission category on a one-year basis only.

Serious reservations were expressed with regard to the proportional shift in categories, viewed by some to be a change in admission policy. It was noted that Simon Fraser University has had a reputation for being more open than other institutions to students who fall in the 'Other' category, such as mature students, and opinion was expressed that the proposed shift will send a message that Simon Fraser University is no longer interested in community education. It was suggested that the motion should be sent back to Committee for further consideration. It was pointed out that admission offers had to reach students by mid-May and, should this matter be referred until the next meeting, the University would not be in a position to make timely offers of admission. Opinion was expressed that it was unfortunate something this important had been delayed to such a late date that Senate had no choice but to act on it.

In reply to an inquiry as to how applicants were prioritized in the 'Other' category, N. Heath explained that specific grade point averages will be used to determine the majority of applicants coming from technical colleges and transfers from other universities and other provinces, and that mature students would be screened more carefully than in the past. He went on to explain that practice has been to divide the mature student into two groups, those who have never attended a post-secondary institution, and those who have a limited amount of post-secondary experience. Priority has been given to those with limited experience and those who have never attended a post-secondary institution have been advised to begin their studies at the colleges.

Moved by B. Bedford, seconded by P. Gray

"that the motion be referred back to the Senate Committee on

Enrolment Management and Planning to elaborate on, and provide a more detailed rationale for the proposed changes"

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

In reply to an inquiry as to whether or not it was the University's goal to acquire younger students with higher GPAs, R. Saunders advised that the higher GPAs are a consequence of enrolment constraints which are a result of inadequate resources, and that the University has not enunciated such a goal.

The Chair informed Senate that the motion was not intended to set out a new policy direction for the University. The intention of the motion was to deal with what was perceived to be a one year problem. However, since serious concerns and issues had been raised during the discussion, the Chair directed SCEMP to review current policies to see whether they should be reaffirmed, fine-tuned or changed, and to report back to Senate.

Opinion was expressed that cutting the intake of B.C. Grade 12 and B.C. College Transfer students would have had a much more serious and direct impact on the community and in turn would possibly have sent a message to the Government about the current lack of adequate resources. A suggestion to include a statement that it is the intention of Senate to return the levels of other student admission categories to their historical levels in the Fall of 1991 was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Reference was made to previous discussions with regard to enrolment limitations when Senate had gone on record as explicitly stating that the historical proportions of the various categories should be maintained and serious concerns were expressed that the proposed motion changed this policy direction.

Opinion was expressed that the diversity of students was a unique benefit to the learning process at SFU and it was felt that it was unfortunate that the 'Other' category of admission was being singled out.

Moved by D. Munroe, seconded by P. Gray

"that the admission targets be amended so that the number of mature students admitted for 90/91 not be less than were admitted in the previous year"

R. Saunders provided clarification with respect to the impact of the proposed amendment on enrolments.

It was pointed out that the amendment does not deal with the problem; it only transfers the problem on to another group of students.

Speaking as a member of the Task Force on University Size, B. Clayman reminded Senate that the intent of enrolment limitations on admission categories was not to keep the absolute numbers the same but to retain the evolving proportions in subsequent development. K. Rieckhoff reiterated that while that may have been the intent of the Task Force on University Size, it was his understanding that Senate has specifically directed that the historical proportions of the various categories remain the same. SCEMP was requested by the Chair to determine current policies and to report back to Senate with or without recommendations for any change.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

Discussion continued with regard to the main motion. The proposal was criticized because it protected one category of students from the effects of inadequate funding at the expense of another group.

R. Brown expressed a deeply felt concern that in terms of meeting student demand and providing a quality education, the Faculty of Arts could not handle any more students without additional resources. He noted that the Access program is providing additional revenue and the University was taking in new students on that basis. However, if the proposed admission targets were approved by Senate and, at the same time, the Government decreased the base operating budget, resulting in the University not being able to adequately service these students, he inquired as to the legal position of the University. The Chair expressed her belief that it was not the Government's intent to trade off one budget against another and she felt the Government was genuinely committed to providing catch-up resources.

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

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

P. Gray and B. Bedford requested their opposition be recorded.

- ii) Senate Graduate Studies Committee
Paper S.90-23 - Annual Report - For Information

Following a brief discussion, the Annual Report was received by Senate for information.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

1. In reply to an inquiry concerning the status of departmental reviews which had taken place over the past year, the Chair informed Senate that several departmental reviews will be presented to Senate at its next meeting.
2. Referring to the recent "freeze the fees" campaign and the current ongoing discussions between the University and the Government concerning funding, T. Hendrickson wondered if it would be appropriate for Senate to pass a motion, or direct the President on behalf of Senate to formally write a letter to the Government, expressing concern about the consequences resulting from a lack of resources and funding. Although it was noted that such matters generally fall outside the normal business of Senate, it was suggested that Senate had the right to comment on whatever it deemed appropriate. The Chair informed Senate that SCAR would take this suggestion under consideration and report back to Senate.
3. K. Giffen suggested that new professors arriving from other universities be given a one-semester period of adjustment rather than having to teach immediately upon their arrival. He felt this might be helpful to both new professors and students.

8. NOTICES OF MOTION

1. The following notice of motion was presented by C. Green: "that Senate request, for the 1991/92 year, FTE funding adequate to allow for admission GPA of 2.5 for Grade XII students, and 2.0 for College transfer, with no limitation on the 'Other' category of admission".

It was suggested that it would be more appropriate for the motion to be considered by the Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning prior to Senate consideration. The Chair indicated that as soon as the motion was received in

writing, the faster it would proceed through the appropriate committees.

2. The following notice of motion was presented by B. Bedford: "that the Senate Committee on Academic Planning be directed to establish a sub-committee to review the academic effect of differential fees on the University"

It was noted that the question of fees was not within the purview of Senate but that Senate can comment and advise the Board of Governors on such issues if it so desires. The Chair indicated that as soon as the motion was received in writing, the sooner it would be given appropriate review and consideration.

9. INFORMATION

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, April 2, 1990.

The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session at 6:00 p.m.

W. R. Heath
Secretary of Senate