

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD
ON MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1991 KLAUS RIECKHOFF HALL, 7:00 P.M.

OPEN SESSION

Present: Saywell, W.G., Chair

Barrow, R.
Bedford, B.
Blackman, R.
Blaney, J.
Bowman, M.
Brown, R.
Bukovac, S.
Carlson, R.
Cerccone, N.
Clayman, B.
Covell, M.
D'Auria, J.
Delgrande, J.
Di Fonzo, A.
Dill, L.
Djwa, S.
Dobb, T.
Duguid, S.
Evenden, L.
Giffen, K.
Gunton, T. (replacing D. George)
Heinrich, K.
Hendrickson, T.
Hoechsmann, M.
Hoegg, J.L.
Jones, C.
Luk, W.S.
Menzies, R.
Mauser, G.
Munro, J.
Nielsen, V.
Palmer, E.
Palmer, L.
Percival, P.
Reilly, N.
Rieckhoff, K.
Saunders, R.
Shannon, D.
Shapiro, S.
Stewart, M.L.
Swartz, N.
Verdun-Jones, S.
Wade, S.
Walker, R.
Warsh, M.
Winne, P.
Wotherspoon, A.

Absent: Gibbons, N.
Gray, P.
Leiss, W.
Maaske, R.
Munro, D.
Myers, T.
Pinfield, L.
Rae, B.
Strate, G.
Tjosvold, D.
Tuinman, J.

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

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was approved as distributed.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION OF ^{February} MARCH 4, 1991

Referring to the fourth paragraph on page 4, request was made to change the reference from Departmental Curriculum Committees to Faculty Curriculum Committees. Following this amendment, 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 honorary degrees will be presented at the June Convocation ceremonies as follows: June 6, 1991 - Liona Boyd, Pauline Jewett, Mary Filer and Harold Spence-Sales; June 7, 1991 (am) - Sherwood Rowland; June 7, 1991 (pm) - Irwin Cutler, and David and Dorothy Lam.

5. REPORT OF COMMITTEES

i) Senate Committee on Academic Planning

a) Paper S.91-12 - Challenge 2001 - The President's Strategic Plan

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by S. Wade

"that Senate endorse the general directions for the University's development as contained in Challenge 2001: The President's Strategic Plan"

Senate had no objection to the President remaining in the Chair to speak to and address questions about the Challenge 2001 paper.

The Chair introduced the paper by providing brief background information with regard to the history of the document. He drew Senate's attention to several areas which he felt were some of the key issues contained in the paper. Firstly, although not specifically outlined in the paper, the Chair wished to stress the fact that he did not feel overly optimistic about receiving significant new developmental funding in the next few years. Secondly, the Chair indicated that the basic outline of the document was based on financial and demographic assumptions, and SFU's tradition of trying to be as accessible to as many students as possible. Referring to the problems and tensions associated with growth, the Chair expressed opinion that had Simon Fraser not absorbed these problems over the past few years, many students in the Province, particularly those in this specific area, would not have had the opportunity to receive a university education and therefore he felt the policy was socially acceptable. The Chair went on to point out what he felt the major advantages associated with growth would be. Firstly, he believed that Access funding would be the only funding available to reallocate and readdress some of the difficulties currently facing the University. Secondly, he believed SFU would benefit from the revitalization that new faculty colleagues bring to any university, and finally, he felt growth would provide an opportunity for the University to improve the balance between undergraduate and graduate studies.

While he supported the emphasis placed on the development of graduate work, there

were some fundamental aspects of the report about which K. Rieckhoff wished to express concern. His major objection was the assumption that through growth the University can resolve its current difficulties which, in his opinion, were caused by the growth experienced to date. He went on to say that in terms of its responsibilities for accessibility, Simon Fraser has done more than its share in the Province but it has been done at the expense of the quality of the undergraduate instructional environment and he could not see any realistic way that further growth would ever catch up. He also felt the report places too much emphasis on the development of professional, trendy programs rather than on the key core disciplines in the University. Finally, he was concerned about the reference to the internationalization of the University because he felt the University was already heavily involved in the international scholarly community and did not need to do anything special to internationalize itself. He felt the document should remain a personal report from the President and was opposed to its support by Senate.

The Chair responded to two points. Firstly, he did not believe the report downplayed the core disciplines and pointed out that Simon Fraser has been innovative and exemplary in terms of developing new program initiatives from its strong core areas, some of which have developed into new disciplines themselves. Secondly, he felt the University could become more internationalized in some areas and referred to co-op placements overseas as one specific example.

Referring to section 4.3 on page 9 with regard to program mix and program growth, R. Blackman expressed concern that if the intent is to provide differential growth plans for the University, this document does not adequately convey that planning. However, he did realize that as a public relations document it might be strategically more appropriate to have the report worded the way it was. On page 12 which refers to planning strategies in terms of enrolment growth, R. Blackman questioned the match between the proposed growth patterns and the pattern of new buildings becoming available and wondered whether a growth pattern that optimized support for the University's argument that additional space is required would be more appropriate.

J. Munro advised that it was not possible to optimize the effect of the document in this way but pointed out that this had been discussed at previous committee levels and that some adjustments had already been made in this area. He also wished to point out that the document is predicated on the assumption that the Access Program will continue and suggested that the level of access funding will leave some flexibility to address some of the difficulties currently facing the University. He felt the document would have more impact in Victoria if it had the general support of Senate and the Board of Governors and reminded Senate that the Ministry may use the document in determining the operating funding for the University.

Speaking in opposition to the motion, L. Palmer strongly objected to the premise that the University must adopt growth in order to get funding and that money was required in order to improve the University. He also expressed opinion that the incremental costs of excessive growth associated with the Access Program have exceeded the incremental benefits to undergraduate students and referred to the current problems of overcrowding in classes, cafeterias and parking. He felt the increased demand for university education should be accommodated in ways other than growth at Simon Fraser and suggested the development of a new university in the Fraser Valley along with reinforcement and encouragement of the community colleges with respect to transfer students at a higher level.

B. Bedford expressed surprise that a document concerned with accessibility and quality of education did not deal with the recent issue of the Province not having access to federal transfer money. He suggested this will have a considerable impact on the future of post-secondary education in the province.

M. Bowman felt there were significant advantages related to growth such as program diversity, program intensity and specialization, and the intellectual richness more faculty and students bring to the academic community and, rather than retreating from growth, she felt the nature of the growth should be directed with more precision and more serious attempts should be made at acquiring additional resources.

E. Palmer objected to the proposal because the large growth in the undergraduate population appeared to be desired in order to support the graduate population and research programs. Such growth would be at the expense of the undergraduate body.

R. Carlson expressed opinion that universities must be programmed for growth and change and he felt that the report in a general sense provided for these changes as needed.

R. Brown reminded Senate that the report was predicated on convincing the Government to make resources available that would be commensurate with the desired growth and that the University is not willing to undertake this growth unless those resources are forthcoming. He also stressed that governments respond to pressure and they are currently under pressure to provide better access to post-secondary education. This report is a responsible and reasonable approach to take to government as it will provide a venue to assist them in addressing public concerns in this area.

Referring to the letter of transmittal, P. Winne noted that in fundamental ways item two through nine were independent of growth and worthy of pursuit in their own right. He expressed preference for a re-ordering of these items so that two through nine appeared first with number one which deals with the issue of growth appearing last. The Chair indicated that he would take this suggestion under advisement.

N. Reilly expressed opinion that Simon Fraser University, being a strong component of higher education in British Columbia and being a publicly funded institution, has an obligation to do the best it can to provide improved access to students in British Columbia. He felt the report provided a plan which would improve and increase accessibility to higher education and the University was obligated to accept this responsibility.

Following clarification, a suggestion to change the third sentence of item two on the second page of the covering letter to "Continuing efforts will also be made to encourage the commercial *development* of university research discovery" was accepted as a friendly amendment.

S. Shapiro suggested that the University should focus on the future rather than the past and pointed out that the document provides opportunities to achieve exciting things while meeting the needs of the community and preserving academic value.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

b) Paper S.91-13 - Natural Resources Management - Change of Status

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by B. Bedford

"That Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.91-13, the change in status of the Natural Resources Management Program to the School of Resource and Environmental Management"

Question was called and a vote taken

MOTION CARRIED

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

a) Paper S.91-14 - Undergraduate Enrolment Targets. 1991/92

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by D. Shannon

Motion #1:

"that Senate approve and recommend to the Board the 1991/92 Access Program undergraduate enrolment target of 450 FTE (which requires a further 316 FTE in 1991/92) as outlined in Dr. Wattamaniuk's memo of 31 January 1991. If the funded Access enrolment is less than 450 FTE, the admission targets specified in motions 2 and 3 shall be reduced accordingly"

J. Munro advised that the original intent was to consider each motion individually but he wished to point out that understanding of the first motion would be aided by consideration of motions 2 and 3.

A motion moved by B. Bedford, seconded by A. Wotherspoon to consider all three motions together was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Motion #2:

"that Senate approve and recommend to the Board the admission targets for 1991/92 as outlined in Dr. Wattamaniuk's memo of 31 January 1991"

Motion #3:

"that Senate approve and recommend to the Board the following admission targets by admission category for Fall 1991 and Spring 1992:

	Fall 1991	Spring 1992
B.C. Grade XII	1,250	100
B.C. College Transfer	1,000	525
"Other"	<u>950</u>	<u>725</u>
Total intake	3,200	1,350"

Question was called, and a vote taken
on all three motions

MOTION CARRIED

b) Paper S.91-15 - Department of Communication - Enrolment Limitations

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by R. Blackman

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.91-15, the mechanism for enrolment limitation proposed for the Department of Communication in Dr. Laba's memorandum of 16 January 1991"

M. Laba, Chair of the Department of Communication was in attendance as a resource person.

In response to an inquiry about the impact of the proposed enrolment limitations, M. Laba advised that it is estimated that approximately 16-18% of the currently declared majors and minors would be affected. He went on to provide a brief background of the details leading up to the proposal.

B. Bedford suggested that the criteria for entry to courses might need to be revisited if telephone registration is introduced.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

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

a) Paper S.91-16 - Change in degree designation for the program at Cariboo College

Moved by S. Shapiro, seconded by K. Rieckhoff

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.91-16, the change in the degree designation for the program at Cariboo College from Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS) to Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)"

S. Shapiro advised Senate that this change was requested by the students enrolled in the Cariboo program because the BBS designation was less clearly understood or recognized by potential employers and others. The request was strongly supported by both Cariboo College and the Faculty of Business Administration at Simon Fraser.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iv) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

a) Paper S.91-17 - Annual Report (FOR INFORMATION)

Concern was expressed about the average degree completion time and inquiry was made as to whether or not any studies have been done within SFU's graduate programs to see what causes the lengthy completion time and also if there were any comparable statistics available from other universities that would indicate how Simon Fraser was situated in this regard.

B. Clayman referred Senate to page 2 of the covering memo which deals with this issue and informed Senate that a study is in progress at the present time with respect to withdrawal rates and this is closely related to student degree completion time. Although there are no comparable studies in Canada at the present time, the Western Canadian Deans of Graduate Studies group is in the process of collecting data from their respective institutions which will be compiled in the Dean's office at Simon Fraser University. B. Clayman indicated once these studies are completed, he would be pleased to provide Senate with the information. Brief discussion followed which included clarification of how the withdrawal rates are calculated.

Following this discussion, the Annual Report of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee was received by Senate.

v) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

a) Paper S.91-18 - Proposed changes to the Rules of Senate. Section V.A.6 and V.A.7

Moved by N. Swartz, seconded by M.L. Stewart

"that Senate approve a change to sections V.A.6 and V.A.7 of the Rules of Senate as follows:

From: V.A.6 Meetings will be called to order at 7:00 p.m.

V.A.7 The open session of any regular meeting normally shall terminate not later than 10:00 p.m. The time may be extended at any meeting by successful motion for extension, such motion requiring only a simple affirmative majority of those who vote.

To: V.A.6 Meetings will be called to order at 3:00 p.m.

V.A.7 The open and closed sessions of any regular meeting normally shall terminate not later than 5:15 p.m. The time may be extended at any meeting by successful motion for extension, such motion requiring only a simple affirmative majority of those who vote"

Concern was expressed that the evidence on which the report was based had a self-selection bias and therefore could not be relied upon to provide a realistic view of what the University community as a whole felt. It was also pointed out that the rationale concerning the safety of the campus and the surrounding areas at night, if taken to its logical conclusion, would imply that it was not safe to schedule classes in the evening.

The report was also criticized on the basis that the Committee did not conduct an adequate survey to find out if in fact there was an underrepresentation on Senate of persons who are principal care-givers in their family. The report was also unclear as to whether or not a change in meeting time would help this particular group of people or be of benefit to the University community as a whole.

It was noted that an earlier meeting time would effectively eliminate Senate dinners which were felt to be beneficial and a valuable part of the Senate process.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, M. L. Stewart informed Senate of some of the concerns the Committee had received regarding late night travel, particularly for women travelling on the transit system. With regard to the evidence on which the report was based, she pointed out that there will always be some bias involved in such a report because the input received by the committee is submitted from groups who have a self-selected interest in representing their point of view. However, the Committee did hear from several sides and tried to take all arguments and comments into consideration.

Opinion was expressed that the report placed greater emphasis on one particular segment of the population but failed to determine if this group would in fact be better off with an earlier meeting time. It was also pointed out that no matter what time Senate met, some people will be disenfranchised but the evening time is more likely to minimize this.

Objection was raised that the change in the Rules would potentially limit Senate's ability to debate substantial issues since the time allowed for open and closed sessions has been compacted into a shorter time frame.

From the students' point of view, it was noted that the majority of students have classes during the day and therefore find it easier to attend Senate in the evening. This is especially true for students in the Faculty of Science who have block scheduling for labs and would find it almost impossible to attend afternoon meetings. It was noted that the student constituency consistently had vacancies and it was suggested that this was due primarily to the heavy workload of becoming involved in Senate and also because of the timetables of students changing from semester to semester. An evening meeting time minimized this to some extent.

N. Swartz, as Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee responded to some of the concerns. He pointed out that Senate's first obligation was to find a time most convenient for people to attend meetings rather than attend dinner, and he reminded Senate that those who prefer an earlier meeting time were not present to voice their opinions and he hoped Senate would take this into consideration. With regard to scheduling classes in the evening versus holding Senate meetings in the evening, he pointed out that the University had no choice but to schedule evening classes. However, the University did have a choice with regard to scheduling Senate meetings in the evening. He also noted that the same provision about extending the meeting time is in place under the proposed changes to the Rules of Senate. Since there were more faculty and students on campus during the day, it was felt that an afternoon session of Senate would provide better opportunity for members of the University community to drop in and observe Senate meetings.

K. Rieckhoff moved that the question be called and a vote was taken. Motion Carried.

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

MOTION FAILED
8 in favour
25 opposed
9 abstentions

6. Other Business

Referring to the concerns expressed about evening travel, M. Hoechsmann suggested that, as a regular practice, at the end of each meeting the Chair make an announcement to determine if anyone needed a ride with other members going in the same direction. Senate was also reminded of the security escort service that was available on campus to accompany individuals to the parking lots or bus stops.

7. Notices of Motion

There was no notices of motion.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, April 8, 1991.

The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session at 9:25 p.m.

W. R. Heath
Secretary of Senate