

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SENATE OF SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD
ON MONDAY, JULY 4, 1994 KLAUS RIECKHOFF HALL, 7:00 P.M.
OPEN SESSION

Present: Boland, L., Acting Chair

Alderson, E.
Arnason, K.
Bacani, J.
Blaney, J.
Bullock, D.
Chan, K.
Clayman, B.
Crawford, C.
Dill, L.
Dobb, T.
Dunsterville, V.
Eaton, C.
Einstein, D.
Etherington, L.
Giffen, K.
Hafer, L.
Heinrich, K.
Jones, C.
Lord, T.
Luk, W.S.
Marteniuk, R.
Mauser, G.
McAskill, I.
McInnes, D.
Morrison, T.
Mueller, B.
Munro, J.
Osborne, J.
Palmer, E.
Perry, T.
Pinfield, L.
Shapiro, S.
Swartz, N.
Thompson, J.
Warsh, M.
Wickstrom, N.
Wideen, M.
Winne, P.
Wu, S.

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

Absent: Barrow, R.
Beattie, S.
Chunn, D.
Ciria, A.
Dean, C.
Dhir, R.
Driver, J.
Hoeflich, K.
Mathewes, R.
Naef, B.
Percival, P.
Rawicz, A.
Sanghera, B.
Segal, J.
Stewart, M.L.
Stubbs, J.

In attendance: Brockman, J.
Lorimer, R.

On behalf of Senate, the Chair welcomed newly elected Senator, J. Thompson to the meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION OF JUNE 6, 1994
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
There was no report from the Chair.
5. REPORT OF COMMITTEES
 - a) SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING
 - i) Paper S.94-48 - Master of Publishing

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the proposed Master of Publishing Program, as set forth in S.94-48"

R. Lorimer, Director of the Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Concerns were expressed about the proposal coming back after being rejected by Senate. It was pointed out that since discussion at the last meeting had mainly focused on financial support and implementation costs of the program, SCAP felt that information which had been available but not provided to Senate at the last meeting should be forwarded and the proposal reconsidered.

Discussion turned to the issue of funding and surprise was expressed that support was going to become available from the University's Innovation Fund. E. Alderson advised that although the President had made a commitment from the University's central budget, it was not entirely clear that the funds were coming from this Fund. He went on to explain that without some commitment from the University, the external funding which has now been committed would not have been possible. Reference was made to the normal procedure whereby SCAP prioritized, for funding, new programs approved but not yet implemented, and concern was expressed about decisions of funding being made in advance of Senate consideration. It was noted, however, that this program was not competing with any other new program. Discussion followed with respect to tuition fees and other financial aspects of the proposal.

With regard to the issue of implementation, it was noted that the entry costs of the program had been significantly reduced and that non-recurring financial support for a three-year period had been committed. A review of the program would take place at the end of that time to determine the feasibility of continuing the program. In response to an inquiry as to how such a review would be conducted, Senate was advised that student demand for the program, job placement in the industry, availability of internship and research grants were the types of issues that would be looked at when the program came under review.

In response to an inquiry about the structure of the program, Senate was advised that, like other similar programs at the graduate level, it would be a free-standing program within the Faculty of Arts accountable to the Dean of Arts.

Discussion ensued with respect to the academic content of the program, and Senate was provided with further details related to the proposed course offerings and academic merit of the proposal.

Concern was expressed about the absence of reports from external referees. Senate was advised that since the original program had been externally assessed and already approved by Senate, the Assessment Committee for New Graduate Programs concluded that since the program had not changed materially there was no need to send it out for further external review.

Moved by N. Swartz, seconded by L. Etherington

"that the motion be referred to the Assessment Committee for New Graduate Programs with request that it be sent to external review"

Opinion was expressed that the motion to refer was inappropriate because the main motion was improperly worded, and a suggestion to change the wording of the main motion was ruled out of order by the Chair. A challenge to the Chair's ruling was upheld and suggestion was made that the main motion should refer to the relocation of the program to a different Faculty rather than approval of the program itself. Discussion followed.

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

MOTION TO REFER FAILED

Concern was expressed that students without industry experience would have difficulty getting into the program, and question was raised about establishing a quota for students graduating directly from undergraduate programs. Senate was advised that the intent is to have a blend of both types of students in the program, but students admitted from outside the industry will be expected to show some level of commitment in order to demonstrate that they are serious and have a real desire to be involved in the publishing industry.

Because of limited resources, both administrative and financial, concern was expressed about approving new programs without having in place a plan based on the values and objectives of the University as a whole. Reference was made

to Challenge 2001. It was noted that this program is entirely consistent with the objectives set out in that planning document, and is consistent with several other new professional graduate programs that have been established over the past several years. The feasibility of considering all new programs once or twice a year instead of at random intervals was discussed. In response to a concern about industry becoming involved in the process of program development, it was pointed out that the program was developed within the University and only taken to industry for comment.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED
(26 in favour, 5 opposed)

ii) Paper S.94-49 - Report of the SCAP/Harbour Centre Sub-Committee - For Information

Brief discussion took place with respect to the proposed development of an international conference centre, following which the report was received by Senate.

b) SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

i) Paper S.94-50 - Change to Library Loan Policy

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate approve the following changes to the Library Loan Policy as set out in S.94-50:

1. That faculty, staff and graduate students be given a semester loan period with one renewal for all general loans books, regardless of whether the books are high or low usage category.
2. That undergraduate students and extra-mural borrowers be given:
 - a) a three-week loan period with one renewal for high use category books
 - b) a semester loan period with one renewal for low use category books.
3. That high use category books for undergraduates and extra-mural students be increased to 20% of the STACKS collection or 200,000 volumes.
4. That all new books being added to the Library's collections be given a high use category for undergraduates and extra-mural borrowers until a low usage pattern results in adjusting these books to a semester loan category for undergraduates.
5. That the semester loan due date be adjusted to one week after the exam period with no grace period for return.
6. That the Library monitor these changes in the loan policy and make a further evaluation with any recommendations to the Senate Library Committee in June 1995"

Reference was made to item #3 above, and a request by T. Dobb to change the word 'students' to 'borrowers' was accepted as an editorial revision.

Senators were provided with background information as to why the proposal was before Senate for consideration. It was noted that existing regulations have caused various forms of borrower dissatisfaction and have failed to meet the objectives of increasing material availability, especially in terms of the high use category. Senate was provided with a brief summary of the proposed changes and advised that adoption of the proposal is expected to increase the availability of the high use collection for a longer period of time.

Brief discussion took place with respect to how materials are designated as high use and how the Library's operating system processes them.

Reference was made to the increase in the number of students appealing fines and opinion was expressed that this appeared to be a direct consequence of having two different loan periods. It was pointed out, however, that the increase in appeals appeared to be more directly related to the implementation of the high fine schedule.

Responding to a concern that the proposal created two classes of library users, it was noted that past experience has shown that different borrowing groups have different requirements and this proposal attempts to accommodate those needs.

Discussion ensued with respect to procedures used to indicate which loan period applied to books, and concern was expressed about the current use of using date slips rather than labeling and stamping individual books. Senate was advised that the cost of labeling and stamping books was very expensive, and there is a distinct possibility of moving to self-serve terminals. It was also pointed out that if the date slip is lost, the book's status can be determined by accessing the computer system.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

c) AD HOC SENATE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE AND STUDENT CONDUCT POLICIES

i) Paper S.94-51 - Code of Student Conduct

Moved by J. Osborne, seconded by L. Pinfield

"that Senate approve effective September 1, 1994 the policies and procedures relating to student discipline, including replacement of the Senate Committee on Academic Discipline (SCAD) with the Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals (SCODA) as set forth in S.94-51"

J. Osborne, Chair of the Committee, acknowledged the work of the committee and extended thanks to all of its members. Senate was advised that, in addition to the Chair, three other members of the committee were in attendance to respond to questions - L. Pinfield, R. Heath, and J. Brockman.

Senate was provided with background information as to how the committee was established and the process it followed which resulted in the report and recommendations currently before Senate.

Moved by K. Arnason, seconded by N. Wickstrom

"that the motion be divided in order to allow discussion of the roman numeral sections separately"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO DIVIDE FAILED

PART I - CODE OF ACADEMIC HONESTY

Clarification, including past examples, was provided with respect to inquiries about sections 3.d and 3.h, and concern was expressed about the use of verbal warnings under 5.2.

Discussion ensued with respect to the illustrations in 3.0 - Forms of Academic Dishonesty, particularly 3.a and 3.d (2nd d). It was noted that the illustrations were not meant to be definitive or exhaustive but rather meant to serve as examples of activities which could be considered to constitute academic dishonesty.

PART II - CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT

Reference was made to page 3, and concern was expressed that there appeared to be a contradiction between the last sentence of the Statement of Principle and section 2.1(a). It was pointed out that the phrase set out in the preamble was borrowed directly from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which states that rights and freedoms are subject to reasonable limits that are justifiable in a free and democratic society. The preamble is a governing statement of principle and the succeeding sections are to be interpreted in light of the preamble. Concern was expressed about allowing a small internal body of the University to address appeals and set out jurisprudence as to what will or will not be deemed to be reasonable or unreasonable. It was pointed out that the body judging the reasonableness of an action is representative of the university community and its social values, and that the rights and privileges of students are protected by this process because penalties imposed under this principle are subject to review at a full hearing.

Amendment moved by B. Mueller, seconded by K. Arnason

"that the word 'unreasonably' be deleted from the last sentence of section 1.0, and the words 'or limit' be added after the word prohibit as follows:

This Code shall not be construed to ~~unreasonably~~ prohibit or limit peaceful assemblies, demonstrations or free speech"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

With respect to 3.2, discussion ensued about the use of verbal warnings, and concern was expressed about the absence of documentation or written record of specific incidents. A brief discussion of procedures followed.

Concern was expressed about Senate's authority to deal with the issues of student conduct and behaviour, and the legality of Senate producing such a document was questioned. It was pointed out that there is an existing Senate policy relating to student conduct and the committee felt it was appropriate to bring all of the proposed policies back to Senate as a package for approval.

PART III - UNIVERSITY BOARD ON STUDENT DISCIPLINE (UBSC)

Reference was made to 5.12. In response to an inquiry as to the use of the audio tapes, it was noted that the tapes would only be transcribed for appeal purposes to SCODA, and that appellants would be able to obtain copies in order to prepare for their appeal.

In response to an inquiry as to why the tribunal was to be constituted with three members, Senate was advised that three is the norm in legal proceedings of this type.

There were no objections to a motion from the Chair to extend the meeting beyond 10:00 p.m.

A suggestion to add the words 'on an annual basis' to Section 8.0, as follows, was accepted as a friendly amendment:

8.0 Reporting

A summary of the Tribunal's decisions and the penalties imposed will be accessible to the University community *on an annual basis* unless the Tribunal or the President decides that all or part of the decision or penalty should not be disclosed.

Discussion ensued with regard to section 7, and clarification was provided as to the procedures used to record penalties on student's transcripts and files.

Reference was made to section 1.1(c), and concern was expressed that Departmental Chairs did not have access to student files in the Registrar's Office and therefore would not be aware if a student has a history of cheating when assessing penalties at the departmental level.

Amendment moved by N. Swartz, seconded by T. Morrison

"that the first paragraph of Section 1.1(c) be changed as follows:

In the case of (b), the Chair shall meet with the student, and after reviewing the facts of the case and any previous case in the student's departmental files, in the Departmental or Registrar's Office, may take one or more of the following courses of action..... "

Senate was advised that the Committee had discovered that the policies were not adhered to consistently and the proposal was an attempt to centralize the process and minimize the amount of responsibility placed on the Instructor and the Departmental Chair.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

Inquiry was made as to why non-academic staff were included as members of the University Board on Student Conduct. Senate was advised that the interests of staff should be represented in cases involving staff members, and Senate's attention was drawn to Section 4.4 where it instructs the Co-ordinator of the UBSC to take into account the nature of the charges brought forward and the diversity of the community when appointing members to a tribunal.

PART IV - SENATE COMMITTEE ON DISCIPLINARY APPEALS (SCODA)

Concern was expressed that the requirements for quorum did not include a student member. However, it was pointed out that the composition of the committee made it impossible to have a quorum without at least one student member present so there was no need to specify it.

Opinion was expressed that the Student Society should have opportunity to put forward representatives on a committee of this nature, and it was pointed out that all of the student members on the current Senate Committee on Academic Discipline are appointed by the Student Society.

Amendment moved by B. Mueller, seconded by K. Amason

"that section 3.1(c) be changed as follows:

From: 3 students elected by Senate for 1 year terms

To: 1 student elected by Senate for one year term
and add

Section 3.1(d) to read: 2 students elected by the Simon Fraser
Student Society for one year term"

In response to a request for clarification as to what was meant by the Simon Fraser Student Society, Senate was advised that the intent was to follow current practice which would essentially have the Board of Directors of the Student Society make such appointments. Discussion ensued with respect to how the selection/appointment process by the SFSS functions, and how student nominations come forward if elected by Senate. A suggestion that the amendment be reworded to use the same language as other appointments to other Senate committees was ruled irrelevant by the Chair because there

appeared to be no uniformity in the wording between committees and, in his opinion, the existing wording did nothing to clarify the intent of the proposed amendment.

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

AMENDMENT FAILED

Discussion ensued.

Amendment moved by K. Amason, seconded by T. Morrison

"that Section 3.1(c) be changed as follows:

From: 3 students elected by Senate for 1 year terms

To: 1 student elected by Senate for one year term
and add

Section 3.1(d) to read: 2 students elected by the Governing
Body of the Simon Fraser Student Society"

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

AMENDMENT FAILED
(13 in favour; 16 opposed)

A general inquiry was made as to the degree of student involvement in shaping these policies, and Senate was provided with a brief summary of the process followed.

Concern was expressed by B. Clayman that the policies had been developed without much reference to graduate students and he wished to inform Senate that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee is considering amendment to the proposed policies that would be more comprehensive and include graduate students in a way that is more reflective of their role within the University community.

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

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

6. OTHER BUSINESS

Reference was made to the news report from Concordia University announcing the availability of gender-neutral degrees, and inquiry was made as to whether or not SFU was considering making available degrees with alternative names. Senate was advised that there was no discussion underway in this regard. In order for the matter to be considered, N. Swartz was advised to forward a submission to SCAR for consideration.

Student Senators Bacani, Chan, Morrison and Wu presented Senate with a semesterly report on the availability of course outlines. As of one week prior to telephone registration many course outlines were still not available. Referring to his past comments about course outlines being made available within a

reasonable time prior to telereg, inquiry was directed to J. Munro. He indicated he could do nothing more than notify Faculty Deans of the Senate regulation in this regard and hope that they in turn pass the information to Departmental Chairs.

7. INFORMATION

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, August 8, 1994.

The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session at 11:00 p.m.

W.R. Heath
Secretary of Senate