

Draft until approved by Senate

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on Monday, March 3, 1997
at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

OPEN SESSION

Present: Stubbs, John, Chair

Alderson, Evan
Arnason, Kristjan
Barrow, Robin
Bawa, Parveen (representing R. Marteniuk)
Berggren, J. Len
Blaney, Jack
Blazenko, George
Boland, Larry
Cellik, Peter
Chan, Albert
Clayman, Bruce
Dahl, Veronica
D'Auria, John
Emmott, Alan
Etherington, Lois
Gagan, David
Jones, Colin
Kozminuk, Angela
Lewis, Brian
Liu, Susan
Luk, Wo-Shun
Mathewes, Rolf
Mauser, Gary
McInnes, Dina
Naef, Barbara
Osborne, Judith
Overington, Jennifer
Percival, Paul
Peterson, Louis
Pierce, John
Rawicz, Andrew
Reed, Clyde
Ross, Douglas
Sanghera, Balwant
Shapiro, Stanley
Whitbread, Katherine
Wickstrom, Norman
Winne, Phil
Wortis, Michael

Watt, Alison, Director, Secretariat Services
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

Absent: Akins, Katherine
Aujla, Angela
Baert, Jessica
Beattie, Suzan
Crawford, Charles
Dobb, Ted
Dunsterville, Valerie
Giffen, Kenneth
Hewitt, Kevin
Howlett, Michael
Kanevsky, Lannie
Nip, Harry
Segal, Joseph
Warsh, Michael

In attendance: Collinge, Joan
Heinrich, Kathy
Knockaert, Joe
LeMare, Lucy
Li, William
Pinfield, Larry
Underhill, Owen
Wrenn, Phyllis

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of February 3, 1997
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

Referring to the federal budget, the Chair reported on the following items which he believed were of considerable interest to post-secondary education, particularly to universities. Immediate increases of \$50 per month and a further \$50 per month next year in allowable deductions; a change in the loan repayment arrangement allowing a further period of grace before repayment takes place. Significant changes in the area of charitable giving are viewed as being very positive for universities and reflect a very active lobby in this area. The Canada Foundation for Innovation will generate a considerable amount of federal money to support research infrastructure. Expectations are that there will be least an equivalent match through Provincial, institutional and private sector funding which will significantly increase the fund over the next several years. The Chair noted that many of these changes occurred because of the enormous amount of work done by the higher education community and although the results are encouraging he felt there is a need to continue and intensify such efforts.

Turning to the Provincial budget, the Chair reported that the university's budget is likely to be known by the end of March or beginning of April. However, the University is operating on the assumption that there will likely be a small cut in the operating budget of about half a percent but Senate was reminded that the freeze on tuition fee increases reduces budget flexibility.

On behalf of Senate, the Chair extended a welcome to newly elected Student Senators - Jessica Baert, Faculty of Arts, Susan Liu, Faculty of Science, and Jennifer Overington, Faculty of Applied Sciences.

5. Reports of Committees

a) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.97-23 - Elections

Senate was advised that there were no nominations to bring forward this month but the Senate Nominating Committee had met and expectations are that further nominations would be forthcoming.

b) Senate Committee on Academic Planning

i) Paper S.97-24 - Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Planning Priorities

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate endorse the processes and priorities for academic planning set out in the final report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Planning Priorities, as set forth in S.97-24, and forward the report to the Board of Governors for information"

The Chair of the *ad hoc* Committee on Planning Priorities (K. Heinrich) as well as several members of the Committee (J. Collinge, L. LeMare, B. Lewis, W. Li, L. Pinfield, and O. Underhill) were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

The Vice-President Academic advised that as a result of the PCUP report being submitted to his office for action, the *ad hoc* Committee on Planning Priorities was created and given a mandate to consult as widely as possible with the University community and to provide advice on two issues. The first issue to be addressed was the priority that should be assigned to the recommendations of the PCUP report; the second issue to define an appropriate strategy for implementing these and other priorities as were defined in the future. Following submission of the *ad hoc* Planning Committee's report, the report was widely circulated and the University community was again consulted specifically on the acceptability of the report, not as a set of policies but as a context within which academic planning would take place in the future. The general response has been very positive and supportive of the report. Senate was being asked to endorse the report as a context and as a process for academic planning and it was stressed that implementation of any actions resulting from recommendations in the report will have to be approved by all appropriate authorities within the University. A number of specific suggestions about how various

recommendations might be implemented have been received and will be forwarded to appropriate university bodies and anyone else interested in receiving them.

The Chair of the *ad hoc* Committee briefly outlined the consultation process followed by the Committee and advised that the report attempts to combine the views of the university community with the PCUP recommendations and reflects a blueprint for the University to plan and operate in the future within a challenging fiscal environment.

In recognition of the concerns surrounding implementation of specific recommendations, and in order to explicitly express that Senate does not accept the report as implementation but rather as a statement of broad principles, and to ensure that any implementation will be contingent on approval from appropriate bodies, M. Wortis suggested the following amendment which was accepted as friendly.

"that Senate endorse *in principle* the processes and priorities for academic planning as set out in the final report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Planning Priorities, as set forth in S.97-24, *with the understanding that any actions taken subsequently to implement it will be subject to the normal processes of consultation and approval at the Departmental, Faculty and University levels*, and forward the report to the Board of Governors for information.

Opinion was expressed that since the *ad hoc* Committee was not a Senate committee, the report should not be before Senate, other than perhaps for information. It was also pointed out that the term endorse is not an option under Robert's Rules and by accepting an entire report, Senate is essentially endorsing every word of the report as its own statement. Several sections of Robert's Rules were quoted, and discussion ensued with respect to this objection. The Chair ruled the objection out of order and discussion on the main motion (as amended) continued.

Reference was made to recommendations 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6. Concerns were expressed about what was perceived to be mandatory language associated with these recommendations and inquiry was made as to how the amended motion would affect implementation of these recommendations.

The Vice-President Academic reiterated that before any initiatives take effect and become policy, they will have to be reviewed by the standing committees of Senate and Departments/Faculties and will be subject to the normal approval processes. However, if Senate endorses the report, the Vice-President, Academic hopes that departments and faculties will be encouraged to use the report as a guideline to achieve what is most important to them in the planning process, and with respect to the specific recommendations in Section 1, Deans, in consultation with their departments/schools will be encouraged to address those issues as quickly as possible.

At the request of the Chair, K. Heinrich briefly explained that the language in Section 1 was used because the Committee felt that in order to be prepared for the next budget a planning process within departments and faculties should begin immediately.

Reference was made specifically to student concerns, and although students have had the opportunity to provide feedback to the *ad hoc* Committee, there was a general concern that there would be less opportunity for student input with respect to implementation of specific initiatives or plans within departments/schools. Senate was advised that the tutorial system is of utmost importance to students and students strongly felt that the tutorial system must be maintained and elaborated.

Amendment moved by J. Overington, seconded by S. Shapiro

"that throughout the document the word 'must' represents the advice of the Committee rather than a direct order"

Brief discussion ensued. An amendment to the amendment by A. Chan to delete the two paragraphs in the report was deemed not to be germane to the amendment on the floor and was ruled out of order.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED
(14 in favour, 21 opposed)

An amendment by A. Chan with respect to the mandatory wording in the report was deemed to be unacceptable because Senate had already expressed its wishes by defeating an amendment on this issue.

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

MOTION CARRIED
(31 in favour, 5 opposed)

The Chair stressed the importance of having such planning guidelines available in order to move on to the next stage and he wished to publicly express the thanks and appreciation of Senate to all members of the *ad hoc* Committee on Planning Priorities, as well as to all members of the PCUP Committee for their work.

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

i) Paper S.97-25 - Undergraduate Student Intake Targets for 1997/98

Motion #1

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the following global undergraduate admission targets to SFU for each basis-of-admission group and for each of the semesters in 1997/98 and that SCAP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall enrolment targets and based on actual enrolment experience in 1997-2 and 1997-3

	Admission Targets			
	<u>1997-2</u>	<u>1997-3</u>	<u>1998-1</u>	<u>Total</u>
B.C. Gr. XII	60	1,720	100	1,880
B.C. College	450	685	425	1,560
Other	<u>275</u>	<u>775</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>1,425</u>
Total Intake	785	3,180	900	4,865"

Reference was made to page 3 of the support documentation and Senate was advised that the funding enrolment target number appearing in paragraph two should be changed from 298 to 246.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion #2

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the following undergraduate admission targets into the Faculty of Science for each basis-of-admission group and for each of the semesters in 1997/98 and that SCAP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall enrolment targets and based on actual enrolment experience in 1997-2 and 1997-3

	Admission Targets			
	<u>1997-2</u>	<u>1997-3</u>	<u>1998-1</u>	<u>Total</u>
B.C. Gr. XII	10	400	30	440
B.C. College	40	75	35	150
Other	<u>10</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>130</u>
Total Intake	60	560	100	720

(The number of new students proposed for the Faculty of Science is included within the global target contained in Motion 1 above)."

Question was called, and a vote taken. MOTION CARRIED

- ii) Paper S.97-26 - International Student Intake Targets for 1997/98, 1998/99, 1999/2000

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by L. Boland

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors to limit the number of international students, excluding exchange students, admitted into undergraduate programs at SFU in the academic years 1997/98, 1998/99 and 1999/2000 to a maximum of 7% of all admissions"

Senate was advised that limit has been set at 7% for some time and rather than bring forward the same recommendation each year, SCEMP has framed a motion covering three years. The limit can be reviewed at any time over the course of the three years if necessary.

Brief discussion took place with respect to why the motion referred to limits and maximums rather than targets.

Question was called, and a vote taken. MOTION CARRIED

- d) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies
- i) Paper S.97-27 - School of Computing Science - Revised Admission Requirements

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by W.S. Luk

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.97-27, the revised

requirements for admission to Computing Science Programs"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.97-28 - Faculty of Science - Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that SCUS, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses (CHEM 215, PHYS 395) and revisions to existing courses/programs within the Departments of Chemistry and Mathematics/Statistics.

iii) Paper S. 97-29 - Deletion of Courses not offered (For Information)

Senate rules state that any courses not offered within a six semester period be deleted from the Calendar unless adequate justification for retaining the course is presented. Senate received information that SCUS, acting under delegated authority, approved the deletion of 15 courses under this regulation.

e) Senate Committee on International Activities

i) Paper S.97-30 - Annual Report (For Information)

D. Gagan, Vice-President, Academic and Chair of SCIA, and J. Knockaert, Director, Office of International Cooperation were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

In view of the abuses of human rights in Indonesia, concern was raised by K. Whitbread about SFU's involvement in the Eastern Indonesia Project and opinion was expressed that without this issue being addressed within the report it looks as though the University is unaware of the problem. Senate was advised that this issue has been discussed by the Committee and the Committee generally felt that the work being done by SFU to help upgrade education at all levels at Indonesian universities is worthwhile and quite rewarding. D. Gagan, Chair of SCIA, extended an invitation to K. Whitbread to attend a meeting of SCIA to discuss her concerns with the Committee. In a response to a suggestion from K. Whitbread that the invitation be extended to student groups who have an active interest in this area, D. Gagan suggested she contact his office to discuss this matter.

A request to include statistical data with regard to the cost of running such programs in relation to the benefits students obtain and the number of students participating in the various programs was duly

noted for inclusion in future reports. Senate was advised that the information is currently available for those interested.

In response to an inquiry as to whether or not the Eastern Indonesia Project will continue beyond 1998, Senate was advised that the project as it currently exists will not be extended but will be phased out slowly with some activities continuing to the year 2000.

f) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.97-31 - Annual Report (For Information)

B. Clayman, Dean of Graduate Studies and P. Wrenn, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate received the Annual Report of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee for information.

g) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Timing of Senate Meetings with Light Agendas

The Chair advised Senate that if, in the opinion of SCAR, the Senate agenda appears to be light, the suggestion of SCAR would be to start the Senate meeting at 5:30 pm and Senate, particularly off campus Senators, were asked for their view. There appeared to be no objection to the suggestion and the Chair requested that Lay Senators be contacted directly with regard to this issue.

6. Other Business

Referring to the Macleans report entitled 'A Guide to Universities' which was published several months ago, K. Arnason advised Senate that five SFU professors were acknowledged for their popularity and congratulations were extended to Professors Douglas Ross (Political Science), David Ryeburn (Mathematics/Statistics), Majorie Cohen (Women's Studies/Political Science), Gary Poole (Psychology), and Allan MacKinnon (Education).

The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session at 9:00 pm.

Alison Watt, Director,
Secretariat Services