

Approved -
As amended by
Senate 5/10/98

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, September 14, 1998 at 7:00 pm in Room 126 Halpern Centre

Open Session

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair

Berggren, Len
Blackman, Roger (representing J. Pierce)
Boland, Larry
Bowman, Marilyn
Burton, Lynn Elen
Chan, Albert
Cheng, Winnie
Coleman, Peter
D'Auria, John
Dhillon, Khushwant
Emerson, Joseph
Emmott, Alan
Finley, David
Fletcher, James
Gagan, David
Giffen, Kenneth
Gillies, Mary Ann
Jones, John
Kanevsky, Lannie
Kirczenow, George
Lewis, Brian
Marteniuk, Ron
McInnes, Dina
Morris, Joy
Naef, Barbara
Ogloff, James
Osborne, Judith
Overington, Jennifer
Percival, Paul
Peterson, Louis
Peters, Joseph
Reader, Jason
Russell, Maya
Russell, Robert
Sanghera, Balwant
Tam, Lawrence
Veerkamp, Mark
Waterhouse, John
Wortis, Michael
Zazkis, Rina

Heath, Nick, Acting Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, Secretariat Services
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

Absent:

Akins, Kathleen
Barrow, Robin
Beattie, Suzan
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
Dunsterville, Valerie
Harris, Richard
Jones, Colin
Mathewes, Rolf
Mauser, Gary
Segal, Joseph
Warsh, Michael
Wickstrom, Norman

In attendance:

Brown, Robert
Johnson, Rick
Peterman, Randall
Selman, Mark
Ward, Roger

The Chair welcomed new Senator, Dr. Lynn Elen Burton, Dean of Continuing Studies to Senate.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was amended to add the following items under Item 6 - Other Business:

- 6.i) Mid-Semester Break
- 6.iv) Advertisements in the Calendar
- 6.v) Exam Schedule/Last Day of Classes

Following the above additions, the agenda was approved as amended.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of June 1, 1998

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

i) Paper S.98-60 - Annual Financial Statement (For Information)

Roger Ward, Vice-President Finance and Administration was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

In response to an inquiry about the increase in the non-recurring expenditures from 1997 to 1998, Senate was advised that the amount varies from year to year depending on a variety of circumstances. Senate was advised that full details of the expenditures are provided in the University's budget which is posted on the Web under Financial Services.

ii) The Chair reported that on September 23, 1998 the Minister of Advanced Education, Training and Technology, the Honorable Andrew Petter will be on campus for several hours. Most of his time will be spent at the campus barbeque meeting students.

iii) The Chair reported that the Vice-Presidents and Deans had met over a two day period to do some initial budget planning for 1999/2000. He explained that this is an accelerated budget planning process and the deliberations of that meeting will be presented to SCUB at its next meeting. The intent is that this year's budget planning process will follow the same principles as last year and will be as open and as consultative as possible.

iv) The Chair advised that at the next meeting Senate will receive a discussion paper entitled 'President's Agenda'. Comments and advice will be sought from Senate and the Board of Governors.

5. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

a) SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

i) Paper S.98-61 - Elections

The following are the results of elections to the following Senate Committees:

Committee To Review University Admissions (CRUA)

One (Alternate) Faculty Member to replace Norbert Haunerland from date of election to May 31, 1999.

Elected by acclamation:

Heeson Bai

Senate Appeals Board (SAB)

One (Alternate) Graduate (at-large) to replace Andrea Welling from date of election to May 31, 2000.

Elected by acclamation:

Thomas du Payrat

b) SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING

i) Paper S.98-62 - Cooperative Resource Management Institute

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.98-62, the proposed Cooperative Resource Management Institute, as a Schedule A institute"

Randall Peterman, School of Resource and Environmental Management was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that the proposal had been discussed at length by SCAP and referred back to the School with a number of recommendations with respect to making the new Institute more inclusive to a larger group of researchers both on and off campus. The proposal before Senate has been revised to reflect the suggestions from SCAP.

Reference was made to the composition of the Advisory Board and concern was expressed that representatives from SFU appeared to be in the minority. It was pointed out that the structure is very typical and it was not unusual for an advisory board to be dominated by external members. Brief discussion followed with respect to the role of the Advisory Board, and Senate's attention was drawn to the supporting documentation which indicates that the Advisory board has no legal responsibility and exercises no direct control over the Institute.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.98-63 - SCAP Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Planning was received by Senate for information.

c) SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING/SENATE COMMITTEE ON CONTINUING STUDIES

i) Paper S.98-64 - Non-Credit Certificate Program: Certificate in Leadership Learning

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.98-64, the Non-Credit Certificate Program: Certificate in Leadership Learning”

Mark Selman, Associate Dean of Continuing Studies, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Opinion was expressed that the central strength of the University rested in its academic expertise within academic departments. Concern was expressed that non-credit programs such as the one being proposed respond to the needs of the outside community but fall outside the core academic areas of departments/schools. It was suggested that the development of such programming reflects a change of emphasis in the University and concern was expressed that outside people were teaching programs under the University's name in areas where there is no core expertise within the University.

It was pointed out that individual programs and course offerings have to be approved by the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies, a committee whose academic membership reflects a wide spectrum of views. The University has a mandate to provide continuing education and it is the responsibility of the Committee to make sure its non-credit programming complements the academic expertise in the University. It was also noted that non-credit programs are very popular, self-supporting, and they put the University in touch with many businesses and industries who end up supporting SFU through contributions. They also create goodwill and credibility in the community at-large. SFU has a reputation for being an innovative university in the area of continuing education because it has always geared its non-credit offerings to the expertise and interests of its faculty members and the strengths of the University.

Brief discussion followed with respect to the specific ICBC program and its potential for growth as well as the process for developing other programs under this certificate.

In response to a suggestion that either SCAP or some other committee look at the role of Continuing Studies vis-a-vis academic programs and how it views itself in the future, Senate was advised that the three-year plan from Continuing

Studies is widely available for perusal. Suggestion was also made to the Dean of Continuing Studies that she may wish to initiate inquiries within the University with respect to perceived priorities for continuing studies.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

d) SENATE APPEALS BOARD (SAB)

i) Paper S.98-65 - Annual Report (For Information)

The Annual Report of the Senate Appeals Board was received by Senate for information.

e) SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING/SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

i) Paper S.98-66 - Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions - Faculty of Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to existing courses and programs within the Faculty of Education, including Minor Programs in Environmental Education and Early Childhood Education, and B.Ed. as a Second Degree.

f) SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING/SENATE GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

i) Paper S.98-67 - Graduate Curriculum Revisions - Department of English (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved revisions to the calendar description of the graduate program reflecting the expanded role of the Writing Centre, the teaching of Writing and Rhetoric within the English Department, and the addition of a new heading and section 'Specialization in Print Culture 1700-1900'.

ii) Paper S.98-68 - Graduate Curriculum Revisions - Department of Geography (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses in Urban Studies - URB 600, URB 601.

iii) Paper S.98-69 - Graduate Curriculum Revisions - Department of History (For Information)

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by R. Blackman

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.98-69, the following addition to the Calendar entry:

Full-time thesis-option students are expected to complete their degree requirements in a maximum of five semesters, and project-option students in a maximum of three semesters. Part-time thesis-option students are expected to complete their degree requirements in a maximum of eight semesters and part-time project option students in a maximum of six semesters"

Moved by M. Russell, seconded by J. Overington

"that the motion be tabled until the recommendations of the Graduate Students Survey Implementation Task Force have been received"

Initial results from the graduate survey indicate that completion time is a fairly salient issue and suggestion was made that it would be prudent to wait until the Task Force has completed its work before Senate considered this matter.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved minor revisions to existing courses within the Department of History, including deletion of HIST 863, 866, 889, and new courses HIST 812, 825.

g) SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGENDA AND RULES

i) Paper S.98-70 - Report - Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Role of Senate regarding University Policies

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by B. Sanghera

"that Senate approve the addition of section 3 to the terms of reference of the Senate committee on Agenda and Rules:

3. To receive, in a timely manner, all proposed new University Policies and all proposed revisions to existing policies (excluding those policies negotiated with employee groups), and to determine which policies should be forwarded to Senate. Senate consideration will take one of the following forms:

Approval	For those proposed policies and policy revisions which SCAR determines to fall within Senate's jurisdiction as defined by the University Act.
Advice	For those proposed policies and policy revisions which SCAR determines to be of direct interest to Senate and which should be discussed at Senate.

Information For those proposed policies and policy revisions which SCAR determines should be circulated to Senate for information."

It was noted that the motion pertained to proposed new policies and future revisions to existing policies. Inquiry was made as to the process to be followed if there were concerns about existing policies not under revision. Senate was advised that these concerns could be brought forward to Senate for consideration at any time.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Inquiry was made as to the status of the remainder of the statements on the blue cover sheet of document S.98-70, particularly the two statements at the top of page two. Senate was advised that they are statements of what SCAR has agreed to do but do not form part of the formal motion. If Senate desired, they could be moved as motions. It was pointed out that the policies referred to were currently under revision and therefore would come to Senate probably by the end of next semester.

Opinion was expressed that the Policy Gazette was a good idea but concern was raised that not everyone may have access to the Web. Suggestion was made that the information, in some form, be advertised in SF News in order to alert a wider section of the university community. There were no objections to this suggestion.

ii) Paper S.98-71 - Voting Eligibility - Part-time Employees

Motion #1 - Continuing Faculty

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by R. Blackman

"that Part-time tenure-track and tenured faculty (Instructors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors including faculty on post-retirement contracts) and continuing Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Lab Instructors and Librarians with appointments of 50% or greater be granted the same rights as full-time colleagues holding the same rank, to nominate, stand for election and vote in the following:

- elections to Senate committees;
- elections for search committees for chairs/directors, deans, vice-presidents and president
- elections of chairs/directors
- ratification of chairs/directors and deans (internal candidates)
- recall votes for chairs/directors and deans"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #1 CARRIED

Motion #2 - Limited Term Faculty

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by R. Blackman

"that Part-time Limited Term faculty (Instructors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors) and Limited Term Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Lab Instructors and Librarians with appointments that are 50% or greater and longer than one year, be granted the same rights as full-time colleagues holding the same rank, to nominate, stand for election and vote in the following:

- elections to Senate committees
- elections for search committees for chairs/directors, deans, vice-presidents and president
- elections of chairs/directors
- ratification of chairs/directors and deans (internal candidates);
- recall votes for chairs/directors and deans"

Opinion was expressed that it was inappropriate to give limited term appointments the same rights and privileges as faculty who have long term commitments to the University.

It was pointed out that a number of limited term appointments are made because of the nature of funding for the position in question, and the process of appointment and renewal is equivalent to the tenure-track process. In such cases, the appointments result in tenure-track positions and opinion was expressed that they should have the same rights and privileges.

The view was expressed that while there may be some limited term appointments such as those described above which ought to be included, there were many other limited term appointments which were not equivalent to tenure-track positions and should not be given the same rights. Unless adequate wording was offered to distinguish between the different groups, opinion was expressed that the motion was inappropriate. Objection was also made to giving part-time limited term appointments the same rights and privileges as continuing faculty.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #2 DEFEATED

Motion #3 - Support Staff

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by R. Blackman

"that Part-time continuing support staff with appointments of 50% or greater with terms of longer than one year, be granted the same rights as full-time colleagues holding the same type of appointment, to nominate, stand for election and vote in the following:

- elections for search committees for deans, vice-presidents and president"

Objection was raised with respect to allowing support staff to vote on search committees in general, and opinion expressed that extending this privilege to part-time support staff went too far.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #3 CARRIED

iii) Paper S.98-72 - Revision to SCAP Membership

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve that the membership of SCAP be amended to replace the Director of Extension Credit Programs with the Dean of Continuing Studies"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

6. OTHER BUSINESS

i) Mid-Semester Break

Senate's attention was drawn to the mid-semester break announced in the new Calendar affecting classes on Monday, February 16th, 1999 and Tuesday, February 17th, 1999.

It was noted that the idea for a mid-semester break originated from a student held referendum in which approximately 60% of the votes cast were in favour of the idea. However, the academic staff had no input or opportunity to debate this issue and this matter should have been addressed by Senate. It was pointed out that scheduling a mid-semester break required the approval of Senate. Therefore, the break ~~should be~~^{was} declared not to exist and Senate^{will} be given an opportunity at the next meeting to consider how a mid-semester break might be accommodated.

Points of order were raised but the concerns were resolved by agreement that the Registrar be instructed to bring forward to the next meeting, an appropriate motion, together with rationale and all possible options, for a mid-semester break.

It was also agreed that the University community would be notified that no mid-semester break had been approved by Senate at this time, and that Senate would consider this matter in October.

ii) Paper S.98-73 - Burnaby Mountain Development

Moved by A. Chan, seconded by J. Reader

"Under the authority outlined in Section 37(1)(o) of the *University Act*, 1996 R.S.B.C., Chap. 468, Senate recommends that the Board of Governors submits any and all construction plans regarding the Burnaby Mountain Development Project to Senate for full consultation purposes before the Board gives its final approval to the project"

R. Brown, President Designate of the Burnaby Mountain Community Corporation, and R. Johnson, Director of Facilities Management, were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

R. Brown indicated that while he had no problem with the principle of the motion, he was concerned with the specific language which he felt was unworkable. He explained that it was perfectly reasonable to bring the major issues pertaining to the development project to Senate for information and discussion but he pointed out that the Board of Governors had already approved what property of the University will be developed and had endorsed the Official Community Plan which has been approved by the City of Burnaby. R. Brown went on to say that there were two items on the immediate agenda which he felt would be very interesting for Senate to discuss. A vision statement for the project is currently in preparation and once that has been agreed to by the community, a master plan for the overall development of the project will be undertaken. He indicated he would be quite happy to bring both of these items to Senate for discussion and consultation prior to taking them to the Board.

A suggestion by J. Overington to change the motion as follows, was accepted as a friendly amendment:

"Senate recommends that the Board of Governors submits any and all community development plans regarding the Burnaby Mountain Development Project to Senate for full consultation purposes before the Board gives its final approval to the project plans"

Senate was advised that students were largely concerned with the human component of the plan rather than detailed planning documents, and R. Brown indicated that the two items which he had previously referred related to this type of issue.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION (AS AMENDED) CARRIED

iii) Paper S. 98-74 - Student Day of Action

Motion #1

Moved by J. Morris, seconded by J. Overington

"that faculty consider student participation in the National Day of Action on Friday, October 16, 1998 as grounds for academic concession"

Federal cuts over the past several years to post-secondary education were referred to, and Senate was advised that the Canadian Federation of Students had organized a national Day of Action to protest these cuts and call upon all levels of government to assume responsibility for the adequate funding of post-secondary education. Since increased funding benefits everyone at the University, it is hoped that students and faculty could work together to ensure that students who wish to participate in the Day of Action would not be penalized for missing class.

Opinion was expressed that Senate had an obligation to remain neutral and it would be inappropriate for Senate to grant preferential treatment and concessions to students who have certain beliefs and wish to engage in a particular political activity.

Since the focus of the student activity was directly related to education and was being coordinated for increased funding which would benefit everyone, suggestion was made that Senate might perhaps be able to support a more general motion.

Opinion was expressed that the request was very modest and only required minimal action on behalf of the University. It was pointed out that the motion, as it was worded, does not obligate or force anyone to do anything; rather it makes a statement which faculty may or may not consider. Therefore, it should be viewed as mild support for an issue of importance to students rather than as making a strong political statement by Senate.

Clarification was requested about the meaning of the term 'academic concession' and whether the motion, if approved, requires faculty to consider student participation as grounds for academic concession or whether it means that faculty may consider it as grounds. It was suggested that "academic concession" would allow a reasonable opportunity for students to learn the material they have missed, as would be provided if they were sick, and faculty would be obliged to consider student participation as grounds for academic concession but it would be up to individual faculty members to decide whether participation was adequate grounds or not.

Opinion was expressed that while it was commendable for students to organize and participate in this kind of political activity, students should balance their participation with their individual academic activities as it would be inappropriate for Senate to condone particular actions on particular topics.

Concern was expressed that the motion, as it is worded, does not allow consistency between different Faculties or faculty members and some students may be penalized while others may not.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #1 DEFEATED

Motion #2:

Moved by J. Morris, seconded by J. Reader

"that faculty be encouraged to reschedule any exams, quizzes and mandatory assignments scheduled for October 16, 1998"

Senate was advised that this motion simply gives faculty members advance notice of the Day of Action and asks them to give some consideration to help students who wish to participate in something that directly benefits everyone at the University.

Senate was advised that the Student Society has organized some informational workshops on this issue and Senators were encouraged to either attend or review the material available.

It was suggested that perhaps this type of activity should be planned on a weekend or that students participate between classes. It was noted that the protest is held downtown and it would not be easy for students to travel back and forth. Past experience has shown that students have to choose between their class and participation and it would be helpful if they didn't have to face missing a quizz or exam.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #2 DEFEATED

Moved by M. Veerkamp, seconded by P. Percival

"that faculty are advised that October 16, 1998 is a day of action and protest and they are requested to avoid exams and quizzes on that day"

Suggestion was made that the motion is out of order since it is essentially the same as motion #2. The Chair ruled that a vote would be taken on the motion without lengthy discussion.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION DEFEATED

iv) Advertisement in the Calendar

J. D'Auria moved the following Notice of Motion for discussion at the next meeting of Senate:

"that advertising not be allowed in the Calendar until the principle has been approved by Senate and the relevant procedures on how the advertising will be selected are discussed"

v) Last Day of Classes/Exam Schedule

Senate was reminded of a motion it had previously passed specifying that when the start of classes falls on a Tuesday after a Monday holiday, the last day of classes is extended by one day into the exam schedule. This did not happen this semester even though classes started on the Tuesday after Labour Day.

Senate was advised that when Labour Day falls on the last possible day it can, such as the case this year, the formula to extend the semester into the exam schedule does not work. Given all of the steps that the Registrar must take to get the grades in and check student performances for registration/non-registration in the following semester, all of the work must be completed by midnight December 24th. If the last day of classes were to take place on December 7th instead of December 4th, the grading process required to be carried out by the Registrar's

Office would run into Christmas Day. This situation happens once every seven years.

Opinion was expressed that the objection was that the Registrar did not bring this to the attention of Senate and ask for an exemption.

In light of the various Calendar issues which have come up, suggestion was made that it might be appropriate to set up a calendar committee or designate one of Senate's standing committees to oversee the Calendar and have the Calendar officially approved by Senate. The Chair indicated that SCAR would consider the suggestion and report back to Senate.

7. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, October 5, 1998 and will be held in WMC 3210.

The Open Session adjourned at 9:20 pm. Following a brief recess, the Assembly moved into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, Secretariat Services