

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, March 1, 1999 at 7:00 pm in room 3210 West Mall Complex

Open Session

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair

Barrow, Robin
Berggren, J. Len
Boland, Lawrence
Burton, Lynn Elen
Chan, Albert
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
Emmott, Alan
Finley, David
Gagan, David
Gillies, Mary Ann
Harris, Richard
Heaney, W. John
Jones, Colin
Jones, John
Kanevsky, Lannie
Kirczenow, George
Lewis, Brian
Marteniuk, Ron
Mathewes, Rolf
Mauser, Gary
McInnes, Dina
Morris, Joy
Ogloff, James
Osborne, Judith
Overington, Jennifer
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Russell, Robert
To, Shek Yan
Waterhouse, John
Weeks, Daniel
Wortis, Michael
Zazkis, Rina

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

Absent:

Akins, Kathleen
Beattie, Suzan
Bowman, Marilyn
Coleman, Peter
D'Auria, John
Dhillon, Khushwant
Dunsterville, Valerie
Emerson, Joseph
Fletcher, James
Giffen, Kenneth
Naef, Barbara
Peterson, Louis
Reader, Jason
Sanghera, Balwant
Segal, Joseph
Veerkamp, Mark
Warsh, Michael
Wickstrom, Norman

In attendance:

Cameron, Rob
Duguid, Stephen
Knockaert, Joe
Martin, Randy
Volker, Michael

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was revised to reverse the order of Item 5 F.i and 5 F.ii in order to consider S.99-30 prior to S.99-29. Following this amendment, the agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of February 1, 1999

The following revisions were made: page 2, 2nd paragraph, Item 4 – SF Week changed to SF News, page 4, 4th paragraph and page 7, 3rd paragraph – typographical error corrected, 'ides' changed to 'ideas', and the following sentence was added to the 2nd paragraph on page 5 – Opinion was expressed that familial hiring be discouraged because the University should aim for strong professional relations rather than supporting ones which could lead to conflict of interest situations.

Following the above amendments, the Minutes were approved.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

Reference was made to the issue raised about the alleged communication problems between the Administration and SCUB. Brief discussion ensued with respect to the current budget process and SCUB's involvement in that process. Discussion also ensued with respect to problems experienced in the past with respect to information being withheld from SCUB. The Chair hoped that this was no longer the case and indicated that from his experience the budget process is as open as it can possibly be. The Chair of SCUB expressed opinion that there was currently no purpose for SCUB and suggested that Senate needs to think about what it wants SCUB to do. The Chair indicated that the procedures for SCUB can be revisited at any time and suggested that the Senate Review Committee look at this issue.

4. Report of the Chair

i) Budget Information

The Chair presented Senate with information to show what has happened to the base grant, the grant per student, and the percentage that tuition represents in the overall budget since 1971-72 and 1989-90. The Chair pointed out the income per student has decreased every year and has become a serious problem, not only for SFU and BC universities, but Canada wide as well. The AUCC has indicated that its priority over the next few years will be pressure relating to funding for core operating budgets. At the national level, the Canadian Federation of Students, CAUT, and AUCC have been very effective by working together and BC universities have to work with the Provincial Government in the same way. In meeting with the Ministry, BC universities presented a joint submission and asked for four items:

- Revenue per student (\$12 million requested system-wide)
- Access – more of the fully enrolment increase for universities (1450 places requested)
- Library acquisitions (\$5 million requested system-wide)
- Tuition freeze relaxation for graduate professional programs

The Chair also reported that the University Presidents are part of large task force that the Government has created on high technology. Its purpose is to try and find out what the Government can do to stimulate the economy and the high technology sectors. People from industry have recommended that the Government be more directive in the allocation of the base budget of the universities so that if more money was needed in a high demand area, funds could be taken from a less popular area. This has been resisted very strongly and with the argument that universities need autonomy over their budgets. The recommendation was subsequently changed but industry and Government continue to expect universities to be more proactive in providing training where the needs are. In response to a suggestion that industry provide endowment money to fill their needs, the Chair indicated that a lot of the industries are small and just getting underway and are already paying premium salaries to keep people from moving to the U.S. They also generally feel they already pay very high taxes to the Government which go to support of the universities.

ii) Paper S.99-20 – TIME Centre Presentation

Mike Volker, Director of the University/Industry Liaison Office was in attendance in order to make a presentation to Senate and respond to questions.

The Vice-President Academic provided Senate with brief background information. Partly in response to the Government's agenda to promote high technology, attempts were made to explore ways to capture and highlight the University's expertise in the area of high technology generally and more importantly in the management of technology. Following discussions with the Government and industry in which a number of ideas were collected as to how to share SFU's high technology expertise in a constructive way with industry/private sector partners, a concept paper was prepared that recommended the creation of a synergistic enterprise shared by SFU, the public sector, and private sector partners. At approximately the same time, the 7th floor of the Spencer Building became available and it seemed appropriate to expand Harbour Centre by linking the activities outlined in the concept paper and a group of interested parties began to translate the concept paper into a business plan.

M. Volker presented overheads to Senate summarizing information about the mission and goals of the TIME Centre, the benefits of the Centre to SFU, industry needs and how the Centre can meet those needs, examples of activities and participants that are envisioned for the Centre, the facilities including the types of rooms and services envisioned, financial considerations, and the management of the Centre by an internal management board and an external industry advisory board.

The Dean of Business Administration and the Dean of Applied Sciences both expressed strong support for the Centre and felt it was a unique opportunity for faculty and students to interact with corporate partners and develop two way relationships that benefit both the University and the private sector.

Skepticism was expressed about the claim that the Centre would support research, and concern was expressed that expanded development at Harbour Centre may reduce similar opportunities for campus initiatives and take resources away from the Burnaby campus. The difference between the environment on campus and the environment at Harbour Centre was noted, and opinion was expressed that this environmental split resulted in two cultures and was not healthy for the University.

Comment was made that if university/industry interactions were to be enhanced it would have been better to have them occur on campus. However, it was pointed out that expansion on the Burnaby campus was not possible at this time as a result of the Government's cap on new buildings for traditional universities. It was also noted that showing visitors from industry the facilities on campus and pointing out the pressures faced by SFU in the hope of receiving funds was no longer adequate. The business community looked at what can be done in terms of mutual benefit and has indicated that the major problem was a lack of recurrent education for people already in the work force. In particular, the high tech industry has indicated that there was no place locally that can respond to their needs and they were having to recruit more and more people from the United States at premium prices or send employees to the United States to get the experience and training that was required. This was one of the reasons why Continuing Studies would play an important role in the Centre. It is hoped that the Centre will address some of the problems associated with the growth in high tech industries and in return the University will benefit in material and concrete ways.

It was pointed out that some faculty members felt alternating teaching between Harbour Centre and the Burnaby campus enriched their experience as a result of working not only with students from downtown but also with the private sector. It is hoped that money will be made available through partnerships with industry to support the purchase of basic teaching and research equipment which is one way the Centre could help in terms of research and teaching.

Comment was made that many high tech companies were not located in the downtown core and the Burnaby campus would be just as convenient. It was also suggested that space in the downtown core was probably much more expensive than elsewhere. It was pointed out that the City of Vancouver exempts the University from property tax which makes the rental costs very advantageous to the university. Senate was also advised that most of the new high tech media and internet companies were locating in the Yaletown and Gastown areas and there were major plans underway by the City of Vancouver to develop the entire area along the waterfront from Harbour Centre eastward into a high tech corridor. By being located downtown and in Burnaby, SFU was in an excellent position to cover both ends of the corridor and meet the needs of the community.

Inquiry was made as to how the Centre fits in and/or competes with Tech BC. Senate was advised that although some of the proposed activities resemble those of Tech BC, discussions with industry tend to suggest that the need is great enough for both ventures.

A suggestion was made to include student representatives on the Advisory Board and Senate was advised that the suggestion would be given serious consideration.

Questions were raised about how the costs would be covered by the Faculties given the current financial situation of the University in general. Senate was advised that expectations are that the revenue generated by the programs offered and corporate sponsorships would offset the operating expenses and cover the lease payments.

Reference was made to the statement on page 4 which indicated that the Vice-President Academic has committed one-third of the funds for the Centre and inquiry was made as to where these funds were coming from. Senate's attention was drawn to the list of participants which was illustrative rather than exhaustive and it was noted that funds from each of these participants would be used to make up the VP Academic's commitment. Senate was assured by the Vice-President Academic that none of the University's academic budget would be used to sustain any of the activities proposed for the 7th floor of Harbour Centre.

iii) FOI/POP Procedures

Reference was made to the e-mail sent by D. Finley to all members of Senate about matters relating to the Freedom of Information office and getting a response in a timely fashion. The Chair acknowledged that there were significant delays and advised that the backlog was enormous. Some requests entailed a lot of detail and the amount of work involved was substantial. However, additional staff has been assigned to the office to help clear up the backlog and hopefully speed things up.

Requests are currently handled on a first come first serve basis and suggestion was made that there should be an expedited process to handle simple requests which specifically identify one or two documents.

Suggestion was also made that a fee be charged for substantial requests to help recoup some of the costs. It was pointed out that there was a schedule of fees in the Act but they were not sufficient to offset the substantial costs in human resources and fees cannot be charged for requests for personal information.

5. Reports of Committees

a) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.99-21 – Election

The following are the results of an election to the following Senate Committee:

Senate Committee on Academic Planning (SCAP) and Senate Committee on University Budget (SCUB)

One Student Senator to replace Maya Russell from date of election to May 31, 2000.

Elected by acclamation:

Albert Chan

b) Senate Committee on International Activities/International University Exchange Committee

J. Knockaert, Director, Office of International Co-operation, and R. Martin, Director, International and Exchange Student Services were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

J. Morris wished to commend the Committee on the format of the document which she found to be extremely readable and, at the same time, comprehensive.

Inquiry was made as to how universities were selected for exchange programs. Senate was advised that this has been done on an ad hoc basis where interested institutions approach SFU and SFU in turn has tried to establish relationships with a number of other institutions. The International Student Exchange Committee then approves and recommends the establishment of such programs to the Vice-President Academic. Senate was advised that an initiative to identify a group of universities around the world which would be a good match for exchanges with SFU, not only for students but faculty and staff as well, was underway and it is hoped that a planned process to strengthen the University's international contacts can be developed over the next couple of years.

c) Senate Committee on Academic Planning

i) Paper S.99-23 – External Review – Library (For Information)

Bruce Clayman, Senator and Vice-President Research and Lynn Copeland, Senator and University Librarian Pro Tem were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to recommendation 21 concerning the Book Robot and Senate was advised that the proposal for an automated retrieval facility was put forward several years ago and was still a viable storage alternative when compared to the option of constructing a new building. Discussion ensued with respect to future space requirements and technological processes available to the Library, including on-line access to scholarly materials. Comment was made that when a final decision was made, it was hoped that faculty would have input in terms of balancing the intellectual needs and financial realities in the matter.

ii) Paper S.99-24 – Establishment of the Department of Humanities

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-24, the establishment of the Department of Humanities”

S. Duguid, Chair of the Humanities Program was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to the description of the Humanities program on page 3 and surprise was expressed to see Science included as part of the Humanities. Senate was advised that occasionally Science topics in courses on critical thinking as well as courses on the history of Science are taught so it was referred to in very broad terms.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- d) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

“that Senate approve, as set forth in S.99-25, the following change to the Registration Priority Rules:

Students attempting to register for a course for the first time shall be given the opportunity to register prior to any students who are presently registered in the course or who previously passed the course with a C- or better”

Note: This Regulation will take effect for the 99-3 semester preregistration process.

R. Cameron, School of Computing Science, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Discussion ensued with respect to whether or not priority for certain categories of students would continue after all first time students had been released to the system. Senate was advised that this rule did not change the boundaries and would only look at students within their specific categories. Concern was expressed that the issue regarding categories was not mentioned in the motion.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- ii) Paper S.99-26 – Faculty of Education – Undergraduate Curriculum Revisions – For Information

Senate received information that SCUS, acting under delegated authority, approved two new courses – EDUC 330 and EDUC 430, and a change of title and description for EDUC 463 and 482.

Overlap concerns were raised with respect to the two new courses. It was pointed out that in order to challenge an item of information the signatures of five members of Senate were required to be submitted before the item can be brought back to Senate for discussion.

- e) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Graduate Studies Committee
- i) Paper S.99-27 – Faculty of Arts – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – (LAS, Psychology) – For Information

Senate received information that the SGSC, acting under delegated authority, approved curriculum revisions as follows:

- a) Latin American Studies: i) Change of preamble for LAS program because of the merger of the LAS program and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology; ii) Change of admission requirements to a biennial basis; iii) Change to LAS MA course requirements; iv) Title change for LAS 851 and 800; v) Course deletions – LAS 810, 811, 812, 813, 830, 831, 850, 852; and vi) New courses – LAS 815, 825, 835
 - b) Department of Psychology: i) Joint SFU/UBC Program in Law and Forensic Psychology; ii) Specialty stream in Child Clinical Psychology; iii) Reorganization of general graduate programs; iv) Editorial changes to Calendar to program descriptions; v) Credit hour change PSYC 830 and 831.
- ii) Paper S.99-28 – Faculty of Education – Graduate Curriculum Revisions – For Information

Senate received information that the SGSC, acting under delegated authority, approved the following curriculum revisions: i) Changes for comprehensive examinations; ii) Calendar changes to individual graduate programs; iii) Title and prerequisite changes – EDUC 899; iv) Description change – EDUC 883; v) New courses – EDUC 859, 878, 983; vi) Deletion of courses – EDUC 861, 875.

- f) Senate Committee on Academic Planning/Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning
- i) Paper S.99-30 – Admission to the Faculty of Business Administration

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-30, that the 15% cap on Category 1 admissions to the Faculty of Business Administration be removed”

Concern was raised about the removal of the cap because unlike other Faculties, Business Administration was the only Faculty to explicitly determine admission to the Faculty by means of a GPA and had four different categories of admission which placed it in an unequal position to other Faculties. Opinion was expressed that unlimited direct admission for Category 1 students would merely substitute one inequity for another. Given the overall limitation enrolment in Business Administration, each student given direct admission resulted in less space for existing students wishing to change their major to Business Administration and these same students were required to have a higher GPA than the directly admitted

students. It was felt that this policy resulted in inequity and unfairness to students who are not admitted directly to the Faculty.

Amendment moved by L. Boland, seconded by P. Percival

"that the word 'removed' be deleted and replaced by 'increased to 50%"

It was pointed out that in practice the 50% limit would likely never come into effect so it would essentially mean nothing. Senate was advised that the objective of the Faculty was to attract the very best students and the new practice of direct admission of high school students has increased the percentage of highly qualified students in the Faculty. Statistical information was requested with respect to the percentage of high school students who managed to maintain the GPA required to stay in the program but it was pointed out that since the policy was only implemented for the first time in 98-3 it is difficult to compare performance over only one term. It would be more useful to analyze these students following the completion of their prerequisite program in two years time.

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

AMENDMENT DEFEATED

Amendment moved by A. Chan, seconded by J. Overington

"that the following sentence be added to the existing motion: and be replaced by the requirement that the maintenance CGPA for Category 1 students be raised to B- (2.67) until these students have completed all the lower division requirements (with the exception of Business 207 and 254)"

Brief discussion followed with respect to what happened to students who fell below the required CGPA. Suggestion was made that the proposed amendment be accepted for the time being and statistical information could then be generated for Category 1 students over the next two years and when the information was available the issue could be revisited.

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

AMENDMENT CARRIED

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

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

ii) Paper S.99-29 – Undergraduate Admission Targets for 1999/2000

Motion #1

Moved by D. Gagan, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.99-29, undergraduate admission targets for each basis-

of-admission group and for each semester in 1999/2000, and that SCAP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall provincial enrolment targets for SFU and based on actual enrolment experience in 1999-2 and 1999-3"

W. Wattamaniuk, Director of Analytical Studies, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was reminded that this was the usual motion brought forward to Senate each year, the purpose of which was to distribute the admission targets by source of students. In response to an inquiry concerning the 'Other' category, Senate was advised that this was an umbrella category which included groups such as university transfer, degree holders, mature students, out of province secondary or college transfers, special entry, concurrent studies. The Admissions Office establishes some targets within this category but they have not been identified. Senate was also advised that most of the sub-categories have an average GPA assigned to them which is usually higher than BC 12 and College transfer categories.

Reference was made to the bottom of table 1 (page 3). The fourth column labelled target was confirmed to be 1999/2000 rather than 1997/98.

Concern was expressed that the minimum admission GPA would significantly increase with the reduced admission targets. Senate was reminded that last year in order to dampen the effect on admission GPA, the University deliberately agreed to accept 200 unfunded students who were still in the system. This practice could not be continued without having a serious impact on the University, and it was therefore decided that this year the University should try to come in right on target.

Brief discussion ensued with respect to the quality of the students in the different categories. Senate was advised that comparisons were done about once every four years and past experience has shown that BC Grade 12 and BC College transfers were roughly equal in terms of their outcomes at university.

Inquiry was made as to how the numbers for the various categories were arrived at. Senate was advised that they reflect historical experience and represent a fairly complex enrolment management protocol within the University. It was also pointed out that SFU attracted a large number of students from the community and university college system and it was necessary to maintain this historical balance.

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, as set forth in S.99-29, undergraduate admission targets to each Faculty as indicated in Table 2, and that SCAP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall

provincial enrolment targets for SFU and based on actual enrolment experience in 1999-2 and 1999-3"

Although not obvious in the data before Senate, it was pointed out that the 384 FTEs that were being shed were coming from the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science, representing a reduction in the Arts and Science intake of 10% each. Concern was expressed that continuing reduced enrolment would have significant budget implications, and reassurance was requested that should the University receive fully funded FTEs which were not targetted for specific programs, they would be returned proportionately to replenish the admission targets for the Faculties of Arts and Sciences.

Senate was reminded that the motion allowed adjustments to be made as necessary and provided funded FTEs were received and not targetted they would be appropriately distributed to achieve a balance amongst all the Faculties. Discussions between the Deans and SCEMP about the implications of unfolding enrolment patterns in each Faculty have been ongoing and there was a general concern among the Deans about the impact of enrolment fluctuations both long term and short term on Faculty resources. Assurance was given by the Vice-President Academic that there would be no short term resource repercussions as a result of the removal of the 380 FTEs from this year's enrolment targets. He felt the real issue was long term in that a level playing field and a mechanism to maintain it across all the Faculties in terms of the relationship between their resources and their equitable share of the University's enrolment needed to be assured.

Concern was expressed that this information was not in the documentation before Senate. It was noted that the background information for motion one contained historical data relevant to the motion but no such data was provided for motion two. The Faculty of Science has had direct admission for several years and in previous years the historical information was provided so that it was possible to determine if enrolments were increasing or decreasing. The Chair advised that the historical data would be included with similar motions next year.

It was pointed out that FTE activity in the Faculty of Science was also affected by the type of student admitted to the University. For example, Engineering Science and Computing Science students take approximately 50% of their course work in Science so the issue was more complex than just enrolment targets.

As the only non-administrative member of SCEMP, A. Chan suggested that it would be very useful if Senate were to consider putting a faculty senator on the Committee as well. The Chair advised that the suggestion would be forwarded to the Senate Review Committee.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- g) Senate Graduate Studies Committee
- i) Paper S.99-31 – Annual Report – For Information

Reference was made to the 1996 date in the 2nd paragraph on page 2 and comment was made that the report should be updated from year to year with new information.

Reference was made to section VII on page 4 wherein statements were made about the setting of enrolment targets at the Faculty level and the discontinuation of less successful programs. Inquiry was made as to the process that would be used to determine and implement these suggestions. Senate was advised that the issue arose as a result of the University having 435 graduate students who were not funded by the Province and SCEMP was in the process of considering mechanisms for deciding this issue. Suggestion was made that Senate should be involved at an early stage in the determination of this kind of policy.

Inquiry was made as to the appointment process for the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. Senate was advised that a lengthy search for candidates who were both suitable and willing to serve was undertaken. The leading candidate was then recommended to the Vice-President Academic, and after consultation with the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, the appointment was made.

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

7. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate has been scheduled on Monday, April 12, 1999.

The Open Session adjourned at 9:40 pm. The Assembly moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, Secretariat Services