

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, March 6, 2000 in Room 3210 West Mall Centre
Open Session

Present:	Blaney, Jack, President and Chair Atkins, Stella Benezra, Michael Blackman, Roger (representing J. Pierce) Boland, Larry Budra, Paul Chan, Albert Chuah, Kuan Copeland, Lynn D'Auria, John Davidson, Willie Delgrande, James Driver, Jon Dunsterville, Valerie Emerson, Joseph Finley, David Gillies, Mary Ann Harris, Richard Hart, Stephen (representing B. Clayman) Hyslop-Margison, Emery Jones, John Marteniuk, Ron Mathewes, Rolf Mauser, Gary McArthur, James McBride, Stephan Meredith, Lindsay (representing J. Waterhouse) Munro, John Naef, Barbara Niwinska, Tina Ogloff, James Osborne, Judith Paterson, David Peters, Joseph Peterson, Louis Reader, Jason Russell, Robert Sanghera, Balwant Smith, Michael Steinbach, Christopher To, Shek Yan Wortis, Michael Zazkis, Rina Heath, Nick, Acting Registrar Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary	Absent: Al-Natour, Sameh Barrow, Robin Fletcher, James Heaney, John Kanevsky, Lannie Kirczenow, George McFetridge, Paul McInnes, Dina Warsh, Michael Wessel, Sylvia Wong, Milton Yerbury, Colin In attendance: Knockaert, Joe Macdonald, Gregg Olewiler, Nancy
----------	---	---

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of February 7, 2000
Reference was made to page 8, motion 3 and suggestion was made that the minutes should make specific reference to the two committees – SCUS and SGSC. On the same page, motion 4 (last sentence), suggestion was made that the word 'composition' be changed to 'membership' and 'the committee' be changed to 'Senate' since the results of SRC's survey reflected a perception of domination of administrators on Senate.

Following these revisions, the Minutes were approved as amended.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
In response to an inquiry, Senate was advised that the location of the ceremony to award Julie Payette an honorary degree had been changed from Centennial High School to Images Theatre on campus as a result of a request from her office.
4. Report of the Chair

i) Paper S.00-22 – Revised 'Values and Commitments' document

Since the President wished to participate in debate of this item, J. Ogloff, Vice-Chair of Senate took over as Chair.

N. Olewiler, Senior Policy Advisor, President's Office and Chair of the Department of Economics, and G. Macdonald, Executive Director, President's Office were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate endorse and recommend to the Board of Governors, the 'Values and Commitments' document, S.00-22"

The President referred to the preparatory comments made at the January meeting and advised that the revised document was the result of Senate discussion at the January meeting and from comments received in writing and at the open meetings held in January.

Brief discussion ensued with respect to the use of the word 'relish' (paragraph 2) 'pioneering' (paragraph 3) and 'can' (paragraphs 3 and 5), and minor editorial suggestions were made related to these concerns. Opinions were also expressed against the suggested editorial changes and suggestions made that the wording not be changed. Since the substance of the statement was not in dispute, suggestion was made that endorsement proceed without specific amendment; the committee would then further discuss the comments made by Senate and make whatever changes they deemed necessary.

Inquiry was made as to whether the statement that 'students can expect teaching that is personal' was a long term commitment to the tutorial process. Senate was advised that although the university was not necessarily at the level where it would like to be with respect to the kinds of values and commitments referred to in the statement, the document should serve as a reminder of the kind of University the planning process should aim for.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

J. Blaney resumed the Chair.

5. Reports of Committees

- a) Senate Nominating Committee
- i) Paper S.00-23 – Election

Senate Committee on International Activities (SCIA)

One Graduate Student (at-large) to replace Kevin Hewitt from date of election to May 31, 2000.

Elected by acclamation:

Lorena Jara

- b) Senate Committee on International Activities
- i) Paper S.00-24 – Annual Report (For Information)

J. Knockaert, Secretary of SCIA and Director of International Co-operation was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was pointed out that previous annual reports included information about the kinds and size of international projects that the University was involved in and inquiry was made as to why this information was missing from the report before Senate. Senate was advised that there had been no change in the projects from last year.

- c) Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning
- i) Paper S.00-25 – Undergraduate Admission Targets for 2000/20001

Motion #1:

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.00-25 , the following undergraduate admission targets for each basis-of-admission group and for each semester in 2000/01, and that SCAP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall provincial enrollment targets for SFU and based on actual enrollment experience in 2000-2 and 2000-3.

Admission Targets for New Students

	<u>2000-2</u>	<u>2000-3</u>	<u>2001-1</u>	<u>Total</u>
B.C. Gr. XII	80	1,837	125	2,042
B.C. College	459	669	604	1,732
Other BOA Groups	172	649	392	1,213
Total Intake	711	3,155	1,121	4,987"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

A substantial decrease over the last 20 years in the number of mature students being admitted to the university, together with a substantial increase in the admission of high school students was noted and inquiry made as to whether this was coincidental or the result of an active policy of the University. Opinion was expressed that these changes were the result of an increase in the general standards for admission and changes in patterns of enrolment in post-secondary institutions whereby mature students tend to enter the university after having completed two years at the community college level.

Motion #2:

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.00-25, the undergraduate admission targets to each Faculty as indicated in the attached table, 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 2000-2 and 2000-3"

Inquiry was made about why Applied Sciences was not being increased next year but the Arts was planned to be increased by 500 students. Senate was advised that it was felt that the college transfer admission GPA was too high in the current year relative to the high school admission GPA and the increase in the number of college transfers would result in more students being admitted to Arts. The question of balance between supply and demand in Arts and Applied Sciences would likely be a significant issue for the university in the future and has been discussed in SCEMP and SCAP.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.00-26 – Limits on International Student Admissions to SFU

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Osborne

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.00-26, that the number of international students, excluding exchange students, who are admitted into undergraduate programs at SFU be limited to 7% of all admissions in the academic years 2000/01, 2001/02, and 2002/03”

Senate was reminded that this was simply an extension of the current limit and that international admissions (4.9% on new admissions this year) were well below the quota.

Inquiries were made with respect to how the limit at SFU compared to policies at other provincial universities and what the percentage would be if exchange students were included. Senate was advised that UBC had approximately the same percentage of international students relative to the size of the university, and that the current 125 exchange students would only make a slight change in the percentage if included.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.00-27 – Limits on International Student Admission to Faculty of Business Administration

Moved by L. Meredith, seconded by G. Mauser

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, as set forth in S.00-27, that the number of international students, excluding exchange students, who are admitted into the undergraduate programs in the Faculty of Business Administration at SFU be limited to 10% of all admissions in the academic years 2000/01, 2001/02, and 2002/03”

Opinions expressed in opposition to the motion included the following comments:

- the limit was unnecessary because the Faculty of Business Administration was no where near the existing 10% limit
- imposing the limit discriminated against students who have already been admitted to the University and treated them differently from other students
- it was unfair to admit students and then restrict their choice of programs
- if qualified, students should not be restricted because of a quota and by having a higher quality of student in a class the learning experiences between students increased

Opinions expressed in support of the motion included the following comments:

- enrolment pressures within the Faculty were severe and as a public institution there was a responsibility to serve the needs of domestic students
- without a limit the percentage of international students would significantly increase which could have a serious impact on domestic students
- the demand from international students for Business programs was much higher than other Faculties

Clarification was sought with respect to the wording of the motion relating to the phrase '10% of all admissions'. Senate was advised that the motion should in fact read '10% of all admissions to the Faculty of Business Administration'; the change was accepted as an editorial amendment.

If there was a concern about the differential for Business Administration but the problem of not having a limit was recognized, it was suggested that the motion could be amended to delete the reference to the Faculty of Business Administration so that the limit would then apply to all Faculties.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the issue of differential fees and the historical background related to the implementation of the existing limit.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION DEFEATED

iv) Paper S.00-28 – PBD Admission to School of Computing Science (For Information)

Senate received information that admission to the regular Post Baccalaureate Diploma Program in the School of Computing Science was suspended until further notice. Admission to the ARC Internship PBD program in Computing Science would not be affected.

d) Senate Committee on Academic Planning

i) Paper S.00-29 – Planning and Review Framework – Revised Guidelines for External Reviews and Guidelines for Academic Plans

Motion #1:

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Osborne

“that Senate approve the revisions to the Guidelines for External Reviews as outlined in S.00-29”

Senate was informed that during the consultation process strong opposition from departmental chairs had been expressed with respect to the interval between successive external reviews and successive academic plans. It was also pointed out that many chairs in the Faculty of Arts supported the concept that the planning cycle be half the length of the external review cycle but were very concerned that the proposed time period for external reviews was too short.

Amendment moved by R. Blackman, seconded by M.A. Gillies

“that the planning period be 4 years and the external review period be 8 years rather than 3 and 6 years respectively”

An amendment to the amendment was moved by L. Boland, seconded by S. McBride

“that the planning period be 3 years and the external review period be 9 years”

Opinion was expressed that external reviews were very expensive and having to go through the process in a shorter period of time significantly increased the cost. It was pointed out that one of the main measures of accountability both publicly and within institutions was the review of academic programs on a regular basis, and opinion was expressed that lengthening the review cycle would have a negative impact on the accountability process. Suggestion was made that annual reports from departments or the three year academic plans could be used to satisfy accountability measures.

It was noted that it was difficult to recruit qualified external reviewers and shortening the time period would make it even more difficult; opinion was expressed it would be better to have less frequent reviews with more highly selected reviewers.

Concern was expressed that the 3/6 plan/external review cycle was unrealistic and too short to make significant curriculum and program changes and departments needed the longer period to make meaningful evaluations between reviews.

It was pointed out that whatever cycle was approved, the time line was not immutable. Under the existing policy, changes were continuously made to accommodate a variety of circumstances within departments each year, and it was felt that increasing the time between reviews was not advisable because it would then be possible for departments to go ten or eleven years between reviews.

Some members suggested that external reviews were very labour intensive and had a much bigger impact on smaller departments so a longer review period was more feasible. However, it was pointed out that some departments may need a review more frequently than others and it was suggested that procedures be written into the process to allow flexibility in determining where in the cycle the review should take place. Another senator suggested that external reviews were not worthwhile at all.

It was pointed out that the orientation of external reviews was meant to be on the academic character and academic quality of a department's teaching and

research programs and not on difficult situations which were better handled internally.

The view was expressed that with the renewal of faculty that would occur over the next several years, there would be a need through the academic planning process to review how departments were evolving at a more rather than less frequent interval.

Moved by J. D'Auria, seconded by E. Hyslop-Margison

"that the motion be tabled to allow reconsideration by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning"

Senate was informed that approval of the motion would refer the original motion as well as the amendments back to SCAP.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED

Motion #2:

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve the new Guidelines for Academic Plans as set forth in S.00-29"

Senate was advised that the proposed plan interval was partly based on the current time period and partly because the university was currently entering a period of rapid change and a longer interval was not feasible. Outside funding agencies were increasingly requesting the university to develop plans and up-to-date departmental academic plans were vital to that planning process. The guidelines reflected past practice and various parts of existing university policy.

It was pointed out that the motion before Senate recommended a 3 year planning cycle. Senate tabled, as part of the previous motion, reconsideration of this issue, and concern was expressed that the SCAP review would be limited by having motion two approved because it would establish one part of the cycle that was to be reviewed by SCAP.

Moved by R. Blackman, seconded by J. Reader

"that the motion be referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Planning for reconsideration"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION TO REFER CARRIED

- e) Senate Graduate Studies Committee
- i) Paper S.00-30 – Annual Report (For Information)

The annual report of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee was received by Senate for information.

- f) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules
- i) Paper S.00-31 – Senate Review Committee – Final recommendations on SCUS and SGSC

Moved by J. Munro, seconded by M.A. Gillies

“that Senate approve the restructuring of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and the Senate Committee on Graduate Studies as follows:

SCUS and SGSC shall become committees reporting directly to Senate. Membership of each committee shall consist of two student members elected by Senate, the chair of each Faculty-level committee plus one faculty member elected by each Faculty-level committee, the Registrar (or designate) and the University Librarian (or designate). The Chair of SCUS will be the Vice-President, Academic (or designate); the Chair of SGSC will be the Dean of Graduate Studies”

As a point of clarification, it was noted that the students elected to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies would be undergraduate students, and the students elected to the Senate Graduate Studies Committee would be graduate students.

Discussion ensued with respect to the election of faculty members to the committees. Suggestion was made that the faculty members should be elected by and from Senate. It was pointed out that although the SRC had considered this option, it was felt that it was too much of a constraint on faculty Senators. Opinion was also expressed that the Chairs of the Faculty-level committees needed to be on these committees in order for them to operate effectively.

Amendment moved by J. D’Auria, seconded by A. Chan

“that each faculty member be elected by and from respective Faculties”

Brief discussed followed with respect to the electoral process and it was clarified that the intent was for the elections to be conducted by the Secretariat Office rather than by individual Faculties.

Concern was expressed that a Faculty-wide election would not be as effective as the original proposal to have the Chair and one member from the Faculty-level committee serving on the Senate committee. Having members already familiar with the curriculum process provided operational knowledge to the Senate committee and since the Faculty-level committees have elected members the confidence of the Faculty had already been given to these people.

Concern was expressed that there was no guarantee that any member on SCUS or SGSC had any knowledge of the Senate process and that the amendment did not address that issue.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT DEFEATED

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

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.00-32 – Report – Ad Hoc Committee To Review Commercialization of University Research (For Information)

Referring to the Government's proposal to introduce 'innovation' as a fourth mission together with teaching, research and community service, opinion was strongly expressed that this step interfered with the academic autonomy of the university. Concern was voiced that the report from the ad hoc committee did not address this issue and the following motion was suggested by J. D'Auria:

"that Senate recommends that the Federal Government not get involved in the academic governance of universities"

The Chair advised that he would be attending a meeting of the Canadian Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, and this issue was on the agenda. He was personally opposed to adding a fourth mission to the university and would express this view if the opportunity presented itself. The Chair reported that there had been a lot of discussion within AUCC about the Government's report and it would be interesting to see the Government's white paper on the matter. The Chair also advised that he and two other university Presidents were meeting with Minister John Manley next week and it was his intention to raise this particular concern at that meeting. The Chair indicated that he would report the outcomes of these two meetings to Senate at the next meeting.

Given the Chair's comments, the proposed motion was withdrawn by J. D'Auria.

iii) Paper S.00-33 – Ad hoc committee to review Research Ethics Revisions (For Information)

The terms of reference and proposed timeline for report of the committee were presented to Senate for information. Senate was also advised that the following

Senators had agreed to serve on the committee: W. Davidson (Chair), J. Driver, S. McBride, and B. Naef.

6. Other Business

i) MBA Program for Professional Accountants

In response to an earlier inquiry about the MBA Program for Professional Accountants, Senate was advised that this program was in the process of receiving assessment as a new program and would come to Senate for approval in due course. During this period, under existing Senate policy, following approval by the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, the program was currently being offered on a cohort basis under Special Arrangements to start in September this year.

ii) Graduate Application Fees

In response to an earlier inquiry about how the graduate application fees were spent, Senate was advised that 99% of the money was accounted for and that 68% was spent on graduate student travel, and the remainder was spent on the recruitment of graduate students and direct research costs for graduate students.

7. Information

Date of the next regularly scheduled meeting – Monday, April 3, 2000.

Open Session adjourned at 7:15 pm; Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat