

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, September 18, 2000 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 West Mall Centre
Open Session

Present: Blaney, Jack, President and Chair
Atkins, Stella
Barrow, Robin
Bawa, Parveen
Budra, Paul
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
D'Auria, John
Delgrande, James
Dill, Larry
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Finley, David
Gerson, Carole
Grimmett, Peter
Gupte, Jaideep
Hill, Ross
Hold, Angela
Jackson, Margaret
Jones, John
Klymson, Sarah
LaRocque, Linda
Livadiotakis, Georgia
Love, Ernie
Marteniuk, Ron
McFetridge, Paul
McInnes, Dina
Miralles-Sanchez, Veronika
Naef, Barbara
Osborne, Judith
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Runyowa, Mac
Russell, Robert
Smith, Michael
Steinbach, Christopher
Stewart, Ryan
To, Shek Yan
Waterhouse, John
Weldon, Larry
Wessel, Sylvia
Wortis, Michael
Yau, David
Yerbury, Colin
Zaichkowsky, Judith

Absent: Chan, Albert
Cooper, Kait
Davidson, Willie
England, William
Giffen, Ken
Gill, Alison
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
Ogloff, James
Sanghera, Balwant
Warsh, Michael
Wong, Milton
Zazkis, Rina

In attendance:
Poirier, Guy
Ward, Roger

Heath, Ron, Dean of Student Services and Registrar
Watt, Alison, Director, University Secretariat
Grant, Bobbie, Recording Secretary

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Agenda was approved as distributed.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of July 10, 2000
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
 - a) Paper S.00-70 – Annual Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 2000
(For Information)

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

Concern was expressed about the decrease in endowments from the previous year. Senate was advised that endowments vary from year to year and that there were some fairly significant donations made last year. If, over a two-three year period, donations were not on an upward trend there would be cause for concern but donations and pledges were already on an upward trend this year.

Further information was requested with respect to the bank loan taken out by the University for the Wosk Centre for Dialogue. Senate was informed that since part of the loan was a donation, it was not subject to interest for a considerable period of time and the loan was more like a line of credit. To date, very little had been drawn on the loan. The Wosk Centre for Dialogue would be funded from the operations of the Centre, not general university revenues, and the business plan for the Centre expected to see the retirement of the loan within the next five years.

Reference was made to the information on page 10 with respect to professional fees. Concern was raised with regard to the reported increase, and inquiry was made as to how much was specifically spent on legal fees. Senate was advised that approximately \$600,000 was spent on legal fees, \$200,000 on University memberships, and the remainder went to consulting fees which were widely distributed across the University.

Reference was also made to the information on page 10 concerning academic salaries. Opinion was expressed that academic salaries have remained constant over the past several years, and inquiry was made as to whether the University had any hopes of removing salary limitations to make it easier to attract new faculty and pay appropriate salaries to current faculty members. Senate was reminded that the University was constrained by Provincial regulations but the salary scale had been revamped so that all ranks had received a modest salary increase this year. It was pointed out that PSEC was currently undergoing a review and it was acknowledged that salaries had been compressed for a long time.

Opinion was expressed that although endowments had done quite well in terms of providing for students, research and instruction at SFU, the investment strategy might not take ethical views into consideration. Inquiry was made as to whether there were any plans for the University to conduct an ethical review of its investment policy. Senate was advised that this issue had received considerable debate by the Board of Governors several years ago and as a result there were no plans to bring in a policy to put an ethical screen on investments.

ii) Commercialization of University Research

The Vice President Research reported that the Federal Minister for Industry Canada, the Ministry responsible for the implementation of the Report of the Task Force on the Commercialization of University Research, indicated that there were no plans in the immediate future to implement any of the recommendations in the report.

iii) Wosk Centre for Dialogue

The Chair reported that although the official opening of the Centre was scheduled to take place on September 20th, some of the technical equipment was not yet in place and therefore it was not possible to hold the September meeting of Senate in the Centre. Provided there was sufficient business to meet in October, it was expected that the meeting would be held at the Centre for Dialogue. It was not possible to hold the November meeting in the Centre because of outstanding bookings, but a Senate meeting would be held in the Centre for Dialogue soon.

Secretary's Note: The October 2nd meeting of Senate was subsequently cancelled.

5. Question Period

Questions relating to registration priority for students taking a course as a duplicate and the priority on which students were released to the system had been received. R. Heath was asked to summarize background information and provide a response to the inquiry.

Senate was informed that telephone registration commenced approximately two months before the start of a semester and continued for a four week period. During that time approximately the same number of students were released to the system each day. The release was based on a Registration Priority Number which was a combination of GPA and hours completed or in progress. As the number of hours increased the effect of the GPA diminished. RPNs varied from semester to semester. A regulation approved by Senate in March 1999 essentially delayed opportunity for students with a grade of C- or better to register in a course which was a duplicate during this four week period. After the four week period was over, any student who had a grade of C- or better could register in any course providing space was available, but until that time the system automatically dropped the student over night if they tried to register.

An additional question was raised with respect to the libel suit against H. Hammerly, and Senate was informed that the University was financially supporting the suit. Concern was expressed that faculty members were not entitled to the same privilege and reference was made to the policy on legal fees. The Chair pointed out that senior

administrators receive legal representation where necessary for matters that arise in the course of their duty. He believed there is also some provision for faculty members but since he was not certain he would report back to Senate on this issue. The Chair declined to respond to further questions as the matter was before the court.

6. Reports of Committees

a) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.00-71 – Elections to Senate Committees

The following are the results of elections to Senate committees. There were insufficient nominations received to fill all positions; vacancies will be carried over and brought forward to the next meeting of Senate.

Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS)

One Faculty Senator to replace Louis Peterson for term of office to May 31, 2002.

Elected by acclamation:

Larry Weldon

One Student Senator for term of office to May 31, 2002.

No nominations received

Senate Committee on University Honours (SCUH)

One Faculty Senator (Faculty of Arts) for term of office to May 31, 2001.

Elected by acclamation:

Alison Gill

Senate Library Committee (SLC) and Library Penalties Appeal Committee (LPAC)

One (at-large) Undergraduate Student Alternate for term of office to May 31, 2002.

No nominations received

Senate Graduate Awards Adjudication Committee (SGAAC)

One Graduate Student (at-large) for term of office to May 31, 2001

Candidates: C. Chapman, N. Pachkhede

Elected:

Narendra Pachkhede

Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee (SUAAC)

One Undergraduate Student (at-large) to replace Kuan Chuah for term of office to May 31, 2001.

Elected by acclamation:

David Yau

Senate Appeals Board (SAB)

Two (at-large) Graduate Students (1 Regular to replace Dan Preece, and 1 Alternate) for terms of office to May 31, 2002.

Candidates: P. Liljedahl, N. Pachkhede, L. Simons

Elected as the Regular Member:

Leeanna Simons

Elected as the Alternate Member:

Narendra Pachkhede

Committee to Review University Admissions (CRUA)

One Faculty Member (at-large) to replace Louis Peterson for term of office to May 31, 2001.

Elected by acclamation:

John Craig

One Undergraduate Student (at-large) to replace Kuan Chuah for term of office to May 31, 2001.

Elected by acclamation:

Chris Steinbach

Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning (SCEMP)

One Graduate Student (at-large) for term of office to May 31, 2001.

No nominations received

International Student Exchange Committee (ISEC)

One Faculty Member (at-large) to replace Barbara Frisken for term of office to May 31, 2001.

Candidates: J. Francis, S. Delany

Elected:

June Francis

Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL)

One Faculty Member (at-large) from the Faculty of Science to replace Barbara Frisken for term of office to May 31, 2002.

Elected by acclamation:

Barry Honda

Diverse Qualifications Adjudication Committee (DQAC)

One Faculty Member (at-large) to replace K.J. Peters for term of office to May 31, 2001.

Elected by acclamation:

Sheila Delany

One Undergraduate Student (at-large) to replace Steven Yeung for term of office to May 31, 2001.

No nominations received

b) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.00-72 – External Review – School of Computing Science

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Peters

“that Senate concurs with the recommendation from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the School of Computing Science on priority items resulting from the external review, as outlined in S.00-72”

J. Delgrande, member of Senate and faculty member in the School of Computing Science was available to respond to questions.

Inquiry was made as to why the University was unable to find an internal reviewer and if attempts were made to find a faculty member from outside the Faculty of Applied Sciences. Senate was advised that considerable attempts had been made both within the Faculty of Applied Sciences and outside the Faculty but the process failed to find an internal person and, after a fairly lengthy period of time, decision was made to go ahead without an internal reviewer. The Vice President Academic informed Senate that he did not know why an internal candidate could not be found but he would report back to Senate on this issue.

Senate was informed that students would like to see the implementation of many of the recommendations, especially the on-line courses, and it was hoped that funding would be received to increase the number of lower level undergraduate courses.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.00-73 – External Review – Department of French

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by P. Budra

“that Senate concurs with the recommendation from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the Department of French on priority items resulting from the external review, as outlined in S.00-73”

G. Poirier, Chair of the Department of French, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

It was reported that students of French felt strongly that the Master’s program should continue.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.00-74 – External Review – Faculty of Business Administration

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Gupte

“that Senate concurs with the recommendation from the Senate Committee on University Priorities concerning advice to the Faculty of Business Administration on priority items resulting from the external review, as outlined in S.00-74”

E. Love, Senator and Dean pro tem of the Faculty of Business Administration was available to respond to questions.

Reference was made to page 11 and clarification was requested with respect to the meaning of the term ‘back door entry’. It was thought that the reviewers were referring to the fact that students who have not been admitted to Business Administration could

take Business courses if space was available and eventually, if they met all of the course requirements, they could apply for and be granted a degree in Business Administration. Due to pressures on the program to first serve Business Administration students, Senate was informed that the opportunities had been tightened up somewhat but the option was still available if students could get access to all the required courses.

It was noted that the report emphasized the faculty compensation problem and the question was raised as to why this issue was not part of the recommendations from SCUP. Opinion was expressed that SCUP had likely concluded that the issue was outside its jurisdiction. It was pointed out that the imbalance of workload within the Faculty of Business Administration compared with the rest of the University had been recognized and additional funding had been allocated over a three year period to help close the gap.

Reference was made to the comments about the quality of the external review and the statement that SCUP would provide the Vice President Academic with suggestions to improve the quality of future reviews. Further explanation was requested with regard to this point. Opinion was expressed that the comments should not be generalized to all reviews. Senate was advised that SCUP felt it would be useful to provide suggestions with respect to the type of general questions that might be framed to external reviewers and comment on the type of documentation that reviewers should receive.

Reference was made to point one on page 2, and suggestion was made that it would be useful for Senate to receive a copy of the overall research plan. It was pointed out that documentation filed with SCUP was available to Senators and there was no objection to Senate receiving a copy of this particular document.

Discussion turned to recommendation four on page 2 with respect to the expansion of the BBA program. Senate was informed that the additional money provided to the Faculty of Business Administration had been directed towards hiring more faculty which should result in additional and smaller classes.

Discussion took place with respect to the issue of recruitment and the difficulties experienced in attracting and hiring new faculty members. It was pointed out that, even though the University was subject to Provincial constraints, attempts have been made to keep salaries competitive, especially in Business Administration and Computing Science.

Senate was advised that the Board of Governors had recently approved in-principle that the Learning Strategies Group be incorporated as a wholly owned entity of the University within the Faculty of Business Administration. Inquiry was made as to why this initiative was not mentioned in the report and why it had not been brought to Senate for debate. Senate was informed that this was being considered.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iv) Paper S.00-75 – Strategic Research Plan (For Information and Comment)

Opinion was expressed that the document was poorly written and concern was raised that the document had gone outside the University in its current form. It was also strongly suggested that future revisions to the document receive a much wider consultation and come forward to Senate for discussion and approval. It was pointed out that the intent of the wording was to make the plan as open to expansion and interpretation as possible in order to allow sufficient flexibility to permit applications in a wide range of areas. Opinion was expressed that the qualifications of the person nominated had to fit with the SRP and therefore the document was extremely important and future iterations should be widely distributed for faculty input and brought forward for Senate debate and approval.

Reference was made to the current shortage of space and concern was expressed about where these new Chairs would be physically housed. Senate was advised that the Vice President Finance and Administration and the Associate Vice President Academic have been asked by the President to undertake a space inventory to examine utilization and ensure effective usage.

Questions were raised with respect to the use of funds from the CRC program and Senate was informed that the program was explicitly designed for both retention and recruitment. Expectations were that where the CRC Chairs were used for retention, salary funding would be freed up to hire new faculty. It was remarked that university discussion about CRCs for retention would have been useful, as at least one prominent Canadian institution has decided to use the CRCs for recruitment only.

Reference was made to the table on page 22 summarizing the distribution of Chairs, and inquiry was made as to how the figures were arrived at. Senate was advised that the information in the table was incorrect because the number of Chairs allocated to SFU turned out to be less than the number originally stated. The ratios used to distribute Chairs were based on national ratios rather than institutional ratios and were determined by the receipt of funds from granting institutions.

In response to questions about the selection process, Senate was advised that University Policy A10.06 set out procedures for the appointment of Chairs, both internally and externally.

Inquiry was made about the number of nominations currently submitted to Ottawa. Senate was informed that only one nomination was ready to be submitted. The nomination would be presented to the University Appointments Committee shortly and then submitted to Ottawa. Three or four others were expected to be ready later in the semester.

c) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.00-76 – Graduate Curriculum Changes – Faculty of Business Administration (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved the following new courses: BUS 873, BUS 836, and BUS 837.

ii) Paper S.00-77 – Graduate Curriculum Changes – Faculty of Education (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved the following curriculum revisions: change of course title and description for EDUC 851; change of course title for EDUC 804; the addition of EDUC 851-1 to the Master's Curriculum and Instruction course list.

d) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.00-78 – Senate Graduate Studies Committee – Revisions

Motion #1

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by J. Delgrande

“that Senate approve the Terms of Reference (Purpose and Operation) for the Senate Graduate Studies Committee to take effect on September 19, 2000 as set forth in S.00-78”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED
(without opposition)

Motion #2

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by V. Miralles-Sanchez

“that Senate approve that graduate students and alternates be elected to the Senate Graduate Studies Committee by graduate students”

Brief discussion took place with respect to the election process and the voting habits of graduate students. Suggestion was made that in order to be consistent with other Senate committees, the graduate students should be elected by Senate.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion #3

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by A. Hold

“that the Graduate Issues Officer be an ex-officio member of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee”

In response to a request for information about the position, Senate was advised that the Graduate Issues Officer was one of the six Executive Officers of the Simon Fraser Student Society elected annually in May by all eligible graduate students.

Request for clarification was made with respect to whether this position would be a voting member or a non-voting member of the SGSC. It was pointed out that if non-voting was not specified, the position was intended to be a voting member, so the GIO would be a full voting member of the committee.

Reference was made to the previous composition of the committee and Senate was informed that the SGSC felt that having the GIO as an ex-officio voting member struck a compromise between the previous composition and the newly approved structure of the committee. In the spirit of the original composition where there was representation from each Faculty, opinion was expressed that it might be desirable to find a way to ensure that students on the committee were from different Faculties.

Brief discussion followed with respect to the duties of the Graduate Issues Officer, and suggestion was made that Senate be provided with information about the organization and duties of the Student Society Executive.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion #4

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by C. Steinbach

“that the quorum for the Assessment Committee on New Graduate Programs be five”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.00-79 – Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee – Revisions

Moved by J. Osborne, seconded by J. D’Auria

“that Senate approve the recommendations of the Senate Undergraduate Awards Adjudication Committee with respect to quorum and Vice-Chair”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.00-80 – Draft – Policy R50.03 – Postdoctoral Fellows (For Advice)

Reference was made to the statement at the bottom of page 3 about PDFs not being eligible to hold external research grants and contracts. Concern was expressed that the wording limited the ability of PDFs to find funds for their research. It was agreed that the word 'normally' would be inserted within the sentence to allow for possible exceptions.

In response to questions about employee benefits, Senate was advised that coverage for PDFs was slightly different from continuing employees but they were eligible for the health benefits as outlined on page 9. Concern was expressed that PDFs on scholarships were not eligible for benefit plans. It was pointed out that under the policy they had the option of applying their scholarship funds to benefit plans purchased for them by the University.

The legality of the classification of PDFs as employees of the grant holder rather than the University was questioned. It was noted that the classification allowed more flexibility to the grantee because there were no constraints by university policies as there were for other types of employees at the University.

iv) Paper S.00-81 – Draft – Revised Policy R20.03 Treatment of Animals in Research and Teaching

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by L. Dill

“that Senate approve the revisions to R20.03 Treatment of Animals in Research and Teaching, as set forth in S.00-81”

Comment was expressed that the documentation contained typographical errors. The Chair suggested that the errors be provided to the Vice President Research for correction. Clarification was requested with respect to wording of the second sentence in Section 3.d on page 1. Senate was advised that the word “will” should be retained and the word “may” should be deleted.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting is Monday, October 2, 2000.

Secretary's note: The October 2nd meeting was subsequently cancelled. The next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, November 6, 2000.

The Open Session adjourned at 8:50 pm. Following a brief recess, Senate moved into Closed Session.

Alison Watt

Director, University Secretariat