

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, March 5, 2001 at 7:00 pm in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael, Chair and President
Atkins, Stella
Barrow, Robin
Bawa, Parveen
Clayman, Bruce
D'Auria, John
Davidson, Willie
Delgrande, James
Dill, Larry
Driver, Jon
Finley, David
Gerson, Carole
Gill, Alison
Gupte, Jaideep
Hill, Ross
Jackson, Margaret
Klymson, Sarah
Love, Ernie
Marteniuk, Ron
McInnes, Dina
Miralles-Sanchez, Veronika
Mundle, Todd (representing L. Copeland)
Ogloff, James
Osborne, Judith
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Russell, Robert
Sanghera, Balwant
Smith, Michael
Steinbach, Christopher
Stewart, Ryan
Waterhouse, John
Weldon, Larry
Wessel, Sylvia
Wortis, Michael
Yau, David
Zaichkowsky, Judy

Absent: Budra, Paul
Chan, Albert
Cooper, Kait
Dunsterville, Valerie
Giffen, Ken
Grimmett, Peter
Hold, Angela
Jones, John
LaRocque, Linda
Livadiotakis, Georgia
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
McPetridge, Paul
Naef, Barbara
Paterson, David
Runyowa, Mac
Warsh, Michael
Wong, Milton
Yerbury, Colin
Zazkis, Rina

In attendance:
Anderson, Bob
Chant, John
Elliott, Liz
Heath, Nick
Jara, Lorena
Jones, Colin
Knockaert, Joe

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

1. Approval of the Agenda
In order to accommodate a visitor, item 6.D.i was moved to follow item 6.A.i. Following this change, the agenda was approved as amended.
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of February 5, 2001
Request was made to add L. Copeland's name to the list of Senators present at the last meeting. Following this change, the Minutes were approved.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the minutes.
4. Report of the Chair
Commenting on recent press releases, the Chair reported that tuition fees would be reduced by 5% with universities to be fully compensated for the loss by the provincial government. The government also announced an increase of 5,000 student spaces for the post-secondary system. In addition, the government has announced a very significant infusion of one-time only money for health research and infrastructure needs. While this was very positive, the Chair pointed out that expectations were that the funding would protect against inflation and cover existing cost increases such as utilities but would provide very little additional flexibility. Expectations were that the budget would be passed in the near future and universities would receive their budget letters shortly thereafter.

In response to an inquiry about capital funding, the Chair advised that within the one-time funding, there was money for planning, i.e. to develop specifications and architectural details but there was no commitment for implementation of any projects.
5. Question Period
There were no questions.
6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.01-14 – Elections to Senate Committees

Senate was advised that no nominations had been received for student positions on the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies or the Senate Committee on Disciplinary Appeals. These vacancies would be carried forward.

With respect to the annual turnover of committee memberships on June 1st, Senate was informed that the Senate Nominating Committee was starting its work early this year and was currently in the process of recruiting committee members. Senators wishing to nominate or be nominated for any committee were asked to forward the information to the SNC.

- D) Senate Committee on University Priorities
i) Paper S.01-19 – Establishment of the Centre for Restorative Justice

Moved by J. Pierce, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the Centre for Restorative Justice as outlined in S.01-19”

L. Elliott, School of Criminology, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- B) Senate Committee on International Activities
i) Paper S.01-15 – Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Eastern Indonesia University Development Project (For Information)

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee, R. Anderson (Chair), J. Chant and L. Jara were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

The Chair reported that prior to sending the report to SCIA for action on the recommendations which would be brought back to Senate, SCAR felt that a full discussion in Senate would be appropriate.

Moved by R. Barrow, seconded by C. Steinbach

“that Senate move into a Committee of the Whole to allow open discussion on the report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Eastern Indonesia University Development”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion ensued and the following opinions were expressed.

- Concerns about past process; in particular the long delay that occurred before a review of the project and associated issues took place, and the lack of an open and consultative process when the initial involvement in the project was approved. It was noted that changes to SCIA's policy have corrected some of these past problems.
- A fairly clear and accurate account of the basic objections of the critics of the project was provided on pages 35-37, but instead of fully addressing those criticisms the report focused more on the benefits accrued by Indonesian participants even though most critics never questioned these benefits.
- The report does not address concerns about the Canadian government investing heavily through CIDA programs in Indonesia during a corrupt government regime and the long term affects of such investments.

- An issue which needs to be addressed for future projects is whether the university is willing to support and participate in projects in countries that do not share the same democratic standards as Canada, or whether support should be restricted to the countries with similar standards as Canada.
- The report sets a new standard for well researched and well written reviews and one of its values was that it prompted debate within the university about some very difficult moral issues.

Moved by L. Dill, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that Senate move out of Committee of the Whole”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

On behalf of Senate, the Chair extended thanks and appreciation to the Committee for its hard work. The Chair reported that the comments and concerns of Senate would be forwarded to SCIA for follow up action on the recommendations in the report. The Chair also advised that CIDA was currently undergoing a review of its own policies and funding priorities and there was a possibility that CIDA was considering less involvement with universities and more direct involvement with governments for official development projects.

ii) Paper S.01-16 – Annual Report – SCIA (For Information)

C. Jones, Executive Director, International Relations and J. Knockaert, Director of International Co-operation were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to Annex C on pages 23 and 24 and concern was expressed about the effort required to develop exchanges for a rather small number of students. Senate was advised that reciprocity was a very important aspect of exchange programs and trying to organize large exchange agreements with any one institution was likely to be problematic whereas having a small number of students coming from and going to one institution was more feasible.

Discussion ensued with respect to the recruitment process used for exchange programs. It was pointed out that in comparison with other universities across Canada, SFU compared quite favourably and was above the national average. Senate was advised that one of the most serious impediments for students participating in an exchange was the cost and if additional funding for students was forthcoming the participation rate would likely increase. The Chair reported that AUCC was trying to establish a federal program of mobility grants for students involved in approved exchange programs and there was a concerted effort to initiate similar financial assistance programs that are currently available in the United States and in Europe for exchange students.

Brief discussion followed with respect to international co-op placements and Senate was advised that it was possible that the incentives currently being considered by the federal government and AUCC could be extended to

international co-op placements. [Co-op student numbers are not included in the data in this report.]

iii) Paper S.01-17 – Change in Terms of Reference for the International Student Exchange Committee (ISEC) (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on International Activities approved a change in the terms of reference of ISEC with respect to the reporting structure for the establishment of any new international or domestic undergraduate or graduate student exchange agreement.

C) Ad Hoc Senate Committee to Review Research Ethics Policy Revisions

i) Paper S.01-18 – Proposed Policy and Procedures for Ethics Review of Research Involving Human Subjects

Committee members W. Davidson, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee and J. Driver were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Senate was advised that the policy revision dated February 16, 2001 had been presented to the Tri-Council for comment. They have advised that the report did not comply in certain areas, in particular the issue of informed consent had not been addressed and the Research Ethics Appeal Board could not be set up as an ad hoc committee. Since further revisions were necessary, it was felt it would be better to withdraw the motion and present the document as it stands to Senate for discussion. A final document addressing the Tri-Council issues and any concerns/suggestions of Senate will then be brought back for approval.

Moved by W. Davidson, seconded by J. Driver

“that Senate move into a Committee of the Whole to allow open discussion on the report from the Ad Hoc Senate Committee to Review Research Ethics Policy Revisions”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion ensued and the following comments were expressed.

- It was suggested that the composition of the Research Ethics Board should be expanded to assure wider range of representation within the university community, such as including one faculty member from each Faculty and guaranteed positions for at least two graduate students.
- Some Faculties have very few ethics applications while other Faculties were much more involved and it would be more appropriate for Faculties with expertise and involvement to be well represented.
- It was pointed out that the membership had to comply with the Tri-Council policy statement and it would be difficult to meet the stipulations of the policy statement if there were a restriction that each Faculty be represented.

- The suggestion was made that terms for students be one year as the proposed three year term was unreasonable and might reduce the number of students willing to serve.
- Reference was made to the provision in the Tri-Council policy statement which allowed institutions to use members of other institution's Research Ethics Boards for their own appeals board. An arrangement of this sort should be investigated with the University of Victoria.
- Reference was made to section 6.3 and concern was expressed about the wording that faculty members must take responsibility for actions of their students as well as teaching ethical issues. It was suggested that reference to the framework agreement which provides legal protection to faculty members should be cross-referenced in this section. University policy offered the same kind of support to other researchers such as post doctoral fellows and graduate students as long as their work was approved by the Ethics Board and they follow approved protocol. Suggestion was made that any revised wording should include reference to researchers other than faculty members.
- The suggestion was made that appointments of student members of the Research Ethics Board should be made by the Student Society or the Graduate Issues Committee of the Student Society. It was pointed out that Senate had previously recommended that appointments to Senate committees should be made by Senate.
- Reference was made to Section 5.2 and the word Committee was changed to Board.
- Clarification with respect to the use of the term Director of Research Ethics in relation to the Office of Research Ethics was required.
- Concerns around the workload of the Director were expressed and a suggestion was made that there should be an assistant.
- Reference was made to Section 3.12 and opinion was expressed that it was necessary to allow the committee to develop procedures as issues arise, and suggestion was made that it would be helpful if the wording of this section could be broadened such that regulations could be developed as long as they are consistent with the policy.
- With respect to the issue of informed consent, the suggestion was made that the salient points of Section 2 of the Tri-council policy statement should be incorporated into the document
- Opinion was expressed that a provision for monitoring projects should be included and a suggestion was made to change the word 'authority' to 'responsibility' in section 3.3.
- Concern was expressed that the wording of Section 6.1.a implied that minimal risk assessment was determined by the subject rather than by an appropriate Board/Committee member and suggestion was made that the wording be revised to clarify the intent.

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

"that Senate move out of Committee of the Whole and that the concerns and recommendations of Senate be taken into consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee for revision, particularly

the incorporation of policy requirements respecting informed consent, and that a final draft be brought back to Senate for approval"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

On behalf of Senate, the Chair expressed appreciation and thanks to the members of the ad hoc committee for their hard work.

D) Senate Committee on University Priorities (continued)

ii) Paper S.01-20 – Establishment of the Centre for Scientific Computing

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by W. Davidson

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the establishment of the Centre for Scientific Computing as outlined in S.01-20"

Senate was advised that the support documentation should be amended to show that the Centre would be established as a Schedule B Centre reporting to the Vice-President Research rather than a Schedule A Centre reporting to the Dean of Science.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Paper S.01-21 – Follow-up – External Review – Gerontology Program and Research Centre (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on University Priorities had unanimously concluded to withdraw its recommendation that Gerontology work toward a single intake of students for the Diploma Program.

E) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.01-22 – Change to admission requirements – School of Kinesiology

N. Heath, Director of Admissions, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Moved by R. Marteniuk, seconded by C. Steinbach

"that Senate approve the revised admission requirements to the School of Kinesiology, as set forth in S.01-22, effective January 2002"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.01-23 – Change to General Admission Requirements

N. Heath, Director of Admissions, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by C. Steinbach

“that Senate approve the addition of Calculus 12 to the admission requirements, as set forth in S.01-23, effective January 2002, under the List 3 (Science Group)”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

F) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.01-24 – Policy for the temporary and permanent withdrawal of graduate courses

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve the proposed policy for the temporary and permanent withdrawal of graduate courses”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.01-25 – Annual Report – SGSC (For Information)

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

G) Senate Committee on Enrolment Management and Planning

i) Paper S.01-26 – Undergraduate Admission Targets for 2001/02

Senate was advised of problems caused by rounding factors to some of numbers in the motion. Corrected numbers were reported and appear in the motion below.

Motion #1

Moved by J. Pierce, seconded by J. Osborne

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the following undergraduate admission targets for each basis-of-admission group and for each semester in 2001/02, and that SCEMP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on

changes to the overall provincial enrolment targets for SFU and based on actual enrolment experience in 2001-2 and 2001-3

Admission Targets For New Students

	<u>2001-2</u>	<u>2001-3</u>	<u>2002-1</u>	<u>Total</u>
B.C. GRXII	80	1,922	125	2,127
B.C. College	459	700	606	1,765
"Other"	172	678	390	1,240
Total Intake	711	3,300	1,121	5,132 "

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #1 CARRIED

Motion #2

Moved by J. Pierce, seconded by J. Osborne

"that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the undergraduate admission targets to each Faculty as indicated in the attached table, and that SCEMP be delegated authority to make adjustments based on changes to the overall provincial enrolment targets for SFU and based on actual enrolment experience in 2001-2 and 2001-3"

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #2 CARRIED

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, April 2, 2001.

Open Session ended at 9:05 pm and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat