

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, March 4, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. in Room 3210 WMC

Open Session

Present: Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair of Senate

Atkins, Stella
Barrow, Robin
Chan, Albert
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
Davidson, Willie
Delgrande, James
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Gerson, Carole
Haunerland, Norbert
Hill, Ross
Jones, Colin
Jones, John
Krane, Bill
Love, Ernie
Naef, Barbara
Parkhouse, Wade (representing B. Lewis)
Percival, Paul
Peters, Joseph
Pierce, John
Russell, Robert
Steinbach, Christopher
Stephenson, Brock
Van Aalst, Jan
Waterhouse, John
Wortis, Michael
Yerbury, Colin

Absent: Alois, Santa
Chang, Jack
D'Auria, John
Dempster, Peter
Gill, Alison
Grimmett, Peter
Heaney, John
Jackson, Margaret
Jensen, Britta
Klymson, Sarah
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
McFetridge, Paul
McInnes, Dina
Muirhead, Leah
Paterson, David
Sekhon, Devinder
Sirri, Odai
Tansey, Caralyn
Thandi, Ranbir
Warren, Joel
Weldon, Larry
Wessel, Silvia
Wong, Milton
Zaichkowsky, Judy

In attendance:
Angerilli, Nello
Hucal, Daria
Stead, Doug

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 February 4, 2002
The Minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the Minutes.
4. Report of the Chair

i) The Chair acknowledged the presence of a group of visitors from Tech BC and, on behalf of Senate, welcomed them to the meeting. The Chair also welcomed newly elected Senator Colin Jones.

ii) The Chair reported that while the budget letters from the Government which provide the necessary details for the University to formulate budget allocations had not yet been received, recent budget announcements give a reasonably clear picture for the future. In keeping with the 0-0-0 framework announced by the Government, there have been no cuts to the budget of the Ministry of Advanced Education, which has been well treated in comparison to other Ministries. Expectations are that funding will be received to cover the New Era program commitments and the impact of medical premium increases. Although not fully funded, the Leadership Chairs program appears to have been retained on a cost share basis, with allocations among institutions yet to be determined. Institutions wishing to activate Chairs will likely have to match the funding from the Province. On the other hand, there are clear problems with the budget in terms of cost pressures in existing programs that will not be met by new grant funding and from the withdrawal of Government commitments to financial assistance and work study programs affecting students, as well as a withdrawal of commitments to funding the previously negotiated cash limits mandate needed to cover the second and third year negotiated agreements with various employee groups. The Finance Minister has announced that wage guidelines in the public sector for the next three years will be zero, zero, zero with the possibility of institutions being penalized for failure to observe these guidelines. The Government has also indicated that it will not continue the program established by the previous Government to fund indirect costs of research infrastructure. This is a problem given the recent Federal Government announcement of a one time only program funding the indirect costs of research; the future funding of which is expected to be conditional on Provincial funding in this area.

The Provincial budget creates a significant deficit in the Simon Fraser University budget estimates, with an associated need to increase tuition fees or to cut programs and services. Consultations over these issues will take place during the next month with the Senate Committee on University Priorities, employee groups and the Student Society prior to any recommendation on tuition fees going forward to the Board of Governors. It is expected that a notice of motion will be presented to the April meeting of the Board and will be considered at the May Board meeting. The Chair pointed out that consideration

will be given to significant improvement in student financial assistance to buffer the impact of any proposed fee increase on those least advantaged.

5. Question Period

Reference was made to the statements by the Chair about research infrastructure support and question was raised as to whether the B.C. Knowledge Development Fund (BCKDF) would continue. The Chair was unable to provide specific information but indicated that if BCKDF were discontinued it would seriously affect B.C.'s capacity to compete effectively in Federal research funding programs.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Nominating Committee

i) Paper S.02-15 – Elections

Senate was advised that no nominations were received with respect to the positions detailed on Senate paper S.02-15. Senate was also informed that the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Undergraduate Curricula had lost its student representative and that SCAR which is the body required to appoint members to this committee had appointed Amy Wong to the position.

B) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.02-16 – Interpretation Policy

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors the Interpretation Policy as set forth in S.02-16”

Senate was advised that the policy provided a mechanism for interpreting policies which have no such existing mechanism.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) Senate Committee on International Activities

i) Paper S.02-17 – Annual Report (For Information)

N. Angerilli, Director, International Co-operation, and Daria Hucal, International and Exchange Student Office were in attendance in order to respond to questions.

In response to an inquiry, Senate was provided with details concerning the number of faculty members involved and the value of the projects associated with activities in Indonesia, following which the Report was received by Senate.

D) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

i) Paper S.02-18 – Communication – Curriculum Revision (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the introduction of a requirement of C- or better requirement for prerequisites.

ii) Paper S.02-19 – Business Administration – Curriculum Revision (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved changes in prerequisites to existing courses and a change in Calendar wording to Joint Major programs to reflect the change in prerequisites.

iii) Paper S.02-20 – Education – Curriculum Revisions

Moved by R. Barrow, seconded by C. Steinbach

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the Minor in Education and Technology, as set forth in S.02-20”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved the removal of the Calendar entry section concerning Secondary School Physical Education.

E) Senate Committee on University Priorities

i) Paper S.02-21 – Certificate in Forestry Geoscience

Moved by W. Davidson, seconded by M. Wortis

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the proposal for a Certificate in Forestry Geoscience as outlined in S.02-21”

Doug Stead, Earth Sciences, was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.02-22 – Tech BC Program Arrangements

Motion #1

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve in principle the establishment of a program which will provide existing undergraduate students at the Technical University of British Columbia the opportunity to complete an appropriate SFU degree. This program is expected to be in effect for at least three years and will start on 1 September 2002. The detailed programmatic arrangements will be developed over the next few months and will be subject to the usual University approval processes”

Senate was advised that the purpose of the motion was to provide comfort to current students at Tech BC that they will be able to complete the programs in which they are currently registered, and to provide time for Senate to consider Tech BC programs and bring through the normal approval processes the necessary motions to create such SFU programs. Referring to the existing Gerontology Program as an example, it was pointed out that the program would require a Director and thus form the beginnings of an administrative structure under which the courses at Tech BC could move forward. The intent was also to establish a committee to examine in detail courses at Tech BC and bring forward recommendations to Senate. The proposed membership of the committee would be Bill Krane, Acting Associate Vice President Academic as Chair; three faculty members, one from each of the Faculties of Applied Sciences, Arts, and Business Administration; and two students, one from SFU and one from Tech BC.

Senate was further advised that the intention was so far as possible to provide students currently accepted at Tech BC with the program they had expected to acquire. However, the intention was not to simply reproduce Tech BC programs for the indefinite future but to use the planning mechanism outlined in the subsidiary motion to generate detailed recommendations for programs that would be offered through a satellite operation in Surrey.

Clarification was requested as to whether Tech BC students would be automatically admitted in existing programs at SFU or if different programs would be established. Senate was advised that the intent was to create a totally separate program which would not have the same degree designation as existing degrees at SFU. Concern was expressed that this may result in a high degree of replication of courses but it was pointed out that the structure of course work at Tech BC was quite different from the structure of the course-work at SFU and so as long as the current programs at Tech BC ran in their current format there would be a minimal amount of overlap. However, during the second phase as captured by the third motion, it was possible that the method of delivery and the structure of the program would resemble some of the SFU course work and programs and there would be mobility of students across programs. It was pointed out that there was no intention to increase enrolments in existing SFU courses on campus. The intent of the

funding arrangement with the Government for the interim period was that no existing resources would be needed from existing budgets to offer programs at Surrey nor would these programs contribute significant resources back to the Burnaby Mountain campus.

Reference was made to the wording in motion 1 which focused on the establishment of a new program for existing students at Tech BC, and question was raised as to whether new students would be allowed to register or whether the new program would be restricted to existing students. Senate was advised that it was possible for new students to enrol in Tech BC and that approximately sixty students have been accepted by Tech BC to begin their first year in September 2002 and it was felt that the University had an obligation to offer Tech BC programs to those students. However the wording of the motion does not guarantee that those students would be able to proceed all the way through the existing program to completion. By Spring of 2003, determination by Senate would be in place as to what programs would be available for registration to new students. In response to an inquiry about admission criteria for future students, Senate was advised that the high school grade point average required by Tech BC was very similar to SFU admission requirements in some Faculties and expectations are that it would likely continue. Views were expressed fully supporting the intent of the motion in relation to currently registered Tech BC students, but reluctance was expressed about extending the same reassurance to high school students who are not yet registered at Tech BC. Furthermore, it was suggested that the length of the transition period should be more clearly defined.

In response to an inquiry about the current offerings at Tech BC, Senate was advised that there are currently three program streams: Interactive Arts, Information Technology, and Management and Technology, and that all three programs are built on a common first year. A question was raised about the location of the program or programs within the SFU structure given that the three streams might not belong in the same Faculty. It was suggested that it would be preferable administratively to keep the programs together.

A point of clarification was requested with respect to whether or not the issue of a satellite campus in Surrey was an open question. Senate was advised that under the funding arrangement with the Government, SFU was committed to enrol 400 students this year, 600 students next year, and 800 students the following year at a satellite campus in Surrey. However, whether the new program(s) would be located at Surrey or located at SFU was still an open question, and exactly how much activity takes place in Surrey was open for Senate to decide.

A question was also posed with respect to the program which would be established for current Tech BC students and whether SFU was committed to offering the current program unchanged for three years. The response was provided that the intent was for the majority of courses and the central structure and substance of current Tech BC programs to remain essentially intact through to graduation of the students currently enrolled in the first year.

Reference was made to the proposed composition of the planning committee which would be chaired by the Acting Associate Vice President Academic and a question was

raised as to why there was no representation from the Faculty of Science since Mathematics and Statistics was a significant part of TechOne and TechTwo. It was pointed out that there were two committees being established, the program committee intended under motion 1 and a long-term planning committee referred to under motion 3 which would have a representative from the Faculty of Science. SCUP felt the proposed membership of the first committee was appropriate and had wanted to keep the size down. The committee would be consulting with various faculties and faculty members with respect to the content of courses and the structure of programs. The Dean of Science expressed strong interest that Science be represented on the short-term committee and the Chair requested that SCUP take that into consideration.

Discussion turned to the formula for funding of students and what would happen if TechOne was not offered to the students who had been offered admission in September. Although the penalty was not specific, the Chair felt that the cost to the University of refusing to enrol students from the Surrey region would be very considerable in terms of the assurance given by the Government and by SFU publicly to expand access to post-secondary education in that specific region. He also felt there was a moral obligation to those students who have made a commitment and paid a deposit.

P. Percival requested that it be clearly recorded in the Minutes that motion 1, if approved, only approved 'in principle' the establishment of a program, and that should not be seen in any way as a *carte blanche*. Details of any new or future expansions of programs would have to come to Senate for approval.

Concern was expressed about the open-endedness of the motion.

Amendment moved by J. Jones, seconded by J. Delgrande

"that the words 'and at most four' be inserted following the words 'for at least three years'"

Question was called and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED
(14 in favour, 11 opposed)

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

"that Senate approve in principle the establishment of a program which will provide existing undergraduate students at the Technical University of British Columbia the opportunity to complete an appropriate SFU degree. This program is expected to be in effect for at least three years, and at most four, and will start on 1 September 2002. The detailed programmatic arrangements will be developed over the next few months and will be subject to the usual University approval processes"

MOTION #1, AS AMENDED, CARRIED

Motion #2

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by J. Driver

“that Senate approve in principle the admission of graduate students currently enrolled at the Technical University of British Columbia into appropriate graduate programs in accordance with Simon Fraser University Graduate Programs policies and procedures”

Senate was advised that this motion was intended to provide a similar degree of comfort to graduate students at Tech BC, and had been developed to provide a route for graduate students to complete degrees in which they are currently registered. The intent is to register graduate students in special cohort arrangement programs and grant degrees through the same process as existing Master cohort programs by Special Arrangements. Similar permission will be requested from Senate for students registered in PhD programs at Tech BC. Approval of the motion will enable and give direction to establish these cohort programs under special arrangements.

In response to questions about funding and the number of graduate students involved, Senate was advised that there were approximately 30 graduate students currently in Master's and Doctoral programs at Tech BC, primarily in two areas at the Master's level – Interactive Arts and Information Technology, and - Management of Technology at the PhD level. SFU will receive \$20,000 per graduate student per year. There was no intention of admitting any new graduate students to begin between now and September but it was possible that new students would be admitted in September depending upon the programs established and upon the approval of Senate. In response to an inquiry about limits on the funding commitment, Senate was informed that the Government had specified a fixed amount per graduate student with no commitment with respect to the number of graduate students. However, it was unrealistic to believe that the commitment was open ended. However, as long as the agreement existed, the University would maximize the opportunity to provide programs for the students covered by the agreement and try to keep the funded ratio of graduate students to undergraduate enrolment constant, which would mean more funding for more students as the undergraduate enrolment went up. It was suggested that the issue of graduate enrolment would be built into whatever program proposal was brought forward to Senate if it was not to be a sunset program. Senators were reminded that under motion 3, once the short-term problem of maintaining a program for current graduate students has been dealt with, long-term plans will be made for either the development of graduate programs at a Surrey campus or the development of plans to end that component.

With respect to the development of new programs at the Master's level, Senate was advised that in the short term expectations were that cohort programs under special arrangements as outlined in the existing graduate regulations would likely be developed. At the PhD level it was unlikely that new programs would be developed. It would be more feasible to integrate PhD students through individual special arrangements programs or a cohort special arrangements program at the PhD level similar to the existing regulation at the Master's level. Students would also be eligible to apply for

admission into an existing SFU program in the same way any student can do from any institution.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #2 CARRIED

Motion #3

Moved by J. Waterhouse, seconded by B. Clayman

“that under the direction of SCUP, a long-term plan will be developed to examine the possibility of integrating the Tech BC programs into the regular SFU offerings. SCUP will direct this planning process and report to Senate in 2003-01 or earlier”

Clarification was requested on the need to have a second committee to deal with long range planning. Senate was advised that the committee envisioned in Motion 3 has a much longer term focus than the first committee, since it would consider not only the existing programs but other possible new areas and would also focus on the structure of programming at SFU in Surrey.

Inquiries were made about the hiring of faculty and how the administrative structure was envisioned for the campus in Surrey vis-à-vis SFU's administrative structure. It was pointed out that the purpose of establishing a program was to establish an administrative home for both students and faculty. Under existing SFU appointment policies, there are ways to appoint faculty directly to programs so over the short term the administrative structure would likely follow that process. Over the long term there would be a number of options including a programmatic focus. These issues would be considered by the long- term planning committee.

Opinion was expressed that the motion was phrased more narrowly than what was intended, and a suggestion to change the wording as follows was accepted as a friendly amendment:

“that under the direction of SCUP, a long-term plan will be developed to examine *the future of SFU at Surrey* including the possibility of integrating the Tech BC programs into the regular SFU offerings. SCUP will direct this planning process and report to Senate in 2003-01 or earlier”

Questions arose concerning the funding arrangement. Under the existing arrangement the current campus and existing enrolment will be fully funded with respect to operating costs and tuition fees. After the current lease expires, and in recognition of enrolment growth, the Government will fully fund appropriate accommodation in Surrey for the enrolment and the programs developed.

It was suggested that the amended wording implied that there would be a campus in Surrey rather than this issue being open to consideration by the committee. A suggestion was made that the added phrase be changed to read *examine the possibility of a SFU*

campus in Surrey. The suggested change was not accepted for incorporation into the motion.

Moved by P. Percival, seconded by A. Chan

“that the motion be rephrased as follows: that under the direction of SCUP, a long-term plan will be developed to examine the possibility of an SFU campus in Surrey including the possibility of integrating the Tech BC programs into regular SFU offerings”

Question was called and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT FAILED

Brief discussion continued on the motion as revised by the friendly amendment.

Moved by A. Chan, seconded by P. Percival

“that the friendly amendment be deleted and the motion revert to the original wording”

Opinion was expressed that the friendly amendment contradicted the original intent and introduced a completely new issue to the motion.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

The Chair clarified that the motion now on the floor was the motion as it originally appears on Senate paper S.02-22.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION #3 CARRIED

F) Senate Graduate Studies Committee

i) Paper S.02-23 – Communication – Curriculum Revisions (For Information)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved the addition of new text to the Calendar with respect to Master's Degree Requirements, re-titled current 'Degree' requirements to 'Course' requirements; the reduction of the number of course hours required for a Master's degree, and revised text and minor changes on admission procedures.

ii) Paper S02-24 – New Graduate Courses – Special Arrangements

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved four new courses for Special Arrangements.

- iii) Paper S.02-25 – Assessment Committee for New Graduate Programs – Revision to Terms of Reference

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by B. Clayman

“that Senate approve changes to the terms of reference of the Assessment Committee for New Graduate Programs as set forth in S.02-25”

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

- iv) Paper S.02-26 – SGSC Annual Report (For Information)

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

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, April 8, 2002.

Open Session adjourned at 9:20 p.m. and Senate moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat