

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY SENATE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, April 8, 2002 at 5:30 pm in Room 3210 WMC

OPEN SESSION

Present: Stevenson, Michael, President and Chair of Senate

Aloi, Santa
Atkins, Stella
Chan, Albert
Clayman, Bruce
Copeland, Lynn
Davidson, Willie
Delgrande, James
Driver, Jon
Dunsterville, Valerie
Gerson, Carole
Haunerland, Norbert
Hill, Ross
Jackson, Margaret
Jones, John
Krane, Bill
Lewis, Brian
Love, Ernie
McFetridge, Paul
McInnes, Dina
Naef, Barbara
Paterson, David
Percival, Paul
Pierce, John
Russell, Robert
Steinbach, Chris
Stephenson, Brock
Thompson, Janny (representing R. Barrow)
Waterhouse, John
Yerbury, Colin
Zaichkowsky, Judith

Absent: Chang, Jack
D'Auria, John
Dempster, Peter
Gill, Alison
Grimmett, Peter
Heaney, John
Jensen, Britta
Jones, Colin
Klymson, Sarah
Mauser, Gary
McArthur, James
Muirhead, Leah
Peters, Joseph
Sekhon, Devinder
Sirri, Odai
Tansey, Caralyn
Thandi, Ranbir
Van Aalst, Jan
Warren, Joel
Weldon, Larry
Wessel, Silvia
Wong, Milton
Wortis, Michael

In attendance:

Hibbitts, Pat
Osborne, Judith

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 March 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

As follow-up to his report at the last meeting, the Chair advised that the budget letter to the University had been received. The news was not as good as anticipated since the grants decline over the next three years by a significant amount in absolute dollars and by a considerable amount in per capita FTE equivalent grants. Grant funding has been received for the Double the Opportunity Program in the amount anticipated and full funding has been received for the initiative in Surrey. Particulars with respect to capital and infrastructure funding required for the Double the Opportunity Program have not yet been received but the Government has indicated a commitment to a capital/infrastructure program and the University is submitting plans for its share. The letter confirms the lack of funding for general inflation, cash limit mandates for previously approved wage improvements, and the withdrawal of selected financial assistance programs for graduate and undergraduate students. The combined effect of these elements results in a projected deficit of 8.9 million dollars for 2002/03 which has to be resolved because the University Act requires a balanced budget.

The situation leaves stark choices for the University. Either a reduction in expenditures and cuts to programs will have to be made or revenues will have to be increased. In the short term, increased revenue cannot be made up by endowments or gifts to the University so heavy pressure is put on tuition fees. The University cannot afford further threats to the quality of education on top of the accumulated impact of underfunding over past years. A recommendation with respect to tuition increases will be presented as a Notice of Motion at the April meeting of the Board of Governors with full debate to take place at the May meeting.

The Chair made reference to the recent publicity on campus for a "Swamp the BOG" protest at the April Board meeting. This follows upon a disruption of the last meeting of the Board of Governors. Protests of this nature prevent open and civil discussion of these issues. The Chair noted that the fee issue is a very pressing and difficult issue for the university and deserves a full opportunity for the airing of different points of views so it is hoped that no such disruption will take place in the future.

5. Question Period
There were no questions submitted.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules

i) Paper S.02-27 – Chairs Appointment Policy

Moved by B. Clayman, seconded by J. Waterhouse

“that Senate approve and recommend approval to the Board of Governors, the revised Policy A13.02 – Appointment of Departmental Chairs and Directors of Schools, as set forth in S.02-27”

J. Osborne, Acting Associate Vice-President, Policy, Equity and Legal was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

Reference was made to Section 4.2 and discussion took place with regard to the meaning of the word ‘normally’ in the second sentence. It was noted that this sentence was in conflict with a later clause which protected a Chair from a further reconsideration for one year following a reconsideration. It was suggested that the wording provided a signal indicating that only in extraordinary circumstances would a recall request be considered in the first year of a Chair’s appointment.

Amendment moved by P. Percival, seconded by B. Stephenson

“that the word ‘normally’ be deleted from the second sentence of paragraph 4.2”

It was noted that the amendment would retain the sentiment expressed in 4.6 and if under extremely unusual circumstances it became necessary to remove a Chair in the first year, the Dean or the Vice-President Academic had the authority to initiate procedures.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Reference was made to the first sentence of paragraph 1.3 regarding gender balance and opinion expressed that the intent was not clear. A suggestion to *strike the word ‘members’* from this sentence was accepted as a **friendly amendment**.

Discussion turned to Section 4 – Reconsideration.

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

“that section 4.4 be amended to the effect that the Dean will provide a copy of the text of the reconsideration request without signatures to the Chair”

Points of view expressed opposing the amendment included the following: people who complain should be prepared to have their identity made public; everyone has the right to know the nature of the complaint and where it came from; academic freedom allows faculty members to express their opinions freely so there should be no consequences to making the names known; signatures are part of the document and reaction to the document may depend on who signed it; having to sign guarantees the complaint is of substance and the person feels strongly about the issue.

One argument in favour of the motion was that having the signatures revealed might prevent some colleagues from expressing their concern. Another reason mentioned was that a Chair might act negatively towards a complainant in assigning teaching responsibilities, for example.

Question was called, and a vote taken. AMENDMENT DEFEATED

It was suggested that a time limit be placed on the conflict resolution process referred to in section 4.4. It was pointed out that conflict resolution was not amenable to strict guidelines, some cases could be simple, others complex, so the Dean has been given responsibility for setting a timeline if the process is undertaken.

Reference was made to section 4.6 and clarification was requested whether 60% of the voting faculty means faculty members who are eligible to vote or those who actually cast a ballot. Senate was advised that the rules for ratification and the rules for reconsideration were now parallel in terms of language and it referred to those who vote.

An amendment by J. Delgrande to reduce the 60% threshold to 50% failed for want of a seconder.

Referring to voter eligibility in section 6, opinion was expressed that the wording was ambiguous and needed clarification with respect to the term ‘leave of absence’. Discussion ensued with respect to the variety and lengths of leaves of absence. It was pointed out that this wording paralleled the rules regarding ratification votes. A proposed amendment to replace ‘unpaid’ with ‘100%’ was withdrawn by the mover.

Discussion again turned to the required 60% support needed for reconsideration and inquiry was made as to why it was deemed better to have 60% rather than a simple majority. It was noted generally that recall

votes have a much higher threshold level than a simple majority and it avoided the possibility of having such a serious issue decided by a margin of one vote.

Opinion was expressed that a certain number or percentage of the total faculty eligible to vote should be required in addition to the 60% of voting members. However, it was pointed out that in that configuration people could thwart a vote by not voting. Comments were made that it was very unlikely that half the faculty would abstain from voting in such a serious and extraordinary situation and that 60% was sufficient.

Questions arose with respect to the percentages referred to in the second sentence of section 1.3 and a suggestion to change the wording as follows was accepted as a **friendly amendment**: "Appropriate representation will vary by discipline but should be *no less than 2 and no more than 6* male or female members.' Discussion ensued with respect to distribution of membership by gender and the number of committee members, and the following wording was added as a **friendly amendment** "*no less than two (at least one of whom must be a faculty member) or more than 6 male or female members*" in place of "20% or greater than 80%".

Further discussion took place about how to ensure appropriate gender balance and still meet the requirements of 1.2 and 1.3. Considerable discussion ensued about the electoral process and a variety of scenarios were debated. It was pointed out that this wording had not changed from the previous policy and Senate was assured that the process had worked over the years.

Question was called, and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Paper S.02-28 – Emergency Management of Physical or other Disasters Policy (For Information)

P. Hibbitts, Vice-President Finance and Administration was in attendance in order to respond to questions.

A comment was expressed about the vagueness of the document. Senate was advised that the policy was general because it was intended to provide the basis for the development of specific procedures outlined at the end of the policy. In the interim, Senate was advised that there was an emergency plan in place and an emergency group that met regularly but there had not been an official policy until now.

Reference was made to the statement under Scope that the Emergency Operations Centre would coordinate operations at Harbour Centre and Burnaby if a disaster affects both campuses, and concern was expressed that communications between the two campuses might not be possible in

certain disasters. Senate was advised that there would be a designated person at Harbour Centre who would take responsibility in that event.

In response to an inquiry relating to the Director of Emergency Operations Centre, Senate was advised that this would not be a new person but likely a senior person from Facilities Management.

A question arose about whether a reference to SFU at Surrey should be included. Senate's attention was drawn to the phrase "where a disaster affects another location", in the last sentence under "Scope" and was advised that this would cover other locations such as Surrey and Kamloops. It was also noted that once SFU at Surrey becomes a legal entity, policies will be reviewed to reflect that change.

iii) Paper S.02-29 – Tech BC Update (For Information)

Senate was advised that the document had been distributed to inform Senate fully as to the nature of the arrangement between the University and the Ministry of Advanced Education and to provide current information about the developments with respect to the Surrey campus. Prospective faculty members for the Surrey program have been interviewed and recommendations are in progress to appoint a sufficient number to staff the program for the next year. A question arose with respect to what fraction of current Tech BC faculty and staff are likely to be offered employment at SFU. Although the fraction was not available, Senate was advised that 27 faculty were to be hired and that the staff situation was still evolving.

Reference was made to point 8 on page 7 with respect to commitment to on-line learning and inquiry was made as to how much flexibility there was within the agreement to use advanced technologies to support on-line learning. Senate was advised that the intent is to look carefully at the success of this learning style, its cost, and its applicability elsewhere in the University before making a decision as to whether or not it should be continued.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Information

The date of the next regularly scheduled meeting of Senate is Monday, May 13, 2002.

Open Session adjourned at 6:44 pm and moved directly into Closed Session.

Alison Watt
Director, University Secretariat