



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
ENGAGING THE WORLD

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, July 4, 2016 at 5:30 pm at the West Mall Complex (Room 3210)

Open Session

Present: Andrew Petter, Chair

Baharmand, Iman
Bartram, Lyn
Binotto, Jordan
Birmingham, Elina
Budra, Paul
Chapman, Glenn
Chen, Larissa
Christians, Julian
Cupples, Claire
Dale, Nadia
Dastmalchian, Ali
Driver, Jon
Gajdics, Sylvia
Gallilee, Patty (for Gwen Bird)
Glässer, Uwe
Gray, Bonnie
Han, Richard
Hans, Paul
Haywood, Weldon
Johnson, Joy
Kirkpatrick, Ted
Kropinski, Mary-Catherine
Laitsch, Dan
Leacock, Tracey
MacAlister, David
Magnusson, Kris
Malhan, Blossom
McTavish, Rob
Miller, Tatum
Moen, Alexander
Mongrain, Steve
Parkhouse, Wade
Percival, Colin
Percival, Paul
Pulkingham, Jane

Sekhon, Gurbir
Shaw, Chris
Spector, Stephen
Stefanovic, Ingrid
Szymczyk, Barbara
Tabin, Yvonne
Tingling, Peter

Absent:

Abramson, Neil
Andersen, Holly
Bird, Gwen
Brennan, Tracy
Burley, David
Farah, Arr
Giardini, Anne
Hedley, Nick
Ige, Adebola Abayomi
Lewthwaite, Jayme
Leznoff, Daniel
Mac Namara, Aoife
Myers, Gordon
O'Neil, John
Paterson, David
Peters, Joseph
Pooghkay, Curtis
Ruben, Peter
Wiese, Kay
Williams, Tony

In Attendance:

Hinchliffe, Jo
Rahilly, Tim

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session on May 16, 2016

The minutes of the open session on May 16, 2016 were approved as distributed.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session on June 6, 2016

The minutes of the open session on June 6, 2016 were approved as distributed.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the Chair

The Chair reported on a number of research awards: the inaugural *Chris Dagg Award for International Impact*, which recognizes the contributions of SFU faculty and staff to the internationalization of the university, was awarded posthumously to Ian Andrews from Education for his work in international education initiatives, and to Yuezhi Zhao from Communications for her work on globalization that has impacted global research and the delivery of education; the inaugural *Compute Canada Trailblazer Award* was awarded to Dugan O'Neil from Physics for his work helping Canadian researchers use Compute Canada's advanced research computing capabilities to support the production of globally competitive research.

The Chair reported that SFU, along with the City of Surrey, signed a memorandum of understanding with France's *Société d'Accélération du Transfert de Technologies Grand Centre* to tackle critical healthcare challenges at a global level. They are particularly interested in partnering with SFU and Surrey around healthcare technologies that spark collaboration and share expertise between Canada and France across a range of innovative projects, with particular reference to our *Digital Health Hub*.

The Chair reported that the Charles Chang Institute for Entrepreneurship was announced since the last meeting of Senate, and with that came the announcement of a \$10 million gift from alumnus Charles Chang, founder of the nutrition company *Vega*. The donation will fund the establishment of a new institute of entrepreneurship, as well as a certificate program in innovation and entrepreneurship. Also, there will be a naming of our new facility downtown, the Charles Chang Innovation Center, with part of it dedicated to innovation, and which will be the home for our social incubator *Radius*.

The Chair noted that in San Francisco we hosted the first-ever SFU *Tech Talk* where we profiled some of our leading researchers in areas of technology: Ian McCarthy, Professor of Technology & Operations Management and the Associate Dean of Graduate Programs in the Beedie School of Business; Uwe Glasser, Dean (pro tem) of Applied Sciences; Lesley Shannon, Chair of Computer Engineering Option and NSERC Chair for Women in Science and Engineering; and Fred Popowich, the Director of the Professional Master's Program in Big Data.

The Chair noted that in June we held the final convocation of our 50th anniversary year, featuring eight honorary degree recipients, including Geoffrey Massey, who was one of the original architects of the campus. It also included an Indigenous Feast for the 55 indigenous students who completed their programs in 2015-16.

The Chair reported that there have been some approved modifications in position titles for VPs, AVPs, and one Dean to better reflect their areas of responsibility and to create equivalence with titles used at comparator institutions. It was noted that these title changes involve no changes in existing responsibilities or in remuneration.

The Chair noted the end of 50th Anniversary celebrations, which consisted of approximately 350 university and community based events. Highlights included: over 1,000 participants at the 50th kickoff; 2,300 guests at *Celebrate and Savour*; 13,000 attendees at the *Burnaby Festival of Learning*; 3,000 guests at *Hidden Pasts*, *Digital Futures* event at the Goldcorp Center for the Arts; and more than 4,000 attendees at Robert Lepage's play *887*, hosted at SFU Woodward's.

The Chair noted the groundbreaking for the Student Union Building on June 1st. Completion is scheduled for Fall 2018, with credit being offered to the student body who provided resources in making this happen.

The Chair noted two upcoming events: *Indian Summer Festival* runs from July 7th – 16th, marking the sixth year SFU facilities have been used for this festival; the *President's Employee BBQ* takes place on July 13th and is a chance to thank the SFU community for all that staff and faculty contribute.

The Chair reported that we continue to await the official word on our infrastructure applications to the *Post-Secondary Institutions Strategic Investment Fund*.

A question was asked if we have received any unofficial news on these applications. Senate was informed we have some unofficial encouragement with respect to the Surrey project in particular. The Burnaby project is less clear, but preparatory work is being done on the assumption that both will proceed.

6. Question Period

Senator Kropinski and Senator Gray asked the following question:

"It is clear from recent media reports that sexual violence at SFU has had a serious impact on our community as a whole. It corrodes the learning environment and everyone's sense of safety and well being. Faculty are often on the front line as the first point of contact for victims of sexual assault. Statistics suggest that the problem of sexual assault is particularly pervasive for people of university age, especially women and sexual minorities. Given its impact on survivors and, secondarily, on those who are called upon to support them, sexual assault undermines the academic mission of a university in both obvious and subtle ways. Consequently, we ask what role will Senate play in the input, development, and approval of this policy? And what, specifically, is the "set governance process" for the final approval of this policy?"

Senator Szymczyk asked the following question:

"Based on media reports that have surfaced in recent weeks relating to sexual violence at SFU, it has been reported that the resulting adverse impacts on victims lives included their academics. While the university is currently in the process of creating a new sexual violence and misconduct policy, what interim measures are currently in place to protect survivors of sexual violence at SFU?"

Senator Driver, Vice-President, Academic, responded to these questions. Tim Rahilly, Associate Vice-President, Students, was also in attendance to answer questions.

Senate was informed there are number of people currently involved in developing a university policy on sexual violence and misconduct. A concern has been whether or not we are able to reach all areas of the community and we welcome the opportunity to get feedback from as many people as possible and also to have the opportunity to provide as much information as possible about the process we are following and the currently available resources and services. The university has a responsibility to ensure a safe environment for work, study and recreation in our community. Often there are employees, students and volunteers at SFU who interact directly with those who have experienced sexual violence and misconduct and those people have been working hard to support those who have been the subject of unwanted and intolerable behavior while at the same time contributing to education about the issues and to try to change the culture at the university and in the community. Those who are involved in this work can also feel the effects of stress and it is particularly distressing for them when the media either ignore this work or suggest that people are not doing their jobs effectively. There are dedicated and caring people who continue to support individuals and this community and they should not be held responsible for any shortcomings in the institutions approach to these issues.

It is clear that as an institution the university must do more. We have a large number of potentially vulnerable people on our campuses and every year, there are reports of sexual violence and misconduct. It does not take much knowledge of these issues to recognize that there will be more incidents that go unreported. The provincial government now requires all post-secondary institutions to have a stand-alone policy on sexual violence and misconduct and that is what we are working towards. When completed, we should see three important outcomes: first, the policy should ensure an immediate and effective response to anyone who discloses or reports sexual violence or misconduct, together with appropriate action and support that will allow them to continue their intended studies or work at SFU; second, we should have a mandate to educate our entire community about these issues; and third, we should have a mandate to change the culture such that sexual violence and misconduct are seen as unacceptable by all members of the community and that we take action on that belief.

The first question asks what role Senate will play in the input, development and approval of this policy. Every Senator has the opportunity to provide input to the development of the policy through the policy development website. The working group and the advisory group are also planning consultations with a wide range of student and employee groups on campus, and there is an opportunity for Senate as a whole or for groups of Senators to ask for the opportunity to participate. As noted, sexual violence and misconduct can affect the academic work of people who experience these unwanted behaviors. Senate therefore will have a role to play in ensuring that policies that relate to the management of student academic performance are sensitive to these issues, and that such policies do not force students to repeatedly describe traumatic events in order to receive some kind of academic accommodation. At the very least the draft policy would be brought to Senate for discussion, with input from Senate during the consultation also being highly valuable. Particularly welcome are Senators thoughts on how to manage the academic consequences of sexual violence and misconduct on victims and survivors, as well as how to deal with perpetrators under student conduct policies.

The second question asks what the set governance process is for the final approval of this policy. In drafting this policy we are following a somewhat broader process of consultation than is

normal for development of university policy. One of the reasons for doing that is its potential to affect every member of the university community. Once we have a draft policy prepared it will be distributed widely for comment, including to Senate. The proposed final version will go to the Board of Governors and it will be the Board of Governors that ultimately approves this policy. It's likely that the policy will build in a mandatory requirement to report results and to review the effectiveness of the policy so there should be ongoing oversight on the policy, its effectiveness, and whether it needs modification. It's not unusual for policies to come back for review after 1 or 2 years and sometimes that is specified by the Board.

The third question asks what interim measures are currently in place to protect survivors of sexual violence at SFU. Currently on the website there is a comprehensive summary of the measures that we currently take to respond to and to prevent sexual violence and misconduct. There is information there for those who want to report or disclose an incident, or who seek assistance for continued impact of past incidence. There is also information for anyone to whom an incidence has been disclosed or reported. Some of these resources include what someone should do if they experience sexual violence or misconduct, covers issues such as disclosure and reporting options, ensuring the immediate and ongoing safety of the individual and then referral to appropriate services. The approach generally taken at SFU is that the survivor is the best person to choose the supports that they want to take advantage of. These could include the police, SFU Health and Counselling, safety planning, SFU Security and on and off campus support groups. The website also includes a description of the policies that relate to preventing recurrence of unwanted behavior. In addition to that, there is also information on the website about the various community education initiatives that we are currently operating, and we also have some new initiatives that are being developed. These include information about consent, the development of an active bystander network, personal safety workshops and workshops for the campus community about preventing sexual violence and misconduct. While we currently have various resources and policies available, the development of a new policy should provide a single point of information about how the university deals with these issues and will allow us to take a more comprehensive approach to preventing sexual violence and misconduct and responding appropriately and quickly when those incidents do occur.

A question was asked as to what might be Senate's role in this process and who would determine that. Senate was informed that a discussion at Senate that specifically revolves around academic consequences and the way in which we might modify policies concerning academic accommodation would be likely. Also, there is the potential to ask Senate to endorse specific areas of the policy to indicate to the Board of Governors that that has been appropriately discussed and that the academic body of the university believes it's taking the correct approach.

A question was asked if misconduct under this policy might result in a student being suspended from the university. Senate was informed that the policy isn't written yet and it's important not to prejudge what the policy might contain. There does have to be some way of dealing more effectively with people who perpetrate these incidents, and we are seeking input on what is the appropriate way to deal with that.

A concern was raised that if this new policy could result in a student being suspended from the university, under Section 61 of the University Act, a suspended student would have a right of appeal to the Senate. Thus, any new policy should be approved by the Senate, thereby ensuring agreement over the terms to be used to review the action taken. Senate was informed that written suggestions are welcome on this and thought should be given as to the role Senate will play re:

approving components of the policy that relate specifically to the academic areas of the university.

A question was asked if any changes within currently available supports or procedures have been made to mitigate such incidences from happening again until the new policy is in place. Senate was informed that preventing and responding to particular cases is important work. Under our existing policies, and without the benefit of a stand-alone policy, our current Code of Academic Integrity and Good Conduct has language in it which speaks to, by word or by action, creating a situation that endangers the health and well-being of an individual which would squarely put sexualized violence under that policy provided it is part of the jurisdiction of the university. In terms of changes, we have been working on a revision to the code of academic integrity and good conduct for some time and the issue of sexual assault, sexualized violence and misconduct has been prominent in our minds. This revision, however, has yet to be implemented. With respect to procedures which are not part of the policy, the university has now included the ability for interim measures which were not present until recently. This would allow the university to take action in a non-punitive manner on a temporary basis to make sure that we are assuring the safety and well-being of those involved. Based on what is appropriate for any given case this could include things like preventing someone from having contact with someone, it could prevent people from being in a portion or all of the university campus, or it could limit the use of IT resources. In addition, some modifications have been made to the license agreement that is used in Simon Fraser University Residence and Housing. Again, these changes would allow for the ability to quickly take action in order to assure the well-being of the individuals in the immediate surroundings.

7. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)

i) Name Change of the Centre for Sustainable Community Development (S.16-76)

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by L. Bartram

“That Senate approve the name of the Centre for Sustainable Community Development be changed to the Centre for Sustainable Development.”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Title Change for Major in Environmental Resource Management (S.16-77)

Moved by J. Driver, seconded by I. Stefanovic

“That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the title change for the Major in Environmental Resource Management to Resource and Environmental Management within the Faculty of Environment, effective Spring 2017.”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

B) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS)

i) Residency Requirements (S.16-67 Revised)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by S. Spector

“That Senate approves the following Calendar language addition:

Residency Requirements

The University may award substantial transfer credit for course work that has been completed elsewhere. These transfer units reduce the amount of work needed to complete a Simon Fraser University credential, subject to minimum residency requirements for work completed at Simon Fraser University. Overall, the residency requirements define two conditions that apply to every program.

- At least half of the program's total units must be earned through Simon Fraser University study
- At least two thirds of the program's total upper division units must be earned through Simon Fraser University study

These conditions apply to all undergraduate degree, post baccalaureate diploma and certificate programs and programs that form part of an overall degree program for example, major, honours, minors, etc.”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Post Baccalaureate Diploma Program (S.16-68 Revised)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by P. Budra

“That Senate approves the following Calendar language change:

Current [Post Baccalaureate Diploma Program]

Transfer Credit

- Transfer credit for work done at other institutions, before or after admission to the program, may be approved toward fulfilment of the program provided that at least 18 of the 30 required upper division units, including at least nine units in the student's area of concentration, be completed at Simon Fraser University
- Transfer credit is normally only valid for approved courses completed within ten years of the diploma student's completion term
- Transfer credit for use toward the diploma is granted only on approval of the registrar, the appropriate faculty post baccalaureate diploma committee, and the dean of the appropriate faculty
- Credit for work done at Simon Fraser University or transfer credit for work done elsewhere prior to admission to the program may be approved provided that at least 15 of the 30 required upper division units, including at least eight units in the student's area of concentration, normally be completed after admission to the program
- Units applied to one diploma may not be applied to another Simon Fraser University certificate or diploma or degree

Proposed (Post Baccalaureate Diploma Program)
Transfer Credit

- Transfer credit for work done at other institutions may be approved toward fulfilment of the program subject to the University residency requirements
- Transfer credit is normally only valid for approved courses completed within ten years of the diploma student's completion term
- Transfer credit for use toward the diploma is granted only on approval of the Faculty
- Units applied to one diploma may not be applied to another Simon Fraser University certificate or diploma or degree”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (S.16-78)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to existing programs and courses in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (Economics, First Nations Studies, Hellenic Studies, Political Science, School of Criminology, French Cohort Program, History, Sociology and Anthropology, French, English).

iv) Curriculum Revisions – Beedie School of Business (S.16-79)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to an existing program in the Beedie School of Business.

v) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Education (S.16-80)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to an existing program and course in the Faculty of Education.

vi) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Environment (S.16-81)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to an existing course in the Faculty of Environment.

vii) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (S.16-82)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to existing programs and courses in the Faculty of Science (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Science, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry).

C) Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)

i) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (S.16-83)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to existing programs and a course in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (English, School for International Studies, Political Science, Urban Studies Program).

A concern was raised with the rationale for the elimination of the MA English thesis option which notes that the thesis option has been undertaken by only two students in the last ten years and that some students have developed research projects in their Social Sciences and Humanities

Research Council (SSHRC) applications but have found virtually no faculty willing to supervise them. Senate was informed there is a trend in many institutions to no longer offer a thesis option within English. Similarly, there are many programs now across the country that have adjusted their requirements for the degree in such a way that students can complete it in three terms. In terms of the SSHRC, it was noted that students are allowed to be involved in any form of research, including extended essays, research or thesis and the SSHRC award is actually a one year award, so the expectation in terms of the amount of research that is to be done has changed over the years. It was noted that the standard now is to do courses, to try to meet as many professors as you can, and to get a broader area of study in preparation for a PhD.

A question was asked on why the thesis option is being removed when, despite showing interest, students have not been able to secure a willing supervisor. Senate was informed that there is a tendency for students, whether doing an extended essay, a project or a thesis, being unable to distinguish what differentiates a thesis from a project or extended essay. The fact that students cannot find a supervisor for a proposed thesis may suggest that the described project does not warrant being a thesis.

ii) Curriculum Revisions – Beedie School of Business (S.16-84)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to existing programs and courses in the Beedie School of Business.

A question was asked why in Business there seem to be proposals for new courses that are shorter than the norm. Senate was informed that Business graduate courses are quite different because of the part-time nature of many of the courses offered, and that they don't follow the standard pattern of 3 hours per week for 13 weeks. It was noted that this would be looked into further, with an answer coming back to Senate.

A question was asked if courses offering fewer weeks of instructions warrant the same value as courses offering a full 13 weeks of instruction. Senate was informed that learning outcomes should indicate whether the students were learning the same amount in such courses.

iii) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (S.16-85)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to an existing course in the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (School of Communication).

iv) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Health Sciences (S.16-86)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to an existing course in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

v) Curriculum Revisions – Faculty of Science (S.16-87)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, made revisions to existing programs and courses in the Faculty of Science (Biological Sciences, Earth Science, Mathematics).

D) Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)**i) Senate Committee Elections (S.16-88)**

Senate received a summary of the nominations, positions elected by acclamation, positions requiring an online vote, and outstanding vacancies for the Senate committees.

8. Other Business**i) 2013-2018 Academic Plan Progress Report (S.16-89)**

Senate received the 2013-2018 Academic Plan Progress Report for information.

A question was asked as to what the phrase “make student success the primary Strategic Enrollment Management driver” means in practice. Senate was that informed Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) can be looked at in two different ways. The first way is getting the right number of students into the university to meet your targets. The second way of looking at it is getting the right numbers of students through their university program with as little attrition as possible. It’s about ensuring that as many students as possible reach their potential and complete their programs successfully.

A question was asked about how long our unfilled Canada Research Chairs (CRC) positions have been vacant and when such vacancies might start to raise concerns of the Tri Council. Senate was informed that the percentage of Canada Research Chairs filled at any one time is relatively low due to our conservative hiring practices. This means that we do not hire these positions simply for the sake of filling the position. If suitable candidates are not found we continue our search. It was noted that it’s getting harder to attract the highest quality faculty members to this part of the world, primarily due to the housing prices. Those who are highly sought after, particularly as researchers, have considerable choice in terms of being recruited and housing prices do play a part in making it more difficult to attract people here. It was noted that our allocation of CRCs is based on the number of Tri Council dollars that we bring in, which is why we have 48 CRCs. Tri Council is not at all concerned about whether we allocate all of our CRCs because the money does not flow until we assign someone into that position, thus it is to our advantage to fill all positions so we can take full advantage of the dollars.

A question was asked about what is an acceptable range for upper division undergraduate courses being taught by non-tenure track faculty. Senate was informed that the breakdown between continuing faculty who would be lecturers or senior lecturers and who could be teaching certain fourth year courses versus the percentage of courses that are taught by sessional instructors is unknown, but that this information could be obtained.

An explanation was sought for a drop in student satisfaction of 6 percent in 2015-16. Senate was informed that one of the issues involved in this seems to relate to the grade withholding in the Summer and Fall semesters, but the only way to test that is to see what happens next Fall. It was noted that this is an area where we need to improve our performance because while the *very* or *somewhat satisfied* numbers look okay, if you break it down into *very satisfied* versus *somewhat satisfied* we could do much better.

A question was asked to clarify which numbers we are happy with and which we are not, notably in the case of course availability. Senate was informed we should be indicating if we have a target we are aspiring to and at the very least which direction we want to be moving in or whether in fact we want to simply remain neutral. It was noted that each year the President issues

a statement of goals and objectives, and better access of students to courses has been a goal and objective every year. What we look to see is if we are improving over time.

A question was asked about the high percentage of upper division undergraduate and upper division graduate courses taught by tenure track faculty, noting it to be almost 100 percent in the Faculty of Science. Senate was informed that this should be examined on a discipline by discipline basis, thinking about the kind of pedagogy involved, and thinking about the skills that we expect different people to bring to the classroom.

A comment was made about making student success a primary SEM driver, noting that student success should be interpreted as success over the course of an entire degree and not merely success in keeping students from one term to the next. We should not be adjusting courses so that students simply remain at the university longer, thereby paying more tuition, only to end up not acquiring the knowledge needed to complete their program. Senate was informed that a key component of SEM is good academic advising, which should go hand-in-hand in students deciding which program is appropriate for them.

A concern was raised that Student Services will be exploring a stream of entrance scholarships for underrepresented student groups, which was mentioned in the Student Services Report, but was not reported to the Senate Policy Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Bursaries (SPCSAB). Senate was informed that student financial aid does need regular review, particularly as our student population changes over the years. It was noted that SPCSAB is aware that a review is being conducted of the major entrance scholarship program, with information from workshops being brought back to the larger committee.

9. Information

i) Date of the next regular meeting – Monday, September 12, 2016.

Open session adjourned at 6:44 p.m. and Senate moved into the closed session.

Rummana Khan Hemani
Registrar (pro tem)