



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
ENGAGING THE WORLD

Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, December 2, 2019 at 7:00 pm at the West Mall Complex (Room 3210)

Open Session

Present: Jon Driver, Acting Chair

Agnes, George (for Jeff Derksen)
Aistov, Nikita
Andreoiu, Corina
Bartram, Lyn
Brennand, Tracy
Bubela, Tania
Burley, David
Chapman, Glenn
Chenier, Elise
Chou, Jennifer
Denholm, Julia
Fiume, Eugene
Forde, Nancy
Fowler, Colin
Gajdics, Sylvia
Gunn, Alexandra
Hendrigan, Holly
Heng Hartse, Joel
Hogg, Robert
HoSang, Giovanni
Johnson, Joy
Kench, Paul
Krauth, Brian
Krogman, Naomi
Laitsch, Dan
Leacock, Tracey
Luu, Susan
Mirhady, David
Murray, Catherine (for Jane Pulkingham)
Myers, Gord
Nepomnaschy, Pablo
O'Neill, Susan
Parkhouse, Wade
Parmar, Abhishek
Plettner, Erika
Poitras, Geoffrey
Raza, Samad
Reder, Deanna
Somers, Julian
Stockie, John
Tavakoli, Kimia
Tingling, Peter
Underhill, Owen
Weldon, Steve
Zanette, Amanda

Absent:

Collard, Mark
Dastmalchian, Ali
Derksen, Jeff
Dunsford, Russell
Elle, Elizabeth
Favere-Marchesi, Michael
Giardini, Anne
Gray, Bonnie
Hall, Peter
Hillman, Sterling
Ho, Shuna
Hoffer, Andy
Keliipio, Kau'i
Kim, Woo Soo
Kimathi, Natasha
Lord Ferguson, Sarah
Luelfesmann, Christoph
Parent, Michael
Percival, Colin
Petter, Andrew
Planchenault, Gaelle
Pulkingham, Jane
Shaw, Chris
Taykandy, Mason
Walsby, Charles

In Attendance:

Birnie, Steve
David, Trevor
Eigenfeldt, Arne
Hart, Stephen
Hawkins, Nancy
Hik, David
Khan Hemani, Rummana
Lacombe, Dany
Lesjak, Carolyn
Marontate, Jan

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of October 7, 2019

The minutes of the open session on October 7, 2019 were approved as distributed.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of November 4, 2019

The minutes of the open session on November 4, 2019 were approved as distributed.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the Chair

The Acting Chair noted the regrets of the Chair, who is attending a meeting in New York City of the *Talloires Network Steering Committee* on which he sits as Canada's sole representative. The *Talloires Network* is an international association of post-secondary institutions formed in 2005 to strengthen the civic roles and social responsibilities of higher education. SFU has been a member since 2009, and President Petter has served on the steering committee since 2015. During the meeting, he will present on SFU's leadership of the Canadian Cohort of the *Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement*.

The Acting Chair reported that in the 2019 *Research Infosource* rankings, SFU placed third in Canadian comprehensive universities for research income, second for research publications and first for research impact. SFU's standing may improve next year given that our research income has grown this year to \$161 million, up \$19 million over last year, marking an increase of 60% over the past seven years. This record is a testament to the growing strength and productivity of our research faculty, as well as our ability to attract new investments in research infrastructure.

The Acting Chair reported on international updates:

- Preparations are underway for the *Asia Pacific Association for International Education (APAIE)* conference SFU will host in 2020. A record 458 presentation submissions have been received, and 330 of a target 380 exhibition booths have already been sold.
- President Petter will host a President's Dialogue for his counterparts from Asian universities at the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue.
- Approximately 100 of SFU's most valued international partners have been invited to a special event where they'll learn more about SFU's mission and our campuses.

The Acting Chair reported that in November President Petter led an SFU mission to Hong Kong, Singapore and Shanghai to develop and strengthen academic and other relationships in the region. Meetings were held with leading universities and Canadian consular officials at all three locations and alumni receptions were held in Singapore and Shanghai. The delegation also participated in a Terry Fox Run organized by SFU alumni in Hong Kong. The mission also provided the delegation opportunities to promote the 2020 *APAIE* conference.

The Acting Chair reminded Senators to save the date of April 4th on their calendars for the annual Senate – Board of Governors retreat. The tentative theme is university governance, with a format encouraging interaction between Board members and Senators.

The Acting Chair reported that December 6th marks the 30th anniversary of the attack on women engineers at Ecole Polytechnique. Canada has a national day of remembrance and this will be marked by a ceremony at the memorial of the murdered women at 12:30 at the East end of the Applied Science Building where there is a memorial bench and garden. There is more information about this on the SFU website.

6. Question Period

i) Senators Forde and Plettner submitted the following questions:

1. *Faculty are very concerned that the consultation process for this overhaul involved only a venture capital expert, and to the best of our knowledge, occurred without any input from faculty stakeholders nor assessment of intellectual property approaches made by other universities. In fact, it was explicitly stated by Trevor Davis at the November 21 meeting that they did not want to look at other universities' approaches in reaching a decision about how to restructure the office, and furthermore, that the extensive research findings of SFU's own expert from the Beedie School did not inform this process. We are very concerned that this approach (a) is not an appropriate one for the academic sector, and (b) strongly deviates from evidence-based decision-making. How can we ensure that future decision-making processes at SFU, in all areas, are evidence-based?*

Joy Johnson, Vice-President, Research, responded to this question.

Senate was informed that in early October a decision was made to restructure not only SFU's Industry Engagement (IE) Office but to rethink the way a number of functions operate in relation to innovation at the University. This was a carefully considered decision and the restructuring work is ongoing. The purpose of the restructuring is to better serve faculty entrepreneurs and inventors and also to protect the University. The University Tech Transfer Office (TTO) helps commercialize and license technology that's been assigned to the university, they connect the University with the business community around research and student engagement and help develop faculty start-ups through entrepreneurship education and start-up incubation. They are often staffed with a variety of different personnel, including post-docs or PhD students involved in entrepreneurship, and sometimes with business analysts. These TTO's are not a profit centre for the University and at a university like SFU where faculty own their own intellectual property (IP), faculty can choose whether or not to engage with the TTO. Increasingly, it has been found that faculty are bypassing the office, with disclosures around intellectual property decreasing over the past 15 years despite research income increasing four-fold over that same period. This indicates the need for a strategic shift in the Industry Engagement Office to better focus on early protection of intellectual property and licensing of technologies assigned by faculty to the University. This restructuring also requires staffing changes and a different configuration of staff including legal IP specialists, patent agents and a dedicated commercialization manager.

At the November information session it was indicated that though the structures of other Canadian TTO's were reviewed, SFU did not wish to copy other offices. The intention was to restructure the IE Office as a focus technology licensing office more active in IP licensing. An outside consultant was brought in to determine how best to do this. The consultant was a CEO of a startup of development and legal affairs lead forensics for a \$60 million company and also an IP specialist with a large company. An evidence based approach was used and analysis of the

office revealed a decreasing of disclosures and that protection mechanisms utilized by the IE Office were not as effective as they needed to be. Though SFU does have faculty experts on IP and entrepreneurship, it was determined that an external consultant was needed to review and address our approach for patent protection and faculty strategy. It was noted that though faculty were not directly involved in the decision to restructure the IE Office, they have been consulted now that some of the HR restructuring is complete.

2. *Faculty are concerned about the speed at which changes were implemented with regard to the IE office, without prior consultation with the community and without a timely announcement. Many faculty found out about the sudden changes through secondary channels and rumors. How can we avoid such haphazard restructuring of a unit at SFU in future? From our perspective, a carefully planned phasing out of the old system and phasing in of the new one would have resulted in a more transparent process and less stress caused by uncertainty about future direction, contacts, etc.*

Joy Johnson, Vice-President, Research, responded to this question.

Senate was informed that changes to the IE Office involved restructuring directly affecting existing employees, leading to sensitive HR issues. As a result, a gradual phase approach wasn't possible. SFU is bound by confidentiality around some of the restructuring and because of that, prior consultation with faculty was not possible. Once affected staff were informed of the decision to make changes, time was provided them to inform their clients, and then an announcement was made to active IE customers, followed by faculty members. Though this process has created some uncertainty, recognition has been given to the need to continue to engage with faculty to discuss these issues and understand their concerns.

3. *What is the mechanism by which administrators are held accountable for decisions such as this? For example, on what basis will the IE reorganization be assessed to determine if it is successful? What are the metrics to be improved, and over what timeline are measurable improvements likely? Who is assessing this process and when?*

Joy Johnson, Vice-President, Research, responded to this question.

Senate was informed that one of the goals of the Research portfolio is to take an evidence informed approach and thereby set goals for each office. Accountability and funding requires meeting certain metrics in terms of the services provided to the university. As a result, several metrics will be applied to measure the performance of the new licensing office. These include, but are not limited to, an increase in the number of IP disclosures, and an increase in licensing revenue to inventors and to the University. A university the size of SFU would typically see a mean of 40 disclosures per year, so Senators are encouraged to check back in one year to determine if progress is being made towards meeting this target.

4. *It seems that the overhaul of the industry engagement office is part of a larger restructuring plan for the Office of Research Services (ORS) and industrial engagement. However, we are very concerned that some of the tasks previously accomplished by this office, such as collaboration in writing Invention to Innovation (I2I) grants, are not being covered adequately during the transition,*

and we learned from Trevor Davis that determination of who will cover these tasks is part of a future planning process whose timeline and execution were unknown. Practical translation grants, such as I2I grants, are a central part of taking an invention from one's own lab to commercialization, and faculty are not equipped to write these on their own: they require expert input. While faculty members wait until February for new staff to be in place in the IE office, it seems they must wait even longer to learn whether and how there will be support for I2I grants, a delay which can be fatal to intellectual property development, considering that the next deadline for I2I grants is January 6. What can we tell our colleagues about support for these grants, both from SFU and from NSERC through their monthly office hours at the IE?

Joy Johnson, Vice-President, Research, responded to this question.

Senate was informed that throughout this transition, a commitment has been made to ensure supports are in place for anyone requiring it, including I2I. Because of the responsibility of the University to provide support to I2I and research proposals, a facilitator in Institutional Strategic Awards Office has recently been hired. It was noted that though hiring is still a work in progress, there are resources and faculty in place to support I2I and this will be communicated to the University community.

5. *During the presentation on November 21 there was some implication that faculty members would be leaned upon for initial assessment of disclosures. We voice concerns that this task should not be done by faculty members for two reasons: 1) it requires both extensive IP and business expertise, which faculty do not have, and 2) the process would be encumbered by any biases of the assessment committee members. Initial assessment should be done by outside experts who have no conflict of interest. Mentorship by faculty of new faculty inventors/entrepreneurs may be a possibility, but the expectations in this regard should be articulated very clearly and discussed with the SFUFA, as these activities have a very significant impact on faculty workloads and time management. Thus, we ask: What are the administration's expectations with regard to faculty input and commitment within the new IE environment being created?*

Joy Johnson, Vice-President, Research, responded to this question.

Senate was informed that it has never been the intention that faculty members would provide initial assessment of disclosures. Instead, some faculty members have indicated an interest in mentoring other faculty on an appropriate direction for technology commercialization. Though assessment would continue to be done by staff, consideration is being given to providing opportunities for senior business students in doing market assessment work.

6. Reports of Committees

A) Calendar Committee (CC)

i) Academic Dates 2021-2024 and Revisions to Academic Dates 2020/2021 (S.19-113)

Motion 1:

Moved by P. Tingling, seconded by C. Murray

"That Senate approve the revised schedule of academic dates for the Fall 2020, moving Welcome Day/Orientation for the Fall term to the first day following Labour Day, for a two year pilot period."

Rummana Khan Hemani, Associate Vice-President Students and International pro tem, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A comment was made that consideration should be given to operating on a multifaith calendar. Senate was informed that moving to a mutlifaith calendar has been given consideration, and though some changes have been implemented based on this, there are significant challenges to fully implementing such an approach.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 2:

Moved by P. Tingling, seconded by A. Parmar

"That Senate approve the proposed schedule of academic dates from the Fall 2021 term to Summer 2024 term."

Rummana Khan Hemani, Associate Vice-President Students and International pro tem, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

B) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules (SCAR)

i) Terms of Reference Revisions to Senate Committee on Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (S.19-114)

Moved by P. Tingling, seconded by J. Stockie

"That Senate approve the revisions to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Teaching and Learning (SCUTL) Terms of Reference."

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

C) Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS)

i) Annual Report 2018/2019 (S.19-115)

Senate received the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies (SCCS) Annual Report 2018/2019 for information.

D) Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)

i) External Review of the Department of English (S.19-116)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by C. Murray

"That Senate approve the Action Plan for the Department of English that resulted from Its External Review."

Carolyn Lesjak, Chair - Department of English, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) External Review of the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry (S.19-117)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by N. Forde

“That Senate approve the Action Plan for the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry that resulted from its External Review.”

Nancy Hawkins, Chair - Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) External Review of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (S.19-118)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by A. Parmar

“That Senate approve the Action Plan for the Department of Sociology and Anthropology that resulted from its External Review.”

Dany Lacombe, Chair - Department of Sociology and Anthropology, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iv) External Review of the School of Communication (S.19-119)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by T. Leacock

“That Senate approve the Action Plan for the School of Communication that resulted from its External Review.”

Jan Marontate, Director - School of Communication, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A question was asked about student space lost to various projects and if any solutions have been found to reclaim the lost space. Senate was informed that negotiations are still underway with the Dean’s Office to free up student space, however some progress has recently been made, with an order for improvements to student labs having just been issued.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED,
with two abstentions noted.

v) External Review of the School for the Contemporary Arts (S.19-120)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by A. Parmar

“That Senate approve the Action Plan for the School for the Contemporary Arts that resulted from its External Review.”

Arne Eigenfeldt, Interim Director – School for the Contemporary Arts, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

vi) Full Program Proposal for the MA in Terrorism, Risk, and Security Studies (S.19-121)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by C. Murray

“That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the full program proposal for the Master of Arts In Terrorism, Risk, and Security Studies in the Department of Psychology within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, effective Spring 2021.”

Stephen Hart, Director - Terrorism, Risk and Security Studies Professional Master’s Program, was in attendance to respond to questions.

A question was asked about the decision to not have Master’s projects deposited in the library and if any work-around was possible to remedy this. Senate was informed that there is no requirement for students to deposit their projects in the library and that due to security and confidentiality the feasibility of depositing projects in the library would need to be done on a case-by-case basis.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED,
with two abstentions noted.

E) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS)

i) Program Changes (S.19-122)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved program changes in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (School of Criminology, Economics, First Nations Language Program, French, School for International Studies, Psychology), The Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (School of Communication, School of Interactive Arts and Technology), and the Faculty of Environment (Geography).

ii) New Course Proposals (S.19-123)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved a new course proposal in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (Economics, English, History, School for International Studies, Linguistics, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology), the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (Publishing Program), and the Faculty of Education.

iii) Course Changes (S.19-124)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved course changes in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (School of Criminology, Economics, First Nations Studies, French, Global Asia Program, Gender, Sexuality and Women’s Studies, History, School of International Studies, Labour Studies Program, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology), the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (Publishing Program, School of Communication), and the Faculty of Environment (Geography).

iv) Scheduling Policy (S.19-125)

Moved by W. Parkhouse, seconded by E. Fiume

“That Senate approve the replacement of T 30.0a, Course Scheduling Policy, with GP 46, Classroom and Course Scheduling Policy, as detailed in the attached document.”

Steve Birnie, Associate Registrar, Information, Records & Registration Services, and David Hik, Associate Dean - Faculty of Science, were in attendance to respond to questions.

A concern was raised about how this policy may adversely affect faculty members with family or other responsibilities who may be unable to teach at certain times and are already struggling with their work load. A concern was also raised that this may lead to the necessity of hiring more sessional instructors. Senate was informed that consideration has been given to such circumstances and is one of the reasons why faculty members may apply for an exemption. It was noted that the University has always had a policy allowing for teaching beyond 4:30 pm and this new policy seeks to spread out the teaching, thereby allowing more flexibility to address existing problems.

A comment was made to point out that the form of classroom is equally as important as the classroom space itself, and that this should be written into the policy.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED,
with one abstention noted.

F) Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)**i) Program Changes (S.19-126)**

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved program changes in the Faculty of Applied Sciences (School of Computing Science, School of Engineering Science), the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (School of Public Policy), and the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (School of Interactive Arts and Technology).

ii) New Course Proposals (S.19-127)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved new course proposals in the Faculty of Applied Sciences (School of Computing Science), and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (Urban Studies Program).

iii) Course Changes (S.19-128)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved course changes in the Faculty of Applied Sciences (School of Computing Science, School of Engineering Science, School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering), the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (Liberal Arts, Economics, Gerontology, Political Science, Psychology, School of Public Policy, Urban Studies Program), the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (School of Communication), the Faculty of Environment (School of Resource and Environmental Management), and the Faculty of Science (Biological Sciences, Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Science).

iv) Graduate General Regulation (GGR) Revisions (S.19-129)

Motion 1:

Moved by G. Agnes, seconded by T. Leacock

“That Senate approve the revisions to GGR 1.3 (Admissions).”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 2:

Moved by G. Agnes, seconded by T. Bubela

“That Senate approve the revisions to GGR 1.4 (Enrollment) and GGR 1.8 (Progress, Withdrawal and Leave).”

A comment was made to suggest that the wording *Students completing the requirements for their program past the normal completion time, as the result of having taken three or more medical leaves, may be required to repeat course...* should be reconsidered because it refers to a specific number of medical leaves rather than a specific period of time and, as a result, may lead to confusion.

A concern was raised about leaves involving an academic break, which states that the *maximum number of terms that are permitted for an academic break is one term per year with no consecutive academic breaks*. Noting that a student has no control over academic breaks, a student could find themselves in breach of this policy if a situation arose where a course is not offered in a particular term. Senate was informed that such a circumstance would be managed on a case-by-case basis.

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED,
with one abstention noted.

Motion 3:

Moved by G. Agnes, seconded by A. Parmar

“That Senate approve the revisions to GGR 1.5 (Graduate Grading Systems and Policies) and GGR 1.6 (Supervision).”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 4:

Moved by G. Agnes, seconded by J. Stockie

“That Senate approve the revisions to GGR 1.7 (Program Requirements).”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion 5:

Moved by G. Agnes, seconded by T. Leacock

“That Senate approve the revisions to GGR 1.9 (Preparation of Examinations).”

A question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

G) Senate Library Committee (SLC)

i) Annual Report 2018/2019 (S.19-130)

Senate received the Senate Library Committee (SLC) Annual Report 2018/2019 for information.

H) Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)

i) Senate Committee Elections (S.19-131)

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

8. Other Business

9. Information

i) Date of the next regular meeting – Monday, January 6, 2020

Open session adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Kris Nordgren
Senate Secretary pro tem