



Minutes of a Meeting of the Senate of Simon Fraser University held on
Monday, October 6, 2025 at 5:30 pm at the West Mall Complex (Room 3210)
and via Zoom Video Conferencing

Open Session

Present: Joy Johnson, Chair

Accettola, Evan	Rassier, Dilson
Ali, Sikandra	Schiphorst, Thecla
Al-Rawi, Ahmed	Schmidt, Michèle
Altman, Rachel	Snyder, Jeremy
Ashoughian, Gohar	Stockie, John
Bhalloo, Shafik	Sutherland, Jill
Black, Sam	Szymczyk, Barbara
Brooks-Wilson, Angela	Thornton, Allen
Carcano, Luana	Travers
Chapman, Glenn	Washington, Marvin
Collard, Mark	Weldon, Laurel
Crage, Suzanna	Whitehurst, David
Denholm, Julia	Williams, Vance
Do, Henry	Zickfeld, Kirsten
Eftenaru, Cristina	
Everton, Michael	
Ferenc, Ava	
Fisher, Brian	
Fiume, Eugene	
Frank, Richard	
Gislason, Maya	
Gray, Bonnie	
Hall, Peter	
Hashemi, Tara	
Herrenbrueck, Lucas	
Khangura, Harinder	
Kim, Lisa	
Kingsbury, Paul	
Kwan, Isabelle	
Laitsch, Dan	
Liu, Connie	
Lysova, Alexandra	
Markey, Sean	
Martell, Matt	
Masri, Kamal	
McKenzie, Janis	
Neustaedter, Carman	
O'Brien, Mary	
Pantophlet, Ralph	
Percival, Colin	

Absent:

Bagga, Rishu
Baker, Micah
Brennand, Tracy
Choi, Jake
Dhelia, Priyanka
Gough, Aidan
Gunawan, Derrick
Jahandideh, Roman
Leznoff, Daniel
Liu, Landy
Murali, Surya
Myers, Gord
O'Neil, Dugan
Shulopova, Sofia
Vrooman, Tamara

In Attendance:

Cooper, Dawn
Hennigar, Francesca
Hubinette, Maria
Price, David
Vanstone, Meredith

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Open Session of July 7, 2025

The minutes of the open session on July 7, 2025 were approved as distributed.

3. The Minutes of the Open Session of September 8, 2025 will be considered for approval at the Senate meeting on November 3, 2025**4. Business Arising from the Minutes**

At the July 2025 Senate meeting, Senator Altman submitted a number of questions on the School of Medicine that were referred to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS) for consideration. Senate was informed that SCUS did have the opportunity to consider whether or not the responses provided at Senate were sufficient and complete. SCUS was joined by representatives of the medical school and received a refresher and update on the admissions process. Ultimately, SCUS concluded that it was satisfied with the responses that have been provided and would highlight the idea that applicants who are judged to meet the priority criteria of the school, and who therefore proceed through to the mixed interview round, are treated the same and the assessors are blind as to the path by which candidates had come to that position. The supports that are provided to Indigenous applicants are designed to ensure that those applicants have their best opportunity to succeed in their applications. Only those applicants meeting both the academic criteria and the non-academic criteria are considered for that round of interviews and there's no automatic promotion to that round of interviews for anyone. The goal of the medical school in its admissions process is to select a class that is likely to end up working in service of underserved populations and communities in British Columbia. It was added that SCUS had the opportunity to review and approve a minor modification to the admissions criteria for the first incoming class about what are considered ways to demonstrate the Indigenous course requirement.

5. Report of the Chair

The Chair, on behalf of Senate, welcomed Dr. Marvin Washington as the new Dean of the Beedie School of Business.

The Chair reported that last month, a team from SFU travelled to Ottawa for meetings with the federal government. More than 15 meetings were held over three days, centered mostly around SFU's innovation capabilities and the work to build AI sovereign compute capacity with the Cedar Supercomputing Centre.

The Chair reported that she, in her role as President, will be headed to Victoria in mid-October to continue liaising with the provincial government, most notably with new Minister of Post-Secondary Education and Future Skills, the Honourable Jessie Sunner. The provincial government has indicated that they will be conducting a review of the post-secondary sector to try and find a solution to sustainability for the sector, which Minister Sunner will lead.

The Chair reported that the School of Medicine has formally received accreditation from the Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS) and is on track to welcome its first students in 2026.

The Chair reported that Senator O'Neil's first term as Vice-President, Research and Innovation will end in July 2026. Per GP 29, a search committee will be struck in the near future. As Dugan is willing to stand for reappointment, the committee's role will be to evaluate his performance and make a recommendation. It was noted that there will be many avenues for the community to get involved and share their feedback.

The Chair reported that Senator Rassier is bringing forward the Academic Plan at Senate today, so thanks was extended to everyone for their engagement on the plan. The plan will be a critical part of setting SFU's path forward and ensuring that the academic mission is centered in everything done at SFU.

The Chair reminded Senate that Convocation is scheduled for later in the week and encouraged everyone to participate and attend if able.

i) Report of the Provost

The Provost had nothing to report.

6. Question Period

No questions were submitted.

7. Report of Faculties regarding students who have met requirements for Degrees, Certificates, and Diplomas

i) Adjustments – Undergraduate Credentials (S.25-152)

Senate received Adjustments – Undergraduate Credentials for information.

8. Reports of Committees

A) Senate Committee on Agenda and Rules (SCAR)

i) School of Medicine Senate Membership (S.25-153)

Senate received School of Medicine Senate Membership for information.

B) Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP)

i) Name Change and Revised Terms of Reference for the Simons Foundation International Endowment and the Simons Chair in International Law and Human Security (S.25-154)

Moved by D. Rassier, seconded by V. Williams

“That Senate approve the revised Terms of Reference for the Simons Foundation International Endowment.”

A concern was raised that the description of the Simons Chair in Peace, Disarmament, and Human Security could be read as dictating a particular research direction. Senate was informed that there is no intention to dictate the research agendas of faculty. Edits were made with this in mind and approved by the donor to ensure that the research program of participants is not restricted.

The question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Suspension of Admission to the Teaching ESL Linguistics Certificate (S.25-155)
Moved by D. Rassier, seconded by S. Black

“That Senate approve the suspension of admission to the Teaching ESL Linguistics Certificate in the Department of Linguistics within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.”

The question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

iii) Annual Report 2024/2025 (S.25-156)

Senate received the Senate Committee on University Priorities (SCUP) Annual Report 2024/2025 for information.

C) Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUS)

i) Examination Policy (S.25-157)

Moved by P. Kingsbury, seconded by K. Masri

“That Senate approve the attached revision to the *Guidelines for Students and Instructors in the Event of a Labour Dispute*.”

The question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Program Changes (S.25-158)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved program changes in the Beedie School of Business, and the Faculty of Science (Biological Sciences, Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology).

iii) New Course Proposals (S.25-159)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved a new course proposal in the Faculty of Science (Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology).

iv) Course Changes (S.25-160)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved course changes in the Faculty of Applied Sciences (School of Engineering Science, School of Mechatronics Systems Engineering, School of Sustainable Energy Engineering), the Beedie School of Business, and the Faculty of Science (Biological Sciences, Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology, Earth Sciences, Mathematics).

v) WQB Approvals (S.25-161)

Senate received information that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies, acting under delegated authority, approved WQB designations in the Faculty of Applied Sciences (School of Sustainable Energy Engineering), Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (History, World Languages and Literatures, Gerontology, Cognitive Science, Philosophy), the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (School of Communication), the Faculty of Education, the Faculty of Environment (Archaeology, School of Resource and Environmental Management), and the Faculty of Science (Biological Sciences, Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology).

D) Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)**i) Graduate General Regulation 1.3 Admissions (S.25-162)**

Moved by M. O'Brien, seconded by H. Do

“That Senate approve the revisions to Graduate General Regulation 1.3 Admissions, effective Summer 2026.”

The question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) Program Changes (S.25-163)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a program change in the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (School for the Contemporary Arts).

iii) New Course Proposals (S.25-164)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved a new course proposal in the Beedie School of Business.

iv) Course Changes (S.25-165)

Senate received information that the Senate Graduate Studies Committee, acting under delegated authority, approved course changes in the Beedie School of Business.

E) Senate Nominating Committee (SNC)**i) Senate Committee Elections (S.25-166)**

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

9. Other Business**i) SFU Academic Plan (2025-2030): Final Version (S.25-167)**

Senate received the SFU Academic Plan (2025-2030): Final Version for information.

Senator Hall did a brief presentation, following which he took questions.

Under the focus area *Decolonization and Indigenization*, a comment was made that a comma should be removed to read that SFU will establish *supports for academic success and decolonized teaching and research*.

Noting a focus area called *Inclusive Excellence and Access*, a comment was made that this section refers mainly to inclusion and access, but does not address excellence in a substantive way. As such, it was suggested that the section either be renamed Inclusion and Access or that goals be added that do address excellence. Senate was informed that part of excellence is being inclusive, which is what the plan is trying to say.

Commenting that supports will be required for instructors to effectively use new technologies and use experiential learning tools in the classroom, a concern was raised around the lack of focus on teaching effectiveness in the Academic Plan. There are elements that go to support effective teaching, but little that focuses on improving one's ability to teach in the classroom. Senate was informed that the fifth goal in the *Program Development and Curriculum Renewal* area recognizes the role of technology and new technologies in teaching, learning, writing and research. It is acknowledged that this plan is not full of spending commitments on teaching supports, but there are commitments in the area of new technologies and effectively bringing research informed teaching to students.

Having indicated support for changes made to the document since the July version, a motion to call the question was made:

Motion:

Moved by E. Accettola, seconded by J. Sutherland

“That the question be called.”

The Chair pointed out to Senate that in the past Senate has not formally approved the Academic Plan. It was added that though precedent is important, it is also important that Senate endorse the Academic Plan, and as discussed by SCAR, there would be a willingness to consider a motion to approve the Academic Plan.

A motion to approve the Academic Plan was moved:

Motion:

Moved by Travers, seconded by V. Williams

“That Senate approve the SFU Academic Plan (2025-2030): Final Version.”

With a motion to approve the Academic Plan having been moved, a vote was held on whether to call the question:

The question to call the question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

With the motion to call the question having failed, discussion continued.

Noting cuts to TA positions at SFU, a question was asked regarding how teaching supports and the overall Academic Plan will be implemented given the current budget situation. Senate was informed that in the current resource climate budgets have been stretched across the university,

which has impacted the level of funding available for all supports, including TA positions. It was added, however, that faculties and individual instructors are working within those constraints as best they can and when decisions are being made on balancing the budget, TAships are the last place they look to cut in terms of discretionary funding.

A question was asked to clarify what happens to the Academic Plan after Senate, and in particular, if substantial changes are made to the document after approval. Senate was informed that Senate is the final resting place for the Academic Plan, and though assumptions may shift in terms of resource allocation, Senate would be kept up-to-date regarding that.

The question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION CARRIED

ii) SFU School of Medicine Discussion - Supporting Document (S.25-168)

Senate received the SFU School of Medicine Discussion - Supporting Document for information.

Meredith Vanstone, Interim Assistant Dean, Admissions and Visiting Professor, and Dawn Cooper, Associate Dean, Accreditation, Assessment, and Evaluation, and Francesca Hennigar, General Counsel, were in attendance to respond to questions.

Senator Rassier introduced this item and provided a summary of what has happened so far in terms of approvals for the School of Medicine (SoM):

- On April 18, 2024 SCUS approved the Full Program Proposal for MD Program. On May 8, 2024 SCUP approved motions to establish the School of Medicine and Full Program Proposal. On May 21, 2024, Senate then approved establishment of the School of Medicine and the Full Program Proposal.
- One of the concerns heard around the approval is that the business case that was submitted with the proposal for approval seems to be different from the one approved at Senate. The business case envisaged approximately 30 to 40 full-time faculty members by the end of 2039/40 and was used mainly for background information and also to provide Senate and the government with what would be the requirements in terms of budget for the medical school.
- From April 2024 to February 2025, Faculty Relations entered into discussions with the SFU Faculty Association (SFUFA) around what the faculty categories would be for the medical school and no agreement was reached. It was then decided by the leadership of the SoM, Faculty Relations, and the Provosts Office to begin hiring given the need for accreditation.
- In February and March of 2025, the Board of Governors (BoG) approved 2 categories that are now categories of faculty in the SoM, that being clinical faculty and medical research faculty. Concerns were raised about the medical research faculty category and why that category would need BoG approval. The reason for this is because courses in the SoM will work differently from those in other faculties, as will the requirements to be a research faculty member in the school.
- On March 20, 2025 SCUS approved faculty rules and guidelines, followed by Senate approving faculty rules and guidelines for admissions, programming, and curriculum on April 7, 2025.

- On April 3, 2025 SCUS approved new course proposals for MEDS 410/420/430, with these proposals coming to Senate for information on May 20, 2025.
- Revisions were made to the clinical faculty appointment approved by BoG to support a greater alignment with UBC's clinical factory policy given that SFU is part of the same university system in BC.
- Faculty Renewal Plans for the SoM will be submitted to BoG on an annual basis, which is consistent practice for all faculties. Such plans will be approved by the Provost's Office and then by BoG.
- There was an intention to begin hiring for another category of faculty, that being medical education faculty, but feedback from BoG, along with others, expressed concerns that the category needs to be more properly defined, so a pause has been placed on this to allow for further evaluation into what this category will look like.
- Any other changes will either go through Senate or BoG, depending on what's required by the University Act. Nothing that has been done was done with a mind to bypass policy, procedure or process, but rather was done according to policy and the needs of developing a medical school.

Senator Price provided the following comments:

- The SFU SoM is accredited to provide a full undergraduate curriculum such that graduates would be able to apply to any residency program in Canada. The mandate of the school, however, goes beyond that and has been developed to help address the needs of British Columbians in terms of the challenges with access to primary care physicians, including family physicians and other primary care specialists.
- Curriculum has been developed with input not only from professors that are local to BC, but with a considerable amount of input from other leading educators from across the country. The school has landed on a three-year program, essentially a spiral curriculum, with a plan on doing a curriculum that is similar to most medical schools in Canada in the sense that it is a small group problem-based type learning environment such that concepts are presented early on through how patients would present to a physician's office and then build on that iteratively over the three years such that by the end students will be well versed in all clinical aspects of medicine.
- Attention is being focused on trying to get students excited about and encourage them to think about primary care specialties, given that 98% of all clinical care in Canada happens in the community, not in hospitals. Hospitals are a very important part of the healthcare system, but the intention is to train students in the community, with increasing amounts of training in the community over their three years.
- The curriculum that has been approved by CACMS has three courses, essentially for second and third year, and that is because it's an iterative process. Curriculum experts will be brought in from across campus, the lower mainland, and Canada to help SFU develop a well-rounded and well-grounded curriculum that helps students not only meet the needs of primary care, but also to address some of the inequities evident in the healthcare system.
- Efforts have focused on engaging experts not just locally, but right across the country in terms of the development of curriculum, development of the admissions process and development of the teaching and the culture that students will experience. Part of that is

about understanding what is being done well and what the positive outcomes are and which ones can be improved. For that reason, a significant amount of energy has been placed into evaluating the curriculum, evaluating the teaching that happens, and evaluating where students end up and which discipline they choose. This will allow for finetuning of the curriculum over the next number of years.

- While the school does now have provisional accreditation to open the website for admissions or applications this month, the school is also in the process of submitting for institutional and residency specific accreditation, which will happen over the next number of months, such that residents can be accepted into the program in the spring of 2027.

Citing potential differences between the approved business plan and the current faculty plan, a question was asked regarding if Senate has approved a business plan which resembles the current faculty plan. Senate was informed that the business case contained numbers as a prediction of how many people would be needed to deliver a medical program and provided an estimate of the budget that would be needed to support the workforce. The approval of new categories of faculty falls under BoG jurisdiction and thus does not require Senate approval.

A question was asked regarding the rationale for maintaining a bifurcated admissions structure (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) given that the admissions criteria are the same for all applicants. Senate was informed that dual streams are in place to ensure that Indigenous applicants have appropriate cultural supports throughout the process and so that the data from Indigenous applicants is stored according to OCAP principles (ownership, control, access, and possession).

Having been informed that a business case, and not a business plan, was submitted to ensure appropriate funding from government to launch the medical school, a number of comments and questions were raised around the confusion of whether the business case was also a faculty hiring plan, as many Senators assumed. There were multiple assurances from the leadership team of the SoM that faculty members within the school would be regular faculty members and would comprise a core of professors who do teaching and research. It now appears that the medical school will not have research led teaching at its heart. In response to concerns about the staffing plan, reference has been made to the University Act, and specifically section 27 (2)(g), which states the BoG's ability to set terms and conditions of employment. What is not being referenced, however, is power 27 (2)(i), which states that the Board is to *consider recommendations from the senate for the establishment of faculties and departments with suitable teaching staff and courses of instruction*. As such, what is to be considered suitable for teaching staff comes from Senate and Senate has not been given the opportunity to approve the new categories of faculty member, that being clinical faculty, medical research faculty, and medical education faculty. Further, there are currently medical research faculty searches being undertaken that are not underpinned by policy and are not covered by the SFUFA Collective Agreement. Also, the search committees for these searches are dominated by administrators, which is inconsistent with the principles of collegial governance. With respect to the University Act, Senate was informed that a distinction needs to be drawn between the language stating that the Board ought to consider recommendations from the Senate and the requirement for approval to come from Senate with respect to suitable teaching staff. The obligation there is for the Board to consider those recommendations made by Senate. With respect to the faculty searches, there is no independent

requirement for hiring searches to be underpinned by a policy, and though administrators do sit on these searches, the administrators also have underlying faculty appointments.

A comment was made that language for the admissions process should be more transparent given that Indigenous applicants, including those from out-of-province, will garner advantage by not going through the lottery process. Senate was informed that the school's priority is to identify candidates who are well prepared to serve Indigenous patients and to promote Indigenous health and is not about that person's background or ethnicity. The priority in the admissions process is about identifying candidates who are aligned with the institutional values of the school, rather than other factors about the candidate. It was added that it cannot be stated that Indigenous applicants will not go through a lottery process, given that if a significant number of applicants were received from Indigenous applicants, they would have to go through the lottery.

A question was asked regarding S.25-168 making no reference to University Act section 37 (1)(k), which states that Senate has the power *to determine the members of the teaching and administrative staffs who are to be members of each faculty*. Senate was informed that with respect to 37 (1)(k), it is not referenced in the document because authority of BoG with respect to hiring is clear enough that it would be untenable to interpret 37 (1)(k) as diluting that authority. If 37 (1)(k) was interpreted such that Senate had authority over the process, it would restrict the effectiveness of the BoG's authority under 27 (2)(g).

Noting that faculty positions were approved by the Board of Governors Executive Committee under delegated authority, a question was asked about how that delegated decision was made within BoG, and was it made before the newest version of policy B10 came into effect. Senate was informed that the exact date of when the terms of reference came into effect is unknown, but that they are a holdover from historic terms of reference that existed and BoG has worked to reconstitute its committees and delegate authority to its committees, as permitted under the University Act.

Given the potential for a large number of practitioner within the SoM, a question was asked around how quality and consistency will be ensured without continuing teaching faculty to maintain standards. Senate was informed that the SoM places a significant amount of time and energy into faculty development, including information related to expectations, what the goals of the program are, what the key features are for teaching, how students will be assessed, and also additional training around communication, narrative assessment, and supporting learners. Within the program itself, there are course leads who do have longitudinal oversight and are supported by a broader team, and thus faculty receiving training are provided guidance around expectations. Also, within the SoM is an educational quality improvement unit to monitor how teachers are doing through peer feedback, student feedback, and self-assessment. This is an intensive process and is part of regular continuous quality improvement (CQI) cycles by the accrediting body.

Following up on a comment stating that the Medical School would not be research intensive, Senator Price informed Senate that the medical school will be a research university medical school, just like every other medical school in this country. The difference is that SFU's will be focused on primary care type research, which includes data understanding, community

engagement, and understanding models of care policy. In the tenure-track faculty hiring advertisement that was published, the stated mission of the school is to advance community based primary care through education, scholarship (including research), innovation and service. It goes on to state that candidates are expected to contribute to all aspects of the SoM mission.

With medical research faculty not currently falling under the SFUFA Collective Agreement, a concern was raised with a line from the document stating that the SoM *is a fundamentally different initiative that was not contemplated at the time of SFUFA's certification and is therefore not captured in their bargaining unit*. Senate was informed that the university has been in discussions with SFUFA and is open to further discussions. Over the past number of months discussions have been held around medical research faculty, however, given differences over issues such as curriculum and the balance between research and teaching, the parties have been too far apart to reach an agreement. It was added that special carveouts have been made in the past, with Librarians for example, in terms of the SFUFA Collective Agreement, so it is hoped that a solution can be found through bargaining.

Following up on an earlier question around admissions, a question was asked to clarify if there are quotas for the school. Senate was informed that there are no quotas or minimum/maximum allocation by stream. Among eligible candidates in both streams there will be an active selection to move people who are aligned with institutional priorities into interview. It is expected that any applicant, regardless of stream, involved in a meaningful way with indigenous communities, will be moved into interview, and it's anticipated that many applicants in the Indigenous stream will qualify this way, but not all. There will be some people who have Indigenous ancestry but potentially no meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities who would not be moved into interview. The lottery process happens if there are either too many highly aligned applicants or too few. The principle is that there's a process of active selection to identify applicant alignment and to categorize applicant alignment in both streams and then the equal probability selection process comes in when the categories of highly aligned don't match the number of interview spots available. Thus, it's not about what stream an applicant is in but rather how they get categorized as highly aligned, aligned or unidentified.

A further follow-up question was asked about the lottery system, at which time the resource person asked the Chair to clarify if it is customary at SFU that Senators are able to ask detailed questions about the admissions process. Senate was informed that it is the tradition at SFU that admissions processes be brought to Senate. Though there are certain elements around medical school admissions that administrators may wish to keep offline so that applicants don't game the system, SFU's tradition is to allow questions and engage Senators to understand admissions processes.

Senator Price apologized to Senate for not being completely open in terms of the selection process, noting that in every single medical school across this country there are general aspects of the admissions process that are made public, but there are also internal mechanisms for selection that have never been made public and that are often not made public to the larger faculty body. This is done to remove the possibility of students figuring out how to game the system by generating the kind of application that would give them the leg up. In addition, the

Chair reminded Senate that SCUS, under delegated authority, reviews in detail the admissions processes and that has happened in the case of the medical school.

A request was made for Senate to receive the documents submitted for accreditation. Senate was informed that whatever is allowed to be shared with Senate can be shared, but consideration will need to be given to ascertain what may be shared.

Frustration was expressed that the university has not followed an established model for creating the SoM, as was the case with the Faculty of Health Sciences. This has led to a protracted and messy process, leaving many to lack confidence in the process. Further, it was argued that if the SoM is confident in the plan for the medical school, for the staffing plan, and for the revised MD program, it should be presented to Senate for approval.

With most faculty in the SoM doing both research and teaching, and some only doing teaching, questions were asked as to why new faculty designations are needed, why these new designations are not part of SUFA, and why this was not brought to Senate. Senate was informed that the plan is to have clinical faculty as educators, which every medical school in the country has in large numbers. They will not be doing research and they will be paid for the teaching they do based on the collective agreement with Doctors of BC and they will be paid in the same fashion that all of the UBC clinical faculty are paid. That is a separate category. There is also a proposed plan to have faculty who are involved in teaching and research. Some will do more research than teaching and others will do more teaching than research, but everybody making a commitment to the medical school will be involved in teaching, research and service. It was added that matters of collective bargaining are not brought before Senate, but rather are dealt with at the bargaining table.

Noting that Senate has authority in matters relating to admissions, and that certain aspects of the admissions process must remain confidential, a motion to move discussion into a closed session was moved:

Motion:

Moved by C. Percival, seconded by D. Whitehurst

“That the School of Medicine Discussion move into a closed session.”

The question was called and a vote taken.

MOTION FAILED

With the motion having failed, discussion continued in the open session.

A comment was made that when the Full Program Proposal for the medical school was approved by Senate, BoG, and the Ministry, it included four faculty categories (medical research faculty, medical education faculty, clinical faculty and adjunct faculty), but it did not specify numbers. Despite being difficult to compare the medical school FPP with others across the university, the closest comparison is the School of Sustainable Energy Engineering, which was approved without specifying faculty types. It was concluded that if such consideration was given to one program, similar consideration should apply to the SoM.

A question was asked regarding if a motion is required to have a closed session discussion on the medical school at the next meeting of Senate. Senate was informed that this matter would be considered by SCAR on how best to proceed.

10. Information

i) Date of the next regular meeting - Monday, November 3, 2025

Open session adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Tom Nault
Secretary of Senate