

**Present:**

Jeff Derksen (Chair, Dean GPS and Associate Provost)  
George Agnes (Associate Dean, GPS, Students)  
Roxanne Panchasi (Associate Dean, GPS, Academic)  
Keshav Mukunda (Designate for Dean of Library)  
Christopher Lacroix (GSS Executive Representative)  
Reema Faris (Graduate Student)  
Hannah Buteau (Curriculum, GPS)  
Stania Juriga (Recording Secretary)

**Faculty Chair:**

Andrew Gemino (BUS)  
Lucy LeMare (EDUC)  
Parvaneh Saeedi (FAS)  
Arne Eigenfeld (FCAT)  
Lawrence McCandless (FHS)  
Vance Williams (SCI)  
Kate Slaney (FASS)  
Valorie Crooks (FENV)

**Guests:**

Colin Copeland  
Zafar Adeel

**Regrets:**

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Review of the SGSC minutes of December 6, 2022 & January 10, 2023
3. Business arising from the minutes
4. Chair's Report

The Chair informed the committee that the Base Allocation Student Support (BASS) funding has been finalized and an email containing all the information for the 2023-2024 academic year will be distributed soon. The Chair also detailed his trip to the Western Deans Conference, explaining that issues on Indigenization and graduate student funding were discussed.

1. For Approval

**1.1 Beedie School of Business**

New Courses: BUS 800, BUS 806, BUS 881

Course Changes: BUS 801, BUS 802, BUS 803, BUS 810, BUS 818, BUS 880

Program Change: Finance MSc

A committee member asked if the courses that BUS 800 replaced will be deleted, as a course deletion form was not included in the proposal. A. Gemino responded that the deletions were not included in this package but that he is happy to update that information if the committee requests it.

Another committee member questioned the compressed nature of BUS 800, BUS 806 and BUS 881 describing them as “heavy courses” and wondered if student success would be affected. A. Gemino explained that students are expected to work through each course one by one rather than all at once, and that students are informed in advance of the course schedule.

L. Le Mare asked about the use of Turnitin for course assignments and whether or not academic units were permitted to use the service. G. Agnes clarified that it can be used, if the academic unit informs the students in advance.

K. Mukunda had concerns about the programming language listed in the BUS 800 course description and wanted to know what support plans Beedie had for students who were not proficient with coding or needed access to a lab. A. Gemino reassured him that Beedie had their own lab and tutorials for their students to access if they needed additional support.

Motion by A. Gemino, seconded by A. Eigenfeldt.

**Approved**

## **1.2 Faculty of Applied Science**

### Department of Computing Science

1.2.1 Program Change: Computing Science MSc

Program Change: Computing Science PhD

1.2.2 Program Change: Professional Computer Science MSc

With the proposed changes to the content of the courses, and that they become elective, the aspect of ethics that was a component of all Computing Science Masters training was going to be altered. This prompted a comment from G Agnes who informed the committee that they should expect some recommendations from The Office of Research Ethics (ORE) regarding co-curricular training with the objective to ensure that ethics training is being considered. He explained that ORE is being told by Tri-Council that ethics in research must be covered and that he wanted the SGSC committee to be aware a course is being created in order to meet ORE's expectation that this subject is covered effectively.

Motion by J. Derksen, Seconded by V. Williams.

**Approved**

### 1.2.3 School of Sustainability Energy Engineering

Full Program Proposal: Sustainable Energy Engineering MEng.

*C. Copeland and Z. Adeel joined the meeting.*

C. Copeland introduced the new program proposal to the committee.

Committee member, L. Lemare posed a question about SEE 770, and how "in class participation" would be assessed, noting that 15% was a large percentage of the students' grade. C. Copeland responded that class attendance and active participation in class discussions would be used to determine in class participation. Z. Adeel reassured the committee that the 15% is

geared towards attendance, and that the expectations would be determined at the beginning of the term.

L. Le Mare asked if the program lead to accreditation. C. Copeland responded it did not, and that typically, graduate degrees in engineering do not lead to accreditation, but the degree could give the students credit towards experience hours for future accreditation. L. Le Mare recommended that the information be made clear to students so they understand what the program offers them.

C. Lacroix asked how Indigenous issues specific to BC and Canada would be integrated into the program, as the proposal lists that graduates could obtain careers as Indigenous policy advisors? Z. Adeel explained that this could be clarified further in the proposal and that they could explore looking into including more Indigenous focused courses in the curriculum.

C. Lacroix requested more detail about the collaborative opportunities for students with business and nonprofits within the proposal. He wanted to know who the small organizations would be and if there are any financial attachments involved between them and SFU also expressing concern over ownership of intellectual property rights over any contributions the students make.

C. Copeland explained that their program commonly has a number of business relationships within the lower mainland, many of which have already submitted proposals, as it is a model their academic unit is familiar with. He added that financial contribution depends on the relationship with each but generally it is a minimal amount. Z. Adeel stated that a few were larger corporations, however, such as Telus and the City of Vancouver who have also been previous partners. He then reminded the committee that the program is not research based and clarified that the common agreement is for both intellectual property and liabilities to sit with the partner. G. Agnes added that it should be clear at the beginning of the project to declare who the intellectual property belongs to in order to avoid any conflicts.

R. Farris noted that there is a lack of reference to Indigenous ways of knowing and that gender-based analysis was not mentioned in the proposal. She added that both would be worth incorporating in the proposal. Additionally, she asked about the intended program audience and if it was for only recent grads or open to those who had been in industry for a while. Last, she questioned whether or not students would need to wait for an industry partner in order to complete their capstone project, or if there was an alternative if no partnership could be found.

C. Copeland agreed that Indigenous ways of knowing and gender-based analysis were important points that should be included in the proposal and that they would work towards more inclusive language in the proposal. He then went on to explain that graduate degrees are not accredited in the same way as undergraduate ones, and that the process to get a program accredited can be restrictive. C. Copeland added that to get accredited you need engineering experience, and that students can use the time within the program as experience. He did however clarify that if someone was not accredited from their undergrad, this program would not create an opportunity to become accredited. On the topic of industry partners for the capstone, C. Copeland noted that these relationships make the program a more fruitful experience for the students but that it would

not be a barrier to program completion as, if necessary, students still would have the option to do a capstone project without the partner.

G. Agnes asked if a discussion had occurred between the Deans of all programs outside of sustainable energy engineering regarding tuition and how to manage costs, since tuition for Business courses is more expensive than the proposed M.Eng. Both C. Copeland and Z. Adeel replied that the tuition was not discussed. They then directed the conversation to A. Gemino who stated that Business was excited to be part of the new program and that he was happy to discuss some ways that they could make their courses affordable for the SEE students so that the partnership could continue successfully. The Chair commented that he was pleased with the open dialogue and that SCUP would be looking more at the finances later. G. Agnes also expressed support for the sharing of resources but wanted to know if the courses were cross listed or co-taught. Z. Adeel clarified that they were co-taught explaining that they felt it would be more interesting for the students and teaching faculty if the two were to come together.

A few committee members brought up the chart on SGSC page 72 asking for clarification of the numbers noting that they seemed to contradict themselves. C. Copeland and Z. Adeel explained that the chart was extracted from the Human Resources Canada website and that those were their numbers.

G. Agnes then asked if the letter of support from Resource and Environmental Management (REM) could be amended to remove the line “if space permits” because if the calendar specifies that students must take “one of” the REM courses for their program, the students need more of a guarantee that they will get into a REM course. After some discussion, C. Copeland and Z. Adeel explained that the courses were meant to be electives and not required courses. Although, they understood the confusion and promised to go back to REM to clarify, adding that they could possibly change the requirement or language. H. Buteau suggested that they could also add language in the calendar to allow more course options to this requirement.

Motion by J. Derksen, V. Williams seconded

**Approved with Amendments**

**1.3 Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences**

Department of Political Science

Course Change: POL 892, POL 897, POL 898

Program Change: Political Science MA

Motion by K. Slaney, Seconded by R. Panchasi

**Approved**

**1.4 Faculty of Environment**

School of Environmental Science

1.4.1 Notice of Intent: Environmental Science MSc

1.4.2 Notice of Intent: Environmental Science PhD

K. Slaney questioned if the academic unit was concerned that this new program will pull applicants away from other programs. V. Crooks mentioned that physical geography might have possible overlap, but they have signed off on the NOI's.

A. Gemino suggested adding more information on potential job opportunities for graduates in this field. He also mentioned the possibility of using more senior faculty members from other departments as most of the faculty listed were newer professors.

V. Crooks noted that the program would offer faculty the opportunity to supervise graduate students in the field of environmental science, rather than having to supervise in other academic units. G. Agnes also mentioned that the program could use co-supervisors from elsewhere, which would bring in interdisciplinary breadth. The Chair added they had changed the definition to allow co-supervisors to be seen as equal, giving the option for external faculty to join committees. V. Williams added that there would be a lot of faculty members in Science who would be interested in co-supervising within these programs.

Motion by V. Crooks, Seconded by G. Agnes

**Approved**

### **1.5 Faculty of Science**

#### 1.5.1 Department of Biology New

Course: BISC 633

#### 1.5.2 Department of Earth Science New

Course: EASC 615

Course Change: EASC 810

#### 1.5.3 Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry New

Course: MBB 764

Course Changes: MBB 669, MBB 727, ONC 510

Course Deletions: MBB 726, MBB 728

H. Buteau reminded the committee that if a course has been deleted, an academic unit would need to wait 10 years before the course number can be used again. She also explained that if a course number is changing, then the old number would automatically be deleted.

### **5.6 Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**

Graduate General Regulations 1.5.2 Competency Grading Basis

The Chair reminded the committee that this would be submitted as a motion for approval to the Senate, where SGSC submits regular program changes, new courses and course changes for information.

A committee member asked if it will be possible for students to retroactively request a grade change. H. Buteau explained that students would have until the end of week-two to request a grading scale change. A. Eigenfeldt requested an outline of the process to request a grading scale change, and after that that they would not be entitled to the retroactive requests. The Chair mentioned that GPS will oversee an email clarifying the changes and the new process.

Motion by G. Agnes, Seconded by V. Williams

**Approved**

2. For Discussion
3. For Information  
Course Reinstatement: BUS 814
4. The date of the next SGSC meeting is scheduled for March 7 2023