

The Chair outlined three voting outcomes and noted positives and drawbacks to each the three possible voting options. The options are approving both programs, approving one program and not the other, and not approving either program.

S. Spector expressed appreciation to everyone involved in seeking a path forward and commented that SCUP must make the decision on whether it is fair for both programs to work on FPPs, particularly if only one is likely to receive final approval.

H. Pahou joined the meeting.

A committee member asked whether a different discussion would be taking place if budget was not a

It was noted that both programs are meritorious. From an institutional perspective there could be a risk of undermining both if they are submitted to the DQAB at the same time as the DQAB is tasked with avoiding unnecessary program duplication in BC.

It was noted that UBC is developing an undergraduate Urban Studies program which is an interdisciplinary collaborative program between their Department of Geography and their School of Community and Regional Planning. UBC is aiming to be more aligned with traditional urban planning and studies. Both SFU programs would differ from this program and from each other thereby targeting different students.

L. Campbell and M. Holden explained that FASS has been in communication with UBC and has a letter of

of how things are going. It was also noted that SFU is working on increased efforts for recognizing their own faculty members, including faculty awards and accomplishment recognition.

T C a a D O N a a

A committee member commented that as industry research funding increases there is less funding for research infrastructure. Would there be a way to determine the cost per paper, along with the funding
c a b a D O N c a a c a c
in some disciplines there is very little reason to go out and seek funding, but it would be interesting to have this data. On the industry side IRP has been much more careful at collecting overhead to address infrastructure concerns, particularly as industry partnerships grow.

It was confirmed that the SRP progress report is a public document and will be posted on the website.

A committee member noted the importance of making sure the reporting structure used remains consistent to ensure it is a transparent representation.

Tri-Council versus Industry funding was discussed along with the differences in approach for research. It was noted that Tri-Agency is decreasing and a question was posed as to what the cause is. D O N explained there is not a clear answer; they did attempt to produce this analysis, but the number of variables add to the complexity of determining an accurate answer.

The Chair noted that it would be interesting to see if there are more publications per faculty member or more publications due to an increase in faculty members.

T C a a D O N a ca c a c

Meeting adjourned at 3:58pm.