Vancouver Senate Secretariat
Senate and Curriculum Services
Enrolment Services
2016–1874 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
www.senate.ubc.ca

VANCOUVER SENATE

MINUTES OF JANUARY 22, 2003

Attendance

Present: President M. C. Piper (Chair), Vice President B. C. McBride, Dr. P. Adebar, Mr. R. Affleck, Mr. O. Alasaly, Ms. C. Bekkers, Dr. B. Bemmels, Dean J. Blom, Prof. C. Boyle, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. J. Brander, Dr. L. Brinton, Dr. M. A. Cameron, Dr. J. Carolan, Dr. D. Cherchas, Dr. B. Crawford, Dr. J. Dennison, Ms. M. Friesen, Dean N. Gallini, Dr. J. H. V. Gilbert, Dr. D. Granot, Dean F. Granot, Dr. L. Gunderson, Dr. P. G. Harrison, Dr. R. Irwin, Dean M. Isaacson, Dr. J. Johnson, Mr. D. Jones, Mr. P. Kahlon, Dr. B. S. Lalli, Ms. J. Lau, Dr. V. LeMay, Ms. C. Lenis, M. Litchfield, Mr. G. Lloyd, Ms. Y. Lu, Dr. M. MacEntee, Dr. P. L. Marshall, Mr. A. McEachern, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Dr. D. Paterson, Dean M. Quayle, Mr. J. Rogers, Dr. A. Rose, Dr. H. J. Rosengarten, Dr. C. Shields, Mr. B. Simpson, Dean R. Sindelar, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Mr. C. Ste-Croix, Dr. B. Stelck, Dr. R. C. Tees, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. S. Thorne, Dean R. Tierney, Mr. D. Tompkins, Mr. D. Verma, Dr. M. Vessey, Dr. R. Wilson, Dr. R. Windsor-Liscombe, Dr. R. A. Yaworsky, Dean E. H. K. Yen, Mr. M. Yung, Mr. C. Zappavigna.

Regrets: Mr. P. T. Burns, Dean J. A. Cairns, Dr. D. Fielding, Mr. E. Greathed, Dr. R. Harrison, Ms. M. Hassen, Dr. J. Hepburn, Mr. R. Hira, Ms. J. Hutton, Dr. S. B. Knight, Mr. T. P. T. Lo, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Dr. K. MacQueen, Dean D. Muzyka, Dr. P. Potter, Ms. C. Quinlan, Dr. B. Rodrigues, Dean J. N. Saddler, Mr. B. J. Silzer, Ms. L. Sparrow, Ms. G. Tsai, Dr. H. J. J. van Vuuren, Dean pro tem. L. Whitehead, Ms. S. Yim.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Dr. Tees
Dr. Rosengarten
} *That the minutes of the meeting of December 18, 2002 be approved as circulated.*

Carried.

Remarks from the Chair and Related Questions

TRIP TO OTTAWA

The President reported that an urgent trip to Ottawa to participate in discussions about the federal budget had precluded her attendance at the December meeting of Senate. The budget was sched-

uled for release in late February 2003, and the President expressed optimism that universities would be significantly featured.

TRIP TO SINGAPORE AND HONG KONG

A UBC delegation including the President, Dean Frieda Granot and Associate Vice President Michael Goldberg had recently spent three days in each of Singapore and Hong Kong. In Singapore, the President was appointed to the board of governors of the National University of Singapore. The President was pleased to participate as the first non-Singaporean to be appointed to the board of this strategic university in the Asia Pacific. The delegation met with friends and alumni of UBC in Singapore, and was also pleased to secure a major grant from the Lee Foundation in support of the annual exchange of 20 students between Singapore, Canada and the United States.

In Hong Kong, the UBC group was pleased to meet with each of the three new presidents of the following Hong Kong institutions: Hong Kong University, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, and the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Each of these three important universities had experienced recent changes in leadership. More than 200 people attended an alumni gathering, which the President stated was evidence of the incredible support for UBC in Hong Kong and other parts of Asia. A group of Johanians, who support St. John's College at UBC, hosted a luncheon in honour of Dean Granot. The President described the trip as extremely productive, and thanked Dean Granot and Associate Vice President Goldberg for their participation.

Curriculum Committee

Please see also 'Appendix A: Curriculum Change Summary.'

Dr. Marshall presented the reports, as Chair of the Committee. He reported that the Curriculum Committee was working toward a proposal to amend its terms of reference. Once approved, the

change would reduce the level of detail in the curriculum reports submitted to the entire Senate, as more of the proposals would receive final approval from the Committee and be forwarded directly to the Calendar editors. The anticipated result would be that Senate would only need to grant explicit approval for new programs, issues of importance for the entire University, and controversial proposals.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

Dr. Marshall
Dean Quayle
} *That the curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences be approved.*

Carried.

APPLIED SCIENCE

Dr. Marshall
Dean Isaacson
} *That the curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Applied Science be approved.*

In response to a query from Dr. Carolan about the relatively low crediting of courses in relation to contact hours (including laboratory hours), Dr. Adebar stated that the Faculty had reviewed the amount of work done by students during the laboratory period to determine whether additional credit was warranted. Dr. Marshall pointed out that the number of credits assigned to a course had a direct effect on the tuition fees paid by students, and that the Faculty of Applied Science had attempted to keep the credit loads for all of its programs at a reasonably low level.

In response to a question about MECH 221, a new course worth 11 credits, Dr. Adebar stated that students who failed this course would also likely fail their entire year and would be required to repeat. There would be no opportunity for remediation for individual sections of the course. In response to a further query, Dr. Adebar clarified that the existing smaller courses that had con-

tributed material to MECH 221, such as APSC 278 and APSC 279, would not be deleted due to their status as service courses for other departments within the Faculty.

The motion was put and carried.

ARTS

Dr. Marshall
Dean Gallini
} *That the curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Arts be approved.*

In response to a query from Mr. Brady about ARBC 420, Dr. Vessey defined "mirrors for princes" as a vulgar medieval genre of literature written to offer advice to rulers on courtly behaviour in the form of didactic manuals depicting rulers in action.

In response to a query from Dr. Tees, Mr. Eric Smith, Coordinator of Curriculum and Elections, stated that the Curriculum Committee intended to make a gradual shift from using "equivalent to" to "same as" when describing equivalent courses.

The motion was put and carried.

COMMERCE AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Marshall
Dr. Tees
} *That the curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration be approved.*

Mr. Ste-Croix, referring to COMM 371, asked why the course had been deleted, only to be reinstated some years later. Dr. Bemmels replied that the course had been deleted from the Calendar because it had not been offered for several years; since the Faculty had recently identified a faculty member willing to teach the course, the Faculty wished to reinstate it in the Calendar. Dr. Marshall stated that, because the process to reinstate deleted courses was perceived as "onerous,"

many Faculties tended to leave defunct courses in the Calendar for excessively long periods of time.

The motion was put and carried.

EDUCATION

Dr. Marshall
Dean Tierney

That the curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Education be approved.

Carried.

GRADUATE STUDIES

Dr. Marshall reported that the Master of Management program and its related courses had been tabled for further consideration by the Graduate Council, and he hoped to be able to present this new program for approval at the February 2003 meeting of Senate.

Dr. Marshall
Dean Granot

That the curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Graduate Studies, with the exception of the Master of Management and its related courses (BAFI 522, BAIT 515, BAIT 516, BAIT 521, BAIT 523, BAIT 525, BAIT 527, BAAC 550, BAHR 550, BAPA 550, BAMS 550, BAIT 550, BABS 550, BASM 550), be approved.

Dr. Johnson asked whether the proposed Bridge Program represented a new program, and how it would be integrated with existing programs. Dean Granot stated that UBC had received funding for this new superstructure from the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR), and that the Bridge Program aimed to combine the courses and expertise of nine participating units. The Dean expressed optimism that the Bridge Program would continue to receive granting agency funding following the initial five year commitment. Dr. Johnson expressed concern about the development of a new superstructure in the institutional hierarchy, particularly in view of the interdisciplinary nature of the Program. She asked whether sufficient consideration had been

given to the resource implications and how UBC will support and sustain programs such as the Bridge Program over the longer term. Dean Granot stated that the intention was to operate the Bridge Program for as long as there was external funding available.

Vice President McBride urged caution in this unusual situation, and asked whether the Curriculum Committee had discussed the resource implications of the Bridge Program. Dr. Marshall responded that the evaluation of resource implications did not fall within the mandate of the Curriculum Committee. Vice President McBride asked that it be recorded that the Bridge Program, if approved, would be funded for a period of five years from external sources, and that there was no commitment to identify ongoing internal funding for the Program. Vice President McBride urged the proposers of the program to include a note about funding constraints in any Calendar entry describing the Bridge Program.

Dr. Tees suggested that the Budget Committee would be the appropriate body to examine the financial issues and report back to Senate. He noted that, normally, when a program receives Faculty approval, the dean involved must indicate that the necessary financial support is in place; given the interdisciplinarity of the proposal, the Senate Budget Committee might take on this role. Dr. MacEntee stated that new programs are normally sent by the Provost's Office to the Senate Budget Committee for approval before appearing on a Senate agenda.

Mr. Brady
Dr. Shields
} *That consideration of the Bridge Program and the six BRDG courses be postponed, pending a report back to Senate on financial viability.*

Mr. Brady requested clarification about which body should be directed to report back to Senate. The President stated that the Budget Committee, in cooperation with the Curriculum Committee and the Provost's Office, should be the body to examine the issues and report back to Senate.

The motion to postpone was put and carried.

The motion to approve the graduate curriculum proposals, with the exception of the postponed items, was put and carried.

SCIENCE

Dr. Marshall
Dr. Harrison
} *That the curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Science be approved.*

Carried.

Nominating Committee

TEACHING & LEARNING COMMITTEE: TERMS OF REFERENCE

As Chair of the Nominating Committee, Dr. Gilbert presented the following proposed terms of reference for the recently constituted Teaching and Learning Committee.

1. To advise Senate on such matters of teaching and learning, as it may consider appropriate, or as may be referred to it from time to time.
2. To promote both Senate and university-wide discussion regarding matters of teaching and learning.
3. To make recommendations, as appropriate, on matters of teaching and learning.

Quorum =6

Dr. Gilbert
Dean Isaacson
} *That the proposed terms of reference and quorum for the Teaching and Learning Committee be approved.*

Dr. Gilbert invited Dr. Paul Harrison, Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, to comment. Dr. Harrison stated that the Teaching and Learning Committee saw itself as a forum for issues related to teaching and learning that did not previously have a formal place for discussion. The Committee did not wish to portray itself as a panel of experts, but hoped that people would be free to bring new ideas and initiatives to the Committee for feedback. Dr. Harrison stated that the Teaching and Learning Committee would not represent an additional step in the curriculum approval process, nor would it serve as another level of bureaucracy. He believed, however, that there was a role for the Committee to gauge the relative success or failure of the institution as it strikes out in new directions. The Committee's discussions would not always result in formal recommendations or motions for approval by Senate.

As a member of the Teaching and Learning Committee, Mr. Ste-Croix stated that he hoped that the Committee would promote dialogue on campus and provide students with an enhanced sense of agency over their education. He expressed the opinion that too little discussion had previously taken place between students and the professoriate.

In response to a question from Vice President McBride about the proactivity of the Committee, Dr. Harrison stated that the Committee would both identify matters of interest and serve as a receptor of issues referred to it.

There was some discussion about whether the third proposed term of reference was necessary, given that the function of making recommendations seemed to be subsumed within the first term of reference, namely to provide advice to Senate. Dr. Harrison stated that the Committee saw the two terms of reference as distinct, because advising Senate would not always necessarily entail actions or recommendations.

Mr. Affleck stated that the proposed terms seemed somewhat vague, and asked whether the Committee intended to conduct concrete research. Mr. Tompkins agreed that concrete measurements were desirable, and stated that the proposed terms of reference would allow the Committee significant flexibility in its activities.

The motion was put and carried.

Reports from the Vice President, Academic & Provost

CUPE 2278 JOB ACTION

The Vice President reported that, in accordance with University policy, he had struck a senior level committee to oversee the academic integrity of the University during the pending possible job action. The committee was to begin disseminating information to the campus community in the near future. Dr. James Carolan had been identified as the University's academic arbiter.

POST-RETIREMENT CONTRACTS

Please see also 'Appendix B: Report from the Vice President, Academic & Provost on Post-Retirement Contracts.'

As requested by Senate at its May 2002 meeting, the Vice President McBride presented a proposed new policy on post-retirement faculty employment contracts. He briefly summarized the history of the ad hoc Committee on the Academic Implications of Mandatory Retirement and the Committee's recommendations, noting particularly the recommendation that the University amend Policy #27 to allow faculty appointments after the age of 65. The ad hoc Committee expected a hiring crisis in the following few years, precipitated by the combination of large numbers of faculty retirements, growing numbers of students, and an inadequate supply of new faculty recruits.

In introducing the proposed new Retirement and Post-Retirement Policy (see `Appendix B' for the text of the Policy), Vice President McBride stated that most of the document simply formalized the current practice at UBC. One new aspect of the policy, however, would be a requirement that departments demonstrate that the advantages of a post-retirement appointment outweighed the advantages of a new tenure-track faculty appointment before a post-retirement contract would be approved. Post-retirement contracts would not be considered a right or a reward, and post-retirement appointees would be expected to carry a full teaching load in addition to conducting research.

Discussion

Mr. Brady expressed the opinion that a revised policy should consider the appointee's competence, rather than simply his/her age. He stated that the current University Policy #27 was 25 years old and should be updated. He questioned the "revenue-neutral" aspect of the policy, asking whether a faculty member might find him/herself performing the same job after the age of 65 for much less money than before. Vice President McBride replied that it was the *ad hoc* Committee that had made the recommendation concerning revenue neutrality, and that the administration had not made any statement on that issue. Dr. MacEntee, who had served as a member of the *ad hoc* Committee, recalled that the Committee envisioned the following:

- a retiring faculty member might earn, for example, $100 K.
- a replacement new faculty member would be appointed at a lower starting salary, e.g., $60 K
- $40 K would therefore be available for deployment in the form of a post-retirement contract.

Mr. Brady raised concern about the following parts of the proposed policy:

1. Policy, #1: if there are regular exceptions, retirement at age 65 was not, in fact, mandatory and should not be referred to as such.
2. Procedure #2b: language about "immediate and specific need" appeared to be inconsistent with Procedure #3c, which stated that a post-retirement contract may be signed up to two years before it is due to commence.
3. Procedures #2e and #2f: "should" should be replaced by "shall."

4. A Post-Retirement Employment contract under Procedure #3a for up to three years was inconsistent with the language about Special-Purpose Retirement Contracts under Procedure #2.
5. Procedure #3a: factors that would result in termination of the contract should be specified.
6. Procedure #3f: does not specify "whose" decision.

The Vice President clarified that Special-Purpose Retirement Appointments, which might be for just one course, would be distinct from Post-Retirement Employment Contracts, which might last for up to three years, with a further extension of two years. In response to #6 above, the Vice President stated that the department head or dean would make the decision.

Dr. Brander spoke in favour of the proposed policy as a real step forward, and was hopeful that this progress was not obscured by debate over mandatory retirement. He noted that the senior faculty in Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration had much expertise to offer, and that it seemed silly to disallow their contributions after the age of 65, particularly considering that all faculty salaries were relatively low compared to market value. Since many of the senior faculty had indicated willingness to remain on staff, Dr. Brander stated that a policy that would permit their employment after age 65 without insulting them was the best solution.

In response to a question from Dr. Dennison, Vice President McBride stated that there was varying opinion about whether mandatory retirement could be a bargaining issue. Dr. Dennison asked whether the Faculty Association had responded to the Senate discussions on the matter. As one of a number of unhappily-retired faculty members, he expressed the opinion that mandatory retirement should be abolished retroactively. Vice President McBride stated that the University was not yet encountering a hiring crisis and was having no difficulty filling its vacant faculty positions with first-rate recruits.

Dr. Windsor-Liscombe stated that the University unfortunately seemed to forget the contributions of professors soon after their retirement. He cited the example of a former department head

in the Faculty of Arts, who had received a major award after the age of 70. Vice President McBride agreed, adding that he knew people who had published in excess of 100 research papers post-retirement.

Dr. Tees, as a member of the ad hoc Committee, stated that the Committee had consulted very widely in a very short time period with emeriti, department heads, and the Faculty Association. He stated that he was positive with respect to the proposed policy and was hopeful that it would send the message that senior faculty who perform exceptionally well have a place on the UBC campus. He urged the Vice President to recognize the pending hiring crisis, emphasizing that, in three to five years' time, the University would face significant difficult in recruiting adequate numbers faculty to fill vacancies.

Dean Gallini spoke in support of the policy, stating that she viewed senior and new faculty members as complementary, rather than one being a replacement for the other. She was hopeful that a policy that allowed productive senior faculty to remain employed would also help the University to more effectively recruit new faculty members.

In response to a question from Mr. Tompkins, Vice President McBride stated that the next step forward for the proposal would be approval by the Board of Governors.

Dean Isaacson stated that the proposal did offer some flexibility, but still did not address the fact that faculty members in their 50's were less willing to be recruited by UBC, due to mandatory retirement. The new policy would not offer any guarantees to those individuals. Vice President McBride stated that the administration was not willing, at that point in time, to make any such guarantees.

In response to a question from Dr. Thorne, Vice President McBride stated that the administration was reluctant to extend the policy to cover administrative positions.

In response to a question from Mr. Lloyd about clinical faculty, Vice President McBride stated that the regulations for clinical faculty were different from those applied to regular faculty, and that clinical faculty contracts were frequently extended.

Dr. MacEntee spoke in support of the proposal as including everything the University required at the moment, but expressed some discomfort about the idea that retaining a post-retirement faculty member necessarily meant not hiring a new person. He expressed the opinion that departments should attempt to both retain productive retirees and actively recruit new faculty.

Dr. Vessey stated that many faculty members approaching retirement would likely wish to take advantage of this proposed policy, but suggested that it would likely only apply to a limited number of people. He likened the approval process for post-retirement contracts to the promotion and tenure process, and stated that adjudication could be expensive if implemented on a large scale. He also pointed out that employing large numbers of post-retirement appointees would have a serious impact on the faculty bargaining unit, because of the number of contracted individuals performing bargaining unit work. Vice President McBride stated that post-retirement contracts would be restricted to a limited number of people who had full support from their departments.

Mr. Rogers pointed out that, when all issues were considered, including pension contributions and withdrawals, post-retirement contracts might not be as "revenue-neutral" as they appear.

The President thanked Vice President McBride for his report and indicated that the proposed policy would be sent to the Board of Governors for further discussion and eventual approval.

Other Business

HONORARY DEGREE CANDIDATES

Dr. Slonecker, as Chair of the Tributes Committee, stated that all but two of the candidates to receive honorary degrees at the 2003 congregation ceremonies had responded to the University's invitation. Once all the candidates had responded, and their availability for individual ceremonies had been confirmed, Senate was to be informed of the results.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be held on Wednesday, February 26, 2003 at 7:00 p.m.

Appendix A: Curriculum Change Summary

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

AGRO 324, 326, 328, 401, 402, 403, 424

AGSC 496

APPLIED SCIENCE

CHBE 401, 402

EECE 310, 423, 452, 492

Computer Engineering Third Year

Software Engineering Option Third Year

MECH 220, 221, 222, 223

Mechanical Engineering Second Year

Electro-Mechanical Design Engineering Second Year

MMAT 460, 462

Environmental Engineering: First through Fifth Years (Third and Fourth Years New)

ARTS

ARBC 420

MUSC 167, 364

Harpsichord Major

WMST 201

HESO 400, 449, 499

COMMERCE & BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

COMM 201, 300, 301, 302, 379

EDUCATION

CUST 431, 432

GRADUATE STUDIES

Arts: Journalism

JRNL 510, 525, 535

Science

ATSC 595

CPSC 540, 545, 554

EOSC 538, 539

ZOOL 524, 553, 554

Commerce & Business Administration

COMM 657

BAAC 550

BAHR 550

BAPA 550

BAMS 550

BAIT 550

BABS 550

BASM 550

Master of Health Administration Program

Applied Science

CHBE 580

CIVL 545

EECE 500, 501, 502, 540, 541, 546, 549, 562, 580, 586, 588

SCIENCE

ATSC 448

BIOL 316, 317, 351, 443

CPSC 101, 111, 121 211, 213, 221, 313, 424

EOSC 110, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117

MATH 342, 437

MICB 318

Appendix B: Report from the Vice President, Academic & Provost on Post-Retirement Contracts

MEMORANDUM

January 9, 2003

To: Senate
c/o Lisa Collins, Manager of Secretariat Services

From: Barry C. McBride
Vice President Academic and Provost

Re: Post-Retirement Contracts

Since 1978, UBC has had mandatory retirement at 65 years of age. There are sound reasons for this mandatory retirement policy. These include:

- ensuring systemic opportunities for faculty renewal through the hiring and promotion of newly qualified faculty members. The lifeblood of universities is dependent on a continuing flow of new ideas and perspectives. It is critical that University faculty draw upon recently qualified individuals who are committed to developing new areas of knowledge and who advocate change and renewal. To attract and retain those individuals the University must provide an environment that provides opportunities for tenure, promotion and advancement.
- creating an environment in which it is acceptable to have a deferred compensation system that involves lower pay in earlier years and higher pay in later years.
- encouraging and enabling faculty to plan in advance for retirement.
- requiring retirement at the age that corresponds with the commencement of both private and public pension plans and tax concessions.
- enabling the University to plan for change and renewal.

Despite the desirability of mandatory retirement in a university context, UBC requires sufficient flexibility to be able to retain faculty past the age of 65 years when it is in the best interests of the University to do so. Since 1977, the University has utilized post-retirement appointments for academic staff beyond the age of 65 years. These post-retirement appointments are made only under special circumstances to meet an immediate and specific need, and are limited to terms of up to one year at a time. The University should also be able to retain, for general academic duties, exceptional faculty who have received the highest acclaim from the academic community and who continue to distinguish themselves as scholars. To be competitive in recruitment, the University may also wish to offer post-retirement employment contracts as part of a recruitment package offered to an outstanding senior scholar.

Attached is a draft policy for Retirement and Post-Retirement for discussion.

DRAFT - January 9, 2003

RETIREMENT AND POST-RETIREMENT POLICY

Purpose:

1. To continue the mandatory retirement age at 65 years.
2. To continue special purpose contracts with academic staff for one-year term positions.
3. To enable UBC to benefit from the continuing contributions of our highest achieving faculty who are beyond the mandatory retirement age 65.

Policy:

1. Mandatory Retirement: Except as may be explicitly set forth in this Policy, the mandatory retirement age is 65 years.
2. Special-Purpose Post-Retirement Appointments: Where there is an immediate and specific need and it is in the best interests of the University to reappoint a retiring or retired faculty member to meet that need, a special-purpose post-retirement appointment may be made for a term of up to one year at a time.
3. Post-Retirement Employment Contracts:
    a. A limited number of exceptional faculty who have received the highest acclaim from the academic community and who continue to distinguish themselves as scholars will be eligible for consideration for post-retirement employment contracts.
    b. Post-retirement employment contracts will only be made if it can be demonstrated that the benefits to the Faculty outweigh the advantages of making a new faculty appointment.
    c. Post-retirement employees will not be tenured.
    d. Post-retirement employees will be expected to teach and maintain a strong scholarly program.
    e. Post-retirement employment contracts require the approval of the Provost.
    f. Post-retirement employment contracts are not a right or a reward and will be approved only if they are in the best interests of the University.
4. Review: This policy will be reviewed in 3 years.

Procedures:

1. Mandatory Retirement:

a. A full-time faculty member whose 65th birthday falls between January 1 and June 30 inclusive will continue in his or her rank and salary with applicable benefits until June 30. A faculty member whose 65th birthday falls between July 1 and December 31 inclusive will continue in his or her rank and salary with applicable benefits until December 31.

b. A sessional lecturer or other part-time faculty member who reaches his or her 65th birthday during the term of his or her appointment may continue in service until the expiry date of the appointment.

2. Special-Purpose Post-Retirement Appointments:

a. There will be no requirement to grant any appointment beyond age 65.

b. There must be an immediate and specific need within the unit concerned and the special-purpose post-retirement appointment must address this need.

c. A special-purpose post-retirement appointment must not be in place of renewing the department through the appointment of tenured or tenure track faculty members.

d. Special-purpose post-retirement appointments are to be made primarily for teaching/collection development duties, and occasionally for service on committees.

e. Remuneration should be commensurate with the services performed (e.g. depending on the circumstances, teaching could be on a pro bono basis, or involve a salary ranging from very modest to the scale amount for lecturers).

f. The title used by a special-purpose post-retirement appointee should reflect the status of the appointee immediately prior to retirement (e.g. Professor Emeritus).

g. No payment will be made for occasional honorific or voluntary duties (e.g. chairing doctoral oral examinations, supervising graduate students).

h. Special-purpose post-retirement appointments are to be recommended by the head of the unit concerned to the dean/librarian to the Vice-President, Academic & Provost for approval. Agreement-in-principle should be sought by the head before any assurances are given to possible appointees.

3. Post-Retirement Employment Contracts:

a. Post-retirement employment contracts may be concluded between UBC and a member of faculty to start no earlier than age 65 and end no later than age 70. The first contract will be for up to three years, with the understanding that it could be renewed for up to an additional 2 years. All contracts will be reviewed yearly and may be terminated with the appropriate notice.

b. The nature and evaluation of the duties must form part of the agreement. Duties will include both teaching and research.

c. A post-retirement employment contract may be signed no earlier than two years before it is due to commence.

d. Compensation will be determined when the contract is negotiated.

e. In making a decision on a post-retirement employment contract the Provost will consider the recommendation of the Department, the Head and the Dean.

f. The decision will be based on evidence of outstanding success in teaching and in research. Where appropriate there must be evidence of ongoing financial support for research.

g. Post-retirement employment contracts may be full or part-time, but must include a teaching component.