THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
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 MAY 17, 1995

Attendance

Present: President D. W. Strangway (Chair), Dr. R. M. Will (Vice-Chair), Vice-President D. R. Birch, Mr. S. Arnold, Dr. D. R. Atkins, Dr. A. P. Autor, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dr. A. E. Boardman, Mr. J. Boritz, Dr. D. G. A. Carter, Ms. L. Chui, Dr. D. H. Cohen, Dr. T. S. Cook, Dr. M. G. R. Coope, Dr. J. H. V. Gilbert, Mr. E. B. Goehring, Dean M. A. Goldberg, Dr. J. Gosline, Dean J. R. Grace, Dr. S. E. Grace, Mr. H. D. Gray, Rev. J. Hanrahan, Dean M. J. Hollenberg, Dr. M. Isaacson, Dr. J. G. T. Kelsey, Dr. S. B. Knight, Mr. T. Lau, Mr. H. Leung, Mr. C. Lim, Professor P. T. K. Lin, Dr. S. C. Lindstrom, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Mr. W. Maas, Dr. D. J. MacDougall, Dr. M. MacEntee, Dean B. C. McBride, Dean J. H. McNeill, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Dean M. P. Marchak, Dean A. Meisen, Mr. R. L. de Pfyffer, Mr. T. Presley, Mrs. M. Price, Dr. D. J. Randall, Professor R. S. Reid, Professor J. A. Rice, Dean J. F. Richards, Dr. R. A. Shearer, Dean N. Sheehan, Mr. D. Shu, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Dean C. L. Smith, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Mr. D. R. Verma, Dr. E. W. Whittaker, Dr. D. Ll. Williams, Dr. W. C. Wright, Jr., Dean E. H. K. Yen.

Regrets: Chancellor R. H. Lee, Dr. S. Avramidis, Mr. J. A. Banfield, Dr. J. Barman, Dean C. S. Binkley, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. D. M. Brunette, Mr. D. Khan, Professor V. J. Kirkness, Ms. L. Lam, Mr. A. Lau, Dr. M. Levine, Dr. D. M. Lyster, Dr. R. T. A. MacGillivray, Mr. A. Oberman, Dr. R. J. Patrick, Dr. W. J. Phillips, Professor M. Quayle, Dr. H. B. Richer, Dr. A. J. Sinclair, Ms. C. A. Soong, Ms. L. M. Sparrow, Dr. L. J. Stan, Dr. S. Thorne, Dr. W. Uegama, Mr. E. C. H. Woo.

Senate membership

REPLACEMENT

The Chair reported that Ms. Linda Lam replaces Mr. Steven Tam, as student representative of the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration.

Minutes of the previous meeting

It was noted that a corrected version of Appendix A (pp.11094-11099) and Appendix B (pp.11100a-11100b), which had been omitted, were distributed at the meeting.

It was moved and seconded } *That the amended minutes of the seventh regular meeting of Senate for the Session 1995-95, having been circulated, be taken as read and adopted.*

Carried.

Business arising from the minutes

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. Maas gave the following notice of motion.

> "In light of the substantial academic and social impacts of tuition fee increases likely needed to maintain university funding at appropriate levels, that Senate establish an ad hoc committee to examine the academic and social implications and make recommendations."

Chair's remarks and related questions

The Chair reported that the Faculty Association and the University had negotiated salary settlements for 1994/95 and 1995/96 and faculty would soon be asked to vote on the issue.

Candidates for Degrees

Dean McBride
Mr. Verma

} *That the candidates for degrees and diplomas, as approved by the Faculties and Schools, be granted the degree or diploma for which they were recommended, and that the Registrar, in consultation with Deans and the Chair of Senate, make any necessary adjustments.*

Carried.

Scholarships and Awards

A list of scholarships, medals and prizes awarded to students in the graduating classes was circulated for information. Dr. Cook informed Senate that more heads of the graduating class had come to UBC directly from British Columbia universities, colleges and high schools than in the past. For the first time, all four Governor General Medal winners entered UBC from British Columbia high schools. Of the twenty-nine heads of graduating class, fifteen came directly from high schools; thirteen from British Columbia

public schools, one from a BC independennt school and one from an international independent school. Six entered UBC from a BC college and one from a Canadian college. Three entered UBC from British Columbia universities and four from other Canadian Universities. The Governor General Silver medal winner in Science and the head of the Occupational Therapy degree group came to UBC with entrance scholarships. Dr. Cook noted that the heads of the graduating class in the Faculties of Law and Arts are Wesbrook scholars.

Senate Nominating Committee Membership

In accordance with established procedures, student vacancies on the Nominating Committee were declared.

Members were informed that a call for nominations to fill these vacancies would be sent to all members of Senate, and that nominations would remain open until the September 1995 Senate meeting. If more than two nominations are received an election will be held at the September meeting.

Reports of Committees of Senate

SENATE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Dr. Williams, Chair of the committee, presented the following recommendations which had been circulated.

Recommendations

1. *In considering how Senate committees operate, the Senate Academic Policy Committee agrees that the independence of committees from any faculty, department or other campus unit should be a principle of their functioning, that theoretically any Senator should be able to Chair a Senate committee, and that the*

2. *work of committees frequently requires both material and personnel support. It is therefore recommended:*
    a. *That the University make available to each committee of Senate appropriate resources and support.*
3. *In considering how the academic governance of the University is vested in Senate, the Senate Academic Policy Committee agrees that the record of Senate and its committees form part of the history of the University; and that the business of Senate is of interest and concern to a broad constituency including faculty, students, alumni and the public. It is therefore recommended:*
    a. *That the record of Senate be made available for wide distribution in a variety of formats such as View UBC, UBC Reports and the Alumni Chronicle.*
    b. *That the Secretary of Senate be asked to coordinate the maintenance of Senate committee records as appropriate.*

Dr. Williams noted that the Academic Policy Committee recommendations arise from an earlier proposal that Senate establish a Ways and Means Committee. This proposal was referred to the Academic Policy Committee which in turn referred it to a sub-committee chaired by Dr. Gilbert. Some of the recommendations are a result of the sub-committee's report. It is not proposed that a Ways and Means Committee of Senate be established, however, the recommendations should achieve similar objectives. The recommendations address committee support as well as the preservation of the record of Senate and its committees, ensuring where appropriate, its dissemination.

Dr. Williams
Dr. Gilbert } *That recommendation #1 be approved.*

Dr. Williams stated that the term "appropriate resources and support" refers to a wide diversity of committees of Senate whose requirements are considerably different. Committees chaired by persons without secretarial support provided within a department may require research support or other forms of secretarial backing. It is anticipated that the appropriateness and level of support would be worked out with each committee Chair and the Registrar's office.

The motion was put and carried.

Dr. Williams stated that the deliberations and conclusions of all Senate committees are not noted in the minutes of Senate as a matter of record. The approval of this motion will ensure the appropriate maintenance of Senate committee records through the Registrar's office for posterity.

Dr. Williams
Dr. McBride } *That recommendation # 2 be approved.*

The motion was put and carried.

SENATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Dr. Will, Chair of the committee, presented the following proposal for changes in the method of calculating admission grade point average for Elementary Teacher Education Programs in the Faculty of Education.

Proposed Calendar Entry: (Changes in italics)

Effective September 1996, pre-admission studies for applicants to both programs must include:

1) Six credits of English Literature and composition (*or UBC Arts One or equivalent*)

2) At least 3 (preferably 6) credits in a laboratory science, in mathematics (not statistics), and in social studies (history or geography). Laboratory science courses are normally selected from the life sciences, chemistry, physical geography, geology, astronomy, or physics.

3) *Six* credits of Canadian Studies.

4) 18 credits at the senior level (normally courses numbered 300 or higher) in one subject area included in the BC elementary school curriculum (art, drama, language arts [English and French], mathematics, music, physical education, science, and social studies).

5) An overall average of 65% on the *six credits of English literature and composition, 3 credits of laboratory science, mathematics, and history or geography, as well as the 18 senior level credits in a subject area included in the BC elementary school curriculum.*

Rationale:

The proposal changes the basis for calculating admission averages for applicants applying to the elementary teacher education programs to give a more balanced appraisal of the pre-admission studies regarded as important for teaching in elementary schools. The proposal also changes the credit requirement for Canadian Studies in accordance with the requirement of the British Columbia College of Teachers.

Dr. Will noted that 6 credits will be required instead of 3, which is in accordance with the requirements of the BC College of Teachers. Previously the average for admission purposes was calculated as an overall average based on the best 60 credits the students presented. Now the average will be based on 27 specified credits, and since these credits are specified for calculating the average, this will make the applications more comparable. Since the specified subjects are in teaching areas or areas related to the Elementary program, it also can be viewed as a raising of standards.

Dr. Will
Dr. Berger } *That the proposed Faculty of Education changes be approved.*

Carried.

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Dr. Isaacson presented the following report which had been circulated.

Since its last report to Senate in May 1994, the Senate Budget Committee has met 14 times to discuss a wide variety of issues. In its role of assisting the President in the preparation of the University budget, the Committee has undertaken the following activities over the past year:

Senior Administrative Structure and Responsibilities

On June 15, 1994, the Committee unanimously passed the following motion:

"The Senate Budget Committee recommends to the President that the University undertake a comprehensive examination of the organizational structure and responsibilities of its senior administration. The President would be responsible for this endeavor and would report widely to the university community."

Final Motion of the President's Proposed 1994/95 Operating Budget

On July 8, 1994, the Committee unanimously passed the following motion which was published in the 1994/95 Budget and Planning Narrative:

"The Committee endorses the President's 1994/95 budget strategy with the following observations:

1. In the present fiscal climate, the Committee endorses zero net salary increases for all employee groups.
2. The Committee supports the principle of performance related step and career advancement increases for all employee groups even though these awards are scaled back from current levels and even though they require across-the board cut backs in salary levels to maintain the zero net salary increase.

3. In view of the significant role of graduate students to the changing society, the Committee is concerned with the growing number of such students for whom the province has not purchased spaces via the provincial operating grant. The Committee encourages the President to seek funding for these students both through increased levels of provincial operating support and through increased tuition fees in selected graduate programs.
4. The Committee believes that periodic evaluation of the value received from non-recurring funds associated with specific programs is an important principle. For example, expenditures related to the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund are becoming significant. This coming year, the Committee will be reviewing how effectively these funds have been utilized to date.
5. Consideration of the funding and allocations to the Faculties of Arts and Science has stimulated the Committee to undertake further study of the funding of those faculties in the light of their core functions and their diversity.
6. A greater level of comparability in the data and format in the individual Faculty narratives would greatly facilitate the deliberations of the Committee. This issue will be examined by the Committee in the context of the Operating Budget 1995/96 priorities and processes."

Identification and Priorities of Issues for Committee Deliberations

In September 1994, the Committee identified and considered 13 possible issues for its deliberations over the year. The 4 issues which it considered to be the highest priority were as follows:

- Ancillary Units: to develop an improved understanding of such units, including their attributes and performance indicators, and to consider possible mechanisms which would best serve the University with respect to their costs and level of service.
- Faculties of Arts and Science: to examine these Faculties in order to gain a greater understanding of their activities that relate to the preparation of the University budget.
- Budget and Planning Narrative: to recommend a greater level of comparability in the data and format in the individual Faculty narratives.

- Teaching-Related Expenditures: to review the effectiveness of expenditures relating to the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund and other teaching-related expenditures.

The Committee has considered the first three of these issues, but is yet to deal with the fourth one concerning teaching-related expenditures. With respect to the latter issue, the Committee has requested related information from the Provost and has just received his report to the Board of Governors on the establishment and development of the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund, including projected revenue and committed allocations for 1995/96.

Budget Guidelines and Budget and Planning Narrative

The Committee suggested a number of changes which were incorporated into the document *Budget Guidelines* (previously *Budget Principles and Process*). This document plays an important part in the preparation of the University's annual budget. A significant change this year is that, in addition to the General Purpose Operating Fund, the document now addresses the various other funds of the University, including Special Purpose Funds, Sponsored Research Funds, Ancillary Enterprise Funds and Capital Funds; and that organizational units are now expected to indicate income and expenses relating to all these funds. The Committee also suggested a number of changes with respect to the format of the *Budget and Planning Narrative*.

Tuition Policy

The committee suggested a number of revisions to the October 1994 draft of the document *Towards a Tuition Policy*, and the March 1995 draft of the document *UBC Tuition Policy*. These suggestions were directed to a clarification of the principles of the proposed policy, and to changes to the content and format of the supporting statements that are made. On April 19, 1995, the Committee unanimously passed the following motion:

> "The Committee supports the principles of the March 1995 draft of the UBC Tuition Policy under consideration, and encourages the University Administration to develop more fully those aspects of the policy relating to student aid."

Faculties of Arts and Science

The Committee met separately with the Deans of Arts and Science with respect to examining the activities of these two faculties. These faculties were identified in the July 1994 motion of the Committee as

warranting particular attention this year in the light of their core functions and their diversity. The purpose of examining particular units is to obtain a greater understanding of the resources allocated to them, their priorities, activities and expenditures - in order to provide better-informed assistance to the President on the preparation of the University budget. A list of questions from Committee members was sent to each Dean before each meeting. The presentations and related discussions have been very valuable to the Committee. The Committee was particularly impressed with both Faculties' achievements in reforming curriculum, enhancing learning technology, and implementing organizational change to achieve fiscal efficiencies. The Committee's view is that means should be found to give these and other faculties financial incentives to achieve continuing gains in effectiveness and efficiency. The high cost of faculty renewal, brought to the Committee's attention by the Dean of Science, may well have similar implications in other faculties.

Centralized Units

The Committee has considered briefly the report *Centralization and Decentralization* which was accepted by Senate in January 1995. Recommendation 4 of the report states:

> "That the Senate Budget Committee be requested to study those centralized units which enjoy full or partial monopoly status on the campus, particularly ancillary units, and to bring recommendations to Senate and to the President not later than the December 1995 meeting of Senate, on a mechanism to ensure that each such unit defines its service in relation to the academic community's needs, provides that service to a standard which meets or exceeds that found in the competitive marketplace, and justifies its operating costs and scale of charges in relation to the fair market value found in the Greater Vancouver area."

A sub-committee will consider this issue over the next few months and report back to the Committee.

Ancillary Units

The Committee has engaged in extensive deliberations on the issue of ancillary units. A list of questions from Committee members was sent to the three Vice-Presidents responsible for ancillary units, the Committee held discussions with these Vice-Presidents, and it examined various materials relating to the units. The Committee then provided

the President with a set of suggestions relating to the operation of ancillary units. These suggestions have echoed recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 7 of the report *Centralization and Decentralization* (which pertain to the mandate, performance assessment, review, and devolution of functions of service units); and the Committee has urged that there be explicit statements of those services which must be monopolistic.

Committee Reports to Senate

An important component of the Committee's work takes place each year shortly after its annual report to Senate in May, and relates to an assessment of the President's annual budget strategy. Because of this timing, the Committee agreed that it would report on this particular matter to Senate early each fall.

Committee Quorum

At a meeting of the Committee on December 7, 1994, the Committee established by motion that its quorum be six voting members, including ex-officio members. This recommendation was sent to the Senate Nominating Committee.

Dr. Isaacson
Dr. Kelsey } *That the report be accepted.*

Carried.

CONTINUING STUDIES

The following proposal for a Diploma Program in Management of Aquaculture Systems had been circulated:

Credential to be awarded:

Diploma in Management of Aquaculture Systems will be granted by the University of British Columbia (UBC). The diploma parchment will indicate that the program is in conjunction with Malaspina University-College.

Units offering the program:

The Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, UBC and the Faculty of Science and Technology, Malaspina University-College.

Need for the program:

Aquaculture, or the production of fish, shellfish and aquatic plants, is relatively new to B.C. Fish farming in B.C. has increased in value from $1.1 million in 1983 to over $100 million today. About 200 farms grow salmon or trout, 400 produce oysters or clams. The production of other species - mussels, scallops, abalone, and marine plants - has also increased rapidly. The result is an expansion of jobs in aquaculture production, hatcheries, processing, marketing, service industries and government.

Rationale for the program:

The rationale for the program stems from three underlying principles:

1. Life long learning is necessary to maintain competency on the job. People with Bachelor's degrees want the opportunity to obtain specific job skills and people who have been working for a number of years want the opportunity to upgrade their skills and knowledge.
2. British Columbia has a comparative advantage for education and training in aquaculture relative to the rest of North America.
3. It is advantageous for institutions of higher learning to share resources and build on areas of relative strength. This results in academic programs which are stronger, more relevant, and more cost effective.

Purpose of the program:

The purpose of this program is to allow Canadian and foreign public or private personnel to fill gaps in their previous training and experience in aquaculture, and obtain relevant job skills. Many people working in aquaculture have had training and experience in the technical/scientific aspects, or the economics/management aspects, but rarely both. Biologists find themselves in management positions, while managers

with commerce and business administration backgrounds desire more technical understanding. Malaspina University-College and UBC have strong, but different, aquaculture programs. Students in this diploma program will draw from the relative strengths and areas of uniqueness at each of these institutions.

Admission requirements:

Successful applicants require either:

1. a Bachelor's degree in an area relevant for the management of aquaculture systems;

   or

2. a minimum of two years relevant post-secondary education plus at least three years relevant work experience in aquaculture.

   Students will be selected on the basis of grades in previous post-secondary education programs, extra-curricular activities, work experience, and reasons for wanting to enrol in the program. Students will apply to the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, UBC, where admission evaluation and selection will be carried out. Admitted students will be assigned a student number and given an eligibility to register by the UBC Registrar's Office.

   For applicants whose native language is not English, proficiency in English will need to be demonstrated at the time of application by submitting the score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). A TOEFL score of 550 or greater is required.

Program requirements:

The program requires a minimum of 30 credits, with a minimum of 15 credits from UBC. Credit for university courses at Malaspina will transfer directly to UBC. Credit for technical courses at Malaspina will transfer to UBC as "Diploma Credit Courses". The UBC Registrar will maintain a transcript of records.

	Credits
Aquaculture Field Trip AGSC 3XX (UBC) / AQUA 3XXX (Malaspina)	3
Malaspina courses	12 or 15
UBC courses	15 or 12
TOTAL	30

Program schedule:

August	The aquaculture field trip course, AGSC 3XX/AQUA 3XX, will be offered each August, provided at least five students are enrolled.[1] The course will be given jointly by UBC and Malaspina University-College, with the assistance of other partners. It will be cross listed and open to UBC and Malaspina students not enrolled in the diploma program.
September - December	Students will take a term of courses at Malaspina University-College. Courses will be selected from the list in Appendix A.
January - April	Students will take a term of courses at UBC. Courses will be selected from the list in Appendix B. Students are expected to have diverse educational backgrounds and experience. Hence, the program is designed to provide considerable flexibility. The specific mix of courses is to be determined by each student and their faculty advisor from predetermined lists of appropriate courses. Both Malaspina University-College and UBC will assign a faculty advisor for each student.
May	Congregation ceremony at UBC for conferring of diploma.

Program flexibility:

The program is designed to be as flexible as possible. For example: (a) a student who has already completed aquaculture courses at Malaspina, or the equivalent, could meet the entire course work requirement by spending two semesters at UBC; (b) a student who could only attend classes during the winter/spring period could attend Term 2 at Malaspina one year and Term 2 at UBC the next year; (c) a student could spend one term in residence at Malaspina and complete UBC

[1] If the course is not offered, or if a student has previous working experience in BC aquaculture, AQUA 271T/272T or 371/372 (Field Practicum) can be substituted for it.

courses via distance education; (d) students could enrol on a part-time or full-time basis.

Funding:

This program will operate on a full cost recovery basis, involving tuition plus a program fee. Tuition will be the regular per credit fee plus regular student fees at Malaspina and UBC. The program fee will be jointly determined by the Dean of Science and Technology (Malaspina) and the Dean of Agricultural Sciences (UBC). The program makes use of existing courses and facilities at both institutions. The only new course is the Aquaculture Field Trip, which will be funded from the program fee.

Proposed Calendar Statement

a. On page 36 (95/96 Calendar)

Add:

Diploma in Management of Aquaculture Systems

b. On page 93 (95/96 Calendar)

Add:

DIPLOMA IN MANAGEMENT OF AQUACULTURE SYSTEMS

The Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, UBC in conjunction with the Faculty of Science and Technology, Malaspina University-College, offers a Diploma in Management of Aquaculture Systems. The program allows Canadian and foreign public or private personnel to fill gaps in their previous training and experience in aquaculture, and obtain relevant job skills.

Admission requirements

Admission to the Diploma Program requires either:

1. a Bachelor's degree in an area relevant for the management of aquaculture systems;

or

2. a minimum of two years relevant post secondary education plus at least three years relevant work experience in aquaculture.

Students are selected on the basis of grades in previous post-secondary education programs, extra-curricular activities, work experience, and reasons for wanting to enrol in the program. Students apply to the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, UBC, where admission evaluation and selection will be carried out. Admitted students are assigned a student number and given an eligibility to register by the UBC Registrar's Office.

For applicants whose native language is not English, proficiency in English needs to be demonstrated at the time of application by submitting the score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). A TOEFL score of 550 or greater is required.

Program requirements

The program requires a minimum of 30 credits, with a minimum of 15 credits from UBC. Credit for university courses at Malaspina University-College transfers directly to UBC. Credit for technical courses at Malaspina University-College transfers to UBC as "Diploma Credit Courses". The UBC Registrar maintains a transcript of records.

[the following appendix is not included in the Calendar entry]

Appendix A: Relevant Malaspina University-College Courses

AQUA 132T	Aquatic Habitats (3)
AQUA 142T	Fisheries Engineering I (3)
AQUA 2XX	Aquatic Plant Biology and Culture (3) Note: Students who take BIOL 429 at UBC cannot receive credit for AQUA 2XX
AQUA 211T/212T	Trout Culture (3)
AQUA 222**	Invertebrate Zoology and Culture (3)
AQUA 231*	Warm Water Fish Culture (3)
AQUA 251	Materials and Methods (3)
AQUA 251T	Fisheries Engineering II (3)
AQUA 252T	Fisheries Engineering III (3)
AQUA 271T/272T or AQUA 371/372	Field Practicum (3)
AQUA 327	Fish Husbandry (3) Note: Students who take ANSC 480 at UBC cannot receive credit for AQUA 327.

AQUA 341	Fish Health (3) Note: Students who take ANSC 581 at UBC cannot receive credit for AQUA 341.
AQUA 391	Husbandry Project (3)
AQUA 392	Husbandry Project (3)
AQUA 3XX	Aquaculture Field Trip (3) (same as AGSC 3XX at UBC)
BIOL 302	Biometrics (3)
BIOL 315	Parasitology (3)
BIOL 321	Lake and Stream Ecosystems (3) Note: Students cannot receive credit for both BIOL 321 and FISH 281/132
BIOL 322	Coastal and Estuarine Ecosystems (3)
BIOL 324	Biology of Fishes (3) Note: Students who take BIOL 426 at UBC cannot receive credit for BIOL 324.
BIOL 325*	Invertebrate Zoology (3) Note: Cannot be taken with AQUA 222.
FISH 132T	Aquatics Habitat (3)
FISH 211	Salmonid Life History (3)
FISH 232T	Resource Ecology (3)
FISH 281T	Fisheries Field Techniques (3)

(*) Courses normally offered in the spring, but can be offered in the fall, if there is sufficient registration.

(**) Normally of two semesters in length, but could be offered as a one semester course if demand warranted it.

Appendix B: Relevant UBC Courses

Distance Ed. Options	Science Based Courses	
	AGSC 213	Genetics in Agriculture (3)
	AGSC 3XX	Aquaculture Field Trip (3) (same as AQUA 3XX at Malaspina

Distance Ed. Options	Science Based Courses	
	AGSC 410	Issues and Problems in Food Production Systems (3)
Yes	ANSC 258	Introduction to Animal Food Production Systems (3)
	ANSC 303	Introduction to Feed Technology (3)
	ANSC 313	Principles of Animal Breeding (3)
	ANSC 322	Fundamentals of Animal Nutrition (3)
	ANSC 430	Directed Studies (2-6)
Yes	ANSC 480	Intensive Fish Production (3)
Yes	ANSC 481	Fish Nutrition (3)
	ANSC 482	Fish Breeding in Aquaculture (3)
	ANSC 580	Advanced Topics in Fish Culture (3)
Yes	ANSC 581	Fish Diseases (3)
	BIOL 326	Biology of Invertebrates (3)
	BIOL 426	Biology of Fishes (3)
	BIOL 429	Algal Aquaculture (3)
Yes	FOOD 258	Exploring our Food (3)
Yes	FOOD 259	Introduction to Food Systems (3)
	FOOD 301	Food Chemistry (3)
	FOOD 303	Quality Control, Standards & Evaluation (3)
Yes	FOOD 308	Principles of Food Process Science I (3)
	FOOD 405	Seafood Process Science (3)
	HUNU 301	Consumer Aspects of Food (3)
	MICB 307	Food and Industrial Microbiology (3)
	MICB 309	Food Microbiology (with lab) (3)
	MICB 417	Introduction to Applied Microbiology (3)
	PLNT 321	Biometrics (3)
	PLNT 540	Plant Molecular Biology Laboratory (3)
	SOIL 313	Soil Physics (3)
	SOIL 433	Soil and Water Conservation (3)
	SOIL 435	Soil Contamination and Remediation (3)
	SOIL 517	Land and Resource Evaluation (3)

Distance Ed. Options	Management/Economics Based Courses	
Note that ECON 100 – Principles of Economics (6) or the equivalent is a prerequisite to all of these courses.		
Yes	AGEC 201	Farm and Business Management I (3)
Yes	AGEC 258	Introduction to Agricultural Economics (3)
	AGEC 295	Managerial Economics (3)
	AGEC 302	Farm and Business Management II (3)
	AGEC 306	Agricultural Market Organization (3)
	AGEC 340	International Development (3)
	AGEC 361	Linear Programming in Agriculture (3)
	AGEC 374	Land Economics (3)
	AGEC 407	Agricultural Market Prices (3)
	AGEC 420	Agricultural Policy (3)
	AGEC 430	Directed Studies (2-6)

Dr. Vanderstoep
Dean Goldberg } *That Senate approve the proposed Diploma Program in Management of Aquaculture Systems.*

Dr. Vanderstoep, Chair of the committee, spoke briefly to the report, which had been circulated for information, noting the uniqueness of a UBC Diploma program involving two post-secondary educational institutions. Extensive consultation had taken place, both within and outside the University, with a strong indication of support for the program from the client community.

The motion was put and carried.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Student Membership on Senate Committees

The following report of students nominated to fill vacancies on Senate committees had been distributed.

Academic Building Needs:

Mr. Sam Arnold	-	replacing Mr. J. A. King
Mr. David Khan	-	replacing Mr. K. R. MacLaren

Academic Policy:

Mr. Sam Arnold	-	replacing Ms. S. Chan
Mr. David Shu	-	replacing Ms. S. Y. Dawood

Admissions:

Mr. Chris Lim	-	continuing member
Mr. Trevor Presley	-	Mr. A. A. Raghavji

Agenda:

Mr. Tim Lau	-	replacing Ms. S. Y. Dawood
vacancy	-	replacing Mr. B. B. Telford

Appeals on Academic Standing:

Mr. James Boritz	-	replacing Mr. J. A. King
Mr. Brian Goehring	-	continuing member
Mr. Tim Lau	-	replacing Mr. D. B. Preikshot

Budget:

Mr. Brian Goehring	-	continuing member
Mr. Hugh Leung	-	replacing Mr. E. C. H. Woo

Continuing Studies:

Mr. Tim Lau	-	replacing Mr. K. A. Douglas
Mr. Willem Maas	-	replacing Mr. A. G. Heys

Curriculum:

Mr. Andrew Lau	-	replacing Mr. K. A. Douglas
vacancy	-	replacing Mr. K. R. MacLaren
vacancy	-	replacing Mr. D. B. Preikshot
vacancy	-	replacing Mr. S. C. S. Tam

Elections:

Mr. Emile Woo	-	replacing Mr. J. A. King

Liaison with Post-Secondary Institutions:

Mr. Chris Lim	-	replacing Ms. L. Chui

Library:

Mr. Jim Boritz	-	continuing member
Ms. Lica Chui	-	replacing Mr. A. G. Heys
Mr. Hugh Leung	-	continuing member

Nominating:

Ms. Linda Lam	-	replacing Mr. A. A. Raghavji
Mr. Emile Woo	-	continuing member

Student Appeals on Academic Discipline:

Mr. James Boritz	-	continuing member
Mr. Hugh Leung	-	continuing member
Mr. Chris Lim	-	continuing member

Student Awards:

Ms. Linda Lam	-	replacing Mr. P. G. Chan
Mr. David Shu	-	replacing Mr. B. B. Telford

Tributes:

Ms. Lica Chui	-	replacing Mr. H. H. F. Leung
Mr. Brian Goehring	-	continuing member

University Organization:

Ms. Lica Chui	-	continuing member
Mr. David Khan	-	replacing Mr. K. A. Douglas

Review Teaching Evaluation:

Mr. Andrew Lau	-	replacing Ms. S. Chan
Mr. Trevor Presley	-	Mr. S. C. S. Tam

Dr. Williams, Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, reported that Ms. Linda Lam and Mr. Emile Woo had been nominated to fill two student vacancies. There were no further nominations.

Dr. Williams
Dr. Kelsey } *That nominations be closed.*

Carried.

Dr. Williams
Mr. Maas } *That Senate approve the student nominations for Senate Committees.*

Carried.

Quorums for Senate Committees

The following recommended quorums of the Senate committees had been circulated.

Committee	Elected Membership	Ex-officio Membership	Recommended Quorum
Academic Building Needs	8	4	6 voting
Academic Policy	13	4	9 voting
Admissions	9	7	5 voting
Agenda	7	3	3 voting
Academic Standing	11	3	5 voting
Budget	12	4	6 voting
Continuing Studies	12	7	8 voting
Curriculum	13	16	8 voting
Elections	4	3	No recommendation
Liaison with Post-Secondary Inst.	10	4	7 voting
Library	13	6	Simple majority of elected members
Nominating	10	3	7 voting
Student Appeals on Academic Discipline	11	2	6 voting
Student Awards	10	4	4 voting
Tributes	13	4	12 voting
Ad Hoc on University Organization	11	6	8 voting
Ad Hoc to Review Teaching Evaluation	7	3	No recommendation

Dr. Williams informed Senate that *Roberts Rules of Order* would apply for the two committees for which there are no recommendations. The term "voting" was used because each committee agrees which are the voting members. The only exception is the Library Committee, with a simple majority of the elected members.

Dr. Williams
Dr. Will } *The Nominating Committee recommends adoption of the quorums as put forward by the various Senate Committees.*

Speaking on behalf of the students, Mr. Lim expressed concern over the low quorums set for the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing and the Senate Admissions Committee. Recognizing the problem that exists in acquiring a quorum during the summer, Mr. Lim emphasized that it is the responsibility of committee members to make themselves available. Mr. Lim requested that consideration be given to scheduling the appeal committee meetings at times convenient for students who work during the summer.

Referring to the Senate Admissions Committee, Dr. Will stated that while a quorum of 5 is not difficult to obtain in the winter, it is problematic in July and August. Although reference to a quorum could not be found in previous minutes, the committee had been operating for years on the assumption that the quorum was 5.

Dr. MacDougall referred to the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing noting that one of the main concerns of the committee is to dispose of the appeals promptly as frequently a student's future rests on the decision. He stated that it is often difficult to obtain a quorum of 5 and it would be even more difficult if that figure was raised. The Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing quorum of 5 had been set out in the rules and procedures when the committee was established.

In amendment,

Mr. Lim
Seconded } *That the quorum for the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing be amended to 6 voting members rather than the current 5.*

Further discussion ensued over the difficulties that would be encountered if the quorum was raised to 6 voting members.

The motion, as amended, was put and defeated.

The original motion was put and carried.

MEMBERSHIP OF *AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON WITHDRAWAL FOR UNSATISFACTORY CONDUCT

Dr. Williams stated that at its meeting of April 19, 1995 Senate agreed to the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Committee on Withdrawal for Unsatisfactory Conduct. The following proposed membership of the *Ad Hoc* Committee had been circulated:

- Dr. D. R. Atkins
- Mr. J. Boritz
- Dean C. L. Smith
- Dr. L. J. Stan
- Dr. E. W. Whittaker

Dr. Williams
Dr. Marchak } *That the membership of the* Ad Hoc *Committee on Withdrawal for Unsatisfactory Conduct be approved.*

Carried.

TRIBUTES COMMITTEE

The President informed Senate that there would not be a report at the present time.

***AD HOC* COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION**

Dr. Shearer, Chair of the committee, presented the following report, which had been circulated:

Third Report

The Process of Institutional Reform - April 1995

I. THE COMMITTEE AND ITS MANDATE

The committee was established following a May 1993 resolution of Senate with terms of reference:

> *To examine and report on the administrative structure for the delivery of academic programs of the University and where appropriate recommend changes, with a view to improving efficiency and academic effectiveness, consistent with the pursuit of the University's goals and objectives and its Mission statement.*

In creating the committee Senate was responding to a recommendation of the Senate Budget Committee.

The terms of reference are broad and general. Senate did not give the committee a detailed list of specific institutional issues to be studied and reported upon. The issues that the committee explored are of the committee's own choosing.

This is the committee's third report. In Section II we review the work of the committee since it was established, including a summary of the main recommendations and the actions that have been taken on those recommendations. In Section III we discuss contemporary pressures for institutional reorganization at the University and the issues that arise in attempting to design and implement reform in an institution that has a tradition of a substantial degree of autonomy of departments and

faculties. Two aspects of the committee's original agenda remain incomplete. With the discussion of Section III as background, in Section IV we discuss the reasons for not completing this work, make some recommendations and respectfully request that the committee be discharged.

The recommendations in this report are summarized in Appendix A. The membership of the committee has changed somewhat in the two years of its existence. Those who have served on the committee, and the present membership, are listed in Appendix B. For information, the recommendations of the first and second reports are listed in Appendices C and D.

II. REVIEW OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

To date the committee has submitted two reports.

A. FIRST REPORT (MAY 1994)

The *first report* made three major recommendations: that there be a minimum size for academic departments; that certain University and Senate procedures be simplified; and that a task force be established to study and make recommendations on the organization of studies in natural resources at the University. The text of these recommendations, as amended and approved by Senate, are attached as Appendix C.

One of the recommendations (# 7) called for action by the Senate Curriculum Committee. A report from the Curriculum Committee was received by Senate at its November 1994 meeting, and proposed new curriculum revision procedures were approved. The other recommendations requested actions to be taken by the senior administration. In the case of matters that clearly fall within the mandate of Senate, the senior administration was asked to report back to Senate (by January 1995 with respect to the organization of studies in natural resources and December 1995 with respect to department size). With respect to items not clearly within the mandate of Senate, the recommendation was a request that the reforms be considered.

The committee recommends:

Recommendation 1

That Senate request a written report from the Vice President Academic and Provost at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to recommendation 6 of the First Report concerning administrative stipends and administrative leave graduated by department size.

Recommendation 2

That Senate request a written report from the President at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to recommendation 9 of the First Report concerning the constitution of the Senior Appointments Committee.

Recommendation 3:

That Senate request a written progress report from the Vice President Academic and Provost at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to recommendations 10-13 of the First Report concerning the administrative organization for programs in natural resources.

B. SECOND REPORT (JANUARY 1995)

The committee's *second report* was concerned with issues related to the centralization and decentralization of decision making and delivery of support services to academic units, faculty members and students. The central concerns were to increase the sensitivity of the delivery of services to students, faculty and academic units, to enhance the flexibility of the University in adapting to its stringent financial circumstances and a rapidly changing technological environment, and to review the institutional arrangements governing centralized service units that have monopoly power. Most of the recommendations were suggestions to the President (the matters in question are beyond the direct mandate of Senate), but the Senate Budget Committee was requested to study the issue of service units with monopoly power and to report to Senate by December 1995.

The recommendations of the Second Report, as amended and approved by Senate, are attached to this report as Appendix C. This report, with amendments, was approved at the Senate meeting of January 1995. It

is perhaps too early to expect a response from the senior administration. However, it is reasonable to expect such a response by early in the fall of 1995.

The committee recommends:

Recommendation 4

That Senate request a written progress report from the President at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to the recommendations of the Second Report concerning centralized services (Recommendations 1, 2 and 3), the control of working conditions (Recommendation 5) and the resource aspects of changes in the level of centralization of services (Recommendation 7).

This, our *Third Report*, has a different character and purpose than did the first two reports.

When the committee began its work, the first task was to decide on the questions to be studied and the order in which they would be considered. The questions addressed in the first two reports were at or near the top of the list of priorities. Two other questions that were relatively high on the priority list are the role of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and the administrative organization of studies in human health. As we continued our deliberations yet another question assumed importance, the number of faculties in the University and the rationale for wide discrepancies in the sizes of faculties. We discuss our consideration of the Faculty of Graduate Studies next; questions relating to studies in human health and faculty size are viewed as unfinished business and discussed in Section 4.

C. FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The Faculty of Graduate Studies at UBC has complex responsibilities that affect virtually all parts of the University. These include not only oversight and some important administrative responsibilities for all graduate programs, but also "budget faculty" responsibilities for the School of Community and Regional Planning, for several institutes and centres and specialized graduate programs and for Green College. The faculty also plays a primary, at times catalytic, role in the development and administration of graduate interdisciplinary programs and research at UBC. The Dean and Associate Deans of Graduate Studies also play

important advisory roles in many decision-making processes within the University, in the broader academic and scientific communities in Canada and internationally, and in government.

The matter before the committee was whether the organization of the University should include a Faculty of Graduate Studies and if so how broad the scope of its activities should be. Conceptually, the various functions could be performed in other ways, by other academic and administrative units, and different administrative arrangements exist at some other universities in North America. The questions raised included: would a different organization enhance or impair the academic effectiveness of graduate programs? increase or reduce administrative costs? enhance or impair the capacity of the University to innovate and to adapt to and study complex changes in society and technology?

While a review of the role of the Faculty of Graduate Studies ranked relatively high on the committee's early list of priorities, there was a division on the committee about the importance of studying this question. The committee met with the Dean of Graduate Studies and following this discussion decided not to pursue additional consultations or to consider the matter further. The committee makes no recommendations.

III. THE PROCESS OF INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

The work of the committee and the difficulties that we have encountered in pursuing all of the important questions on our preliminary agenda have heightened our awareness of the delicate problem of effecting institutional reform in a university of the size, complexity and academic stature of UBC. We are particularly concerned about the appropriate role of Senate and its committees in this process. Our concern with the question of process is further heightened by our perception of the urgency of reform.

A. THE CONTEXT OF INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

UBC has an enviable reputation for distinguished scholarly and applied research, high standards in graduate, professional and undergraduate education and dedicated public service. This reputation has not been achieved by accident. Excellence in teaching, research and public service rests on the quality, imagination, initiative and dedication of

individual faculty members who are supported in their pursuit and dissemination of knowledge by institutional protection of their academic freedom. To achieve and maintain a high degree of excellence in teaching, research and public service a university provides a substantial degree of autonomy to individual faculty members and to basic academic units (departments, schools, institutes, faculties, etc.,) in designing, developing and pursuing programs of research and teaching.

UBC has a long tradition of providing a great deal of independence to faculties and departments, while maintaining university-wide oversight of academic performance (through periodic reviews of departments and faculties, Faculty of Graduate Studies' monitoring of graduate programs, and departmental, faculty and university reviews of individual faculty members for tenure, promotion and merit salary awards). This structure of university governance has served us well and has contributed in no small measure to the development of the University as a distinguished centre for teaching, research and public service. It is important to society that the University's standards of performance not be impaired through ill-considered institutional reforms.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that important aspects of the world in which the University functions are changing and changing dramatically. First and most pressing is a change in the financial environment. The pressure of financial constraints is obvious to all concerned and we believe that it would be naive to assume that these constraints will be relaxed in the foreseeable future. It is important that we seek financial savings -- small and large -- in all possible ways that do not impair the quality and integrity of our strong academic programs and our capacity to innovate. As part of this, we must seek savings from the rationalization of our administrative structure at all levels.

Associated with intensified financial constraints are increasing external demands for "accountability" and responsiveness to changing social priorities. In considering these pressures we must not forget that while we are an autonomous "private" corporation, we are also a provincial university with all that implies for service to the society of the province. One of the objectives of administrative reform should be to design effective and economical methods of responding sensitively to the changing needs and preferences of the community to which we belong.

Equally profound is the acceleration of technical change affecting both the style and cost of research and methods of instruction and the increased emphasis on multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary teaching and research in both academic and professional fields. Methods must be found to facilitate the sharing of expensive research facilities when practical and to adapt to the pressures and opportunities of technological change and interdisciplinarity. There are many important examples of such adaptation at UBC. Reform of our administrative structure should be designed to enhance such activities.

There have also been important changes in the provincial network of post-secondary educational institutions: some colleges have degree programs, a new university has been established, and a new technical institution is planned. In part this expansion of the post-secondary education system intensifies the competition for the restricted budget for post-secondary education; in part it provides new options for students and new possibilities for inter-institutional specialization and cooperation. These are developments that must be taken into consideration in planning institutional changes at UBC. Opportunities exist for cooperating with other provincial institutions in order to minimize unnecessary duplication while enhancing UBC's distinctive role within the provincial higher education system.

It is the considered opinion of the committee that these emerging realities make urgent the consideration of institutional reorganization at UBC. We have made a number of recommendations in our two previous reports for the reform of administrative arrangements in the University. Some of these involve major changes; some relatively minor. There are undoubtedly many other changes that would facilitate the transition of the University to the 21st century. Institutional reform will be an ongoing process. An important question is the role of Senate in this process.

B. THE ROLE OF SENATE IN INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

As we have already noted, the committee has been unable to complete its study of all of the items on its preliminary agenda let alone all of the issues that could have been considered. The task assigned to the committee proved to be too large, well beyond the time and energy that committee members could devote to it. Given our assessment of the importance of institutional reform, this is a serious concern.

With this in mind, we are led to consider fundamental questions about the process of institutional reform. How should large scale administrative reorganization be pursued in an institution with important traditions of autonomy for basic academic units? In such a context does institutional change have to be consensual? If so, consent at what level and by whom (individuals? departments? faculties? Senate?) and for what kinds of changes?

The principle that institutional change must be consensual makes the process of institutional reform slow and difficult. There is a natural tendency to protect the familiar administrative structures with which we have become comfortable; and there is a natural tendency in evaluating proposed reorganizations to minimize the benefits and emphasize the perceived problems with alternatives. At a minimum, determined opposition from departments or faculties that goes beyond careful consideration of the implications for research and academic programs may seriously distort or prevent desirable reorganizations. The danger inherent in a requirement of consensus is institutional inertia -- perhaps institutional paralysis -- manifest as an unwillingness to give rational consideration to alternative administrative structures.

On the other hand, there are acute dangers in centralized decision making that forces change on academic units. It is not obvious that the senior administration will understand and give appropriate weight to all of the complex and subtle issues that can arise in changing the administrative arrangements for departments, schools, institutes and faculties. It is important that institutional reform not impair the academic freedom and creativity of faculty members in designing, developing and pursuing programs of research and teaching. It is also important that there be a substantial degree of acceptance of institutional changes to avoid disruptions to teaching and research. A substantial degree of compatibility and harmony among colleagues is important for a productive academic environment and is in the best interests of students.

It is important to find a process of institutional reform that avoids the twin perils of institutional paralysis and unproductive disruption. This suggests an important role for Senate as a largely elected, broadly representative academic governance body. However, our experience suggests that there are difficulties in Senate's fulfilling this role.

As the body responsible for academic governance, Senate has a legislated responsibility to make recommendations to the Board of Governors on "the establishment or discontinuance of any faculty, department, course of study, ...(etc.)...," and on anything "considered advisable for promoting the interests of the university." How should Senate carry out this mandate?

There are two opposing principles:

- Senate should *receive proposals* from faculties and the administration, and after appropriate consultation, careful review and deliberation make recommendations.
- Senate should *initiate proposals* and after appropriate consultation, careful review and deliberation make recommendations.

In most of its business, Senate is guided by the first principle. It acts primarily as a forum for review, reaction and recommendation. In establishing the *Ad Hoc* Committee on University Organization, however, Senate acted on the second principle. It sought to take the initiative in administrative reorganization within the University. We can find no reason why initiation of institutional change by Senate is inappropriate. The experience of the committee, however, suggests that there are severe limits to what is feasible.

The issues before a committee like this one are fundamental, yet very broad, potentially affecting the working environments for many faculty members and the programs of many students. The analysis of such a committee should not be superficial. However, there are at least two obstacles to careful review of the broad-ranging issues of institutional reform by a Senate Committee. On the one hand is the lack of adequate research, secretarial and administrative support. While the Office of Budget and Planning is very helpful in supplying important information, the requirements of such a committee go well beyond the assistance that this office is able to provide. On the other hand, any Senate committee is comprised of faculty, student and convocation senators each of whom has other demanding responsibilities. The time and energy required for appropriate wide-spread consultation, analysis and deliberation on a broad range of major administrative reorganizations is well beyond what can reasonably be expected of a committee of "part-timers."

Moreover, such a committee can only be effective in its activities if it is perceived to have the support and backing of the senior administration of the University -- if it is a body whose findings will be taken seriously by all concerned. That is not to say that the senior administration must give the committee a blank cheque to make proposals which, if approved by Senate, will necessarily be supported by the administration in recommendations to the Board of Governors. To do so would be a dereliction of its responsibilities. The point is that the conceptualization, investigation, analysis and implementation of administrative reforms requires close cooperation between Senate and the senior administration of the University, and should be seen to involve such cooperation.

A broadly based Senate committee can be an important participant in the early stages of administrative reform, identifying possible consolidations and reorganizations. But it is unlikely to have the comprehensive perspective on such institutional problems and possibilities that is possessed by the senior administration. The detailed investigation of possible institutional reorganizations should be undertaken by specialized task forces, so constituted as to include people with appropriate specialized knowledge as well as senior members of the University community with a broad understanding of the functioning of the University and an appreciation of the relevance of structural change for diverse parts of the University. A task force might include senators, but not be restricted to senators. It might also include specialists from outside the University when this seems appropriate. The constitution of a task force should be in the hands of the President or Vice President Academic and Provost, but with reasonable consultation with the Senate Nominating Committee. Any such task force should have appropriate staff support and, as necessary, the financial resources to obtain relevant information and expert testimony. The report of any such task force should go to Senate as well as the President, for review and recommendation, before going to the Board of Governors for decisions and, if appropriate, implementation.

When such a task force is created, the primary role of Senate should be that of a forum for the receipt of proposals, their careful review and the formation of recommendations to the Board of Governors. It is in this

spirit that the committee makes recommendations on the two items, the study of which we have been unable to complete.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

For reasons set out in the previous section of this report, the committee has been unable to conclude its studies of the appropriate administrative structure for studies in human health and disparities in the sizes of faculties.

A. PROGRAMS IN HUMAN HEALTH

The Faculty of Medicine is by a considerable margin the largest, most complex and powerful of the various units engaged in the study of human health at UBC. There are separate and (in terms of full-time equivalent faculty members and full-time equivalent students) very small Faculties of Dentistry and Pharmaceutical Sciences. In addition, there are a number of schools, departments and programs that in varying degrees are involved in teaching, research and professional activity in human health. These units are located in other faculties, including in the case of Nursing a faculty whose primary academic activities are remote (but not entirely divorced) from the study of human health. The Office of the Health Sciences Coordinator and the Health Sciences Coordinating Committee provide forums for the consideration of issues of mutual interest to the academic units involved in the study of human health, for the promotion of interdisciplinary research and teaching, and for the creation and management of some shared services.

From the outset the committee has been concerned that this fragmented organization of programs in human health may not be optimal for the training of health professionals for the 21st century, particularly with the increasing emphasis on community-based interdisciplinary decision-making and treatment teams. We considered this an important question. However, in our preliminary consultations we were told by many that the organization of health sciences at UBC is not a problem and that feasible reorganizations would not result in financial savings and would not improve academic effectiveness. Considerable emphasis was placed on the role of the Coordinator of Health Sciences in promoting interdisciplinary cooperation.

The committee is not convinced by these assertions. We are concerned that relatively informal coordinating procedures through the Health

Sciences Coordinator and the Health Sciences Coordinating Committee may not be the most effective long term solution to the ongoing problems of coordination, integration, cooperation and change. While reason and goodwill can accomplish much, the Office and the Committee lack the independent financial resources and the institutionalized "clout" that may be necessary to persuade faculties, schools and departments to make adjustments in programs and administrative arrangements. In any case, the status and organizational home of the School of Nursing is a question that should be addressed in the near future.

The committee is of the opinion that the administrative organization of studies in human health is an important question that should be carefully explored. However, it is also a very large and complex question. The committee is well aware that apparently simple answers can contain deadly traps. After some preliminary investigations, it became apparent that a thorough analysis is well beyond the time and energy that the committee members have available.

We are concerned, however, that the question not be dropped. We therefore recommend:

Recommendation 5

That the Vice-President Academic and Provost be requested to establish by September 1995 a task force, with appropriate staff support and financial resources, to examine the administrative organization of studies in human health at the University of British Columbia and to make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Vice-President Academic and Provost and to Senate by December 1996.

B. FACULTY SIZE

The number and wide disparity of` sizes of faculties are matters of concern to the committee. We suspect that there are cost implications from unnecessary duplication of administrative officers, offices, services and small enrollment courses, and we are concerned that the existence of so many faculties creates or reinforces unnecessary barriers for students in designing their programs. On another level, we are also concerned about the significant imbalances in representation of different disciplines in central university forums (Senate; Committee of Deans). Some of these issues were considered in the first report of the

committee, and they were discussed more fully in the April 1993 report of the Senate Academic Policy Committee on "Guidelines for the Establishment of a Faculty," which was attached as an appendix to the first report of this committee.

We have been told that in the Committee of Deans decisions are not necessarily taken by formal votes. We have also been told that what is important is the cogency of the arguments advanced and that voiced opinions are implicitly weighed by the size of the faculty involved. Nonetheless, we persist in thinking that the number of voices with a related message or perspective can have an important effect on the outcome of deliberations. It has been suggested that the proportion of "science based" vs. "arts based" voices is important in this regard, and possibly the proportion of "professional" vs. "academic" voices. In Senate, of course, formal votes are taken so imbalances in representation can be directly translated into decisions (although, it should be noted that there is a tendency for the "at large" representatives to be elected from the large faculties, partially offsetting the relatively heavy representation from small faculties). The representation of faculties on Senate is prescribed in the University Act.

Questions related to the number and relative sizes of faculties intersect with other issues considered by the committee and by Senate, including the administrative organization of studies in natural resources and human health. We presume that the academic, administrative, and financial implications of faculty size and the broader implications of fragmentation into separate faculties will be given due consideration by the task force that Senate has requested be created to examine the administrative organization of studies in natural resources and, if our recommendation 5 is accepted, by the task force on administrative organization of studies in human health. However, these issues have broader ramifications which should be given careful consideration.

Therefore the committee recommends:

Recommendation 6

That the Vice-President Academic and Provost be requested to establish by September 1995 a task force, with appropriate staff support and financial resources, to consider the number and relative sizes of faculties in the University of British Columbia and to make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Vice-President Academic and Provost and to Senate no later than December 1996.

In our first report, the committee considered the question of administrative stipends and administrative leave provisions for heads of departments of widely disparate sizes. Our recommendation that these stipends and leave provisions be graduated depending on department size was approved by Senate, for consideration by the President. Given wide disparities in the size and complexity of faculties the committee is also concerned about University policy that provides the same administrative stipend and administrative leave for all Deans. We do not regard this as appropriate.

The committee recommends

Recommendation 7

That Senate request the Vice-President Academic and Provost to reconsider the policy on administrative stipends and administrative leave for Deans with the objective of having administrative stipends and administrative leave provisions that are graduated according to the size and complexity of the faculty

V. CONCLUDING NOTE

The committee has found its work over almost two years to be intensely interesting. Part of the interest has been in the alternation of exhilaration and frustration, of action and impasse. In a number of areas we consider that we have played a useful catalytic role in the development of people's thinking about change in the way our university is organized. We also consider, however, that, for the reasons sketched in this report, we have reached a point beyond which our committee is no longer the most useful instrument for dealing with the issues which the university faces. Our preceding recommendations urge the continuation of productive thinking about change. Our final recommendation, consistent with *ad hoc* nature of the committees, is:

Recommendation 8.

That the committee be discharged.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE THIRD REPORT

Recommendation 1

That Senate request a written report from the Vice President Academic and Provost at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to recommendation 6 of the First Report concerning administrative stipends and administrative leave graduated by department size.

Recommendation 2

That Senate request a written report from the President at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to recommendation 9 of the First Report concerning the constitution of the Senior Appointments Committee.

Recommendation 3:

That Senate request a written progress report from the Vice President Academic and Provost at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to recommendations 10-13 of the First Report concerning the administrative organization for programs in natural resources.

Recommendation 4

That Senate request a written progress report from the President at the September 1995 meeting of Senate on the administration's response to the recommendations of the Second Report concerning centralized services (Recommendations 1, 2 and 3), the control of working conditions (Recommendation 5) and the resource aspects of changes in the level of centralization of services (Recommendation 7).

Recommendation 5.

That the Vice-President Academic and Provost be requested to establish by September 1995 a task force, with appropriate staff support and financial resources, to examine the administrative

organization of studies in human health at the University of British Columbia and to make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Vice-President Academic and Provost and to Senate by December 1996.

Recommendation 6

That the Vice-President Academic and Provost be requested to establish by September 1995 a task force, with appropriate staff support and financial resources, to consider the number and relative sizes of faculties in the University of British Columbia and to make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Vice-President Academic and Provost and to Senate no later than December 1996

Recommendation 7

That Senate request the Vice-President Academic and Provost to reconsider the policy on administrative stipends and administrative leave for Deans with the objective of having administrative stipends and administrative leave provisions that are graduated according to the size and complexity of the faculty.

Recommendation 8.

That the committee be discharged.

APPENDIX B

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION.

A. Current Members

- D. R. Birch
- D. G. A. Carter
- L. Chui R.
- K. Douglas
- S. E. Grace
- M. Isaacson
- J. G. T. Kelsey
- M. I. MacEntee
- R. T. A.MacGillivray
- D. J. Randall
- A. Shearer (Chair)
- S. Thorne
- W. A. Wehrung
- D. Ll. Williams

B. Previous Members (not currently serving)

- G. W. Eaton
- C.L. Greentree
- B. Horner
- R. Tees

C. Ex Officio Members Who Did Not Participate in the Deliberations of the Committee

- R.H. Lee (Chancellor
- D.W. Strangway (President)
- R.A. Spencer (Registrar)

APPENDIX C

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FIRST REPORT

(as amended and approved by Senate at its meeting of May 18, 1994)

With respect to department size:

1. Senate establish a minimum size for departments, schools and divisions that have department-like responsibilities.
2. The minimum size for departments, schools and divisions be 15 full-time faculty members in the department.
3. Deans be asked to arrange for consolidations of relevant departments, schools and divisions to conform with the minimum size and to report regularly to the Vice President Academic and Provost on progress. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to report to Senate on the results of these reconfigurations by December 1995.
4. Exceptions to the minimum size should be rare, be permitted only on the basis of special circumstances which must be made explicit.
5. All exceptions to the minimum size approved by the Vice President Academic and Provost, be reported to Senate.
6. Provisions for administrative stipends and administrative leave for department heads be graduated depending on department size.

With respect to University and Senate procedures:

7. The Senate Curriculum Committee be instructed to study the process of curriculum revision and to bring recommendations to the Senate not later than November 1994 for the simplification of the process.
8. As guidelines, the Senate Curriculum Committee be invited to
    a. Establish a broad category of minor changes that can be made by departments, schools or non-departmentalized faculties

without further consultation except notification of the appropriate curriculum review officer (who might be the Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee), who will be responsible for ensuring that the change is indeed "minor" and that no other academic program is likely to be adversely affected. This category might include, at a minimum, changes in course numbers, course names, prerequisite requirements and editorial changes in course descriptions.

b. Establish a narrow category of major changes that require consultation and full review by faculties and the Senate. This category might include new programs, new courses, deletion of courses and changes that affect requirements for student programs in other departments.

c. Consider the possibility that proposals for major changes in graduate courses and programs go directly to the Faculty of Graduate Studies from departments, schools and non-departmentalized faculties for full review before being sent to Senate for review and approval.

9. Senate ask the President to review the constitution of the Senior Appointments Committee, with a view to removing Deans from that committee and with a view to strengthening its ability to represent high university-wide standards of excellence and objectivity.

With respect to teaching and research in natural resources:

10. Senate endorse the idea of a reconfiguration of some existing faculties and other academic units to develop and intensify the University's commitment to teaching and research relating to natural resources and the natural environment.

11. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to establish a task force to develop plans for the achievement of this end.

12. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to submit a progress report to Senate no later than January 1995.

13. The task force proposed in Recommendation 11 above be asked to consider the proposed merger of the departments of Geography

and Soil Science in the context of their deliberations on the reconfiguration of teaching and research on natural resources.

APPENDIX D

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SECOND REPORT, CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION

(as amended and approved by Senate at its meeting January 18, 1995.)

4.1 Centralized Services: Cost Minimization and Responsiveness

Recommendation 1. That Senate request the President to ensure that the mandates of all centralized service units explicitly recognize the twin needs of cost minimization and responsiveness to academic departments and other users.

Recommendation 2. That Senate request the President to require all centralized service units have a formal mechanism for regularly assessing their performance, including the extent to which they are satisfying the legitimate needs of academic departments, individual faculty members and students. In some cases this may be achieved with an advisory committee, but other mechanisms may be appropriate in other cases. Whatever the format, consultation with appropriate parts of the academic community should be required. The nature of the mechanism and changes in it should be reported to the Senate Budget Committee for review and comment, and the substance of evaluations and responses to them should be included in the unit's section of the annual Budget and Planning Narrative.

Recommendation 3. That Senate request the President to require periodic reviews of all centralized units with a view not only to minimizing costs but also to enhancing responsiveness with which services are provided to the academic departments, individual faculty members and students, and that a summary and a copy of the recommendations of each review together with the administrators' responses to them (excluding confidential personnel material) be sent to the Senate Budget Committee.

4.2 Monopolistic Services and Charges

Recommendation 4. That the Senate Budget Committee be requested to study those centralized units which enjoy full or partial monopoly status on the campus, particularly ancillary units, and to bring recommendations to Senate and to the President not later than the December 1995 meeting of Senate, on a mechanism to ensure that each such unit defines its service in relation to the academic community's needs, provides that service to a standard which meets or exceeds that found in the competitive marketplace, and justifies its operating costs and scale of charges in relation to the fair market value found in the Greater Vancouver area.

4.3 Control of Working Conditions

Recommendation 5. That Senate recommend to the President and the employee groups that they jointly undertake a serious review of the contract provisions which are the basis for regulating work and working conditions at the University, and that this review focus on the need to provide for the improved administrative efficiency of academic units and for a degree of flexibility which permits innovation and timely response to change in academic units with the goal of serving the University's academic needs in the best possible way.

4.4 Intermediate Levels of Centralization

Recommendation 6. That deans (i) move some administrative functions from the department level to the faculty level if this would improve administrative efficiency; and (ii) where there is no faculty-level provision of functions which need to be performed in several departments, the deans request heads to consider the possibility of pooling resources and operating shared services.

4.5 Resource Aspects of Centralization Level Changes

Recommendation 7. That administrators who intend to devolve any function to other units ensure (i) that the proposal be assessed, in consultation with the units affected, for its impact on the academic work of those units; and (ii) that any such devolution be

accompanied where necessary by a budget transfer sufficient to offset its effect on the units' academic functioning.

Dr. Shearer thanked the members of the committee on behalf of the Senate for their hard work, stressing the fact that "the members have done most of the work."

Dr. Shearer spoke briefly to the report stating that much of it is concerned with the process for institutional reform.

Dr. Shearer
Dr. Carter } *That recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4 be adopted.*

Carried.

Dr. Shearer reiterated points made in the report stressing the importance of institutional reorganization and that the increasing emphasis the province is placing on community-based health teams perhaps should be reflected at UBC. The committee, however, did not have the time, resources or technical expertise to explore the issue of human health properly.

Dr. Shearer
Dr. MacEntee } *That recommendation 5 be adopted.*

Dean Hollenberg indicated that he was of two minds regarding the motion and he agreed that the Coordinator of Health Sciences is not yet a strong cohesive force working to integrate fully the Health Sciences and that it should be examined, but thought it would be wise to wait for a couple of years before instituting the task force in order to allow some of the uncertainty to settle down. Concern over the teaching units in the Health Sciences hospitals given the major

hospital reorganization now under way, the development of the new curriculum in medicine, uncertainty in the research organizations and searches for new Deans while the Health Sciences are in a state of flux were noted as some of the reasons for delaying the implementation of a task force.

Dean Meisen agreed that this was an important issue, but would like to see a general examination, one not limited to the items of concern mentioned by Dr. Hollenberg. Dean Meisen suggested that the Vice President Academic and Provost be requested to define clearly the terms of reference of this committee and to lay out a reporting schedule which would result in a preliminary report. Based on the preliminary report, a decision could be made on whether a further detailed report would be valuable.

Dean Yen stated that if we were to leap into this right now the committee would be chasing a moving target. He felt it would be wise to wait until the dust has settled and the government and the public policy on health care is in order before embarking on a task of this magnitude.

Dr. Carter's feeling was that the university should be proactive in addressing the inevitable changes in health care. He felt is important that we look concurrently with the externally imposed changes and how we can best react to them within the university.

Dr. Birch expressed concern that the argument suggesting the university wait until the dust settles in the public sector does not reflect accurately the present situation. He stated that the university is very much an integral part of public

policy debate and has "a set of dynamic responses that are taking place and are reflected in curricular revision, in pedagogical revision, and in collaboration across faculties and schools."

The motion was put and carried.

Dr. Shearer stated that the issue of wide disparities in the sizes of faculties had been raised in the first report but was one which the committee was unable to resolve. The issues of cost implications and/or "economies of scale" had been considered. There was also concern over inequitable representation of different parts of the University in forums such as Senate and the Committee of Deans. Representation on the Senate is straightforward as it is specified in the University Act.

Dr. Shearer
Dr. Carter } *That the Vice-President Academic and Provost be requested to establish by September 1995 a task force, with appropriate staff support and financial resources, to consider the number and relative sizes of faculties in the University of British Columbia and to make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Vice-President Academic and Provost and to Senate no later than December 1996.*

It was pointed out that almost 30 years ago a similar motion resulted in a visionary report titled "The President's Report on the Reorganization of the University" which recommended changing the organization of the faculties and departments as they existed at that time.

The motion was put and carried.

Dr. Shearer
Dr. Carter } *That Senate request the Vice-President Academic and Provost to reconsider the policy on administrative stipends and administrative leave for Deans with the objective of having administrative stipends and administrative leave provisions that are graduated according to the size and complexity of the faculty.*

The motion was put and carried.

Dr. Shearer
Dr. Slonecker } *That the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on University Organization be discharged.*

Dean Marchak pointed out that the Faculty of Arts had taken the committee's first report very seriously. The ongoing process of trying to meet the recommendations has had a profound impact on the faculty; it has not been easy for anyone and has involved "far reaching discussions, a lot of anger, and a lot of frustration." Dean Marchak expressed concern that Senate has not been fully aware of the gravity of the motions that it has passed in terms of the impact. She also observed that support mechanisms for those who are required to implement those decisions should be provided. Deans of large faculties with departments were faced with a particularly complex task. Before the committee is disbanded, consideration should be given to creating a process of decision-making that fully engages the university in the debate so that the issues are known and public, and don't come out of the blue from the Senate, the Deans or from the Vice Presidents and President.

Dr. Birch expressed thanks and appreciation to the Committee for their hard work.

The motion was put and carried.

Faculty of Arts

ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR AND SYNTAX IN STUDENT WRITING

At a meeting of the Faculty of Arts held on February 21, 1995 the following motion was approved:

> *"That in all courses taught in English in the Faculty of Arts, students' written work be evaluated in part on grammatical and syntactical correctness."*
>
> Rationale:
>
> It is the obligation of the Faculty of Arts to ensure that its students are able to write grammatical English sentences. The writing of English cannot be the sole responsibility of the English Department. Unless the level of accomplishment achieved in first year English is reinforced by the continued demand that students write correct English sentences, the ability of some students to do so can and will deteriorate. It is assumed that errors in composition, as distinct from grammar and syntax, are already included in the assessment of essays. Errors such as lack of agreement, wrong tenses, mixed constructions, and faulty references work against the implicit contract between writer and reader that the writer will minimize such potential obstacles to ease reading and comprehensibility. Finally, it does the reputation of the Faculty harm if its graduates are unable to write proper English sentences.

Dean Marchak stated that the Faculty of Arts was concerned with how issues are phrased as well as with their content." Students should be writing essays and should be evaluated on the basis of their communication skills in all courses in

the Faculty of Arts which are taught in the English language. This would not be imposed on courses which are taught in other languages or courses with no essay component. Students in other faculties also would be affected, but only in Arts courses. Other faculties are encouraged to take similar measures. Dean Marchak emphasized that completion of first year English is insufficient for sustaining communication skills.

Dean Marchak
Dr. Coope
} *That in all courses taught in the English language in the Faculty of Arts, student's' written work be evaluated in part on grammatical and syntactical correctness.*

Dr. Kelsey's opinion was that if we are taking the evaluation of teaching seriously, there should be a connection between what is taught and what is evaluated. Not all courses taught in English in the Faculty of Arts aim to teach grammar and syntax. His preference would be to see a statement of an expectation that in these courses grammar and syntax would be correct

Dr. Will spoke in support of the motion, but anticipated that there would be operational problems. Noting that one of the ways to improve the writing of students is to have the students write a lot of essays and that the number of courses with written work today is much smaller than five years ago, he suggested that a motion be made to increase the number of courses requiring written work. Dr. Will noted that some universities in Ontario require students to take a certain number of courses with an essay component. This has the effect of encouraging the number of courses requiring essays. In Dr. Will's opinion, the motion does not require Senate approval.

Dr. Carter strongly endorsed the motion but was concerned that it is restricted to the Faculty of Arts. While wanting to encourage other faculties requiring written expression to consider both content and grammar as part of the assessment process, he recognized the significant resource implications.

Dr. Shearer urged the Faculty of Arts to give this issue more consideration. He drew attention to the practice of some students, for whom English is not their mother tongue, to either seek editorial assistance with their papers or face the possibility of failing, despite making a very good effort in writing a large essay.

Dean Marchak stated that this issue had been debated at length and that one of the major reasons for putting this motion forward was to provide support to teachers of philosophy, anthropology, classics, etc., who are faced with students who maintain that marks cannot be deducted for grammatical errors because the subject is not English.

Following further discussion, the motion was put and carried.

Faculty of Graduate Studies

PROPOSED CALENDAR CHANGES - DOCTORAL RESIDENCY

Dean Grace presented the the following proposed Calendar changes which had been circulated.

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the present regulations governing doctoral residency be changed so as to:

a) replace the requirement for two years of residency on campus (three for those without a Master's degree) with a normal expectation of two years of full time study, and

b) make it possible for departments to make program regulations different from the norm,

c) a re-ordering of the clauses in section B of page 222 of the Calendar to make a more logical sequence than is presently found there.

One change to the Policy and Procedures Manual is also proposed.

Rationale

Residency requirements as presently stated are defined in terms of three elements. These are (a) a minimum time (three academic years, or two for people admitted with a Master's degree), (b) full time status, and (c) location ("at the University").

The nature of scholarship has changed very much in many fields over the last few decades. The revolution in information transfer, the advent of computing facilities and the ease of travel have had marked effects on the nature and definition of a university. While the university continues primarily to be thought of as being the UBC campus, it can no longer be defined solely as being in a specific place. The graduate programs within the university show great diversity and this diversity is to be encouraged. It includes the blurring of former distinctions between "study" and "work" in some fields.

A situation has evolved where one of the university's means of trying to ensure the best possible quality of graduate education (i.e., the requiring of residency) is (a) no longer fully in tune with the legitimate diversity in the modern world of scholarship, and (b) unenforceable at the institutional level. While it is useful to state a normal expectation for full time study on campus, it is necessary now to recognize that there may be legitimate departures from that norm and to allow different decisions about student programming to be made at the level of the academic unit which is best able both to judge the most appropriate form of "residency" and to enforce its observation.

The proposed new calendar entry is as follows:

B) Program of Study

1. The work of each candidate will be supervised by a Candidate's Committee consisting of not fewer than three members; these may include faculty members from a department other than that in which the candidate is writing the thesis. Changes may be made to the membership of the Candidate's Committee subject to the approval of the major department and the Dean of the faculty of Graduate Studies.
2. Upon registration, the student will consult the Candidate's Committee to develop a program of studies, which is then reviewed and approved by the department concerned. The program of studies will consist of seminars, directed readings, consultations, and such formal courses as may be deemed essential for the fulfilment of the requirements for the degree. Some departments require competence in languages other than English. The department in which the student intends to write the thesis shall determine the number of such languages and the level of competence necessary in each. A major part of the candidate's work will consist of a thesis embodying the results of original research.
3. Changes in the program of study may be required during the study period; these must be reviewed and approved by the Candidate's Committee, the major department and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies.
4. The progress of all students working for the Ph.D., D.M.A. and Ed.D. degrees will be reviewed from time to time and at least once a year in the spring by the department concerned and by the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. A candidate may be required to withdraw if progress has not been satisfactory as shown by course work, the comprehensive examination, progress on the thesis, or other requirements of the Department or the faculty of Graduate Studies.
5. Students normally will be Admitted to Candidacy when they have completed all required course work, and passed the comprehensive examination and their research supervisor has certified that their thesis proposal has been approved.

6. It is normally expected that students admitted with a Bachelor's degree will spend at least three sessions (each of uninterrupted duration of at least eight months) in full time study at the University. For students admitted with a Master's degree, this expectation is for a minimum of two sessions in full time study at the University. Departments, with the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies, may make different regulations concerning the duration, sequencing and location of full time study.
7. Duration of Program
    a. Students must maintain continuous registration throughout all years until graduation by keeping up with fee payments.
    b. If the degree is not awarded within a period of six years from initial registration, the student's candidacy will be terminated and the student will be required to withdraw from the program. Extension of candidacy will be granted under exceptional circumstances.
    c. For provisions regarding on-leave status, see "Graduate Student Status" in this section.

p.222, col. 3 - p. 223, col. 1

Graduate Student Status

1) Full-time Graduate Student. paragraph 3

Under special circumstances a full-time student may be required to conduct research at some location away from this campus.

delete paragraph 4

2) Part-Time Graduate Student . . .(clause continues unchanged)

Dean Grace spoke briefly to the proposal drawing attention to paragraph 6 which comprises the core of the changes.

Dean Grace
Dr. Kelsey
} *That the proposed Calendar changes in the Doctoral Residency, Faculty of Graduate Studies, be approved.*

Carried.

RENAMING OF CENTRE FOR SOUTH ASIAN RESEARCH, UNDER THE INSTITUTE OF ASIAN RESEARCH, TO THE CENTRE FOR INDIA AND SOUTH ASIA RESEARCH

A letter from Dr. Mark Fruin, Institute of Asian Research and Dr. John Wood, Chair, Centre for South Asian Research, recommending the re-naming of the Centre had been circulated.

Dean Grace
Dr. Boardman

} *That the Centre for South Asian Research, under the Institute of Asian Research, be re-named the Centre for India and South Asia Research.*

Carried.

AMALGAMATION OF WESTWATER RESEARCH CENTRE AND GRADUATE PROGRAM IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

The following report from Dean Grace to Graduate Council had been circulated.

> Discussions have been in progress for about two years regarding possible mergers of Faculty of Graduate Studies units involved with subjects broadly related to the environment and natural resources. These discussions have reached a point where we wish to combine the Westwater Research Centre and the Resource Management and Environmental Studies Graduate Program.
>
> Effective July 1, 1995, it is proposed that the two units be merged, with a single Director and a single operatiang budget. The existing graduate program (approved in 1993) will continue to operate under the name Resource Management and Environmental Studies, and all students registered in that program will continue. For the time being, the overall unit will be called Resource Management and Environmental Studies. The Westwater name will continue to be used informally for attracting grants and contracts because of the reputation achieved by the Westwater Research Centre since it was founded in 1971. Arrangements with the Forest Economics Policy Analysis (FEPA) Research Unit will continue unchanged.

Over the next few months, those involved will finalize arrangements for integration of resources, (including physical amalgamation), a common advisory committee and other details. These details will be reported to the Graduate Council in the Fall. Discussions will also continue regarding closer integration with other units in this area and other possible amalgamations.

Dean Grace
Dean Goldberg } *That the Amalgamation of Westwater Research Centre and Graduate Program in Resource Management and Environmental Studies be approved.*

Dean Grace stated that the Westwater Research Centre, in existence for approximately 25 years, has six associated faculty members. Its primary work has been related to water but it has also been involved with other resources. The Resource Management and Environmental Studies program does not include any FTE faculty members, but it is a viable program drawing on faculty from various units. The Westwater faculty already give a course under the Resource Management and Environmental Studies banner.

The motion was put and carried.

Triennial Elections of Representatives to the Board of Governors and the Senate

The Registrar presented the following proposal which had been circulated:

The *University Act*, Section 42, states that "... Senate shall make and publish all rules necessary and not inconsistent with this Act in respect of nominations, elections and voting ..."

For the 1995/96 Triennial Elections, the Registrar proposes to change from a mailed ballot system to a telephone ballot system using voice-response technology.

If time permits and security considerations can be addressed, we would like to also allow the option of voting via the Internet.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS:

i. The Registrar shall conduct the elections.

ii. Each candidate shall be nominated in writing, the nomination to be signed by seven persons entitled to vote in the election of the Board of Governors and by the nominee indicating willingness to run for election, and the nominations shall be sent to the Registrar.

iii. Each nominee shall be requested to supply a brief curriculum vitae and be permitted to include a further statement of up to 150 words which will be circulated with the ballot information.

iv. The elections shall be conducted by either phone-in ballot or mailed ballot. The balloting system will be designed to permit computer tabulation of the election results.

v. The election schedule shall be as follows:-

Faculty (two to be elected)	
Call for nominations	Monday, September 11, 1995
Close of nominations	Monday, October 2, 1995
Last day of voting	Friday, November 3, 1995

Non-Faculty full-time Employees (one to be elected)	
Call for nominations	Monday, October 16, 1995
Close of nominations	Monday, November 6, 1995
Last day of voting	Friday, December 8, 1995

SENATE

Election of Chancellor and (eleven) Convocation Members of Senate:

i. The Registrar shall conduct the elections.

ii. All nominations of candidates for the office of chancellor shall be signed by seven persons entitled to vote in the election.

iii. All nominations for membership in the Senate shall be signed by three persons entitled to vote in the election.

iv. All nominations for election of candidates for the office of chancellor and for membership in Senate shall require the signature of the nominee indicating willingness to run for election.

v. "The registrar shall forthwith send a written notice of nomination to each person nominated as a candidate for the office of chancellor and to each person nominated as a candidate for membership in the Senate, with a request that the candidate forward to the registrar information respecting his degrees, the dates thereof, his occupation, offices held by him at a university or in any other organization, his other professional or business interests and his publications." (*University Act*, Section 14 (3)).

The registrar shall circulate only the information specified in the *University Act*.

vi. The election of convocation members will be scheduled and regulated as follows:

a. this election shall include the election of a chancellor;

b. the notice of the election and call for nominations shall be made in the fall Chronicle to be published in August 1995;

c. the close of nominations for chancellor and for convocation membership in the Senate shall be 4.00 p.m. on Monday, October 30, 1995.

d. the biographical information on the candidates and voting instructions shall be circulated with the winter Chronicle to be published in November 1995.

e. the last day of voting shall be Thursday, February 29, 1996.

vii. In the event that after the close of nominations but before the election date it is found that a nominee for the office of chancellor could not serve if elected, the registrar shall be authorized, if so instructed by the Chairman of Senate, to delay the election and issue another call for nominations.

viii. The balloting system shall be designed to permit computer tabulation of the election results.

ix. The results of the election, in accordance with Section 16 of the University Act, will be reported to the Senate at its next regular meeting, March 20, 1996.

x. Replacement procedures for Convocation representatives to Senate - replacements will be appointed on the basis of the recommendation of the remaining Convocation representatives to Senate.

(Approved by Senate, April 21, 1976)

Election of Faculty members at-Large (Ten to be elected)

i. The Registrar shall conduct the election.

ii. Each candidate shall be nominated in writing, the nominations to be signed by three faculty members (see definition of faculty members under General Provisions: Eligibility).

iii. The election schedule shall be as follows:

- Call for nominations: Wednesday, January 10, 1996
- Close of nominations: Wednesday, January 31, 1996
- Last day of voting: Friday, March 8, 1996

iv. Replacement procedures - "a vacancy in this category shall be filled by a candidate in the ... election of members at-Large. Where no candidate is willing or able to serve as a replacement, a special election to fill that vacancy will be held."

"the Registrar shall invite the candidate who received the highest number of votes in the ... general election ... to fill the vacancy. If that candidate declines ... the candidate with the next highest number of votes shall be invited to fill the vacancy, and so on, until a willing candidate is found."

"An individual who has vacated a position as a representative of the faculty members at-large is not thereby disqualified from filling a vacancy in accordance with the above procedures."

(Approved by Senate, May 25, 1977)

Elections of Faculty Members from Individual Faculties (Two from each Faculty)

Individual Faculties will make their own decisions on the procedures and timing of the election of their two representatives to serve on Senate on the understanding that all elections be completed by February 29, 1996. Such elections may be held at Faculty meetings subject to the

terms of the *University Act* (i.e. those participating in the elections must be faculty members as defined in the "General Provisions" section of this submission under the heading Eligibility, on Page 4).

With the election period for Faculty representatives to the Board of Governors ending Friday, November 3, 1995, and the election period for Faculty Members at-Large to Senate ending Friday, March 8, 1996, I suggest the following schedule for individual faculties. This schedule would enable any eligible faculty members who wished to do so to run as a candidate in all of the elections involving Faculty Members at-Large.

Faculty of Graduate Studies	
Call for nominations	Friday, October 6, 1995
Close of nominations	Friday, October 27, 1995
Last day of voting	Friday, December 8, 1995

Other faculties requiring an election by ballot	
Call for nominations	Friday, November 17, 1995
Close of nominations	Friday, December 8, 1995
Last day of voting	Friday, January 26, 1996

Replacement procedures - Nomination and election shall be conducted in accordance with established Faculty procedures. Where such established procedures do not exist then nominations shall be called for either before or on the floor of a meeting of the Faculty concerned and voting shall be either by show of hands or by balloting at the meeting. It was agreed that the Registrar's office would not be involved.

(Approved by Senate, April 21, 1976)

Faculties who want to have runners-up used as replacements in the event of a vacancy during the three-year term will be asked to advise the Registrar so that this may be stated clearly on the call for nominations.

Faculties will be asked to advise the Registrar of their decisions.

Election of a representative of the full-time Professional Librarians:

i. The Registrar shall conduct the election.

ii. Each candidate shall be nominated in writing, the nominations to be signed by three professional librarians employed by the University who have been employed in that capacity for a

iii. period of four months or longer, and by the nominee indicating willingness to run for election.

iv. The election schedule shall be as follows:-

- Call for nominations: Tuesday, January 9, 1996
- Close of nominations: Tuesday, January 30, 1996
- Last day of voting: Thursday, February 29, 1996

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Eligibility

Faculty members eligible to participate in the elections of representatives to serve on the Board of Governors and the Senate shall be only those persons who, at the time the nominations are called, hold full-time Board appointments (which they have held for four months or longer) at the ranks of lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or professor.

Any faculty member who has been granted leave extending for more than six months from the time at which Senate membership would commence (September 1, 1996) or who is on disability leave at the close of nominations shall not be eligible to stand for election to Senate.

(Approved by Senate, November 18, 1981)

Nominations

In some elections the Registrar publishes the names of the nominators in the information provided to electors. Where more signatures than are required are submitted in support of a particular candidate, the Registrar will publish only the minimum number of names required. Only one nomination will be accepted for each candidate in any one election.

Results

Results will be counted and tabulated by computer program.

Terms of office (three years)

Unless otherwise determined by the Board of Governors, the Chancellor shall take office on June 25, 1996 and the installation ceremony will take place on Friday, May 31, 1996.

All other members of the Board of Governors will take office on February 1, 1996.

All other members of Senate will take office on September 1, 1996.

Leaves of absence

The position of an elected faculty member shall be declared vacant by the Secretary of Senate when he has received notice that the member has resigned, or that the member is going on leave for a period of more than six months, or that the member has been granted disability leave.

(Approved by Senate, November 18, 1981)

Any elected member of Senate may be granted leave of absence for up to five consecutive ordinary meetings of Senate. Any absence without leave for more than five consecutive ordinary meetings of Senate shall result in a declaration of vacancy by the Secretary of Senate.

(Approved by Senate, November 18, 1981)

Dr. Goldberg
Dr. Berger } *That the following proposals be adopted:*

a) To change the 1995/96 Triennial Elections from a mailed ballot system to a telephone ballot system using voice-response technology

b) If time permits and security conditions can be addressed, to allow the option of voting via the Internet.

Carried.

Other Business

TEACHING EVALUATIONS/*FREEDOM OF INFORMATION & PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT*

Dr. Will advised that when the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Teaching Evaluation reported to Senate in May of last year one of the recommendations was that departments and faculties be urged to publish the results of the evaluations. Dr. Will's understanding was that the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* had placed some constraints on possible implementation of this

motion. Dr. Will wondered what might be done, if anything, to try to minimize the impact of this Act on the intent of that motion.

Dr. Gosline replied that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Teaching Evaluation is preparing a report which it hopes will be submitted to Senate in the fall. The committee realizes that the privacy section of the *Freedom of Information Act* has an impact on the release of student evaluation information. The committee will attempt to suggest to Senate, in the form of recommendations, some mechanisms that can be discussed and possibly implemented to assist the appropriate release of information that is consistent with the *Act*.

Dr. Birch informed Senate that he had consulted on this subject and it seems that under the protection of privacy we are constrained from acting unreasonably in the release of the protected information. In his opinion, the release of teaching evaluations without placing a constraint of requiring a sign off or approval of the individual faculty member is entirely within the spirit and intent of the *Act*.

During further discussion on different interpretations of the Act it was pointed out that Associate Vice President, Dr. McClean, had been consulted on this issue and his opinion was that until a case is actually brought to the Commissioner of Privacy, on the basis of a complaint, it is unlikely that a decision will be made.

Ms. Chui stated that it would be appreciated if courses listed in the Calendar could include the names of the instructors as students often use the teaching evaluations to assist in their choice of courses.

It was pointed out that often the instructors are not known at the time of the Calendar publication, however, the registration guide includes the names of all instructors known at the time of publication. Course outlines, written by and containing the names of instructors, usually may be obtained directly from the individual departments.

The Registrar suggested that the freedom of information section of the *Act* was equally as applicable as the privacy section in this debate. He stated that the Registrar's office intends to make as much information as possible available to students on line through View UBC and as time progresses, through other internet communications. Presently the publication deadlines are such that instructors are not assigned and in many cases sections are not established at the time of publication.

Mr. Maas informed Senate that the Faculty of Science donates its teaching evaluations to the Science Undergraduate Society. He questioned the legal basis for requiring professors to sign a waiver.

Dr. Birch replied that Senate had not endorsed the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Teaching Evaluation's recommendation that releasing teaching evaluations be mandatory, but that there are a number of Faculties which do make them available. The *Act* does not automatically require the university to obtain waivers from individual faculty members.

Report of the Tributes Committee (in camera)

EMERITUS FACULTY

Dean McBride, Chair of the committee, presented the following list of people to be invited to accept emeritus faculty status.

Dr. Boye Ahlborn	Professor Emeritus of Physics
Dr. Charles P. Anderson	Associate Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies
Mrs. Ingrida Brenzinger	Senior Instructor Emerita of Linguistics
Dr. Sydney J. Butler	Assistant Professor Emeritus of Language Education
Dr. H. Alan C. Cairns	Professor Emeritus of Political Science
Dr. Tali A. Conine	Professor Emerita of Rehabilitation Sciences
Dr. B. Leroi Daniels	Professor Emeritus of Educational Studies
Dr. George W. Eaton	Professor Emeritus of Plant Science
Dr. Sidney B. Effer	Professor Emeritus of Obstetrics and Gynaecology
Dr. John A. Gaitanakis	Assistant Professor Emeritus of Architecture
Dr. Edward G. Hauptmann	Professor Emeritus of Mechanical Engineering
Dr. Robert G. Hindmarch	Professor Emeritus of Human Kinetics
Dr. Klaus Hoechsmann	Professor Emeritus of Mathematics
Dr. Peter Lusztig	Dean Emeritus of Commerce and Business Administration
Dr. W. Robert Morford	Professor Emeritus of Civil Engineering
Dr. Mervyn D. Olson	Professor Emeritus of Civil Engineering
Ms. Marcie Powell	Program Director Emerita of Continuing Studies
Dr. W. Robin Ridington	Professor Emeritus of Anthropology and Sociology
Dr. Sally M. Rogow	Professor Emerita of Educational Psychology and Special Education
Dr. Sun Shik Shim	Professor Emeritus of Orthopaedics
Mr. Joseph C. Smith	Professor Emeritus of Law
Mr. John P. Stewart	Assistant Professor Emeritus of Philosophy
Dr. Vincent P. Sweeney	Professor Emeritus of Medicine

Dean McBride
Dr. Randall

} *That the recommendations of the Tributes Committee concerning emeritus status be approved.*

Carried.

HONORARY L.L.B. DEGREES

Dean McBride
Dean Smith } *That the Senate approve the granting of honorary degrees to lawyers who qualified for practice in BC prior to the establishment of the UBC Faculty of Law.*

Dean McBride informed Senate that the Faculty of Law is celebrating its 50th Anniversary this year and as part of that celebration they would like to recognize those individuals who received their legal education in the Province of British Columbia prior to the existence of the UBC Faculty of Law. These individuals do not possess an LL.B. or its equivalent, but became Barristers or Solicitors in the Province of British Columbia, members of the Law Society of British Columbia and have remained in good standing throughout the time of their practice, are still living and there are no other impediments that might stand in the way. Those people so honoured will be asked to come forward during the Faculty of Law's 50th Anniversary celebration in the fall.

Dean Smith elaborated stating that following investigation and solicitation of nominations the Faculty of Law had recommended to the Tributes Committee that approximately 20 candidates be awarded honorary LL.B.'s. Following a review by Dean McBride, the Tributes Committee recommended a group of some of the most distinguished senior members of the legal profession in the province. A special ceremony has been planned for October 13, 1995.

The motion was put and carried.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Next meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on Wednesday, September 20, 1995.

Confirmed

Secretary

Chair