



**SENATE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES**

Monday 28 March 2022 3:36-5:04 pm via Zoom

**Attendees**

**Senators**

J. Burnham  
J. Gilbert  
S. Gopalakrishnan  
P. Harrison  
C. Krebs  
K. Lo (Chair)  
C.W. Marshall  
A. Pratap-Singh  
J. Schumacher  
K. Smith

R. Spencer (Vice-Chair)  
H. Zerriffi

**Ex Officio**

K. Ross

**Regrets**

M. Aronson  
E. Bhangu  
J. Fox  
M. Quayle

S. Matsui

**Guests**

M. McTavish  
S. Porter  
A. Webb

**Senate Staff**

C. Eaton  
J. Iverson

**Call to Order and  
Territorial  
Acknowledgement**

The meeting of the Senate Academic Policy Committee (the “Committee”) was called to order at 3:36 pm on 28 March 2022 by K. Lo, Chair.

P. Harrison offered a territorial acknowledgement.

**Agenda**

***THAT THE*** Senate Academic Policy Committee adopt the 28 March 2022 agenda as presented.

Moved: C. Krebs  
Seconded: J. Schumacher  
**Carried.**

**Meeting Minutes**

***THAT THE*** Senate Academic Policy Committee approve the 28 February 2022 meeting minutes as presented.

Moved: S. Gopalakrishnan  
Seconded: H. Zerriffi  
**Carried.**

**Faculty of  
Education |  
Bachelor of  
Education |  
Academic Policies  
and Regulations**

***THAT THE*** Vancouver Senate Academic Policy Committee approve, and recommend to the Senate for approval, the revised Academic Policies and Regulations Calendar entry as presented.

Moved: K. Lo  
Seconded: H. Zerriffi

A. Webb explained the Faculty of Education is clarifying students' appeal options for courses and practica.

Members provided the following comments:

- C. Eaton noted the Review of Assigned Standing (RAS) process relates to academic judgement while appeals on academic standing deal with procedural reasonableness and correctness.
- R. Spencer said the revisions could be further clarified with respect to the similarities between the Committee on Curriculum, Admissions, Standings, and Appeals (CCASA) and the Senate Appeals on Academic Standing Committee. If CCASA operates under the same policies as the Senate committee, the entry should state as much. The question of academic judgement is nuanced.
  - C. Eaton said Senate appeals committees strive not to replace academic judgement of the Faculties, but sometimes the reasonable outcome is to change a course standing.
- H. Zerriffi suggested removing all references to CCASA where RAS is concerned.
- K. Smith suggested changing "his/her" to "their."
- H. Zerriffi suggested clarifying the process when the appeal relates to procedural issues.
- S. Gopalakrishnan asked for clarity on the difference between an appeal on academic standing and a RAS. He also asked if CCASA adds a layer of appeal for students.
  - C. Eaton explained a RAS addresses the correctness of a grade, whereas an academic standing appeal addresses the process or reasonableness of the procedure to achieve that grade. Academic standing appeals are about the reasonableness and procedures related to the academic judgement, but not the academic judgement itself.
  - A. Webb noted CCASA has been functioning since the 1980s. The intent of the revisions is to ensure appeal pathways are clear for students, including where practica are concerned.
  - K. Lo said rules for RAS and academic appeals standings already exist in the Calendar; what needs to be explained is where the Faculty differs (CCASA and practica).
- K. Ross suggested subheadings as opposed to a numbered list to make it clearer to students that there are different appeal options that may not necessarily be sequential.
- R. Spencer said there are two pathways: one deals with grades/standing and the other with process/procedures. C. Eaton noted an overlap WRT Faculty and Senate processes in the proposal. He also clarified RAS do not apply to practica.

- P. Harrison said parts of the entry are contradictory because department heads may not be involved. He agreed the steps need to be clarified for students.

The Committee asked the guests to further revise the proposal and resubmit for the April meeting. The motion was tabled.

**Tabled.**

**Policy J-XXX:  
Academic Freedom**

P. Harrison suggested the item be moved to the end of the agenda in the interest of time-sensitive proposals. The Committee agreed to the reordering.

**Faculty of  
Graduate and  
Postdoctoral  
Studies | Joint  
Doctoral Research  
Fellows Pathway**

***THAT THE Vancouver Senate Academic Policy Committee approve, and recommend to the Senate for approval, the Joint Doctoral Research Fellows Pathway, and related Calendar entries, as presented.***

Moved: C. Krebs  
Seconded: H. Zerriffi

Members provided the following comments:

- H. Zerriffi asked why UBC students would require the designation, noting it makes sense for students from other universities.
  - S. Porter explained that, similar to the joint PhD, it would serve as official recognition that research is completed under the auspices of two universities/supervisors. It signifies significant experience at another institution.
- C. Krebs questioned the use of “fellow” in the designation, suggesting “student” instead.
  - S. Porter said it is related to fellowship. The designation recognizes something distinct and has connotations of more than a student. Additionally, Joint Doctoral Research Fellows (JDRF) are not students in the normal sense.
  - C. Eaton said JDRFs are like pre-doctoral fellows. The designation is a way of showing status at UBC.
  - H. Zerriffi suggested “scholar,” to which S. Porter said she would confirm the suggestion with the Faculty.
- C. Krebs asked if the pathway is compatible with Workday, to which K. Ross said it is similar to existing statuses like VIRS.
- P. Harrison asked how UBC students who receive the designation will be noted as such, to which S. Porter confirmed they will be registered in VGRD 699, the related 0-credit activity, and receive the transcript notation.
- A. Pratap-Singh asked about funding. Will students have their own funding? Will they be subject to UBC’s funding policies? Are there protocols for departments that want to encourage JDRFs?

- S. Porter explained funding will operate like it does for VIRS. If there is a need to pay a stipend, there are possible avenues, but students will be expected to bring their own funding.
- R. Spencer suggested changing “record of scholarship” to “record of scholar status.”

With those amendments, and hearing no further comments or questions, the Committee voted.

**Carried.**

**Campus-wide  
Policies and  
Regulations |  
Compliance with  
Health Safety  
Requirements**

**THAT THE** *Vancouver Senate Academic Policy Committee approve, and recommend to the Senate for approval, the revised Compliance with Health Safety Requirements Calendar entry as presented.*

Moved: J. Schumacher

Seconded: K. Smith

C. Eaton recognized the controversy at the University WRT mandatory testing and vaccinations; however, there are still vaccination requirements for some programs. The revisions before the Committee allow for mandatory vaccinations for specific students, while removing declaration and testing requirements for the general student population.

Members provided the following comments:

- H. Zerriffi asked whether an amendment to the regulation that would allow a more general approach would make sense given the potential for future outbreaks and pandemics. He suggested stating students need to comply with the regulation, whatever it may be.
- K. Smith asked if the regulation still applies for incoming students.
  - C. Eaton explained the amendment removes the ability to deal with students in bulk and reverts back to case-by-case requirements that students must comply with all university regulations.
- K. Smith questioned whether “including but not limited to” gives Faculties the authority to have other requirements.
  - C. Eaton explained only where required by a third party. If a Faculty wishes to institute a unilateral rule, that would require the Senate’s consent.
  - A. Pratap-Singh asked why Senate’s consent is not needed if there is a third-party requirement, to which C. Eaton said students engage in a variety of experiential learning placements with third parties, and those parties are permitted to require COVID-19 vaccinations; they have the flexibility to mandate vaccinations, UBC does not. Students cannot undertake

experiential learning placements unless they comply with third-party rules.

- C. W. Marshall noted the revisions include three major changes. He understood and agreed with the first (striking bullets). He did not understand the second (striking compliance with COVID-19 Campus Rules), to which C. Eaton explained the language was redundant, and further clarified campus rules only apply for on-campus students. C. W. Marshall disagreed with the third (striking responsible officer and process), stating someone should be identified for dealing with non-compliant students. C. Eaton suggested retaining, “Deans of Faculties shall be responsible... School based regulations.” to identify who will act in those cases. WRT to the rest of the struck language, C. Eaton said there is no opportunity for insubordination, and the University has attempted to grant students concessions, etc. to avoid deregistration. He added the clause at the end regarding discipline and unsatisfactory conduct still applies.
- K. Ross suggested adding “or third-party” to the sentence regarding Deans’ responsibilities for clarity.
- R. Spencer suggested retaining the entire second-to-last paragraph as a general enforcement procedure. The Committee supported the suggestion.

With those amendments, and hearing no further comments or questions, the Committee voted.

**Carried.**

**Policy J-XXX:** The Committee did not have time to discuss this item.  
**Academic Freedom**

**Next Meeting** The next meeting of the Committee will be held on 25 April 2022 3:30-5 pm.

**Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.