



**SENATE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES**

Monday 28 February 2022 3:36-5:02 pm via Zoom

**Attendees**

**Senators**

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

H. Zerriffi

**Ex Officio**

J. Fox  
K. Ross

**Regrets**

M. Aronson  
E. Bhangu  
J. Gilbert

S. Matsui

M. Quayle

K. Smith

**Guests**

N. Campbell  
J. Kasperski

**Senate Staff**

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 February 2022 by K. Lo, Chair.

R. Spencer offered a territorial acknowledgement.

**Agenda**

K. Lo noted two amendments to the agenda: the Bachelor of Education Academic Policies and Regulations item was removed and the Academic Standings and Academic Achievement Designations item was added. With those revisions, the agenda was adopted by general consent.

**Meeting Minutes**

The 31 January 2022 meeting minutes were not included in the materials. K. Lo said they will be circulated for email approval under a separate cover.

**IRP | Academic  
Standings and  
Academic  
Achievement  
Designations**

K. Lo explained the item was added to the agenda following the Friday 25 February 2022 joint meeting of the Okanagan and Vancouver Senate Academic Policy Committees. By the end of that meeting there was no longer quorum and the Committee did not vote on any motions.

***THAT THE Vancouver Senate Academic Policy Committee approve, and recommend to the Senate for approval, new and revised academic standings\* as presented.***

\*In Good Standing, On Academic Probation, Failed, Required to Withdraw (modified), Failed, Permitted to Continue (modified), In Review (new)

Moved: A. Pratap-Singh

Seconded: C. Krebs

Carried.

**THAT THE** Vancouver Senate Academic Policy Committee approve, and recommend to the Senate for approval, new and revised additional period honours\* as presented.

\*Dean's Scholar (streamlined), Dean's List (streamlined), None (new)

Moved: C.W. Marshall

Seconded: C. Krebs

K. Lo explained Dean's List is an academic achievement commonly used across Faculties. Dean's Scholar is currently only used by the Faculty of Science and presently titled Science Scholar.

Key points of the ensuing discussion were as follows:

- N. Campbell said if the additional period honour is "None," it will not be placed on the transcript; additional period honours will only appear on the transcript if awarded.
- S. Gopalakrishnan asked if it might be more informative to use terminology like "academic excellence" versus "Dean's, President's, etc." N. Campbell said Dean's List is the best practice standard within the US and Canada and is readily understood. S. Gopalakrishnan countered this could be an opportunity to do something different. K. Lo said at this point it is a unifying term/standard, but it could be changed in Workday. N. Campbell confirmed the terminology is completely configurable and the Senate could provide direction if there was a reason to change in the future.
- R. Spencer asked what the distinction is between transcripts and academic records and if access to the record is restricted. Could seeing "None" by someone unfamiliar with UBC practices negatively impact student? N. Campbell said the academic record is internal to UBC and accessible by students and those with appropriate Workday security permissions. Transcripts, paper or electronic, will not include the "None" designation. R. Spencer then asked how easy will it be for readers of a transcript to see the rules that govern what appears. N. Campbell said those rules will continue to be shaped by the Faculties and reflected in the Academic Calendar. Old rules remain in the Calendar archives.
- WRT to S. Gopalakrishnan's earlier comment regarding terminology, A. Pratap-Singh said he does not think there are power-related connotations related to Dean. S. Gopalakrishnan said his point was less about the name and more about recognizing the achievement. He said this is an opportunity to reflect on past practices, which are not always good. K. Ross said that the proposal before the Committee is a big step forward in terms of consistency across the institution. The suggestion is

a good one, but the consistency is sorely needed. S. Gopalakrishnan did not object to the normalization, but said it is better to recognize things directly for what they are.

- WRT consistency, C.W. Marshall asked if both Dean's Scholar and Dean's List will be available for all Faculties to use? K. Lo said yes, if they wish, and with Senate approval of the necessary Calendar entries.
- WRT to a two-tier system, N. Campbell said the proposal stays true to current state: single-tier is Dean's List, two-tier would mean Dean's Scholar is the higher of the two levels. It remains for the Faculties to determine what students have to achieve to be placed at the two levels. Most Dean's List requirements fall around 80-85%, whereas Science Scholar is 90%.

The Committee voted on the motion on the floor.

**Carried.**

**Indigenous  
Strategic Plan |  
Self-Assessment  
Tool Survey  
Results**

J. Kasperski began by inviting members to reflect on the resources she provided and share what has surfaced since the first discussion. Members offered the following:

- J. Fox noted ISP work is happening in parallel across Senate committees and it is interesting to connect those conversations. She added a number of Senate Teaching and Learning Committee members have registered in the [Reconciliation Through Indigenous Education](#) MOOC.
- C.W. Marshall said he has been called upon to offer land acknowledgements. As an employee of an institution that he thinks is not doing everything it could be, he said he feels his words ring hollow when he does not have the power to respond adequately.
  - J. Kasperski said this is a common sentiment. There is no way to represent the institution, but individuals can continue to learn, to grow and to be authentic about their own position.
- J. Burnham said she has been working through the [Respect, Sincerity & Responsibility: Land Acknowledgements @ UBC](#) module. She likes how the module maps out various pieces and recommended the resource.
  - J. Kasperski said the CTLT is attempting to use the creation of that module as a learning tool in and of itself. She said she has a related resource to share.
- R. Spencer said Daniel Health Justice gave a talk to the Emeritus College on land issues relating to the Cherokee Nation. R. Spencer said it was eye-opening and he was left with a new understanding of the fundamental difference of what land ownership means between Indigenous people and Western economic competitive societies. He was impressed by the difficulty of reconciling two fundamentally different views.

- C. Krebs said meaningful land acknowledgements can be an important turning point in our history. It is an incremental step to keep cultures alive. It is humbling in many ways.
  - J. Kasperski said land acknowledgements are about not only acknowledging the lands we are on but also our relationships to lands. They provide space for dialogue around what relationships to land mean. When you are able to speak out loud and talk through it you may realize things that you didn't know you were previously overlooking.
- A. Pratap-Singh said the first discussion greatly affected him and he felt motivated to do something tangible. He introduced land acknowledgement assignments in two of his courses. Students were asked to reflect on the lands they are on now and the lands from which they came, and in one of the courses, this was followed up with an assignment on Indigenous food products and technologies. Responses elicited a lot of emotion. He said now is the time to investigate what can be done so the same conversations aren't repeated each year, but rather, progress is made.
  - J. Kasperski said this is what these conversations are about: feeling empowered, capable and able to do something. There are so many ways to do things right now while still working to effect systemic change in the institution.
- S. Gopalakrishnan said in light of the ISP, Applied Science has a committee that is trying to understand how engineering programs can evolve. One thing that comes up consistently is the tension between support/acknowledgement and the notion of meritocracy. He said this challenge is compounded when layered with a veneer of reconciliation, and he is unsure how to work with the model.
  - J. Kasperski said this is a common frustration. The road to reconciliation is difficult and uncomfortable and there won't be a quick answer, but we can control what we do now, continue to move forward and contribute to the process today. She said to acknowledge the difficulties and question yourself whenever there is something performative. Who is this benefitting? Why are we doing this? The frustrations are valid.
  - S. Gopalakrishnan said one idea is to require new hires to have some sort of training/understanding of the background to build knowledge over many years. This would lay the groundwork for a succession plan. STEM is particularly challenged in this respect and may benefit from cross-disciplinary conversations, especially when faculty are new and receptive to ideas.
  - J. Kasperski agreed STEM needs supports. "This is the way it's always been" discounts the ways in which things can evolve and change. She mentioned a Justice, Equity, Decolonization,

Indigenization and Inclusion series that focuses on STEM and suggested people in the field could be required to watch it.

Turning to Q5 (*We have and are able to identify the services and resources available to Indigenous students, faculty and staff relevant to our unit.*), J. Kasperski asked in ten years, if the Committee were to report on the policies that were created/revised as a result of the ISP, could it? She welcomed other thoughts on the question.

- K. Ross said it is about having the necessary lens through which to look at policies. What else do we need to think about? Are we ensuring the necessary voices were consulted and have input? Will the policy work for everyone? Will all students be treated fairly and might Indigenous students need to be treated differently?
  - J. Kasperski asked if the Committee has collectively created a vision of how it will meet its goals? She shared [CBC's Beyond 94 website](#), which monitors progress on the TRC's 94 calls to action. Various universities are using the site as a model for assessing how they are meeting their goals.

Turning to Q6 (*We demonstrate awareness of, and responsiveness to, challenges and systemic barriers faced by Indigenous students, faculty and staff in our unit.*), J. Kasperski pulled a specific comment from the survey responses: "While explicitly Indigenous proposals tend to receive particular care and attention, there are gaps in how we understand and reflect on the unique experiences of Indigenous students, staff, faculty under the context of each universal policy the committee considers." She asked what it would look like to ensure all academic policies have this lens accounted for moving forward. She noted that while the unit might be the Committee, all students are impacted by the policies the Committee approves. Reframing could be helpful in moving things forward.

- J. Fox said this caused her to think about how to be more intentional with the consultation processes for all policies. How can we use these processes as a point of advocacy?
- H. Zerriffi echoed J. Fox's point and circled back to Q5. Who provides service to Indigenous students, staff and faculty and how could those folks be included in the consultation process?
- J. Kasperski said it is important to consider who we are consulting and the way we do it. What does it mean to value and compensate Indigenous students, staff and faculty who do work beyond their usual roles? It is meaningful to students to reiterate the value of their input and the far-reaching impacts. She noted the same Indigenous staff and faculty members are usually consulted. It is important to think about how that is done and how practices can be expanded.
- J. Kasperski pulled another comment from the responses: "I think this is an area we really need to improve on. We need to find a way to

analyze, from a policy perspective, what we can do to indigenize UBC.” She encouraged challenging “this is how we’ve always done it” conversations. What would it mean to change things?

Turning to Q7 (*We understand that the Indigenous Strategic Plan is a response to Canada’s historic and continued colonial oppression and that the Plan moves beyond equity, diversity and inclusion to acknowledge Indigenous peoples’ distinctive histories, experiences, and lived realities associated with and impacted by colonialism.*), K. Lo said as an immigrant to this country he is also a settler on these lands. While he is a minority, he is not Indigenous, and so an EDI lens is useful but not sufficient in this context.

- K. Ross said there is a tension between the ISP and Inclusion Action Plan. J. Kasperski said other institutions are grappling with these tensions and some offer workshops, etc. on understanding the lands on which they are situated.
- J. Burnham [shared an article](#) for thinking through Indigenization versus decolonization initiatives in higher education.

Turning to Q7 (*We are committed to furthering our unit’s understanding of the continued history of colonialism, including the residential school system and its ongoing impact on Indigenous peoples, specifically in the sphere of higher education.*), J. Kasperski asked how the Committee is committed to furthering understanding of this history. She noted the Committee could have a role in supporting students, staff and faculty. For example, some departments at UBC cancel classes on February 14 to honour the Women's Memorial March in Vancouver. Unmarked graves will continue to be uncovered, and the findings will have far-reaching impacts on Indigenous peoples in academia. She said the significance of the question is understanding why we are having the conversation. The last time she met with the Committee was December and has now heard about steps folks have taken since that time. This is the work.

K. Lo thanked J. Kasperski for her helpful contributions.

#### **Policy V-1**

The Committee did not have time to discuss this item.

K. Lo informally polled the Committee on returning to in-person meetings: 4 AGAINST, 2 FOR. He said the next meeting will be online, and J. Burnham said the Senate Agenda Committee is assessing meeting format. WRT hybrid meetings, K. Ross said the issue is how to do them well. C. Krebs said it is dependent on space and equipment.

#### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on 28 March 2022 3:30-5 pm.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.