

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 14, 2008

Attendance

Present: Dr. R. Windsor-Liscombe (Vice-Chair), Associate Vice-President B. J. Silzer (Secretary), Dr. P. Adebar, Dr. N. Banthia, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dr. G. Bluman, Dean M. A. Bobinski, Ms. H. Boyd, Prof. C. Boyle, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. M. Bryson, Mr. G. Costeloe, Dr. E. Dean, Dr. J. Dennison, Dr. W. Dunford, Mr. P. Edgcumbe, Dean B. Evans, Vice-President D. Farrar, Dr. C. Friedrichs, Ms. M. Friesen, Dean N. Gallini, Mr. C. Gorman, Dr. P. G. Harrison, Dr. R. Harrison, Dr. R. Irwin, Dean M. Isaacson, Dean M. Isman, Dr. S. B. Knight, Dr. B. S. Lalli, Mr. A. Lee, Mr. D. Leung, Mr. A. Loughheed, Mr. R. Lowe, Dr. M. MacEntee, Dr. P. L. Marshall, Dr. A. McAfee, Dr. W. McKee, Dr. D. McLean, Mr. R. McLean, Mr. W. McNulty, Principal L. Nasmith, Dr. B. Osmond, Dean S. Peacock, Dr. J. Plessis, Dean C. Shuler, Ms. L. Silvester, Dean R. Sindelar, Dr. R. Sparks, Dr. B. Stelck, Dr. S. Thorne, Dean R. Tierney, Dr. M. Upadhyaya, Mr. A. Wazeer, Dr. D. Weary, Dr. R. A. Yaworsky, Dr. J. Young.

Guests: Mr. T. Ahmed, Vice-Provost A. Kindler, Mr. G. Podersky-Cannon.

Regrets: President S. J. Toope, Dr. B. Arneil, Dr. J. Brander, Principal M. Burgess, Dr. H. Burt, Dr. L. Chui, Mr. D. Dance, Dr. D. Fielding, Dr. W. Fletcher, Mr. B. Frederick, Dr. S. Grayston, Dr. D. Griffin, Dr. L. Gunderson, Dr. R. Helsley, Mr. A. Ionescu, Ms. W. King, Dr. T. McDaniels, Mr. A. Mohan, Dean D. Muzyka, Ms. A. Peterson, Dr. P. Potter, Dr. K. Russell, Dean J. Saddler, Dr. J. Sarra, Ms. A. Shaikh, Mr. B. Simpson, Dean G. Stuart, Mr. R. Taddei, Mr. B. W. Wang, Dr. P. Ward, Dr. R. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Associate Secretary Ms. L. M. Collins.

Call to Order

Vice-Chair Dr. Windsor-Liscombe called the meeting to order.

Remarks from the Vice-Chair and Related Questions, continued

Dean Michael Isaacson (18 years);
Dr. James Berger (15 years);
Mr. Patrick Brady (15 years);
Mr. Robert Lowe (15 years);
Dr. Michael MacEntee (15 years); and
Dr. Perry Adebar (12 years).

Candidates for Degrees

<i>Dr. P. G. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That the candidates for degrees and diplomas, as recommended by the Faculties and Schools, be granted the degrees and diplomas for which they were recommended, effective May 2008, and that a committee composed of the Registrar, the appropriate Dean, and the Chair of the Vancouver Senate be empowered to make any necessary adjustments.</i>
<i>Mr. C. L. Gorman</i>		

The motion was put
and unanimously
carried.

From the Council of Senates

COUNCIL OF SENATES ELECTIONS COMMITTEE: PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CHANCELLOR SELECTION PROCESS

Elections Committee Chair Dr. Yaworsky presented the following report.

As Senate may be aware, our provincial government has introduced Bill 34, The *University Amendment Act* and scheduled it for second reading (May 1, 2008).

The provision that affects UBC relates to the selection of the Chancellor. Bill 34 proposes to amend the *University Act* such that the Chancellor will no longer be elected by the Convocation, but rather he/she “is to be appointed by the Board of Governors on nomination by the alumni association and after consultation with the council [of senates]”.

The Elections Committee believes that this provision and its implementation are inappropriate for a number of important reasons, and accordingly, we feel it appropriate that this issue be brought to the attention of both Vancouver and Okanagan Senates.

First, our university's convocation is significantly broader than the group represented by the Alumni Association - our convocation includes not only alumni, but faculty, librar-

From the Council of Senates, continued

ians, senators, and most recently those honoured with emeritus status – all of whom have now been disenfranchised by the practice of having the Board appointed a chancellor upon the sole nomination of the Alumni Association (who previously did have a tradition of nominating a candidate, but this candidate was required to stand for election by the convocation).

Second, the history and tradition of our Chancellor's election runs deep and indeed dates back to the centenary we now are celebrating – I am informed that the first Chancellor election was in 1908, between Francis Carter-Cotton and Sir Charles Tupper. For the next 90 years or so, election turn-out was strong, averaging 20%, although the usual pattern was for a chancellor seeking re-election to stand unopposed, and for an election for new chancellor, it resulted in what was often an interesting contest.

In the past decade, thousands of people have voted with the size of our convocation doubling over the past 17 years, the percentage of those voting is of course low. In those years with low turnout, specifically the 1990s, it should be noted that the university significantly reduced the publicity around the election and its nomination process. Nevertheless, over the past three elections the number of votes cast for Chancellor has more than doubled. In our view, none of the above indicates the need for a replacement of a long-standing tradition without, at the very least, open discussion and review.

Third, the general practice throughout Canada is for the Chancellor to be elected - either from their convocations or by their senates; joint senates and board or by a joint council of various sorts. Only one major institution, Dalhousie, appoints its Chancellor by its Board alone. The British universities upon whom our structures are based also generally continue to elect their (vice) chancellors.

Finally, this provision was advanced by the government in the absence of consultation and communication with our Convocation, our Senates, and critically, our Council Elections Committee. Note that the Elections Committee's Terms of Reference state we "shall be responsible for recommending to the Council of Senates, in consultation with the Secretary to the Council of Senates, any rules necessary for nominations, elections, and voting in any election of the Chancellor."

In summary, our Committee is strongly opposed to this intended change - without consultation and careful consideration at the very least - and thus we are recommending the

From the Council of Senates, continued

following resolution to both the Vancouver and Okanagan Senates for their consideration:

*Dr. Yaworsky
Mr. McNulty*

}

Whereas the office of Chancellor and its election is an institution dating back to the founding of UBC and our predecessor universities; and

Whereas the election of the Chancellor is an important symbol to many parts of the UBC community - including alumni, faculty, librarians, senators, and most recently those honoured with emeritus status - together forming our Convocation and coming together to select the ceremonial head of our University; and

*Whereas the Chancellor is a member of university senates and serves in an academic role as conferrer of degrees and chair of the Convocation in addition to its ceremonial position; and
Whereas the autonomy of the University to govern its affairs should be respected and its internal governance should not be adjusted externally without thorough study, consultation, and consideration:*

*That this Senate resolve to express its concern for the lack of consultation with the University of British Columbia on the changes to the manner in which the Chancellor is selected;
And that this Senate further resolve to express its concern for the changing of an office elected by the Convocation to an office appointed by the Board of Governors;*

And that this Senate further resolve to direct the Secretary of Senate to inform the Board of Governors, and the other senates currently under the University Act of the position of the Senate on this matter;

And that this Senate further resolve to direct the Chair of Senate to inform the Honourable Murray Coell, Minister of Advanced Education and Minister Responsible for Research and Technology, of the position of the Senate on this matter with the request that he communicate these concerns to others in the Government of British Columbia.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Yaworsky spoke briefly to the report, emphasizing key points. In response to a question from Dr. McAfee about whether the Senate ought to request that the Minister take more specific

From the Council of Senates, continued

action, Dr. Yaworsky expressed hope that the government would respond appropriately, once made aware of the Senate's position.

Dr. Dennison expressed the opinion that the reason for this change was directly related to the establishment of new universities in the province under the same *University Act*. The new universities did not yet have an alumni base from which to elect a chancellor.

Ms. Silvester stated that she understood that voter participation had been low in previous elections.

Dr. Thorne spoke in support of the motion, adding that she was confident that the University already had in place a good process for electing its chancellor and that such a change was therefore unnecessary.

AMENDMENT

By consent, the following was appended to the last paragraph of the motion: "and with the request that UBC be allowed to continue the practice of electing its Chancellor in the traditional manner."

The main motion,
as amended, was
put and carried.

COUNCIL OF SENATES BUDGET COMMITTEE: PROPOSED CHANGE IN BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Committee Chair Dr. Adebar presented the following report.

The Budget Committee has reviewed its operations and the operation of its Okanagan and Vancouver Sub-Committees over the past few years. It has become apparent that the original assumption of one UBC budget for which the Committee could advise the president is not the state of affairs that has developed, and that campus-specific budgets will be the norm. As the Sub-Committees for each campus are based on the full membership of the Committee from each campus, the current sub-committees are quite small.

From the Council of Senates, continued

The Committee had participated in discussions with the Deputy Provost about the work of the Steering Committee for Academic Planning Process. Because the work of the two committees was interrelated, the Budget Committee looked forward to continuing collaboration.

The Budget Committee had also received information about the allocation of proceeds from land development. The Committee noted its thanks to Mr. Ian Burgess, Associate Vice-President, Finance, for providing detailed information.

Dr. Adebar noted that the Budget Committee was established under a specific requirement in the *University Act*. Ensuring that the Committee was able to meet its obligation to assist the President in preparing the university budget remained challenging for both the Committee and the executive. The Committee hoped to provide input early enough in the budget process to influence budgetary development, rather than to receive information at the same time as the rest of the university community.

From the Board of Governors

The Senate received for information confirmation that the following items approved by the Vancouver Senate had been subsequently approved by the Board of Governors as required under the *University Act*.

Senate Meeting of February 27, 2008

- Curriculum Proposals from the Faculties of Commerce and Business Administration, Graduate Studies (Faculties of Applied Science, Arts, Education, Medicine, and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and the College for Interdisciplinary Studies) and Pharmaceutical Sciences;
- Student Awards;
- Establishment of the Department of Emergency Medicine within the Faculty of Medicine;
- Enrolment Targets 2008/2009.

Carried.

REVIEW OF UBC UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION POLICIES: PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION TO UBC

The following is an excerpt from the report circulated by the Committee.

At the December 2007 meeting of the Vancouver Senate, the Admissions Committee was directed to “undertake a review of UBC’s undergraduate admission policies with a view to determining their efficacy in meeting the goals of Trek 2010 and the UBC Academic Plan and report back to the Senate no later than December 2008 with recommendations on any necessary changes”. The report presented herein completes the reporting responsibility delegated to the Admissions Committee. If approved by Senate, the principles presented in the report would guide any subsequent review of admission policies and practices, and also guide policy-makers as they prepare new admission policies in the future.

The proposed principles were as follows:

Alignment with UBC’s Goals:

- Admission policies should ensure that the institution “...attracts and retains the best undergraduate and graduate students from across BC, Canada and the world” (Trek 2010). Such students should be predisposed to take advantage of the opportunities to seek academic challenge, to do research, to develop leadership skills, to do community service, to foster global awareness, and to participate in sports and the fine and performing arts.

Corollary: Policies or practices that discourage the enrolment of top-quality students should be identified and reviewed.

Corollary: Where two or more principles are in conflict, the resolution should always aim to achieve the overall goals of the University.

Evidence-Based Policy Review:

- Admission criteria will be based on knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of educational systems world-wide and of student performance at UBC.

Corollary: Student achievement at UBC will be used regularly to review and modify admission policies and practices, and to identify areas of potential improvement in UBC curricula and pedagogy.

Corollary: The University needs the ability to forecast changes in demand for programs so that policies can be adapted within this framework of principles.

Admissions Committee, continued

Excellence of Fit:

- Evaluation criteria will aim to identify those applicants who are most likely to prosper at the University of British Columbia.

Corollary: General university admission criteria shall identify where possible common core academic requirements for admission to all undergraduate programs.

Corollary: Admission criteria for specific UBC programs shall be based on the framework of the general admission criteria.

Corollary: In addition to evidence of academic achievement, diverse admission criteria may be used (i.e., broader-based admission).

Fairness:

- Applicants will not be disadvantaged by the structure (timing, sequencing, grading schemes) of the educational system followed that provides the basis of admission.

Corollary: Fair and equitable treatment of applicants does not require the application of identical policies and practices because to do so would be to ignore the different educational backgrounds and needs of prospective students.

Corollary: What is considered sufficient evidence of readiness to succeed may differ for different academic programs.

Corollary: Grading schemes should not be equated to the BC high school system unless data on student performance support such a practice.

Corollary: Applicants who are continuing UBC students wishing to change program should not be disadvantaged as long as they are in good academic standing in their current program.

Integrity:

- Admission practices should conform to policies.

Transparency:

- Admission requirements should be clear and understandable to prospective students, counsellors, and others who influence student choice.

Corollary: The University will be openly direct in its communication of admission policies and practices.

Timeliness:

- An offer will be made in time for the applicant to plan for the transition to UBC and for UBC to meet its enrolment targets.

Admissions Committee, continued

Corollary: Applicants must know the terms of an offer from UBC in time to compare it to offers from other institutions and to make reasonable financial and relocation plans for the eventual transition to UBC.

Corollary: To attract excellent applicants, UBC needs to make most offers before May 1st, which probably means that final grades cannot be considered from most educational jurisdictions and systems.

Corollary: Some applicants may be able to present evidence of readiness for success earlier than others so some offers of admission may be made much earlier than others using different sets of data.

Comprehensiveness:

- The terms of an offer of admission will include space in an academic program, and space in student housing and financial support when applicable.

Corollary: The application processes and decision timelines for both entry into academic programs and space in student housing must be linked because the allocation of student housing spaces must be part of a larger strategy for effective student recruitment.

Corollary: Offers of admission to an academic program and of merit-based financial assistance should be made at the same time based on similar sets of data because the allocation of scholarships must be part of a larger strategy for effective student recruitment.

Commitment:

- An offer of admission will not be revoked unless the applicant does not meet a minimum set of conditions that are conveyed with the offer.

Corollary: An applicant offered admission will in turn be expected to make a firm commitment to the university.

Corollary: The minimum conditions for retention of an offer of admission should be reviewed and modified regularly to ensure that as many students as possible succeed academically.

Corollary: All direct-entry programs should adhere to a common minimum set of conditions for retention of offers of admission.

Dr. Berger
Mr. Lee

} *That the report of the Admissions Committee on “Review of UBC Undergraduate Admission Policies: Principles of Effective Undergraduate Admission to UBC” be received and that the principles for effective undergraduate admission to UBC recommended therein be approved.*

Admissions Committee, continued

AMENDMENTS

The following amendments were accepted by consent:

1. First Corollary under “Alignment with UBC’s Goals”: replace “discourage” with “encourage.”
2. Under “Integrity”: replace “should” with “shall.”
3. Last sentence of the report: modify to begin, “The Admissions Committee is prepared to work with Enrolment Services and the Student Awards Committee...”

It was agreed that, in the interest of clarity and consistency, “shall” and “will” were generally preferred over “should” and “would.” The Secretary, in consultation with the Chair of the Admissions Committee, was directed to review the document and make these replacements where appropriate.

The following additional amendments were suggested but were not accepted by the assembly.

1. First corollary under “Alignment with UBC’s Goals”: amend to begin (addition in bold) “Policies or practices (**including entrance scholarship programs**)...”
2. Bullet under “Fairness”: replace “grading schemes” with “grading criteria.”
3. Third corollary under “Fairness”: amend to read “Grading criteria of a particular jurisdiction should be taken into consideration when evaluating applicants.”
4. Second corollary under “Comprehensiveness”: replace “merit-based financial assistance” with “entrance scholarships.”

DISCUSSION

Dr. Dunford stated that he was not convinced of the need to articulate principles, citing concern that unsuccessful applicants would use them to make a case against the University. Dr. Dunford was disappointed with the progress of the Committee, as he had hoped that the Committee would have identified new methods of evaluating applicants (similar to those in place at the University of Cambridge) that would effectively replace BC provincial examinations as admission requirements. Dr. Berger expressed his strong support for the principles, adding that he believed the articulation of principles to constitute the beginning, rather than the end, of discussions in this area.

Admissions Committee, continued

Dr. Young expressed concern that the following statement, under “Fairness”, was too strong: “Applicants will not be disadvantaged by the structure ... of the educational system followed that provides the basis of admission.”

In response to a question from Dr. Dunford, Dr. Berger confirmed that the proposed principles would apply only to UBC Vancouver. Dr. Berger stated that he was hopeful that UBC Okanagan would consider approving a similar set of principles in the future.

Dean Isaacson noted that there remained significant work to be done by the Admissions Committee to review admission policies in light of the above principles. He noted the need for a mechanism to orient the new Admissions Committee, which was to take office in September 2008, with respect to the work ahead. Dr. P. G. Harrison stated that the Committee acknowledged that approval of the principles constituted only the first step in an ongoing review process.

The motion to approve the amended principles was put and carried.

Dean Isaacson
Dr. McLean

} *That the Admissions Committee be directed to report to the Senate not later than the December 2008 meeting of Senate to follow up on the review of admission policies, consistent with the direction made by the Senate in December 2007.*

Carried.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES & PROCEDURES OF THE VANCOUVER SENATE

Dr. Berger explained that it would be necessary to suspend certain of the *Rules and Procedures of the Vancouver Senate* in order to consider the matter of BC provincial examinations as admission requirements for a second time within the same Senate session. The following two developments were offered as rationale for the motion to suspend the rules:

Admissions Committee, continued

1. The approval by the Vancouver Senate of the above Principles of Effective Undergraduate Admission to UBC; and
2. The Okanagan Senate had recently voted to remove provincial examinations (other than those required for high school graduation) as admission requirements, effective for applicants to begin studies in September 2009.

Dr. Berger

Dr. Marshall

} *That Senate suspend any sections in the Rules and Procedures of the Vancouver Senate and Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised necessary so as to allow for the consideration of the matter of provincial examinations as admission requirements for applicants to UBC Vancouver following the British Columbia/ Yukon secondary school curriculum.*

Carried by the
required two-thirds
vote.

APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION TO UBC: BC PROVINCIAL EXAMINATIONS AS ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The following is an excerpt from the Committee's report:

The Vancouver Senate voted in December 2007 to continue to require BC high school applicants to write four grade-twelve provincial exams. The UBC V Calendar statement (<http://www.students.ubc.ca/calendar/index.cfm?tree=2,22,63,0>) seems clear on first reading: "The admission average will be calculated on English 12 and the three additional approved examinable Grade 12 courses or the equivalent...All courses must be completed by June. Final examinations offered by the BC Ministry of Education...must be written". Applying the newly defined "Principles of Effective Undergraduate Admission to UBC", the Admissions Committee analyzed the policy and found that too many principles are being violated to support its continuation.

- First, although there would be fairness if all admission decisions were made once the final grades were available for all applicants for all courses, with the current practice of admitting students in the spring, some applicants are assessed on a combination of final grades (i.e., school and provincial exam components) while others are judged on school grades alone simply because of the nature of the particular school systems they attend.
- Second, there is an implied date for admission decisions to be finalized, i.e., in the summer when the results of the provincial exams written in June become available, which does not serve the needs of either the applicant in making plans or the university in managing instructional resources (people and space) and ultimately in meeting its commitment to government.

Admissions Committee, continued

- Third, there is a lack of transparency because there is no indication of how the marks on the provincial examinations will be used in determining admissibility to the university. Applicants are left guessing and the lack of certainty could deter some from pursuing their application.
- Fourth, the restriction of the choice of courses to be included in the calculation of the admission average to only four, all with provincial exams (in itself a more nebulous requirement now that most of those exams have been made optional for high school graduation), may be artificially limiting intellectual exploration in both the schools and the university. As well, some university programs may be missing a chance to select students who have had a particularly appropriate high school education because the courses involved are not currently acceptable for admission purposes.

Grades are not final until both the school component and the provincial exam are completed; the provincial exam result counts for 40% of the final grade. All high school students eligible to apply to UBC will complete their courses and write their last provincial exams in June and the final results become available through the Ministry of Education sometime in late July or early August. At first glance, the *principle of fairness* would seem to dictate that all BC high school applicants be evaluated in the summer when all of them have comparable sets of final course grades. However, some would argue that there is unfairness in comparing even those final grades because students are allowed to repeat a provincial exam, a course, or both in the hopes of raising the grade. Consequently, for some students, final grades reflect the outcome of two exposures to a course, which disadvantages the applicant who presents grades from only one exposure.

For several years UBC V has attempted in different ways to implement the *principle of timeliness*, whereby applicants who report their grades on-line in March and April may soon afterward receive a “firm” offer of admission (see below for a discussion of what “firm” might mean to a student). Another group of applicants receives offers in May after the Ministry of Education reports grades electronically to the Undergraduate Admissions Office. How fair is the evaluation of applicants’ grades in March, April, or May? Several aspects of the school system contribute to perceived or real unfairness. First, some students write provincial exams in grade eleven and may therefore have some final grades to report at the start of their grade-twelve year along with interim (i.e., incomplete, school-assessed) grades for other courses. Other students who may have some final grades to report by March are those attending semestered schools where courses that started in September are examined in January. However, those same students may not have a grade in a key admission requirement (English 12, for example) early enough to be considered for the early offers of admission. UBC may be losing some excellent students because of a rigid adherence to a requirement for grades in specific provincially examinable courses. Finally, a relatively new phenomenon has arisen whereby students take courses on-line through a Ministry-sanctioned, distributed or distance learning system rather than in a traditional school; which grade is reported to the Ministry of Education by May has been a source of variability. There are concerns about the comparability of some of the “school-based” grades being reported from distributed learning “colleges” to those from regular schools. In summary, the grades on which the

Admissions Committee, continued

majority of applicants are assessed are a mixture of interim, final, and repeated grades so it is difficult to argue that fairness is being achieved.

How the offers of admission made from March to June have been treated by the university in recent years brings us to the *principle of integrity*, i.e., the concurrence of policy and practice, and the *principle of transparency*. Until two or three years ago, most programs set a final cut-off average, and applicants who were offered early admission had the offer withdrawn if their final grade was below the cut. Some discretion was used, mainly to achieve the desired final enrolment target. By mid-summer, when final high school grades are available, most of the students UBC hopes to enrol have already made a decision to attend elsewhere and so new offers to them are both an affront and an ineffectual tool for enrolment management.

More recently, many programs have put more weight on the *principles of commitment and timeliness*, and have become more reluctant to revoke offers unless applicants' final grades had dropped drastically from the grades on which their early offers were based (remembering that those grades may have included both final and interim grades). In effect, the results of the June provincial exams became a much smaller factor in the decision to admit many students but there has been much variation in the way that students admitted to different programs have been treated. The decision by the Provost's office in 2007 to ban the practice of revocation of offers to students who maintained the University's published minimum standards brought these discrepancies into full light. The resulting change in practice has not been matched by a change in published policy which still requires that the provincial exam be written. We are now seen to lack nimbleness, unable to act with integrity because our published policies do not conform to our practice, and unable to provide applicants with a transparent process to follow.

Conclusion

The Admissions Committee recommends that the policy of requiring provincial exam results from BC high school applicants be discontinued for entry beginning in summer 2009 because it restricts UBC's ability to adhere to principles of fairness, timeliness, integrity, commitment and transparency, all of which should underpin an offer of admission.

Dr. Berger

Mr. McNulty

}

That the report of the Admissions Committee on "Applications of Principles of Effective Undergraduate Admission to UBC: BC Provincial Examinations as Admission Requirements" be received.

Carried.

Admissions Committee, continued

<i>Dr. Berger</i> <i>Dr. McKee</i>	}	<i>That the policy of requiring provincial examination results from BC high school applicants be discontinued, effective for the 2009 UBC Vancouver admission cycle and thereafter; and that the corresponding Calendar statement be approved.</i>
---------------------------------------	---	--

The proposed corresponding Calendar statement read as follows:

Beginning in 2009, applicants will not be required to write the final examinations offered by the BC Ministry of Education (BC Provincial Examinations) other than those required for graduation. For admission decisions, BC Provincial Examination results will be used if the examination result increases the applicant's admission average.

DISCUSSION

In response to a question, Dr. Berger clarified that the new policy would be first effective for applicants to begin studies in September 2009.

Dean Isaacson spoke in support of the motion. Although he had expressed earlier concerns about the previous proposal to implement a policy on short notice and in contravention to language in some letters of offer, he indicated that he was pleased to vote in favour of the present proposal.

Dr. Bluman noted that both the prior approval of the Principles of Effective Undergraduate Admission and the increased notice to prospective students constituted improvements over the December 2007 proposal. He expected, however, that mathematics would be the subject most directly affected by the policy change. Dr. Bluman cited data that students who do not write a final examination in mathematics typically receive one letter grade lower in MATH 100 (or equivalent) at university. He predicted that MATH 110 would therefore become a more expensive course for students and the University because it would take some students longer to successfully complete it. He asked Senators to consider whether this change would be fair to students.

Admissions Committee, continued

MOTIONS TO AMEND

Dr. Bluman } *That the Calendar statement be amended to*
Dr. Knight } *read as follows:*

Beginning in 2009, applicants will only be required to write the final examinations offered by the BC Ministry of Education (BC Provincial Examinations) required for graduation. For admission decisions, BC Provincial Examination results will be used if the examination result increases the applicant's admission average.

Carried.

Dr. Bluman } *That the following sentence be added to the*
Dr. Knight } *proposed Calendar statement:*

“Applicants who intend to take a calculus course are strongly encouraged to write the Principles of Mathematics 12 provincial examination.”

Failed.

DISCUSSION ON MAIN MOTION, CONTINUED

In response to a question from a Student Senator, Dr. Berger stated that the Committee was concerned about differences in grading between different jurisdictions, but that no one wished to unduly penalize applicants. Dr. Berger added that the University would continue to monitor student performance and provide feedback to the Ministry of Education and to individual schools.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Mr. Edgcumbe suggested that the following be appended to the main motion:

That the Admissions Committee submit a report no later than April 2009 on the following: the methods by which the undergraduate admissions office changed their selection procedures now that provincial examinations are no longer required, future challenges and strategies to ensure the fair assessment of students applying to UBC Vancouver

Admissions Committee, continue

within the context of standardized testing, grade inflation in BC high schools, and BC high school marks as predictors of success at UBC Vancouver.

Dr. Harrison stated that this topic would form part of the Admissions Committee's ongoing discussion about the newly-approved principles would be reflected in new policies. He expressed the opinion that an additional motion to this effect was unnecessary. Dr. Berger agreed, noting that the Admissions Committee was aware that policy adjustments would be necessary over time.

Mr. Brady suggested that Mr. Edgcumbe's proposal could be considered notice of motion for the following meeting of Senate so as to allow sufficient time for Senators to read and reflect on the motion. Dean Tierney urged caution with respect to the proposed amendment, noting that some of the statements therein appeared to be sweeping and speculative in nature.

There was some discussion about whether applicants from high schools were normally admitted based on Grade 11 or Grade 12 marks, and how much information was available to UBC in time to send out early offers of admission.

In response to a question from Dr. McKee, Dr. Berger agreed that it would be necessary to update the Calendar statement listing examinable high school courses in British Columbia if that list were to change over time.

The motion was put
and carried.

**AFFILIATION AGREEMENT: UBC FACULTY OF EDUCATION NATIVE INDIAN
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM (NITEP) AND THOMPSON RIVERS
UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF EDUCATION**

The Committee circulated a draft memorandum of understanding between the Native Indian Teacher Education Program in the Faculty of Education at UBC Vancouver and the Thompson Rivers University Faculty of Education. The terms of affiliation had been reviewed by the Council of Senates' Executive Committee in June 2007. The Executive Committee then referred the

Admissions Committee, continued

matter to the Vancouver Senate Admissions Committee and the Vancouver and Okanagan Faculties of Education for further consultation. Dr. Berger reported that the Admissions Committee was satisfied that sufficient consultation had taken place.

<i>Dr. Berger</i>	}	<i>That the affiliation agreement between the UBC Faculty of Education Native Indian Teacher Education Program and the Thompson Rivers University Faculty of Education be approved as specified in the attached Memorandum of Understanding.</i>
<i>Mr. Lowe</i>		

Carried.

ANNUAL REPORT – APPEALS ON APPLICATIONS FOR ADMISSION AND READMISSION TO PROGRAMS

The Committee had circulated for information a summary of appeals heard between May 1, 2007 and April 30, 2008. Of the 16 student appeals heard, seven had been allowed and nine had been dismissed.

Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing

ANNUAL REPORT 2007/2008

Committee Chair Dr. Yaworsky had circulated for information a summary of appeals heard by the Committee between May 2007 and April 2008.

Since the previous report to Senate in May 2007, nine appeals proceeded to Committee hearings, of which six were dismissed, two were allowed, and one was resolved and withdrawn prior to the Committee reaching a decision. In addition to these nine appeals, the Committee had been advised that in the past year an additional 17 appeals had been presented to the Registrar, of which nine were resolved prior to a Committee hearing; two were dismissed by the Registrar due to lack of timely prosecution; and six were in progress and are expected to be heard by the Committee in the upcoming months.

Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing, continued

In its report, the Committee made the following general observations:

The Committee continues to draw to the attention of faculty and departments the importance of following due process in all matters relating to student assessment, promotion and appeal; of maintaining scrupulous records of course requirements, grade schemes, and student performance; as well as drawing such regulations and requirements to the attention of students.

Additionally, the Committee would like to emphasize to faculties and departments the importance of dealing with these issues and student appeal inquiries in a timely manner.

Dr. Yaworsky expressed his personal thanks to his fellow Committee members for their consistently thoughtful input on student cases.

Curriculum Committee

Please see also 'Appendix A: Curriculum Summary.'

Committee Chair Dr. Marshall presented the curriculum proposals from the Faculties and Schools.

<i>Dr. Marshall</i>	}	<i>That the new and changed courses and programs brought forward by the Faculties of Arts, Forestry, Graduate Studies (Applied Science, Arts, Education, Land and Food Systems and Science) and Science be approved.</i>
<i>Ms. Friesen</i>		

Carried.

Joint Report from the Admissions Committee and the Curriculum Committee

Curriculum Committee Chair Dr. Marshall presented the joint report.

NEW PROGRAM: MASTER OF DENTAL SCIENCE / DIPLOMA IN ENDODONTICS

<i>Dr. Marshall</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the Master of Dental Science / Diploma in Endodontics program and its associated courses as set out in the attached report.</i>
<i>Ms. Friesen</i>		

Carried.

Admissions Committee and Curriculum Committee, continued

Dr. Marshall
Dr. McKee } *That Senate direct the Academic Policy Committee to consider the matter of research thesis-based graduate programs being offered by the disciplinary faculties under the provisions of the Senate policy entitled “Optional Transfer of Professional Graduate Programs from the Faculty of Graduate Studies to the Disciplinary Faculties” and to make recommendations to Senate on any improvements to that policy if needed.*

DISCUSSION

Dr. Marshall emphasized that the Curriculum and Admissions Committees were both very supportive of the new Master of Dental Science / Diploma in Endodontics. The Curriculum Committee was of the opinion, however, that there were some inconsistencies in current policy about the administration of thesis-based graduate programs that Senate ought to consider for future.

Dean Shuler noted the relatively small size of the Master of Dental Science program, and suggested that the review should focus on all advanced graduate programs, rather than on any particular program.

The motion was put and carried.

Nominating Committee

Committee member Dean Isaacson presented the report.

ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND PROCEDURAL DOCUMENTATION FOR STANDING COMMITTEES

The Committee had circulated for information a statement on committee roles, responsibilities, and procedures for each of the standing committees of the Senate. Each Committee had drafted its own statement, in consultation with Nominating Committee and using a template provided.

Dean Isaacson noted the following:

Nominating Committee, continued

- statements for the Student Awards Committee and the Teaching & Learning Committee had yet to be drafted;
- the statements were not intended to adjust terms of reference or change the jurisdiction of any committee;
- the statements would be remain “works-in-progress” for some time.

Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline

Committee Chair Prof. Boyle presented the report.

ANNUAL REPORT ON COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The Committee had circulated for information a report on its activities from May 1, 2007 through April 30, 2008. During that time period, the Committee had heard six student appeals. Five appeals had been dismissed, and one had been allowed in part. The following is an excerpt from the Committee’s report:

Concern Arising Out of Appeals Heard This Year

During the year, Committee members developed a heightened concern about consistency in student discipline. The Committee asked its chair to share this concern with President Toope, since the President holds the responsibility for imposing student discipline under the University Act. There was a division of opinion among Committee members about whether to share the concern more broadly, for example, with the Student Advocacy Office, which often represents students in discipline matters. It was decided to share the concern more publicly via this report to Senate. What follows is the text of the letter, dated November 6, 2007.

I have been asked by members of the Senate Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline to write to you with an expression of concern about consistency in disciplinary penalties imposed on students under the University Act. It may seem unusual for a body such as the Senate Committee to communicate directly with the person responsible for decisions which are the subject of appeal. However, I felt that at the very least, as a matter of courtesy, we should not raise a general concern with Senate without alerting you first. At best, we may be of assistance to you in carrying out your role under the Act or in improving the disciplinary system.

The Senate Committee is very conscious of the importance of academic integrity in a university. As well, it is aware of the need for attention to the varying circumstances of the human beings involved in the disciplinary process. However, bearing in mind this need for

Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline, continued

attention to individual circumstances, it feels that there should be a reasonable level of consistency in the disciplinary actions taken. Concern about consistency is intermingled with other worries, such as a lack of transparency and a lack of reasons which could explain decisions which might otherwise appear inconsistent. A disciplined student does not have access to all the reports of your Advisory Committee, and even if he or she did, they might not help to explain variations in penalty. Such a student may focus more on a feeling of being unfairly or arbitrarily treated (rather than on how to improve his or her moral judgment), but lack the means either to demonstrate arbitrariness or be reassured that there was been no arbitrary treatment.

Members of the Senate Committee have felt such disquiet on a general level, but have recently encountered what they believe to be cause for more specific concern in the context of a particular case. A student who copied code from the internet was given a zero in the course, a notation and 8 months suspension. Several months later, in three somewhat similar cases, one of which appeared very similar, the discipline was simply a zero and letter of reprimand. In the absence of any information in the relevant reports from your Advisory Committee to assist in distinguishing the cases, or information about a shift in view about the use of notations and suspensions, the Committee felt obliged to decrease the period of suspension and remove the notation. This occurred in spite of the fact that in the past the Committee has dismissed appeals requesting removal of citations.

Decisions based on concern about lack of consistency rather than on a principled position on the issue of what responsibility the university has to alert others in the community to academic misconduct are clearly not satisfactory. The question arises as to how we should address appeals against notations and suspensions in the future where they could be seen as reasonable in themselves but, in the absence of reasons explaining very different disciplinary actions, appear to be arbitrary.

We do not wish to interfere with how you carry out your statutory responsibility, but simply to draw our concern to your attention. If you feel there is assistance we could offer and it is consistent with our role as an appeal body and a Senate Committee, then of course we would be willing to offer such assistance.

The incoming Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline may wish to consider the issue of how to pay attention to individual circumstances while achieving a reasonable level of consistency.

Prof. Boyle thanked members of the Committee, as well as Ms. Mann of Senate & Curriculum Services, for their competent work over the previous year.

Student Awards Committee

Committee Chair Dr. Bluman presented the report.

NEW AWARDS

See also 'Appendix B: New Awards.'

<i>Dr. Bluman</i>	}	<i>That Senate accept the awards as listed and forward them to the Board of Governors for approval; and that letters of thanks be sent to the donors.</i>
<i>Dr. Stelck</i>		

Carried.

Teaching & Learning Committee

Committee Chair Dr. Bryson presented the report.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON CR/D/F GRADING PRACTICES

The Committee circulated a report on its progress to date and its plans for the future with respect to the March 2008 Senate referral to the Committee. The Committee planned to continue its work through the summer of 2008. As the current Committee's term was to end on August 31, 2008, the Committee planned to provide as much information as possible to the subsequent iteration of the Teaching and Learning Committee, which was to take office in September 2008. Dr. Bryson encouraged Senators and others interested in this topic to direct inquiries and comments to the Committee through the Senate secretariat or to contact her directly.

<i>Dr. Bryson</i>	}	<i>That the Vancouver Senate Teaching and Learning Committee's Preliminary Report on Credit/D/Fail Grading Practices be received.</i>
<i>Mr. Leung</i>		

Carried.

Tributes Committee

Committee Chair Dr. Thorne presented the reports.

HONORARY DEGREE NOMINATIONS

Dr. Thorne announced that nominations had opened for candidates for honorary degrees to be conferred in 2009. The deadline for receipt of nominations was September 15, 2008. A revised nomination form was available at a new Honorary Degrees page at the Vancouver Senate website at www.senate.ubc.ca/vancouver/honorary.cfm . Dr. Thorne encouraged Senators to review the criteria posted on the website and to consider nominating worthy individuals.

CANDIDATES FOR EMERITUS STATUS

Please see also 'Appendix C: Emeritus Status.'

<i>Dr. Thorne</i>	}	<i>That the attached list of individuals for emerita or emeritus status be approved and that, pursuant to section 9(2) of the University Act, all persons with the ranks of Professors Emeriti, Associate Professors Emeriti, Assistant Professors Emeriti, Senior Instructors Emeriti, Instructors II Emeriti, Instructors I Emeriti, General Librarians Emeriti and Administrative Librarians Emeriti be added to the Roll of Convocation.</i>
<i>Ms. Silvester</i>		

Carried.

MEMORIAL MINUTE FOR DR. JOHN HOBART MCLEAN ANDREWS

The Committee had prepared the following memorial minute for a former Senator who had recently passed away.

Dr. John Hobart McLean Andrews was born on May 15, 1926 in Kamloops, British Columbia. After attending Kamloops High School, he received a Bachelor of Arts in Physics from the University of British Columbia. Following teacher training, he taught at various schools across British Columbia in communities such as Squamish and Salmon Arm. In 1957, he received a doctorate from the University of Chicago in the

Tributes Committee, continued

field of Education Administration, and soon afterwards joined the University of Alberta as a Professor of Education Administration.

From 1965 to 1973, Dr. Andrews served as the Associate Director of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Upon his return to British Columbia, he joined UBC as the Dean of the Faculty of Education, serving as Dean until 1979 and then as Professor until his retirement in 1985. Dr. Andrews enriched the lives of many UBC students and held a deep personal and professional commitment to the University and to public education both in Canada and around the world.

<i>Dr. Thorne</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the Memorial Minute for Dr. John Hobart McLean Andrews, that it be entered into the Minutes of Senate, and that a copy be sent to the family of the deceased.</i>
<i>Dean Tierney</i>		

Carried.

Reports from the Provost & Vice-President, Academic

Vice-President Farrar presented the reports.

UBC POLICY #18: APPOINTMENT OF DESIGNATED SENIOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

Vice-President Farrar had circulated proposed revisions to Policy #18. He explained that this was one of three appointment policies undergoing revision, and that the policy required approval by both the Board of Governors and the two Senates.

<i>Vice-President Farrar</i>	}	<i>That the Senate approve the proposed revisions to UBC Policy #18: Appointment of Designated Senior Academic Administrators.</i>
<i>Dean Isaacson</i>		

DISCUSSION

Mr. Lougheed asked about the process for identifying student members of the advisory committee for the selection of a Vice-President, Administration & Finance. Vice-President Farrar noted that that particular vice-presidential appointment was not addressed in Policy #18, but was covered by another appointment policy that had been sent to the Senate for consultation.

The motion was put and carried.

Reports from the Provost and Vice-President, Academic, continued

TEACHING AND LEARNING INITIATIVES

At the request of Vice-President Farrar, the meeting Chair recognized Vice-Provost Anna Kindler, who was the author of a report circulated to the Senate for information. The report gave an overview of the implementation of the May 2007 Senate Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching, as well as other teaching and learning initiatives underway both centrally and within the Faculties and Schools.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Brady congratulated the authors of the report, citing excellent progress on the Lasting Education Achieved and Demonstrated (LEAD) initiative, the Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth, and training programs for teaching assistants.

In response to a question from Dr. Bluman, Vice-President Farrar stated that an electronic tool for the submission of teaching evaluation data would be made available in the next phase of implementation. Instructors would also be able to add their own questions, if desired.

In response to a question from Mr. Lee, Vice-President Farrar stated that it had taken longer than anticipated to analyze the data collected during the first year. The results from term 1 of the 2008/2009 academic year would be the first to be released to students. He acknowledged that the Alma Mater Society had expressed disappointment that data from the first year would not be released.

In response to a further question from Mr. Lee, Vice-President Farrar stated that the online model would support more frequent evaluation by students, including in-term or mid-term evaluation. Vice-Provost Kindler also drew attention to initiatives in place to support the development of excellent teaching skills, including specific skill development workshops.

Reports from the Provost and Vice-President, Academic, continued

In response to a question from Dr. Dunford about concerns raised by the UBC Faculty Association, Vice-President Farrar stated that formal consultation with faculty members, Faculties, and the Faculty Association would continue during the summer of 2008.

A Student Senator asked whether monetary compensation might increase participation by teaching assistants in training programs. Vice-Provost Kindler noted that there appeared to be more interest among teaching assistants to participate in programs delivered within Faculties, compared to mandatory centrally delivered training. She was hopeful that a recent change to a more distributed model would help increase participation rates.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INSTITUTE FOR THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

Vice-President Farrar had circulated for information the annual report of the Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning for the period from May 2007 to May 2008.

<i>Vice-President Farrar Mr. Gorman</i>	<i>}</i>	<i>That the Senate receive for information the report to Senate on the Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, May 2007 -- 2008.</i>
---	----------	--

Carried.

Proposed Agenda Items

None.

Other Business

None.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. The following regular meeting of the Senate was scheduled for Wednesday, September 17, 2008.

APPENDIX A: CURRICULUM SUMMARY

Faculty of Arts

COURSES

ANTH 428 (3), ANTH 429 (3), CRWR 403 (3/6) D, CRWR 404 (3/6) D, CRWR 414 (3/6) D, CRWR 415 (3/6) D, CRWR 424 (3/6) D, CRWR 433 (3/6) D, CRWR 434 (3/6) D, CRWR 435 (3/6) D, FNLG 101 (3-12) D, FNLG 102 (3-12) D, FNLG 111 (3-12) D, FNLG 112 (3-12) D, FNLG 121 (3-12) D, FNLG 122 (3-12) D, FNLG 131 (3-12) D, FNLG 132 (3-12) D, FNLG 141(3-12) D, FNLG 142 (3-12) D, FNLG 151 (3) FNLG 152 (3), FNLG 161 (3), FNLG 162 (3), FNLG 191 (3/12) D, FNLG 192 (3/12) D

Faculty of Forestry

COURSES

CONS 425 (3), CONS 452 (6)

Graduate Studies: Faculty of Applied Science

COURSES

CIVL 592 (1-6) C, EECE 531 (3), EECE 581 (3), MTRL 571 (3), MTRL 594 (3)

Graduate Studies: Faculty of Arts

COURSES

CRWR 503 (3/6) D, CRWR 504 (3/6) D, CRWR 511 (6), CRWR 514 (3/6) D, CRWR 515 (3/6) D, CRWR 522 (3/6) D, CRWR 523 (3), CRWR 524 (3/6) D, CRWR 533 (3/6) D, CRWR 534 (3/6) D, CRWR 535 (3/6) D, CRWR 547 (3-12) C, ECON 557 (3), ECON 562 (3)

Graduate Studies: Faculty of Education

COURSE

EPSE 683

Graduate Studies: Faculty of Land & Food Systems

COURSE

FOOD 510

Appendix A: Curriculum Summary, continued

Graduate Studies: Faculty of Science

COURSE

PHYS 520

Faculty of Science

PROGRAMS

B.Sc. Degree Requirements: Dual Degree Program in Science and Education

B.Sc. Mathematics: Dual Degree Program in Mathematics and Education

B.Sc. Physics: Dual Degree Program in Physics and Education

B.Sc Physics: Dual Degree Program in Physics and Education

COURSES

BIOL 423 (3), COGS 303 (3), MATH 110 (6), MATH 180 (4), MATH 184 (4), MATH 256 (3),
MATH 310 (3), MATH 412 (3), PHYS 348 (3), STAT 443 (3)

APPENDIX B: NEW AWARDS

AMACON-Beasley Graduate Student Prize for Excellence in Urban Planning: Two prizes of \$1,500 each are offered by Amacon Construction to recognize excellence and innovation in graduate students at SCARP. Students are invited to submit their work for consideration and may include: a paper, design project, thesis, final project, or video. The work submitted must have been done while at SCARP, must have an urban planning focus and must demonstrate innovation. Both Masters and Ph.D. students are encouraged to apply. The awards are made on the recommendation of the School of Community and Regional Planning in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (First awards available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

W. Erwin DIEWERT Prize in Applied Economics: A \$300 prize has been endowed in honour of W. Erwin Diewert, an internationally renowned Canadian economist specializing in problems of Economic Measurement, a Distinguished Professor, a recipient of the Killam Prize, the Purvis Prize and the Shiskin Memorial Award, and an advisor to statistical agencies of the U.N., World Bank, European Central Bank, Canada, U.S., U.K. and many other countries. The prize is offered to an undergraduate student who has written an outstanding paper in Applied Economics and is made on the recommendation of the Department of Economics. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

W. Erwin DIEWERT Graduate Prize in Applied Economics: A \$300 prize has been endowed in honour of W. Erwin Diewert, an internationally renowned Canadian economist specializing in problems of Economic Measurement, a Distinguished Professor, a recipient of the Killam Prize, the Purvis Prize and the Shiskin Memorial Award, and an advisor to statistical agencies of the U.N., World Bank, European Central Bank, Canada, U.S., U.K. and many other countries. The prize is offered to a student who has written an outstanding Master's thesis in Applied Economics and is made on the recommendation of the Department of Economics. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

EMAAR Canada Graduate Entrance Scholarship in Architecture: A \$2,500 scholarship is offered by Emaar Canada to a student entering the Master of Architecture Program who places within the top 10% of accepted applicants. Candidates must demonstrate initiative in understanding the practice of architecture in their application materials. The award is made on the recommendation of the School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

FACULTY Women's Club 90th Anniversary Entrance Scholarship: A \$1,000 scholarship is offered by the UBC Faculty Women's Club to celebrate the Club's 90th anniversary in 2008. The scholarship is awarded to a female student beginning undergraduate studies in Engineering. The award is adjudicated by the Office of Student Financial Assistance and Awards. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

NOTE: In addition to supporting this new scholarship on an annual basis, the donors have pledged to build an endowment of \$20,000 or more over the next five years in order eventually to make the award self-sustaining.

John H.V. GILBERT Interprofessional Scholarship: A \$1,000 scholarship has been endowed by friends and colleagues in honour of Dr. John H.V. Gilbert for an outstanding stu-

Appendix B: New Awards, continued

dent who, having completed the penultimate year of any undergraduate health or human services degree program, combines academic excellence and demonstrated student leadership in interprofessional education for collaborative patient centered practice. Activities related to interprofessional education in all undergraduate years are considered. Candidates must apply to the College of Health Disciplines and are required to include two signed letters of recommendation, which may be mailed separately or e-mailed from their originator. Original transcripts must also be submitted. The award is made on the recommendation of a committee chaired by an individual appointed by the College of Health Disciplines. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session.)

Clay GILLESPIE Rogers Group Financial Bursary: Bursaries totalling \$1,000 have been endowed by Clay Gillespie of Rogers Group Financial to assist undergraduate students in need of financial support while enrolled at UBC. In adjudicating eligibility, consideration may be given to candidates' active participation in campus-related extra-curricular activities, including UBC Athletics Programs. (First awards available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

LEDCOR Industries Inc. Centenary Scholarship in Accounting and Finance: A \$1,000 scholarship has been endowed by Ledcor Industries Inc. for an undergraduate student in the third or fourth year of a Bachelor of Commerce Program, in either the Accounting or the Finance Option. The award is made on the recommendation of the Sauder School of Business. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

LEDCOR Industries Inc. Centenary Scholarship in Architecture: A \$1,000 scholarship has been endowed by Ledcor Industries Inc. for a students entering the Master of Architecture Program or Master of Advanced Studies in Architecture Program. The award is made on the recommendation of the School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session) Senate Committee on Student Awards May 2008 Awards page 3

LEDCOR Industries Inc. Centenary Scholarship in Civil Engineering: Two scholarships of \$1,000 each have been endowed by Ledcor Industries Inc., one for a student entering Civil Engineering and one for an undergraduate student in second, third or fourth year Civil Engineering. The award is made on the recommendation of the Department. (First awards available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

LEDCOR Industries Inc. Centenary Varsity Athletic Award: A \$1,000 award has been endowed by Ledcor Industries Inc. for an undergraduate student on a Varsity Team, with preference for a student in Engineering, Architecture or Commerce. The award is made on the recommendation of the President's Athletic Awards Committee to a student who has demonstrated leadership skills and maintained good academic standing. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

Harold D. McLELLAN Chemical Engineering Scholarship: One or more scholarships totalling \$1,000 have been endowed by Harold D. McLellan (B.A.Sc. Chem. Eng. 1947) for outstanding students entering Chemical Engineering. The award is made on the recommendation of the Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

OKANAGAN Bar Association Entrance Scholarship in Law: Scholarships totalling \$5,000

Appendix B: New Awards, continued

have been endowed by the Law Foundation of British Columbia, Mr. Wally P. Lightbody, Q.C. and members of the Okanagan Bar Association for students who have graduated from The University of British Columbia Okanagan with good academic standing, entering the LL.B/Juris Doctor Program at UBC. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law in consultation with the University of British Columbia Okanagan as and when appropriate. (First awards available for the 2008/09 Winter Session.)

PLANT Science Graduate Scholarship: One or more scholarships totalling \$1,000 have been endowed for graduate students in the Plant Science Graduate Program in the Faculty of Land and Food Systems who are working on agricultural and/or horticultural topics. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Faculty in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

(First awards available for the 2008/09 Winter Session.)

Sydney J. RISK Graduate Award in Directing: A \$1,000 award is offered by the Sydney J. Risk Foundation in memory of Western Canada theatre pioneer, Sydney J. Risk, to recognize a student who shows exceptional promise for a directing career in the theatre. It is awarded to a promising Directing candidate as they enter their second year of the Master of Fine Arts Program. The award is made on the recommendation of the Department of Theatre and Film in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (First awards available for the 2008/09 Winter Session.)

John SCHILDROTH Memorial Scholarship: A \$1,000 scholarship has been endowed in memory of John Schildroth by family, friends and colleagues at the B.C. Ministry of Agriculture and Lands and at UBC's Faculty of Land and Food Systems for a graduate or undergraduate student with excellent academic standing in the Faculty of Land and Food Systems who has also demonstrated excellence in a range of non-academic fields such as community service, student leadership, volunteerism, and athletic or artistic performance. Preference is given to a graduate student studying food and resource economics, public policy or a related field. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty and, in the case of a graduate student, in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session)

TOTAL E&P Canada Engineering Scholarship: Two scholarships valued at \$5,000 each are offered by Total E&P to undergraduate students enrolled in the fourth year of Civil, Chemical (Process or Environmental Option), Geological, Materials, Mining, or Mechanical Engineering. Candidates must have achieved a minimum 80% overall average and demonstrated an interest in petroleum or related industries. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Applied Science. (First award available for the 2008/09 Winter Session.)

Previously-Approved Awards with Changes in Terms or Funding Source:

None.

APPENDIX C: EMERITUS STATUS

RETIREMENTS DECEMBER 31, 2007 TO AUGUST 31, 2008

Last Name, First Name: Emeritus Title as Approved by the Senate

Carty, Elaine: Professor Emerita of Nursing

Chase, Mackie: Program Director Emerita

Dyck, Isabel Jean: Professor Emerita of Occupational Therapy

Ganders, Fred: Professor Emeritus of Botany

Globe, Alexander V.: Professor Emeritus of English

Harris, Susan R.: Professor Emerita of Physical Therapy

Johnston, Judith Rae: Professor Emerita of Audiology & Speech Sciences

Kennedy, Susan: Professor Emerita of Environmental Health

Macleod, Elizabeth: Senior Instructor Emerita of Audiology & Speech Sciences

McLean, John A.: Professor Emeritus of Forest Sciences

Perry, Jo Ann: Associate Professor of Nursing

Pinel, John J.: Professor Emeritus of Psychology

Piper, Martha C.: President Emerita

Tingle, Aubrey J.: Professor Emeritus of Paediatrics

Trip, Everard: Senior Instructor Emeritus of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

Vernier, Michel*: Associate Professor Emeritus of Health Care & Epidemiology

Wilkie, Donald M.: Professor Emeritus of Psychology

Wilson, Deborah G.: Librarian Emerita

Werner, Walter H.: Associate Professor Emeritus of Curriculum Studies

*Adjustment to Rank-this individual was approved for Emeritus Status by Senate in September 2007 as Clinical Associate Professor