



VANCOUVER SENATE

MINUTES OF 15 OCTOBER 2025

Attendance

Present: B.-A. Bacon (Chair), R. Ng (Secretary), A. Adibi, M. Adshade, F. Andrew, G. Averill, E. Baniassad, S. Bates, H. von Bergmann, S. Bredin, B. Britton, L. Burr, A. Chui, J. Cool, J. Cragg, C. Crowston, C. Desjarlais, A. d'Entremont, P. Englezos, A. Esteves, D. Evans, A. Fisher, D. Fontana, N. Ford, S. Forwell, J. Fox, J. Gilbert, T. Gill, S. W. Graham, S. Grayston, A. Gupta, S. Hagerman, P. Harrison, K. Hassib, M. Hirst, A. Ivanov, D. Kitts, M. Koehoorn, R. Kozak, F. Lalji, C. Lim, J. Lorien, M. MacLachlan, C. W. Marshall, S. McElduff, S. McGillivray, C. Menzies, L. Moss, Z. Nawar, W. Norman, J. Olson, S. Pelech, J. Phelps, A. Pratap-Singh, I. Price, M. Prost, L. Raman-Wilms, R. Spencer, J. Stewart, R. Topping, G. Tsiakos, G. Turcotte, A. Uzama, D. Warburton, J. Xu, J. Xue

Regrets: B. Agafitei, B. Bhandar, Y. Chen, D. Dahl, C. Dai, K. Doering, A. Dulay, B. Forster, C. Godwin, S. Gopalakrishnan, J. Hare, E. Jenkins, R. Kim, K. Lo, C. Overall, S. Parker, N. Pindell, J. Rogers, S. Singh, P. Spilsbury, A. Wang, S. Yi-Kieran

Clerk: C. Eaton

Call to Order and Territorial Acknowledgement

The Chair of Senate, Dr Benoit-Antoine Bacon, called the second meeting of the Senate for the 2025/2026 academic year to order at 6:01 pm and he provided an acknowledgement of the land.

Senate Membership

NEW MEMBERS

The Registrar announced the following new members of Senate:

Pratyaksha Awasthi, Student Representative of the Faculty of Education until 30 September 2026 and thereafter until replaced.

James Stewart, Representative of the Peter A. Allard School of Law, to replace Ben Goad, Representative of the Peter A. Allard School of Law, until 31 August 2026 and thereafter until replaced.

The President expressed appreciation for their service.



Minutes of Previous Meetings

Kareem Hassib
Cade Desjarlais

*That the revised minutes of the meeting of 17
September 2025 be approved as corrected.*

Correction: Attendance

Approved

Remarks from the Chair

The President indicated that there had been significant activity on campus and highlighted the official launch of *UBC's Strategic Directions 2025-2030* during the previous week. He observed that the Senate had played an important role in the process and that events had been held in both the Okanagan and Vancouver. He emphasized that the plan resulted from extensive work and engagement across the University.

The President noted that the final version of the plan reaffirmed the University's commitment to academic and research excellence and renewed its dedication to several key operational plans. He explained that it introduced seven new strategic directions designed to help the institution adapt to changing realities and address pressing societal issues. He added that the approval of the plan marked the beginning of the next phase, which was implementation.

The President reported that there had been interest in the plan from the business community, government, and the broader public. He mentioned that he had spoken at the BC Business Summit about the productivity crisis in Canada, where he highlighted the importance of university education and research in fostering prosperity and stability. He noted that the presentation was well received.

He added that earlier the same day he had spoken at the Vancouver Board of Trade, where he was joined by UBC researchers who had contributed to innovation and economic growth through collaboration with provincial businesses. The President described the day as a strong representation of UBC's partnerships and its contributions to British Columbia.

The President acknowledged the contributions of Vice-President, Research and Innovation, Dr Gail Murphy, recognizing her leadership in enhancing UBC's research and innovation ecosystem over the previous nine years. He informed the Senate that Dr Murphy had announced her intention to step down from her position at the end of May. He expressed gratitude for her



service, noting that there would be opportunities in the coming months to celebrate her accomplishments. He announced that a search process would begin in the following weeks to identify her successor.

Senator Charles Menzies asked whether, beyond the business community, the President had engaged with trade unions, community organizers, or local groups that did not operate for profit. He inquired if the President had recently spoken to any such communities on behalf of the University.

The President replied that this type of outreach had been included in consultations for the University's strategic plan. He explained that ongoing meetings took place with community organizations through the Community Engagement team. He noted that these meetings were consistently well received and provided an example, explaining that he had been invited to meet with the Ismaili Council within the next two months. He added that this type of engagement was ongoing.

From the Board of Governors

The President confirmed that materials from the following meetings, as approved by the Senate and by the Council of Senates, were subsequently approved by the Board of Governors as required under the *University Act*:

Memorandum of Understanding: Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Helsinki and Faculty of Forestry, UBC Vancouver

Renewal of Affiliation Agreement: UBC Vancouver Faculty of Education, Linköping Universitet (Sweden) and University of the Western Cape (Republic of South Africa)

Candidates for Degrees

The President requested that the Senate consider revising the motion to include the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and a Doctor of Philosophy, to be granted posthumously.

With general consent, the motion was revised to include the candidate for a posthumous degree from the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

Charles Menzies
Jasper Lorien

That the candidates for degrees, as recommended by the Faculties of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and Science be granted the degree or diploma for which they were recommended, effective October 2025, and that a committee



comprised of the Registrar, the Deans of the Faculties, and the Chair of the Senate be empowered to make any necessary adjustments.

Approved

Academic Policy Committee

The Vice-Chair of the Senate Academic Policy Committee, Mx Jasper Lorien, presented.

REVISED ACADEMIC REGULATIONS FOR ACADEMIC RECOGNITION, PROMOTION, AND CONTINUATION: BACHELOR OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS

Jasper Lorien
Clare Crowston

That Senate approve the amendments to the academic regulations for the Faculty of Arts, Vancouver School of Economics, Bachelor of International Economics, with respect to continuation requirements, effective 2026S and thereafter, as set out in the attached proposal.

Approved

Admissions Committee

The Chair of the Senate Admissions Committee, Dr Joanne Fox, presented.

NEW AFFILIATION AGREEMENT: UBC AND EUROLIFE NETWORK (UNIVERSITÄTSMEDIZIN GÖTTINGEN, TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN, LEIDEN UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTRE, KAROLINSKA INSTITUTET, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG, MEDIZINISCHE UNIVERSITÄT INNSBRUCK, SEMMELWEIS UNIVERSITY AND UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH)

Joanne Fox
Shannon Bredin

That Senate approve and recommend to the Council of Senates for approval the terms of the affiliation between the University of British Columbia Faculty of Medicine and the EUROLIFE Network of European Universities in Life Sciences, as outlined in the “8th EUROLIFE



Collaboration Agreement” and the “Addendum to the 8th EUROLIFE Collaboration Agreement.”

Dean Mieke Koehoorn noted that the Faculty of Medicine supported the proposal.

Senator Steven Pelech referred to the €6,000 fee and inquired about the corresponding fees paid by other regular members of the network. He noted that UBC appeared to be the only institution outside of Europe participating as an affiliate member. He sought clarification on how the agreement applied to UBC, particularly regarding the placement of students among the European universities. He asked whether UBC students would study at those institutions and whether European students would come to UBC. He also asked about the criteria governing the responsibilities of each university in covering educational costs and whether students were required to pay for their own accommodation. He expressed some uncertainty about the specific provisions applicable to affiliate partners, as the agreement seemed primarily to describe arrangements among full members. He further observed that UBC did not have full voting rights on strategic directions and noted that the network was limited to twelve partners, with nine existing members, suggesting that UBC would become the tenth.

With permission of Senate, Dr Michelle Wong responded that UBC was the first university outside Europe to join the network, which she described as a significant achievement given the network’s long-standing establishment. She confirmed that UBC had joined as an affiliate member and that the contribution amount was the same as that of the European partners. She explained that the exchange of students and other participants was expected to follow the same model as the existing European institutions. She added that, as a result of this new relationship and UBC’s participation as part of a country eligible under the Horizon funding framework, UBC would gain access to the same student funding opportunities as the other members. She clarified that this was the eighth amendment to an existing agreement among the nine European universities and that UBC was joining partway through that process. She noted that once the full version of the new agreement was executed, UBC would be included in the next iteration of the agreement, which would then be brought back to the Senate for consideration.

Approved

NEW AFFILIATION AGREEMENTS: UBC AND SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE (TANZANIA); UBC AND MKWAWA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (TANZANIA); AND UBC AND UNIVERSITY OF THE CAPE COAST (GHANA)

Joanne Fox
Jasper Lorien

That Senate approve and recommend to the Council of Senates for approval the terms of



affiliations between The University of British Columbia and Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania (SUA), The University of British Columbia and Mkwawa University College of Education, Tanzania (MUCE) and The University of British Columbia and University of Cape Coast, Ghana (UCC), as outlined in the “Agreement between The University of British Columbia (Canada) and Sokoine University of Agriculture (Tanzania),” “Agreement between The University of British Columbia (Canada) and Mkwawa University College of Education (Tanzania)” and the “Agreement between The University of British Columbia (Canada) and University of Cape Coast (Ghana)”.

Approved

Agenda Committee

The Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee, Dr Joanne Fox, presented.

CHANGE START TIME OF SENATE MEETINGS

Senator Fox explained that the proposed change would be made in response to feedback received during the *External Review of the Vancouver Senate*, which recommended that the meeting time be moved to the late afternoon. The Agenda Committee discussed that shifting the meetings to the afternoon during standard work hours was anticipated to encourage participation, accessibility, and inclusivity.

She noted that the current meeting time was particularly difficult for those with evening family commitments. The proposed 4 pm start time would begin in the next triennium, and the current meeting schedule would remain unchanged for the duration of the present triennium. The revised meeting time would remain in place for the next two triennia, beginning on September 1, 2026. Hybrid meeting formats would continue to be offered regardless of the start time.

She explained that the motion was presented well in advance of the nomination period for the next triennium, to ensure that all prospective candidates, both new and returning, were informed of the new 4 pm start time as they considered their potential involvement in Senate



Joanne Fox
Wendy Norman

That the Senate endorses the decision of the Agenda Committee, made pursuant to Rule 17(a) of the Rules and Procedures of the Vancouver Senate, to change the start time for all Vancouver Senate meetings from the current scheduled time to 4:00 PM, effective for the two triennia commencing September 2026.

Senator Sean Graham asked whether the new meeting time would create greater conflicts for those who taught during that period compared with the previous schedule.

The Clerk replied that such conflicts would exist because some classes continued until 5 pm as part of the daytime schedule, with additional classes running from 5 to 8 pm and from 7 to 10 pm. The Clerk explained that the Okanagan campus already held Senate meetings beginning at 3:30 pm and that, in those cases, the administration maintained a list of senators who taught at those times and attempted to address scheduling conflicts when possible. The Clerk added that a similar process could be implemented for the Vancouver campus if the need arose and noted that there had also been challenges with student class registration.

Senator Kareem Hassib acknowledged the practices at the Okanagan campus but noted that the Vancouver campus included the Faculty of Medicine, whose students were required to be in hospitals from 9 am to 5 pm. He observed that students in professional programs such as Education, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Law, and those in co-op placements or practicums would face similar conflicts. He indicated that many student senators would be unable to attend meetings starting at 4 pm. He reflected on his own experience, explaining that while on co-op he had needed to adjust his schedule and expressed concern that the new start time would create a significant barrier for students with work or academic commitments extending to 5 pm.

Senator Cade Desjarlais expressed agreement with the points raised by Senator Hassib. He noted that a 4 pm start time would make attendance nearly impossible for many in his program. He questioned the rationale behind selecting 4 pm and suggested that a 5 pm start would be a more practical compromise if the intent was to move the meetings earlier. He expressed concern that the proposed change was arbitrary and suggested that, since Senate meetings occurred only once per month, senators should be prepared to accommodate that service commitment. He compared the Okanagan and Vancouver campuses, noting that the earlier meeting time at Okanagan might be influenced by local conditions.

Senator Lorien noted that Senator Desjarlais had previously served as President of the Student Union at the Okanagan campus and said they accepted their experience with conditions there.



They recalled that this issue had been discussed during their first term on Senate, both in the Agenda Committee and in a joint meeting with the Nominating Committee. They reiterated that the proposed 4 pm start time would create an access barrier for many students. They referred to students in Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, and Education who would be unable to participate because of full-day academic or professional commitments and mentioned that students in co-op programs faced similar challenges. They emphasized the value of student perspectives and noted that participation from those programs might be lost if the motion passed. They further explained that students in some disciplines, such as Arts, had more flexibility than those in professional programs, whose commitments could not easily be rearranged.

The President summarized the concerns about barriers for students in certain disciplines had been raised by several student senators and asked Senator Fox to comment on whether the Agenda Committee had discussed these issues.

In response, Senator Fox confirmed that the matter had been discussed by the Committee. She explained that the timing of the effective date was chosen deliberately so that class scheduling and teaching assignments could be adjusted in advance of the change. She acknowledged the points raised and explained that finding an ideal meeting time was extremely difficult. She added that the Agenda Committee's recommendation had been guided by feedback from the external review.

Senator Laura Moss expressed support for the motion. She expressed that she had not considered putting herself forward for Senate until her children left home and explained that the evening meeting time had been a barrier to access. She noted that a similar access barrier existed for faculty members with children or long commutes and emphasized that faculty and other staff who had long workdays also experienced challenges with evening meeting times.

Senator Ben Britton also spoke in favour of the motion. He acknowledged the students' concerns and noted that the current narrative was guided by senators able to attend the evening meeting. He highlighted that access challenges affected parents, those with second jobs, and others with caring responsibilities, spanning students, staff, and convocation members. He referenced other universities that held meetings during the daytime. He agreed with Senator Moss regarding the difficulty of long Wednesday schedules, describing his own day of governance, teaching, and research as exhausting. He noted that the advance notice provided by the Agenda Committee allowed adaptation and suggested implementing measures to increase Senate efficiency, citing recommendations from the external review.

Senator Charles Menzies shared his personal experience when he started working at UBC when his children were young and explained how his availability was affected. He acknowledged the contributions of colleagues who had enabled flexible arrangements and described managing



evening meetings alongside personal and professional responsibilities. He commented on the importance of governance matters relative to evening meetings and noted that the concept of equity, diversity, and inclusion had sometimes been misapplied in this context.

Senator Pelech asked whether the Committee had considered an alternate time for meetings. He explained that there were pros and cons to both an early start and a later start. He noted that Senate meetings occurred once a month and suggested alternating the start time between 4 pm one month and 6 pm the next month, indicating that this approach could reduce the impact and allow more people to benefit.

Senator Fox replied that the Committee had not discussed that option. She explained that the scheduling challenges and logistical considerations would increase with alternate times, and that the Committee had focused on the proposed time.

Senator Lorien asked for clarification, inquiring whether any other times had been discussed.

Senator Fox responded that the Committee had primarily focused on 4 pm. She invited the Clerk to provide additional context regarding previous discussions on timing.

The Clerk explained that the timing of Senate meetings had been a topic of discussion for many years. Historically, the Senate met at 8 pm, which posed challenges, and the time had gradually moved forward to 6 pm. Surveys and questionnaires had shown a trimodal preference. The Clerk noted that various times had been considered, but no single time satisfied all participants. He explained that further exploration could be undertaken, but it was unlikely that a universally suitable time would be found.

Senator Lorien acknowledged the childcare challenges and the lack of a perfect solution. They expressed concern that the current early time could prevent members of certain programs from attending at all, citing the impracticality of requiring individuals to take a day away from hospital duties. They suggested further discussion about 5 pm and also recommended referring the matter back to the Agenda Committee for additional consideration.

REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

Jasper Lorien
Amin Adibi

That the decision of the Agenda Committee be referred back to the Agenda Committee for review, and that the Committee be further directed to consider alternative start times for Vancouver Senate meetings and report back to Senate with a revised recommendation.



Motion to Refer
Approved

Senator Lorien explained that part of the reason for referring the matter was to allow discussion about 5 pm and alternating times.

Senator Hassib added that while some faculty members might find it difficult to attend Senate meetings in the evening, the issue was particularly challenging for students in professional programs.

The Clerk reminded members that the motion to refer had already passed and that there was no motion currently on the floor, indicating that debate could not proceed on a matter that was not formally before the Senate.

The President noted that the primary concern related to student scheduling, particularly in certain disciplines. He encouraged the Committee to engage directly with the students who raised the issue to seek a solution that could work better for everyone.

Curriculum Committee

The Vice-Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee, Dr Shannon Bredin, presented.

CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

See Appendix A: Curriculum Report

Shannon Bredin
Simon Bates

That the Senate approves and recommends to the Board of Governors for approval the new courses and discontinued program brought forward by the Faculties of Arts, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (Education), and Pharmaceutical Sciences.

Approved

NON-CREDIT CREDENTIAL PROPOSALS

See Appendix A: Curriculum Report



Shannon Bredin
Joanne Fox

That the Senate approves the new non-credit program microcertificates brought forward by Vantage College in partnership with UBC Extended Learning, and the Faculty of Education.

Approved

Senator Sean Graham expressed concern that the course description did not specify whether participants could use generative AI to complete assignments, noting that this could present issues of academic integrity. He referenced UBC's *Principles for the Use of Generative AI Tools* and questioned why similar language was not included in the micro-certificate description.

Senator Simon Bates asked Senator Graham to clarify which of the two micro-certificates he was referring to.

Senator Graham confirmed that his concern was related to the AI-focused course.

Senator Bates explained that the course was offered by the Faculty of Education in conjunction with Extended Learning and that both non-credit micro-certificates integrated the ethical and critical use of AI into the learning objectives. He noted that ethical use of AI was an integral part of the programs.

Senator Graham reiterated his concern that a student could still use AI unethically to complete assignments, particularly because the micro-certificate assignments were conducted entirely online. He suggested that language be included to specify non-permitted uses of AI, consistent with other UBC courses.

Senator Bates acknowledged that he did not have the assessment details at hand but committed to raising the concern with the course proponents.

Nominating Committee

The Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee, Dr Ben Britton, presented.



COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

Ben Britton
Charles Menzies

That Alex Chui, Yi Chen, and Taran Gill be elected to the Council of Senates (representative committees);

That Jasper Lorien, Zarifa Nawar, and Solomon Yi-Kieran be appointed to the Academic Policy Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Kamil Kanji, Jasper Lorien, and Taushifa Shaikh;

That Solomon Yi-Kieran, Alex Chui, Taran Gill, and Ananya Gupta be appointed to the Library Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Kareem Hassib, Jacky Xue, and Solomon Yi-Kieran and to fill a vacancy;

That Cade Desjarlais, Judy Xu, Taran Gill, and Ananya Gupta be appointed to the Appeals on Academic Standing Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Grant Guo, Jasper Lorien, and Maddie Reid;

That Amin Adibi, Kareem Hassib, and Zarifa Nawar be appointed to the Teaching & Learning Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Kareem Hassib, Salva Sherif, and Enav Zusman;

That Amin Adibi and Yi Chen be appointed to the Admissions Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace David Qi and Jacky Xue;

That Amy Wang, Alex Chui, Brian Agafitei, Judy Xu, and Chaeyoung Lim be appointed to the Curriculum Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Jasper



Lorien, Maddie Reid, Salva Sherif, Solomon Yi-Kieran, and William Zhu;

That Cade Desjarlais, Jacky Xue, and Yi Chen be appointed to the Student Appeals of Discipline Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Kareem Hassib, Tony Jiang, and Kai Rogers;

That Amin Adibi and Amy Wang be appointed to the Research & Scholarship Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Siddharth Rout and Enav Zusman;

That Jacky Xue and Chaeyoung Lim be appointed to the Tributes Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Tony Jiang and William Zhu;

That Jacky Xue and Taran Gill be appointed to the Awards Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Tony Jiang and Solomon Yi-Kieran;

That Jasper Lorien and Drédyn Fontana be appointed to the Agenda Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Kamil Kanji and Drédyn Fontana;

That Kareem Hassib and Dylan Evans be appointed to the Council Budget Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Joseph Al Rahmani and Kamil Kanji;

That Kareem Hassib be appointed to the Council Elections Committee until 31 March 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Kyle Rogers;

That James Stewart be appointed to the Teaching & Learning Committee until 31 August 2026 and



thereafter until replaced, to replace Catherine Rawn;

That James Stewart be appointed to the Tributes Committee until 31 August 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Guy Faulkner;

That Siobhán McElduff be appointed to the Senate Curriculum Committee until 31 August 2026 and thereafter until replaced, to replace Catherine Rawn.

Senator Lorien asked for typographical errors in the motion to be noted.

Senator Amin Adibi requested that all typographical errors be corrected.

In response, the Clerk confirmed that any typographical errors would be corrected.

Approved

Teaching and Learning Committee

The President explained that amendments could not be made during the meeting. He explained that any revisions would need to be referred back to the Committees to ensure that the Okanagan campus was also considered.

The Chair of the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee, Dr Laura Moss, presented.

NEW JOINT POLICY J-138: *INTEGRATED EVALUATION OF TEACHING*

Senator Moss described that the policy established a consistent framework for the evaluation of teaching. She explained that it promoted an integrated approach by incorporating multiple sources of information, including self-reflection, peer review, and student feedback, into the evaluation process.

She indicated that, if approved, the policy would come into effect in the fall of the following year, allowing Faculties time to develop and implement the necessary procedures.

She clarified that, although the policy document currently noted an effective date of October 2026, the intent was for the policy to come into effect on 1 September 2026, to align with the



beginning of the term and the deadline for submission of teaching dossiers for promotion and tenure considerations.

With general consent, the motion and draft policy were revised to have 1 September 2026 as their effective date.

JOINT POLICY APPROVAL

Laura Moss
Jasper Lorien

That Senate approve Policy J-138: Integrated Evaluation of Teaching, effective 1 September 2026 and thereafter, as attached.

Senator Bates reported that the work began in 2018, when the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee established a working group to conduct a comprehensive review of the approach to student evaluations. He noted that the working group reported to both Senates in May 2020 with sixteen recommendations organized under five key topics.

He explained that the current policy responded directly to recommendation 5, which called for an integrative approach to the evaluation of teaching, including an updated Senate policy. Senator Bates noted that the second stage, alongside other work such as revisions to the questions and planned future analyses.

He described that the policy goals and development were informed by research and practices at other institutions. Senator Bates noted that both projects recommended a three-line-of-evidence approach, triangulating student feedback, peer review, and educator self-reflection.

He noted that the policy had been framed within a wider body of scholarship and best practices, emphasizing professional growth, reliance on multiple data sources, and alignment with the institution's context.

Senator Bates outlined that faculty members had been provided with both the policy document and draft guidelines, although only the policy required approval. He explained that draft guidelines were intended to provide context for implementation and supported the inclusion of a year for Faculties to develop local processes. He reported that a total of ninety-three comments had been received, some addressing both policy and process implementation.

He described the categories of feedback, noting sixteen comments related to SEI questions, several regarding the self-reflection component of the policy, and the largest proportion concerning workload. Senator Bates explained that the policy largely codified existing best practices at the institution and reflected emerging best practices across higher education.



He acknowledged that implementation would require effort but proposed that a consistent and defensible evaluation process was necessary for assessing a core institutional activity. He noted that workload and implementation matters would be addressed in subsequent discussions, but stressed the importance of balancing evaluation frequency with practical constraints while recognizing the evolving nature of disciplines, students, pedagogy, and technology.

Senator Bates explained that, in response to feedback, policy wording was added to clarify the self-reflection component, guidance was provided for designing procedures aligned with Faculty contexts, and it was noted that policy procedures would be summarized and posted on the Vancouver and Okanagan Senate websites. He noted that opportunities existed to address workload considerations during the development of these procedures following policy approval.

Senator Britton acknowledged that the Senate focuses on academic matters while the Board of Governors and administration handle workflow issues. He noted that best practice units often have the capacity to address these matters, but capacity can be uneven across units, particularly under current fiscal constraints. He highlighted challenges for early career faculty members and observed that capacity varies significantly across different Faculties.

He explained that while these capacity issues fall under administrative rather than academic discussion, they must be addressed to ensure proper implementation. He raised the topic of timeliness in peer review, questioning how efficiency could be achieved while maintaining regular evaluation of teaching. He noted that the timing of review is particularly important for formative improvement, especially for established colleagues teaching within their areas of expertise.

Senator Britton then discussed training for peer review, noting the need for faculty members to have the space to consider equitable and inclusive approaches that support pedagogical objectives. He indicated that the current implementation of peer review does not provide sufficient capacity for this.

He expressed concern about the consultation process, noting that the Faculty Association had not been included. He referenced the importance of timely implementation for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure and noted that peer review evaluations are also used in merit and PSA processes. He highlighted that while the Senate focuses on academic mission, the evaluations also intersect with personnel management, and could potentially be used in decisions regarding non-renewal for both tenure-track and non-contract faculty.

Senator Moss responded by addressing the point on peer review, citing the policy language that allows academic units to determine processes for both formative review



and summative evaluation, taking into account capacity and unit size. She explained that the policy recognizes that building capacity may take time but affirms its importance.

Senator Bates added that central expertise exists within CTLT and CTL to support capacity development for peer review. He noted that consultations with past and present Senior Appointments Committee chairs revealed concerns that peer review of teaching reports previously lacked sufficient evidentiary weight for promotion and tenure deliberations. He explained that if peer review is to be implemented, it must be done thoroughly and properly resourced so that faculty can perform it effectively.

Senator Bates also addressed the question of Faculty Association consultation, noting that the Faculty Association had been made aware of the policy development, which had been ongoing for three years, though some engagement occurred while he was on administrative leave.

Senator Graham reported that his unit had effectively implemented this policy, or a similar approach, for at least fifteen years. He noted that it had been instituted by forward-thinking faculty members and expressed strong support for the policy. Senator Graham indicated that the approach had required a cultural shift at the time but had provided valuable formative feedback. He described the process as requiring substantial effort, particularly for pre-appointment, tenure, and summative reappointment reviews, but affirmed that his unit had the capacity to manage it. He suggested that other units might need to reprioritize work and adopt a cultural shift to implement the policy effectively and explained that he considered this one of the most important service roles he performed at the University.

Senator Siobhán McElduff questioned whether the teaching reviews conducted to date had resulted in actual improvement. She asked if there had been any assessment of whether teaching quality had increased, noting that the processes seemed complex but questioned whether they achieved the goal of improvement.

Senator Bates responded that assessing improvement across the institution was difficult. He offered anecdotal evidence, noting that he had reviewed dozens, if not hundreds, of promotion cases, particularly in the educational leadership stream. He explained that the quality of dossiers had improved over the past decade, reflecting a greater degree of self-reflection. He acknowledged that systematic measures could still be implemented and highlighted the feedback from the Senior Appointments Committee regarding peer review of teaching.

Provost Gage Averill commented that it was challenging to attribute improvements in teaching quality to a single factor. He pointed to multiple contributing factors over the



past ten to fifteen years, including peer reviews of teaching, awards for the study of teaching and learning, funding for teaching and learning initiatives, and the development of the educational leadership stream. He observed that these efforts had contributed to more sophisticated tenure files, improved analyses, and better student evaluations. He proposed that the institution had experienced a significant renovation of teaching that positioned it ahead of many other Canadian universities.

Senator McElduff asked whether assessment of teaching improvement had been conducted on a university-wide basis or if that would be a consideration for the future.

Senator Bates responded that he would welcome a discussion on how such an assessment could be designed and implemented, acknowledging that it was a complex question.

Senator Austin Uzama asked what safeguards were included in the policy to protect faculty members whose first language is not English and to prevent unfair practices by evaluators. He inquired whether any safeguards existed within the policy.

Senator Moss responded that although the policy did not directly address these issues, it included self-reflection alongside student feedback and peer review of teaching. She explained that this structure allowed instructors to present challenges or strengths they perceived in the classroom and to engage with any issues regarding their language abilities or subject matter expertise.

Senator Anubhav Pratap-Singh asked whether the policy replaced or superseded the student evaluation of teaching, noting confusion because it referred to that process in both the preamble and clauses. He questioned the wording regarding the discretion of course instructors and academic units, specifically the use of “and/or” and sought clarification on whether instructors could opt out of additional student surveys or whether academic units could impose them independently. He also addressed cross-Faculty appointments, suggesting that some level of ratification or oversight by the Teaching and Learning Committee or Senate could enhance fairness and accountability in the implementation of procedures across different Faculties.

Senator Bates clarified that the policy did not replace or supersede the Student Evaluation of Teaching policy but introduced a new policy called Student Experience of Instruction. He noted that the student evaluation of teaching policy, which dated back to 2005/2006, would be revised in the future. He explained that the “and/or” clause reflected faculty feedback, allowing inclusion of mid-semester surveys and departmental surveys for new or redesigned courses. He also addressed cross-Faculty appointments, acknowledging the complexity and noting that procedures would need to account for these nuances rather than applying a uniform approach across all Faculties.



Senator Jenny Phelps noted some ambiguity regarding the applicability of the policy to teaching and instruction outside of courses, such as graduate student supervision. She observed that while the policy seemed intended to limit its scope to credit courses, some wording later in the policy, including the definition of teaching as any activity by which students derive educational benefit and references to supervision of individual students' work, appeared less clear. She proposed potential adjustments to clarify that graduate student supervision was not covered under the policy and asked whether the Committee had discussed its relevance.

Senator Bates responded that the Committee had indeed considered graduate supervision. He acknowledged the blurred lines between supervising students in self-directed studies or 400-level courses and graduate supervision. He confirmed that the policy was intended to apply only to credit-based courses and did not cover non-credit courses or graduate supervision. He noted that the definition of teaching, which was consistent with other policy language, contributed to some of the complexity.

Senator Charles Menzies reflected on whether the focus on improvement primarily measured key performance indicators rather than meaningful progress. He shared that many colleagues he had worked with in the past were as competent as current colleagues, despite differences in technology. He supported aspects of the discussion presented earlier and explained the workload implications under current conditions. He noted that much of the work required added to already busy schedules and proposed that terms like capacity building masked the actual labour required from faculty.

Senator Menzies questioned whether the University could unilaterally change conditions of employment covered under a collective agreement, even though Senate had authority over teaching policies. He noted that evaluating and assessing teaching for improvement was appropriate, but integrating it into employment conditions was unclear. He recommended greater clarity regarding whether the policy could affect the collective agreement and explained the need to recognize the actual labor involved in peer review and capacity building. He also noted the importance of having skilled individuals conduct peer evaluation, citing concerns about reliability and bias in evaluating colleagues' teaching. He explained that while the policy may exist, its ability to influence employment conditions, particularly during ongoing negotiations, required careful consideration.

Senator Moss responded by affirming that the policy aimed to evaluate teaching in a broad and inclusive manner, promoting accountability to students and colleagues. She explained that the policy provided instructors the opportunity to discuss their innovations and challenges, thereby expanding the understanding of teaching. She noted that the proposal offered clarity in integrating self-reflection, student feedback, and peer review



of teaching as complementary components for evaluating and improving teaching practices.

Senator Adibi noted that he wished the policy covered graduate student supervision, as there were currently no formal mechanisms for students to provide feedback on graduate supervision, despite its effective role in teaching and its significant impact on graduate students' experiences compared with credit courses. He also noted, based on his experience as a student at UBC since 2015, that some courses had received poor student feedback for multiple years with little observable change. He asked for clarification how student feedback was formally used in teaching reviews and dossiers before the implementation of the policy, and how the policy would change that process.

Senator Bates responded that practices for addressing poor student feedback varied across Faculties. He provided examples from the Faculty of Science, explaining that the dean or their representative reviewed all student feedback questionnaires and held discussions with the head of the department regarding courses with low scores. He noted that the intent was to investigate reasons for low feedback rather than immediately attribute poor teaching to the instructor. He added that some cases involved students being inadequately prepared for their courses, and that such cases, though in the minority, were addressed by deans as part of the review process.

Approved

Report from the Provost

The Provost, Dr Gage Averill, presented.

UBC'S STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS 2025-2030: YEAR 1 ACTIONS AND KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Provost Averill reported that the launch had been celebrated with a ceremony on both campuses. He explained that the seven directions previously approved had been broken down into specific actions and institutional key performance indicators.

Provost Averill highlighted that the executive leads were accountable for overseeing the implementation of the directions, while deans, heads, directors, and other faculty and administrative members would also participate. He explained that leads had worked with subject matter experts to identify two to three actions per direction that could be completed in the short first year beginning in October. He explained that these actions were intended to be reviewed and renewed annually as part of a living, evolving five-year plan.



He outlined the first priority area, creating flexibility for learners, noting that the institution aimed to demonstrate accessibility and support diverse student needs. Year one actions included exploring flexible credit and non-credit programs in high-demand areas, identifying opportunities to enhance pathways between campuses, and piloting off-cycle admission access points for undergraduate programs at UBC Okanagan.

Provost Averill indicated that UBC aimed to expand undergraduate research opportunities and advance infrastructure initiatives supporting climate resilience and bio-innovation research across both campuses.

He described the commitment to preparing graduates with career-ready skills and life-ready capacities. Year one actions included articulating a shared vision for experiential education across campuses, understanding current initiatives, and improving student awareness and engagement.

He highlighted the impact of AI and other technologies on teaching, research, and work. Year one actions focused on strengthening digital infrastructure to support institution-wide adoption, developing programming to provide students with ethical AI literacy, and assisting faculty in integrating AI into curriculum design and pedagogy.

Provost Averill noted the goal to maximize UBC's system strengths while highlighting the unique and complementary strengths of the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses. He noted that these efforts reflected a commitment to collaboration across the University to serve the diverse needs of British Columbians and reinforce UBC's role as a leading institution provincially and beyond.

He described several actions that had been articulated, beginning with the identification of distinct recruitment strategies for both campuses to attract the best students. He noted that UBC Okanagan had finalized a set of academic priorities and had advanced the budget reimagination project to improve resource allocation across the UBC system.

Provost Averill then referred to community engagement, explaining that this priority had been introduced by UBC Vancouver Senate. He highlighted the importance of nurturing a strong and vibrant UBC community by fostering a sense of belonging, supporting well-being, and creating an environment where every member could thrive. He indicated that the focus for the year would be on community experiences and refreshing the well-being strategic framework with students as a central consideration.



He noted the initiative “Partner for Purpose” which had been discussed by the President at the Board of Trade. He described this initiative as emphasizing relationships and collaborations with local, national, and global communities, including Indigenous and rural communities. He explained that the initiative aimed to generate meaningful impact through research and partnerships while amplifying the relevance of UBC’s educational offerings. He stated that in the first year, the focus would include growing philanthropic support, enhancing local and global impact, and advancing the business case for the extension of rapid transit to UBC.

Provost Averill indicated that questions regarding the actions would be addressed later and introduced KPIs that had been developed to support strategic directions and actions. He presented a conceptual diagram illustrating the relationship between KPIs, strategic directions, and actions, explaining that while KPIs were separate from strategic directions, they informed and were informed by them. He noted that the KPIs were intended to serve as institutional markers of academic excellence and to allow the Board of Governors and the community to assess progress on an annual basis.

He outlined the ten KPIs identified to date. The first was student applications and enrolments, with a focus on attracting a strong and high-quality applicant pool. The second was student retention and graduation, emphasizing the importance of supporting students who wished to continue their studies. The third KPI addressed student experience and satisfaction, with mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of the student experience across both campuses. Graduate employment was highlighted as the fourth KPI, ensuring that students were prepared for meaningful careers.

The fifth KPI related to staff and faculty experience, focusing on the quality of work and academic life. Research funding was identified as the sixth KPI, providing a quantitative measure to track research endeavours. Scholarly impact was the seventh KPI, encompassing academic, economic, social, and cultural contributions of faculty and students. Innovation impact was the eighth KPI, reflecting the transformation of research ideas into economic and social benefits. The ninth KPI addressed philanthropy, focusing on partnerships with donors and alumni to support students and research. The final KPI related to reputation, monitoring the perception of UBC locally and globally.

Provost Averill noted that these ten KPIs were not exhaustive but represented typical institutional indicators. He noted that they would be elaborated over time and reported annually to the Board of Governors. He explained the importance of maintaining a manageable number of KPIs with available data to track progress, while acknowledging that additional qualitative indicators and ongoing institutional plans, such as the Indigenous Strategic Plan, would continue to be monitored.



Senator Drédyn Fontana expressed pleasure that the Millennium Line and undergraduate research were included in the Strategic Plan Refresh. He asked a question concerning the emphasis on a two-campus approach in maximizing UBC system strengths. He inquired about advancing the budget reimagination, seeking clarification on the depth and breadth of the initiative.

Provost Averill responded that integrating finances was considered an outcome rather than an input. He explained that a discovery process had been underway for approximately one to two years, reviewing budget practices and ensuring that the finance team at UBC was fully equipped to engage with the budget. He added that parts of the community had been involved in the process. He stated that a steering committee would be launched starting in January, initially involving deans and later expanding to the broader community. He confirmed that the issues raised regarding the two-campus budget would be explored. He emphasized the goal of allocating resources equitably while incentivizing desired behaviours and addressing some drawbacks of the current budget. He noted that the initiative had not yet produced outcomes.

Senator Pelech expressed support for the proposed initiatives. He raised a concern regarding the presentation and priorities, noting that reputation was listed as the tenth priority. He suggested that community involvement, including engagement with media, courts, governance, and industry, should be considered as an important measure, observing that it was not reflected in the priority list.

Provost Averill acknowledged the importance of the areas he identified. He explained that these were part of one of the seven directions, titled Partnership for Purpose, and that a quantitative assessment had not yet been developed, but it would be considered in future evaluations.

Senator Pelech commented that he had previously been critical of over- and under-representation of people in the presentation materials, and provided feedback on the images in the slides that were shown to Senate.

Senator Britton raised a point of privilege, noting that discussion regarding the slides did not pertain to the Strategic Plan and was creating challenges for members to speak freely and contribute to the Senate. He respectfully asked his colleague to focus on the content of the presentation as it related to the agenda item.

The President clarified that the content of the presentation was distinct from the presentation itself.



Senator Steven Pelech responded that he believed the presentation would be shown to donors and potential students in the future, and he emphasized that it should reflect the breadth of the peoples at UBC. He observed that the current presentation did not achieve this representation.

The President acknowledged the point.

Senator Anubhav Pratap-Singh congratulated the group on the various pathways that had been identified. He highlighted emerging technologies, particularly AI, and noted a significant gap between aspirations and implementation potential. He observed that both bullet points focused on AI, reflecting a strong emphasis. He explained that Faculties currently lacked sufficient technical support to integrate AI into research and teaching. He stated that faculty members did not yet have enough AI experts across departments, with expertise concentrated in computer science and computational departments, and minimal representation in areas such as food science.

Senator Pratap-Singh also discussed the University structure, explaining how faculty appointments, staff appointments, and postdoctoral positions had historically bridged gaps between research, teaching, and operations. He noted that the five-year limit on postdoctoral appointments imposed by some funding agencies restricted these efforts. He suggested parallel investment in hiring bridging postdoctoral staff scientist positions in AI to support current and future initiatives motivated by societal developments.

Provost Averill explained that UBC IT supported the implementation of AI projects across campus, and the Teaching and Learning and Learning Technology teams provided support in instruction. He acknowledged the option of bringing in additional personnel to build capacity across the campus.

Senator Richard Spencer expressed appreciation for the detailed feedback on the plan. He commented on the action “Excel in Development and Application of Emerging Technology,” noting that it covered the increased use of information technology, particularly AI, to provide students with enhanced access to learning resources and personalized guidance. He suggested the introduction of a key performance indicator to measure UBC’s use of information technology in teaching.

Provost Averill acknowledged the importance of developing AI-related capabilities across disciplines, noting that employers increasingly expected entry-level workers to have experience with AI and large language models. He explained that while measuring this was desirable, it would be considered in ongoing planning.



Report from the Registrar

The Registrar, Dr Rella Ng, presented.

2025 VANCOUVER SENATE BY-ELECTIONS

The Registrar advised Senate that Pursuant to Section 15 of the *University Act*, Darren Warburton, Faculty of Education, was acclaimed as elected as representative of the Faculty on the Vancouver Campus on the Vancouver Senate for a term ending 31 August 2026 and thereafter until a successor is elected.

Other Business

MOTION FROM THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE TO APPOINT MEMBERS OF SENATE TO A PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SELECTION OF A VICE-PRESIDENT, RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Senator Britton reported that the Vice President, Research and Innovation, would depart in May. He explained that senior appointments of this type required considerable time due to the demanding nature of the role and its importance to the University. He noted that the administration wished to begin the process promptly so that the position profile could be developed and advertisements posted before the holidays.

Ben Britton
Paul Harrison

That the Senate approves, notwithstanding Rules 29 and 30 of the Rules and Procedures of the Vancouver Senate, to delegate the power to appoint members to a President's Advisory Committee for the selection of a Vice-President of Research and Innovation to the Senate Nominating Committee, and that the Committee be directed to report back to the Senate for information at its next meeting on any actions taken in this regard.

The President thanked Senator Britton and the Nominating Committee for considering the responsibility. The President emphasized the urgency of having two Senate members ready to serve to allow the search to proceed with the full committee. The President clarified that two-thirds majority was required because the motion involved delegated authority.

Senator Paul Harrison posed a question regarding whether interested senators would be asked to express their interest to the Nominating Committee.



The Clerk explained that, if the motion was approved, an email would be sent the following morning to solicit expressions of interest from senators wishing to serve on the committee.

Approved

Adjournment

Seeing no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 pm.



Appendix A: Curriculum Report

UBC EXTENDED LEARNING

New non-credit program certificate

Non-Credit Program Certificate AI Skills Accelerator for IT, Digital and Enterprise Systems Professionals

FACULTY OF ARTS

New courses

ASIX_V 467 (3) Islamic and Persianate Sufism; **PERS_V 460 (3)** Sufism in Persian Literature; **RMST_V 271 (3)** Introduction to Hispanic Literature

New non-credit program microcertificate

Mental Health and Substance Use – Level 1: Non-Credit Program Microcertificate

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

New non-credit program microcertificate

Research to Impact 2.0: Non-Credit Program Microcertificate

FACULTY OF FORESTRY

New non-credit program microcertificate

Forest Carbon Modeling Non-Credit Program Microcertificate

FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

Education

New courses

EDCP_V 547 (3) Home Economics: Enacting Transformative Pedagogies; **EPSE_V 628 (3)** Translation and Adaptation of Tests and Measures

FACULTY OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

Discontinued program

Community Pharmacy Residency Program