

# **FIRST REPORT OF THE SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION**

**MAY 1994**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### ***Terms of Reference***

At its May 1993 meeting Senate approved the following motion of the Senate Budget Committee:

*That Senate, in consultation with the President, appoint an ad hoc or standing committee to advise the President on restructuring and/or consolidating both among and within Faculties and Departments into fewer units that are coherent and have less overhead than at present.*

Thus, the concern that brought the committee into existence was in substantial degree budgetary. At a subsequent meeting (15 September 1993) Senate approved the following terms of reference for an *ad hoc* committee:

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

While limiting the committee's mandate to "the administrative structure for the delivery of academic programs," the terms of reference extend the Committee's mandate to considering both "efficiency" and "academic effectiveness." The committee interprets its scope ("academic programs") to encompass both teaching (including continuing education) and research. A separate committee was established by the President as a steering committee for an external consultant's review of the "non-academic" aspects of university administration. A report on a limited range of administrative issues has been received from the consultant

and widely circulated with a covering letter from the President.<sup>1</sup> The steering committee has not published a report.

### ***Scope of the Report***

The work of the Committee is on-going. In this initial report, we first describe the procedures of the Committee and the principles that underlie our review and proposals for reform of the administrative structure of the academic side of the University. We then turn our attention to substantive issues and recommendations. We have solicited and received suggestions for administrative restructuring and/or consolidation from many people in diverse parts of the university community over the past 8 months. The range of possible reforms is considerable. Rather than attempting to consider all simultaneously, the Committee chose to confine its attention initially to a small number of proposals and to move on to others as recommendations are formulated on the first ones. In this report we have chosen to limit our analysis to issues relating to the number and relative sizes of faculties, department size, some aspects of Senate and University procedures with respect to important academic decision-making, and the organization of teaching and research on natural resources and the environment. It is the intention of the Committee to continue study of a number of other proposals, and to produce a second report in the fall. At that time, the Senate may wish to consider the future of the Committee.

## **II. SOME BASIC PRINCIPLES**

### ***Criteria***

The committee approached its review of university organization with three criteria in mind:

- academic effectiveness
- administrative cost
- administrative effectiveness

We interpret administrative cost and administrative effectiveness as components of "efficiency" in the committee's terms of reference.

To the extent that our work has been directed by cost considerations, the Committee's concern has been only the "administrative cost" of delivering academic programs. We have not been directly concerned with the non-administrative costs of academic programs, although, inevitably, considerations of total costs have at times entered our deliberations.

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Dupré, *Administrative Organization and Processes at the University of British Columbia*. (March 1994).

It is also important to note that our recommendations are not predicated solely on the reduction of administrative cost. Although reductions in administrative cost are possible, and over time may amount to considerable sums of money, it is unlikely that the administrative reforms that we are proposing will result in large savings in the operating budget of the university in the short run. We are also concerned with both administrative and academic effectiveness. In some cases there are reforms that could result in important enhancements to academic or administrative effectiveness even though there may be little or no administrative cost savings. In some cases we think the university should be prepared to accept the risk of some small, temporary reduction in academic effectiveness where there are important gains to be made in administrative effectiveness or reductions in administrative cost that will add to the resources available to enhance academic effectiveness throughout the university.

### ***The Concept of Administrative Cost***

The committee construes the concept of administrative costs in a broad sense. Some costs are obvious, involving *explicit expenditures* on administrative activities, such as expenditures on

- salaries of administrative support staff
- administrative stipends and honoraria for deans, associate deans, assistant deans, directors, department heads and some other administrative officers of departments and faculties
- administrative leave for deans, associate deans, assistant deans, directors and department heads
- external searches for new deans, directors and department heads
- external reviews
- administrative travel
- retreats
- external meetings of deans, directors and heads.

However, there are also *implicit administrative costs* that do not involve explicit expenditures for administrative purposes but nonetheless divert scarce resources from alternative uses, particularly teaching and research. These include:

- released time from teaching responsibilities for department or division heads and other academic administrators within departments or divisions
- faculty time devoted to committee work and administrative tasks (time that could otherwise be devoted to teaching and research)
- space devoted to administrative activities (space that could otherwise be used for other academic activities).
- time devoted to internal and external searches for new deans, directors and department heads
- time wasted as a result of the duplication of functions and activities at various levels of administration and/or overlap in administrative duties

- time wasted as a result of unnecessarily repetitive, overlapping and multiple demands for information from higher levels of administration
- time wasted as a result of administrative inefficiencies in the processing of information.

While most (if not all) of these administrative activities are important to the functioning of the university, we must be concerned about the total explicit and implicit administrative cost. In general and within limits, fewer administrative positions would involve smaller aggregate expenditures on administrative activities and less administrative time and other scarce resources devoted to administrative activities and their coordination.

## ***Consultation***

The Committee decided as a basic principle that widespread consultation is essential both to understand the existing administrative structure and to develop sensible proposals for reorganization. However, it was also apparent to the committee that the only feasible method of consultation was through the existing administrative structure. The time that members of the committee could devote to this task, the resources available to the committee, and the perceived urgency of proceeding with the review did not permit us to consult directly and widely with individual faculty members and students. We anticipated, however, that deans, directors and heads would engage in such consultations on specific questions posed by the committee, and we are pleased to note that a substantial amount of such consultation has occurred.

The importance that we assign to consultation is also reflected in our recommendations for implementation of proposed administrative reorganizations.

## ***The Committee's Procedures***

The Committee felt that the first important task was to attempt to develop an understanding of the complex administrative structure for academic programs in the university. In September 1993 we wrote to all deans, directors and department heads asking for information about existing administrative arrangements, problems with and impending changes in those arrangements, suggestions for reform and different administrative models elsewhere with which they were familiar and that we might consider. The committee also read reports on restructuring at several other universities.

The results of this survey were helpful to the committee in clarifying our thoughts about issues to be studied. We drew up a long list of potential issues, and based on our preliminary deliberations we agreed on an order of priority for study and decided to consider initially:

1. establishing a minimum size for departments

2. reforming certain Senate and University procedures
3. reorganizing teaching and research in natural resources
4. uniting the study of soil sciences and geography

With respect to the suggestion of a minimum size for academic departments, we wrote to the deans of each faculty with formal academic departments or divisions, seeking information on explicit and implicit administrative costs of departments and divisions, and inviting submission of other information about the reorganization of the departmental or divisional structure of each faculty, with a view to reducing administrative costs and enhancing both administrative and academic effectiveness. All deans cooperated in providing information, although the degree of useful detail provided was variable.

With respect to the suggestion that teaching and research in natural resources be reorganized, we sought advice from the Deans of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry and Graduate Studies on the feasibility and desirability of creating a new faculty with this broad mandate, and from the Dean of Applied Science on the merits of a reconfiguration that would include much of the Faculty of Applied Science.

With respect to the proposed merger of Geography and Soil Science we sought advice from the heads of the affected departments and their deans.

This report reflects our deliberations based on the advice that we received on these issues, and contains our recommendations for action by the Senate.

As background for much of our deliberations we found it necessary to consider the nature, role and number of faculties. Before turning to the issues listed above and our recommendations with respect to them, we wish to explain our general perspective on Faculties at UBC.

### **III. FACULTIES**

At its meeting in May 1993, on the recommendation of the Academic Policy Committee, Senate adopted nine "Guidelines for the Establishment of a Faculty." These guidelines are reproduced as an appendix to this Report. While specifically addressed to the establishment of new faculties, the guidelines provide an important starting point for reviewing the existing complement of faculties in the university.

#### ***The Role of the Committee of Deans***

The Committee is strongly of the opinion that on all academic matters the appropriate primary advisory body for the President, within the formal administrative structure of the

university, is the Committee of Deans, meeting together with the Vice-President Academic and Provost and the Vice-President Research. This Committee ought to be a central and influential body in academic governance. However, it is the perception of the committee that the importance of the Committee of Deans as an advisory body in major decisions has declined in recent years as the number of vice-presidents and associate vice presidents has expanded. This is a perception that is difficult to document without intensive research, but it is a perception that is widely held within the university.<sup>2</sup> It is a matter of deep concern to the Committee.

### ***Relative Size of Faculties***

Guideline 6 of "Guidelines for the Establishment of a Faculty" expresses concern about the relative weighting of different parts of the university within the committee of deans.

We agree that there is a striking imbalance in the relative sizes of faculties, whether measured by operating budget, the number of full-time equivalent faculty or the number of full time equivalent students in the faculty (Table 1). As a result, there is also an imbalance between science-based (including medical science) and humanities and social science based disciplines. To the extent that decisions are taken by vote, this imbalance is so severe as to be wholly inappropriate and to impair the credibility of the Committee of Deans as a representative advisory body. Even when decisions are not taken by vote, there is a corresponding imbalance in the voices heard in the deliberations of the Committee of Deans. For this reason, the Committee is of the opinion that it would be highly desirable to consolidate some faculties in a way that will significantly reduce the inequality in the relative sizes of faculties in the University.

### ***Number of Faculties***

Quite apart from the question of the relative sizes of faculties, a reduction in the number of deans should increase the effectiveness of the Committee of Deans within the governance structure. In general, the influence of any particular voice in deliberations depends on the number of people "at the table." A smaller committee of deans, working with the Vice-President Academic and Provost and the Vice-President Research, should be more cohesive, with each dean having a stronger voice in deliberations. For this reason also, the Committee considers it important to consolidate some faculties and reduce the number of deans.

If some of the smaller faculties were to become schools associated with a larger faculty, there would be considerably less pressure to departmentalize such small "faculties."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See also the Senate approved report of the Senate Academic Policy Committee on "Guidelines for the Establishment of a Faculty," pp. 7-8. (Attached as Appendix 1).

<sup>3</sup> See p. 11 of "Guidelines for the Establishment of a Faculty" for a description of a school.

**Table 1**  
**Full Time Faculty and Student Enrollment, by Faculty, 1992-93**

Faculty	Full Time Faculty Members	Number		Full Time Faculty Members	Percent of Total	
		FTE Undergrad. Students*	FTE Graduate Students*		FTE Undergrad. Students*	FTE Graduate Students*
Arts	468	7307	1039	25.3	33.6	21.5
Medicine	375	1823	382	20.3	8.4	7.9
Science	309	4764	897	16.7	21.9	18.5
Education	187	2423	819	10.1	11.1	16.9
Applied Science	167	2130	700	9.0	9.8	14.5
Commerce	105	1177	351	5.7	5.4	7.2
Agricultural Sciences	64	516	191	3.5	2.4	3.9
Law	44	685	32	2.4	3.1	0.7
Forestry	38	347	153	2.1	1.6	3.2
Pharmaceutical Sciences	35	351	57	1.9	1.6	1.2
Dentistry	30	246	15	1.6	1.1	0.3
Graduate Studies#	27	9	206	1.5	0.0	4.3
Total**	1851	21778	4842	100	100	100

\* Course enrollees

\*\* Total full time faculty members includes 2 faculty members not recorded in a faculty.

# Includes only faculty members and student enrollees in administrative units within the Faculty of Graduate Studies

Sources: UBC Fact Book, 1992 ; Institutional Research, Office of Budget and Planning);

Under the University Act (Section 34), the existence of each faculty adds four members to Senate -- a dean, two faculty members and one student. Fewer faculties would also mean a smaller, more effective and more representative Senate.

### ***Administrative Cost and the Number of Faculties***

It has been asserted repeatedly to the committee that the cost saving from reducing the number of faculties and deans will be minor. This is true if the same administrative structure remains in place, only called by different names (schools with directors rather than faculties with deans). It seems clear that some savings are possible through streamlining administration and sharing of facilities and administrative personnel in ways that are not encouraged when units are organized into separate faculties, and many small cost savings can add up to significant sums. In any case, our observations about the number of faculties and deans are predicated primarily on improvements in administrative effectiveness -- on reducing the inequalities in the representation of various parts of the university in the Committee of Deans, and on enhancing the role of the Committee of Deans in the governance structure.

### ***Recommendations***

At this time, no specific recommendations for Senate action emerge from this section of our report. However, our conclusions about the number of faculties and deans underlie our search for possible consolidations and reorganizations of existing faculties that have the potential to enhance academic effectiveness.

## **IV. DEPARTMENTS**

### ***The Nature and Role of the Department***

The academic department or school (or in some cases the division)<sup>4</sup> is the basic administrative unit in the university. It is the administrative "home" for almost all faculty members. The department, through the head and committees, normally makes the initial recommendations regarding appointments, promotion, tenure, salary, teaching and research prizes, etc., reviews performance, and makes the administrative arrangements for most aspects of faculty academic activities (office space, secretarial assistance, supplies, etc.). The department supports and houses the faculty who are engaged in expanding and transmitting knowledge. Thus, it is a scholarly community, promoting scholarship and research and continuing scholarly contact among individuals engaged in related areas of

---

<sup>4</sup>

For brevity we will refer to all such units as departments

research. The department is also responsible for the development, operation, assessment and revision of most undergraduate and graduate curriculums, including making most of the necessary administrative arrangements (instructors, timetable, room bookings, advising, etc.). The department is usually the academic "home" for students. It is generally the place where students pursue enquiries about academic programs, seek advice, find their academic identity and, both formally and informally, participate in program review and development. The department also provides an interface with the profession or industry and an important link with the international community of scholars who carry out work in a defined area of inquiry. It is generally a formal and easily recognizable point of contact for the world outside the university.

Many departments are coincident with the representation of a "discipline," somehow defined, among faculty members and in the teaching programs of the university. However, this is not necessarily the case. Some departments encompass more than one "discipline" or provide more than one program, and increasingly faculty members of the same "discipline" can be located in different departments or schools. Moreover, new and interdisciplinary modes of enquiry and teaching often transcend traditional departmental boundaries. We note, for example, that there are many interdisciplinary programs, centres and institutes in the Faculty of Graduate Studies. At times the formal departmental structure can interfere with interdisciplinary innovations in teaching programs. It is also important to note that informal groupings of scholars for research purposes often do not coincide with departmental boundaries. Many departments contain well defined research groups within them, and many research groups include people in several departments and indeed from outside the university. Such research groupings are flexible, forming and reforming quite independently of the university's departmental structure.

It is also worth noting that the scope of services provided by the department can and does vary. In some cases, the provision of secretarial services is arranged through the dean's office, and there are examples of administration (e.g., the management of stores) for several departments with similar laboratory requirements on a "building" rather than a "department" basis. It is possible that a careful reconsideration of which services should be provided centrally and which provided on a decentralized basis would reveal significant improvements in efficiency.

Our major point is that while departments may be the basic unit in the university for certain administrative purposes, UBC's existing departmental structure, with more than 90 departments and schools, is not essential for effective pursuit of the central tasks of the university, teaching and research. Other configurations are possible. With a will to make them work, other configurations would not only be feasible but would have the potential of enhancing both academic and administrative effectiveness, with smaller administrative costs. In this context we note the reconfiguration that is occurring in the Faculty of Education. While the Committee has not been involved in this process, we have been informed about it, and we applaud the initiative of the Dean of Education to undertake such a large-scale review and reorganization.

## ***Department Size***

Table 2 provides a distribution of departments by size, with size measured by the number of full time faculty members in the department. The committee is well aware that the relative number of full time faculty members does not fully reflect the differences in the range of administrative responsibilities among departments and for this reason it is an imperfect measure of department size. There are significant differences among departments of similar size in the scope of graduate and undergraduate programs, the degree of laboratory work involved in teaching and research, the employment of clinical and other auxiliary teaching staff, and interaction with professional bodies. These are factors that will have to be taken into account in refining and implementing our proposals. Nonetheless, while imperfect as a measure of "size," the number of full time faculty members provides a useful starting point for comparisons among departments.

In any case, by any measure that one might use, UBC has many departments that are very small.

## ***Administrative Effectiveness and the Size of a Department***

In a large faculty, small departments imply a large number of departments. Some of the same considerations that arise in considering the number and relative sizes of faculties also apply in considering the number and relative sizes of departments. The committee of department heads should play a central role in the academic governance of the faculty. It should be a forum for the free and open discussion of academic policy and hence for advice to the dean. However, it should not be a forum in which there are significant inequalities in the number of faculty members represented by a single voice and a single vote. Moreover, in general, the larger the number of participants in the debate, the less effective is any particular voice. While it is important to have representation from the diverse sectors of the faculty, it is also desirable to do so economically. Within limits, a smaller committee is to be preferred to a larger one.

There are many reasons to be concerned about the large number of small departments. For example:

- Not all faculty members are suitable as department heads. Administrative talent is scarce even in a large department. While there will always be exceptions, in very small departments the problem of the availability of administrative talent is magnified.
- A major function of a department is the assessment of the performance of faculty members in teaching, research and administration. The Committee is concerned about the quality and objectivity of such assessments in very small departments with very few individuals participating in the assessment process. The problem is compounded if there are few senior faculty members.

**Table 2**  
**Distribution of Departments by Size, September 1993**

Size Number of Full Time Faculty	Number of Departments	Number of Full Time Faculty	Percentage Distribution		Cumulative	
			Departments	Faculty	Departments	Faculty
0-4.99	4	13	4.3	0.7	4.3	0.7
5-6.99	5	26	5.4	1.4	9.8	2.1
7-8.99	7	52	7.6	2.8	17.4	4.9
9-10.99	9	83	9.8	4.5	27.2	9.4
11-12.99	9	104	9.8	5.6	37.0	15.0
13-14.99	12	165	13.0	8.9	50.0	23.9
15-16.99	11	170	12.0	9.2	62.0	33.1
17-19.99	8	146	8.7	7.9	70.7	41.0
20-29.99	14	369	15.2	19.9	85.9	60.9
30-69.99	13	585	14.1	31.6	100.0	92.5
Not in Departments.		138		7.5		100.0
Total	92	1851	100.0	100.0		

Sources: UBC Fact Book, 1992 ; Institutional Research, Office of Budget and Planning);

- With a small group of faculty members to choose from, it is difficult to structure committees. Indeed, some faculty members may be involved in almost all departmental committees. The spreading of the committee load that is familiar in larger departments cannot occur.
- Small departments also have less budget flexibility than large departments. The loss of any faculty member or a member of the support staff for whatever reason can have unusually serious consequences. Indeed, a faculty member's being on sabbatical leave can create a serious problem, and on occasion this has limited the ability of some faculty members to use the sabbatical leave provision to improve their capacity as teachers and researchers.

It is also important to note an important implicit cost when there are many small departments. That is the time and energy that must be devoted by the dean's office and other senior administrative offices to consultations with departments and to the supervision and coordination of departmental activities. These costs increase with the number of departments in the faculty.

### ***Administrative Cost and Department Size***

Small departments have been established for diverse reasons, and many have a long history. They came into existence for various reasons. In some cases they were once larger departments that have contracted. In other cases they were established as small departments responsible for an academic program that was initiated as part of a larger department or an institute. The normal justification for a small department is "academic." In varying degrees emphasis is placed on the uniqueness of the program offered by the department, on the ability of an autonomous department to develop graduate and/or undergraduate programs that might be stifled if they were part of a larger department with other primary interests, and on the sense of academic community developed among the members of the autonomous department.

We are sympathetic to these concerns and we recognize that members of small departments generally have intense commitment to the autonomy of the department. As a result, the process by which small departments are merged into larger units may not be painless. There may be strong resistance by members of small departments because of apprehensions associated with an altered and unknown environment, perceptions that their field of study may not thrive in a larger, more diverse department, and a sense of loss of power over important decisions. However, with the will to make a new configuration work, these are difficulties that can be overcome.

In considering the future of small departments at UBC, we must also give careful consideration to administrative effectiveness and administrative cost (implicit as well as explicit).

Some administrative costs vary directly with department size. However, not all administrative costs vary *proportionately* with department size and some are independent of department size.

### **Space**

Normally each department has a departmental office. Combining two or three small departments into a single department should permit some reduction in the space devoted to this function. Space is a valuable resource at UBC.

### **Administrative Leave**

Under current UBC policy, a department head is entitled to one year of administrative leave, at full salary and benefits, at the end of a five year term as head.<sup>5</sup> This administrative leave substitutes for the study leave for which the head would otherwise be eligible to apply given the same period of service as a faculty member. The net cost of the administrative leave, then, is the difference between the salary and benefits received on administrative leave and the salary and benefits that would otherwise be received on study leave. This may be 25% or 40% of the head's salary, depending on whether the leave is taken after 4 or 6 years of service since the previous leave. However, experience shows that only a third to a half of those eligible for study leave in any year are able to take study leave. By contrast, it seems highly unlikely that someone eligible for a full year of leave at full salary would decline that opportunity. Thus a simple calculation based on formal study leave provisions will likely understate the cost of our administrative leave provisions.

The Committee is not opposed to the principle of administrative leave. Indeed, we regard the leave provisions as essential. Long service in an administrative position can have very deleterious effects on a person's scholarship, currency in the field and capacity to teach at the frontiers of the discipline. It is important that administrators have an opportunity to refresh and retool, to enhance the contribution that they can make to the university. We also observe that it is increasingly difficult to persuade suitable faculty members to assume administrative responsibilities. The availability of administrative leave, can help reduce the sacrifice imposed on someone who assumes a headship, thereby improving our chances of persuading appropriate people to serve.

In the present context, however, the important point is that provisions for administrative leave do not vary by size of department (and hence by the complexity of the administrative responsibilities). Two or three small departments will be more expensive in this respect than a combined larger department.

### **Administrative Stipends**

Policy with respect to stipends for academic administrators varies among faculties. In some cases, there is a difference between the stipends paid to heads of small departments and to

---

<sup>5</sup> Six months of leave if the head is continuing for a second term.

those of large departments. However, this is not universal; and in general the differences that exist are not proportionate to differences in the sizes of departments.

Again, the Committee is not opposed to the principle of administrative stipends. They are often important in order to induce suitable people to accept administrative responsibilities. However, present UBC practice does not differentiate sufficiently between stipends for administrators of large units and those for administrators of small units. (this applies to faculties as well as departments).

### ***Released Time***

A similar observation can be made about released time from teaching for academic administrators. Policy varies among faculties and among departments,<sup>6</sup> and there is no centralized compilation of information on released time. Our enquiries suggest that in many cases there is a differential between the released time for heads of large and small departments. However, this is not universal; and in general the differences in released time are not proportionate to differences in the sizes of departments.

### ***The "Efficiency" of Small Departments***

We have been told repeatedly that small departments are "efficient" because their administrative expenditures are very small. Typically, small departments do not have administrative assistants, have smaller secretarial staff, and may have a departmental secretary only part time (and in at least one case shared with another department). In some cases the department office is effectively open only part time.

In this context, we do not regard small expenditures on administration as "efficient." Indeed, the material supplied to us suggests that a disproportionate share of administrative activities in small departments is performed by faculty members whose time would be much better devoted to the central tasks for which they are employed, teaching and research. It seems apparent also that the faculty and students in these departments are deprived of administrative services that are normal in larger departments. It is also worth noting that public and student access to the department is restricted by departmental offices that are staffed only part time.

### ***Very Large Departments***

Very small departments are relatively costly. We have not explored the economics of very large departments. It is possible that very large departments, and particularly departments with several programs, are also relatively costly. For example, they often require program coordinators or other faculty-administrators with released time and occasionally honorariums, positions that are not common in smaller departments. However, it is not necessary to create very large departments with complex administrative structures. It is possible to organize a smaller number of medium sized departments in place of the large number of very

---

<sup>6</sup> In some faculties, departments have considerable autonomy in arranging for released time for academic administrators, including administrators other than department heads.

small departments . In some cases the reconfiguration may take the form of a merger of small departments; in some cases it may involve a small department joining a larger department; and in other cases it may involve a more complex rearrangement of faculty members and programs.

### ***Academic Effectiveness and Department Size.***

The case in favour of small departments usually emphasizes academic arguments. Even on academic grounds, however, we have concerns about very small departments.

Small departments generally find it difficult to mount a comprehensive graduate program, and often are forced by the shortage of faculty to adopt a very restrictive definition of the "core" of the discipline. These problems in turn affect their ability to attract and retain excellent graduate students and to survive reviews of graduate programs. They have few faculty members available to serve on graduate student committees. New imaginative and innovative undergraduate and graduate student programs that cross traditional disciplinary boundaries can be one of the important results of combining small departments into larger groupings. We would reemphasize in this context the serious consequences for the integrity of academic programs in a small department from the loss of a single faculty member or a faculty member going on sabbatical leave.

### ***A Minimum Size for Departments?***

The committee's consideration of small departments at UBC leads us to the conclusion that there are strong arguments for establishing a minimum size for a group to have departmental status. What should that minimum be?

We could pretend to have a scientific answer to that question. We do not. It is the opinion of the committee, however, that a minimum size of 15 full time faculty members would be appropriate to provide a unit with the faculty resources to provide academic programs of adequate depth and breadth and to spread the administrative burdens fairly. It should also provide a balance of faculty members in various ranks to staff personnel committees, provide supervision for graduate students, and permit faculty members to take advantage of sabbatical leave provisions.

It is true that if no exceptions were made, the data in Table 2 suggest that this rule would affect 46 departments, about half of the departments at UBC. However, a considerably smaller proportion of the full time faculty (24%) would be affected. It is the opinion of the committee that this degree of disruption is manageable and, given the benefits in academic and administrative effectiveness and the reduction in administrative cost, well worth undertaking. Moreover, the potential cost saving is substantial. A rough calculation based on the size distribution of departments in Table 2 suggests that for each department headship that we can eliminate, the savings from the administrative stipend, administrative

leave and released time would amount to between \$22,900 to \$ 52,900 annually.<sup>7</sup> If 46 departments could be consolidated into 29 departments of 15 faculty members each, the annual saving to the university from these factors alone would be in the range \$ 389,000 to \$ 900,000. To these savings must be added the substantial savings in implicit and explicit costs from fewer head searches, fewer external reviews, the reduction in space devoted to administrative tasks, etc. .

We recognize that there may have to be exceptions to the minimum size rule. As we noted above, the number of FTE faculty members is an imperfect measure of the administrative responsibilities of some departments. However, we are also of the opinion that if a minimum size is established it should be an effective floor. Exceptions to it should be rare and should require special justification.

### ***Process***

It is one thing to specify a minimum size for departments. It is another to specify which programs and departments should be reorganized in the process of achieving that minimum.

In general, a committee of Senate is not an appropriate body for making these choices and conducting the consultations and negotiations that will be necessary in the reconfiguration process. The Committee is of the opinion that these are tasks that must be performed by the deans. However, we are also of the opinion that the Vice-President Academic and Provost must take responsibility for ensuring that the spirit of the policy is adhered to and that Senate must maintain a watching brief on the process.

### ***Recommendations:***

Based on the preceding discussion, the Committee recommends that:

1. *Senate establish a minimum size for departments, schools and divisions that have department-like responsibilities.*
2. *The minimum size for departments, schools and divisions be 15 full-time faculty members in the department..*
3. *Deans be asked to arrange for consolidations of relevant departments, schools and divisions to conform with the minimum size and to report regularly to the Vice*

---

<sup>7</sup> This assumes an annual administrative stipend of \$5,600 (the 1992-93 average for heads of departments smaller than 15 full time faculty members); annual net cost of administrative leave of \$4300 (25% of the average salary for heads of small departments, spread over five years [5% per year]); and annual cost of released time from teaching (and reduced time for research) of between \$13,000 and \$43,000 (16% to 50% of a normal load, priced at the average salary for heads of small departments). The Faculty of Medicine has been excluded from these calculations.

*President Academic and Provost on progress. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to report to Senate on the results of these reconfigurations by December 1995.*

4. *Exceptions to the minimum size should be rare and should be permitted only on the basis of special circumstances which must be made explicit.*
5. *All exceptions to the minimum size approved by the Vice President Academic and Provost, be reported to Senate.*
6. *Provisions for administrative stipends and administrative leave for department heads be graduated depending on department size.*

## **V. SENATE AND UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES**

As part of its review of the administrative structure for the delivery of academic programs the committee gave careful consideration to a number of Senate and University procedures affecting academic decisions. We wish to make recommendations about two of them.

### ***Curriculum Revision***

The present process for revisions to the curriculum is complicated and cumbersome. The principle appears to be to make curriculum revision almost "fail safe" in terms of avoiding overlap in courses in different departments and minimizing the invasion of departmental teaching fields by members of other departments. Even the most minor of changes can require widespread consultation, extensive paper work, and deliberations by three or four committees, by one or two (and occasionally more) faculties and by the Senate. Of course, the procedure can only control changes in the Calendar description of courses; it cannot prevent hidden curriculum changes within existing Calendar descriptions, with the result that Calendar descriptions in some cases no longer reflect course content. Innovation in courses and programs is discouraged, and departments are discouraged from making even minor revisions to the Calendar because of the cumbersome procedure.

The resources devoted to the process of curriculum revision are excessive. It is the opinion of the committee that the benefits of the present procedure do not justify the cost. We must be willing to accept a higher degree of risk in our curriculum revisions, so that cost of the process of curriculum revision can be reduced.

## **Recommendations**

The Committee recommends that:

7. *The Senate Curriculum Committee be instructed to study the process of curriculum revision and to bring recommendations to the Senate not later than November 1994 for the simplification of the process.*
8. *As guidelines, the Senate Curriculum Committee be invited to*
  - a. *Establish a broad category of minor changes that can be made by departments, schools or non-departmentalized faculties without further consultation except notification of the appropriate curriculum review officer (who might be the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee), who will be responsible for ensuring that the change is indeed "minor" and that no other academic program is likely to be adversely affected. This category might include, at a minimum, changes in course numbers, course names, prerequisite requirements and editorial changes in course descriptions.*
  - b. *Establish a narrow category of major changes that require consultation and full review by faculties and the Senate. This category might include new programs, new courses, deletion of courses and changes that affect requirements for student programs in other departments.*
  - c. *Consider the possibility that proposals for major changes in graduate courses and programs go directly to the Faculty of Graduate Studies from departments, schools and non-departmentalized faculties for full review before being sent to Senate for review and approval.*

## **Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures**

Procedures for appointments and for the generation and review of recommendations for the granting of promotion and tenure are different in principle from those for curriculum revision. For the University there is the fundamental consideration of obtaining the very best faculty possible; for the individuals involved there are fundamental considerations relating to career development and personal and family disruptions. It is important that all major deliberations involve the best university-wide professional standards and evaluation procedures, that deliberations be conducted in a fair and professional manner, and that safeguards ensure a fair hearing of all pertinent evidence. However, it is also important that the procedures not involve unnecessary administrative cost.

We note that a new agreement on Conditions of Appointment has been signed by the Faculty Association and the University after prolonged negotiation. While this agreement appears to generate new administrative costs with respect to recommendations on promotion and

tenure, we are not yet in a position to assess whether those additional costs are warranted by commensurate improvements in the effectiveness of the process. We must wait and see.

There is, however, one aspect of the appointments, promotion and tenure process that is outside the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment. That is the Senior Appointments Committee. The Senior Appointments Committee is an important committee, responsible for ensuring that the advice received by the President on the granting of tenure, promotions and appointments to senior ranks reflects high standards of excellence in teaching and research that are reasonably consistent throughout the university. We are of the opinion that significant changes could be made in the composition and procedures of the Senior Appointments Committee that would reduce administrative costs without impairing the integrity of its review process.

At present the senior appointments committee is large, comprised of 12 deans, 12 faculty members broadly representative of the university and a non-voting chair, with an Associate Vice President Academic as non-voting secretary. It is the opinion of the committee that the Senior Appointments Committee does not have to be this large to ensure broad representation and to ensure careful and fair review of all cases.

It is important that the broadly representative nature of the committee be maintained. However, in our opinion it is neither necessary nor desirable that deans of faculties be members of the committee. We recognize the advantage of having deans on the committee: It is an important forum through which the deans develop an understanding of the requirements, standards and personnel problems of other faculties and new deans learn about the university and their fellow deans. However, their regular participation in the frequent (through much of the academic year, weekly) meetings of the Senior Appointments Committee and the associated "homework", consumes a vast amount of expensive and scarce administrative talent. It is our opinion that this administrative cost is not justified by the presumed benefits of having the deans as members of the committee. Even if the number of faculty members on the committee had to be expanded slightly to ensure representativeness, the removal of deans from the committee would reduce implicit administrative costs.

### ***Recommendation***

The constitution of the Senior Appointments Committee is beyond the powers of Senate. However, we recommend that:

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

We note that the Dupré report recommends minor changes to the procedures of the Senior Appointment Committee that would reduce the number of cases reviewed by the whole committee. We support these changes.

## **VI. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

Teaching and research about natural resources and environmental issues occurs in many parts of the university and in the process the perspectives of diverse disciplines are brought to bear on important common problems. The Committee regards this diversity as an important feature of UBC and one which we wish to encourage and promote.

However, in the opinion of the committee, the issues in the management of natural resources and the natural environment are of such vital importance to British Columbia and Canada that the University of British Columbia should take a major step forward in facilitating and accentuating integrated approaches to the study of these issues. In recent years, there have been significant interdisciplinary initiatives for the study of environmental issues, particularly in research and in graduate studies, but also in undergraduate teaching. Nonetheless, Faculty and departmental regulations place significant barriers in the way of full development of interdisciplinary teaching programs, particularly at the undergraduate level, and to the full utilization of the extensive resources of the university in these fields. Science programs in life sciences are seriously over-enrolled while valuable faculty resources in agricultural sciences and forestry are not as intensively involved in such teaching.

It is the opinion of the committee that there are possible organizational changes that would enhance the study of the management of natural resources and the natural environment at UBC, would improve the effective use of faculty resources in this field and permit some budgetary savings.

In considering the possible organization of studies in natural resources and environmental issues, the Committee considered various options. Three alternatives were considered:

1. amalgamation of Forestry and Agricultural Sciences;
2. a reconfiguration involving Engineering, Agriculture and Forestry;
3. the creation of a new Faculty of Natural Resources.

The Committee agreed that the first proposal was too narrow to achieve the objective of enhancing and developing scholarship and teaching on natural resources and environmental studies at UBC. Each of the other proposals has attractive features. A majority of the committee is of the opinion that the third alternative provides the best chance of a vigorous, exciting expansion of this field of study at UBC. A substantial minority is of the opinion that

a reconfiguration involving engineering is a more realistic approach to achieving such an expansion of teaching and research in this field

Whatever the form of reorganization, it is apparent that it must involve Forestry and Agricultural Sciences. It is important to emphasize, however, that little by way of advancement of the field of study will be accomplished if all that happens is the combination of these two faculties into one. There must be a commitment to a broader expansion of the field, and ways must be found to including individuals and possibly whole units from other faculties in the new venture.

In thinking about a reconfiguration of studies in natural resources, several considerations must be kept in mind:

- the approach should be "comprehensive" and interdisciplinary. Without stifling teaching and research on natural resource and environmental issues in other departments and faculties, the new faculty should have a broad, interdisciplinary base, including elements from social sciences and humanities as well as sciences. The curriculum and research activities should include the analysis of issues of relevant values and social and private policy as well as issues of scientific interest.
- while not precluding significant revisions of existing programs in agricultural sciences and forestry (including the possibility that some programs might be shifted from undergraduate to graduate programs), there should be no lessening of the university's commitment to professional programs in forestry and agricultural sciences.
- cooperation must be obtained from many parts of the university, in some cases through the shifting of positions to the new faculty, in some cases through joint appointments, and in many cases through a willingness to assist in the development of teaching and research programs.

## ***Process***

A Senate committee is not the appropriate body to develop specific plans for the reconfiguration of the administrative structure for teaching and research in natural resources. That process requires a specialized task force under the direction of the Vice President Academic and Provost. That task force must consult widely and intensively to obtain sound advice and widespread cooperation. We urge that the task force consider both alternatives 2 and 3. Given the interest and enthusiasm that we have detected for these proposals, we think that the work of the task force can be completed relatively quickly. For this reason, we recommend that the Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to report to Senate on progress no later than January 1995.

## ***Recommendations***

The Committee recommends that:

10. Senate endorse the idea of a reconfiguration of some existing faculties and other academic units to create a new faculty with a mandate to develop and intensify the university's commitment to teaching and research relating to natural resources and the natural environment.
11. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to establish a task force to develop plans for the establishment of the new faculty. The task force should be asked to develop proposals for arrangements that will induce some relevant faculty members and academic units to transfer from other faculties to the new faculty, will encourage the active participation in the new faculty of relevant faculty members who prefer to retain their appointments in other faculties, and will encourage the cooperation of relevant academic units in other faculties.
12. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to submit a progress report to Senate on plans to establish a new faculty concerned with natural resources, no later than January 1995.

## **VII. GEOGRAPHY AND SOIL SCIENCES**

One of the proposals that was given careful consideration by the committee is for a merger of the Departments of Geography (Faculty of Arts) and Soil Science (Faculty of Agricultural Sciences). Such a merger has strong support in both departments, and, considered on its own merits, appears to be academically justifiable and feasible, with appropriate budgetary arrangements. The Committee is sympathetic to the proposal. However, a reorganization of studies in natural resources could have a profound effect on the merits of the proposal.

The Committee recommends that:

13. The task force proposed in Recommendation 11 above be asked to consider the proposed merger of the departments of Geography and Soil Science in the context of their deliberations on the reconfiguration of teaching and research on natural resources.

## **VIII. ISSUES FOR FURTHER STUDY**

Several important issues remain on the Committee's list of issues to be studied. In accordance with the Committee's usual procedures, we do not wish to reveal those issues until preliminary consultations have occurred through the administrators responsible for the

affected units. On one issue such consultations have occurred. The Committee has under active consideration a proposal to bring together in one faculty academic units in diverse parts of the university that have a common interest in health care. We anticipate making a report on our deliberations and conclusions in the fall of 1994.

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee recommends that:

### ***With respect to department size:***

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

### ***With respect to University and Senate procedures:***

7. *The Senate Curriculum Committee be instructed to study the process of curriculum revision and to bring recommendations to the Senate not later than November 1994 for the simplification of the process.*
8. *As guidelines, the Senate Curriculum Committee be invited to*
  - a. *Establish a broad category of minor changes that can be made by departments, schools or non-departmentalized faculties without further consultation except notification of the appropriate curriculum review officer*

*(who might be the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee), who will be responsible for ensuring that the change is indeed "minor" and that no other academic program is likely to be adversely affected. This category might include, at a minimum, changes in course numbers, course names, prerequisite requirements and editorial changes in course descriptions.*

- b Establish a narrow category of major changes that require consultation and full review by faculties and the Senate. This category might include new programs, new courses, deletion of courses and changes that affect requirements for student programs in other departments.*
  - c Consider the possibility that proposals for major changes in graduate courses and programs go directly to the Faculty of Graduate Studies from departments, schools and non-departmentalized faculties for full review before being sent to Senate for review and approval.*
- 9. Senate ask the President to review the constitution of the Senior Appointments Committee, with a view to removing deans from that committee and with a view to strengthening its ability to represent high university-wide standards of excellence and objectivity.*

***With respect to teaching and research in natural resources:***

- 10. Senate endorse the idea of a reconfiguration of some existing faculties and other academic units to create a new faculty with a mandate to develop and intensify the university's commitment to teaching and research relating to natural resources and the natural environment.*
- 11. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to establish a task force to develop plans for the establishment of the new faculty. The task force should be asked to develop proposals for arrangements that will induce some relevant faculty members and academic units to transfer from other faculties to the new faculty, will encourage the active participation in the new faculty of relevant faculty members who prefer to retain their appointments in other faculties, and will encourage the cooperation of relevant academic units in other faculties.*
- 12. The Vice President Academic and Provost be asked to submit a progress report to Senate on plans to establish a new faculty concerned with natural resources, no later than January 1995.*
- 13. The task force proposed in Recommendation 11 above be asked to consider the proposed merger of the departments of Geography and Soil Science in the*

*context of their deliberations on the reconfiguration of teaching and research on natural resources.*

Respectfully submitted,

R.A. Shearer, Chair	J.G.T. Kelsey
D.G.A. Carter	R.T.A. McGillivray
L. Chui	D.J. Randall
G.W. Eaton	D.LI. Williams
C.L. Greentree*	D.R. Birch
S.E. Grace	R.C. Tees
M. Isaacson	D.A. Wehrung

\* B. Horner replaced C.L. Greentree on the Committee in May 1994 but did not participate in the deliberations for this Report.

## GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FACULTY

### ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

Increasing the number of faculties has implications for academic governance, not just for the unit seeking faculty status, but for the university as a whole. There are significant ramifications as far as the size and effectiveness of both the **Senate** itself, the **Committee of Deans** as an advisory body to the president and academic vice-president, and the degree to which academic governance is centralized, as a result of increasing the number of academic units and administrators that report directly to the president's office.

For these reasons it is recognized that there cannot be indifference to the number of faculties at UBC. Any proposal to increase the number, either by raising the status of a school to that of a faculty, or by accommodating a new area of programming by creating a faculty, must be carefully considered, and declared benefits to the unit seeking faculty status must be examined in this context.

#### (i) Senate Size and Effectiveness

Under the University Act (Section 34), creation of a new faculty adds five members to Senate--a dean, two faculty members, and two students. The present Senate has 87 members. If UBC were to have seventeen instead of twelve faculties, as is the case, for example, at the University of Western Ontario, Senate would have 112 members.

The effectiveness of Senate is not just a function of its size. For it to work well, all parts of the university community must have effective representation in the Senate. Academic units and programs are represented in Senate by their dean and their faculty and student representatives. In the case of a small or professional faculty, this tends to constitute a more direct representation than exists in the case of a large faculty encompassing several disciplines or professional programs (departments and schools), where both the dean and representatives of faculty and students may have to represent and speak for interests outside their discipline or program of study. This kind of indirect representation is inevitable in a large university, if Senate is to be of manageable size. The question is how well is it achieved? Do faculty and students so represented have an effective voice in Senate?

The answer to this question is unlikely to be found, in the particular instance, in the performance--adequate or inadequate--of the representational role of incumbent senators. It must be looked for, instead, in the academic and organizational integrity of a faculty, as constituted, as well as in its everyday functioning and "culture" (inter-relationships). There are two issues to be addressed in this respect. First, is the diversity of programming in a faculty of such a nature as to lead to the conclusion that interests of a particular unit or discipline within a faculty, say for example a school, cannot be represented indirectly in Senate? Or alternatively, are there compelling reasons from the viewpoint of the university or the wider community for a particular discipline within a faculty, say for example a school, or program to be represented directly in Senate, which can be assured only by faculty status? Secondly, is there basis for concluding that due to the diversity

and size of units or disciplines that make up a faculty, and the absence of a shared identity, faculty and students in a particular program are unable to elected to Senate?

Insight into the latter question can be obtained from the experience of recent elections to Senate. Have a school's faculty and students been nominated regularly for Senate and failed to get elected? Is there a history of apparent little interest in Senate, and a willingness to be represented by others? The question whether a dean can effectively speak for a discipline or profession unrelated to, or far removed from, his or her own may also be relevant. This is a question related to the cognateness of a faculty's programs and mission, which is discussed briefly below. That he or she may not always be able to do so is anticipated in the regulation of Senate,<sup>1</sup> seldom used, that permits a director in person to Senate matters of special interest to his or her school.

**Guideline 1--The effectiveness of a school's or other unit's representation in Senate is an important consideration in deciding whether to grant faculty status. This consideration must be tempered by a concern for the impact of change on the overall size and representativeness of Senate, and realization that many programs and units in the university must continue to be represented in Senate indirectly through a dean, faculty, and students who may be in another discipline.**

## (ii) Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Faculty

The negotiated **Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty** (see **Faculty Handbook**) recognizes a three-tiered structure of collegial and administrative involvement in decisions affecting the appointment, reappointment, tenuring, and promotion of members of faculty holding appointments without review. This document establishes and defines the role of a faculty member's immediate colleagues and administrative head in such decisions, as well as that of colleagues at the faculty and university levels. It is based on the norm of departmentalized faculties where a department head, on the advice of an advisory committee initiates all recommendations relating to appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The role of faculty committees and the Senior Appointments Committee in this process is two-fold--to assure and maintain faculty- and university-wide standards of performance and achievement for faculty, and to provide a dynamic and responsibility for these standards that is conducive to their improvement. The **Faculty Handbook**, to ensure the viability of collegial input at the departmental level, as well as preserve the anonymity of the advice given, provides for the expansion of a head's advisory committee by the addition of faculty members from outside the department, when numbers are small. There is thus explicit recognition of a minimum size of a department for the provisions of the **Handbook** governing conditions of appointment, reappointment and promotion to apply as intended. Presumably the same holds for a faculty that is too small or has too few colleagues eligible to serve on mandated advisory committees.

It is at the level of the Senior Appointment's committee where the difference in the administrative scrutiny and collegial assessment received by recommendations for appointment, tenure and

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for motion of Senate of 1949 establishing schools and regulating their governance.

promotion in departmentalized and non-departmentalized faculties is most apparent. The Senior Appointments Committee, for the departmentalized faculty, represents a third level of assessment, after a recommendation has been initiated and approved by a candidate's department or school, and supported at the faculty level where it must be considered by a dean's advisory committee. Furthermore, the dean's advisory committee, like the Senior Appointments Committee, is composed for the most part, if not entirely, of persons outside the candidate's discipline or field of study, whose knowledge of the candidate is based primarily on the documentation presented.

This situation is different for that of a recommendation reaching the Senior Appointments Committee from a smaller, non-departmentalized faculty. Such a recommendation has had no second-level scrutiny, nor has it been considered by person's other than the candidate's immediate colleagues and his or her dean. It is also presented and argued before the Senior Appointments Committee by the candidate's dean, who in this case is also the administrator responsible for initiating the recommendation at the first level. (In this connection it is interesting to note that department heads and directors of schools do not serve on the Senior Appointments Committee on the grounds that they would be required, or would have the opportunity, to participate in the assessment of recommendations that they had initiated and supported at the department or school level.)

**GUIDELINE 2--That any new faculty be of a size and complexity that permit departmentalization in conformity with the norms for administrative review of, and collegial participation, decisions relating to appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion as laid out in the *Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty*. Particular attention should be given to the viability of advisory committees in relation to the number of eligible members of appropriate rank available to serve on them.**

### (iii) The School within its Faculty

The 1949 motions of Senate establishing and governing schools (Appendix A) recognized them as "mainly professional or vocational in character", as offering a "specialized" curriculum, and as having policies that "do not generally affect policies in other departments to any great extent". Despite their distinctiveness and "special problems", schools were clearly envisaged by Senate as forming an integral part of an academic community defined by the boundaries of the faculty in which they were situated. Senate gave the school council jurisdiction over "matters pertaining only to the school", but saw fit to grant the dean discretion over whether these matters would also have to be referred to the faculty for approval before being forwarded to Senate. The 1949 motions explicitly stated that "all other academic matters" had to be referred to the faculty for approval. The relatedness of a school's mandate to that of its faculty and the faculty's departments is reflected in the provision that schools' councils consist of a school's faculty members and "representatives of closely related departments".

Practice in many cases has not conformed to Senate's intentions and instructions with respect to schools. Schools were established that did not share a sense of mission and community with departments and other schools in their faculty to the extent envisaged by Senate, if indeed at all. As a result, some schools have been accorded a degree of independence in the conduct of their

affairs not intended by Senate. Academic matters have been deemed to be of interest to the school only, and for this reason, are not required to be approved by a faculty committee and the faculty as a whole before being forwarded to Senate. The act, in this respect, much like mini-faculties.

The relative independence from the academic governance of its faculty both reflects and contributes to a sense of apartness in a school, which is bound inevitably to raise the question whether it belongs, and whether it might not be better off, or no worse off, if it were to become a faculty. Only in the Faculty of Arts do schools seem to be integrated into the academic, as distinct to budget and personnel, committee structure of the faculty in a manner if not exactly contemplated, then encouraged, by Senate in 1949. The absence, with two recent exceptions, of school faculty serving as an assistant or associate dean of their faculty, not to mention dean, also presumably does little to enhance a feeling of belonging on the part of a school, and of being more than an anomaly within the faculty structure, or an appendage to it.

After all is said, there remains the question of how disparate can the programs administered within a faculty be, and there be, equally accessible to all programs, the academic leadership and environment, not to mention resources, needed to assure their well being and future development. In other words, how cognate, if at all, must be the various programs and academic endeavours of a faculty? The answer to a large extent depends on how a faculty is viewed and defined. For example, is it foremost an academic body, or an administrative body, or both? The same enquiry can be raised with respect to the role of dean. Is the dean viewed as the academic leader of the entire faculty, of the schools as well as of departments, or is this role or aspect of the dean's job tend to be assumed, in the case of schools, by their directors? The reality is that it probably does, especially in the case of professional schools with wide outside involvement in professional organizations and the community.

It is reasonable to assume that Senate, in establishing schools, saw the director and not the dean as providing leadership in all matters particular to a school's professional or vocational existence, and with respect to the associations with outside organizations that this entails. Such a view or model of the complex faculty suggests that the dean's role as academic leader is restricted primarily to his or her discipline or general area of competence, which means, barring the possibility that the dean holds an appointment in a school, to the faculty's departments. For the school, the dean becomes essentially, a provider, and an advocate and expediter before Senate and in the president's office.

But if we accept that a faculty, regardless of its complexity, is an academic unit, and comprises an academic community, it seems reasonable that a sense of belongingness and purpose be shared by all who hold appointments in the faculty. In some cases this shared feeling has come easily, through an affinity of disciplines or professional concern, or a shared history, while in the case of other schools the basis for its existence is less evident, or non-existent. A majority of UBC's schools have evolved from within their faculty; others have been created and "attached". Schools are the product of the development and evolution of the university's mission, and for this reason it must be recognized that what was once considered their appropriate place in the organizational structure of the university, may no longer be so. This the university must be capable of doing and

acting upon. The interests of the school and the university may be best served if a school becomes a faculty.

**GUIDELINE 3 -- As an academic community, a faculty should be comprised of departments or departments and schools that share similar or common educational goals, and at least to some extent are inter-dependent and mutually reinforcing in the achievement of their respective goals. Measures of the latter may include the exchange of students in elective or required courses, joint research, and shared human and physical resources.**

**GUIDELINE 4 -- A school should be involved in a meaningful way in the academic governance of the faculty in which it is located, and similarly, members of departments and other schools in that faculty should have the opportunity to participate, where appropriate, in academic decision-making affecting a school.**

## ADMINISTRATION

### (i) Organizational Structure

The issue here is largely one of the degree of centralization in administrative structure and processes that is appropriate for a university of the size and complexity of UBC. Perspectives on this issue may not always be reconcilable with otherwise held views on optimum organization. In a very large organization that can invoke a sense of powerlessness, or even of neglect, it is natural that everyone would wish to be represented directly at, or report to, the "centre". Yet everyone also recognizes the importance of decentralized decision-making and responsibility. In the large university, the benefits of faculty status depend to a significant extent on there being relatively few faculties, although this may not always readily be seen as being the case.

The number of faculties defines the role of the president and vice president academic, to the extent that the nature of the decisions they must make, and the information level needed to make these decisions, depends on the number of administrators (deans of faculty) who report directly to them. It also, of course, defines the role and the scope of activities of deans. The organizational pyramid provides the balance between the need for control and accountability at the centre and the need for decentralization which, within the context of university governance and collegiality, has an appropriateness of its own. The present organizational structure at UBC of faculties, schools and departments is intended to provide such balance, and probably does in an acceptable, albeit less than perfect, way. Any argument to increase significantly or even incrementally the number of faculties has to be weighed carefully against any possible harm that might be done to this balance.

The number of faculties also has important implications for the manner in which resources are allocated within the university, or more specifically among academic programs. Faculty budgets are determined by the president's office, not without regard to the needs of departments and schools, but with the understanding that they are best attended to by allocations and reallocations within a global faculty budget. This approach to budgeting has proven to be sufficiently flexible to permit ear-marked funding from the centre, as well as additions to faculty budgets for the

specific purpose of meeting the needs or program initiatives of a particular department or school. Its great advantage for the sub-faculty unit (department or school) is that the competition for funds and the important decisions affecting its budget occur at a level where its goals and objectives are likely to be best understood, and where support for them, and if necessary, articulation of them to a wider university community is likely to be greatest. The role of a dean, working together with a director in advancing the interests of a school, must not be underestimated, and should always be compared to the situation that would exist if the school were a faculty having to compete for resources in a larger arena, and on its own--especially of the number of faculties so competing were to increase much beyond the present number.

**GUIDELINE 5 --** The implications that an increase in the number of faculties has for the organizational structure of the university, as this relates to the administration of academic units and programs, should be carefully considered. There are implications for both the unit seeking faculty status and other faculties, and for the university as a whole, of having decision making and responsibility presently located at the faculty level moved to the president's office.

**(ii) The Committee of Deans**

As an advisory and consultative committee to the president and academic vice-president, the Committee of Deans plays the important role of bring together the different and often seemingly conflicting interests of the faculties for the purpose of articulating a university point of view or position. Consisting of the university's senior academic administrators, it also quite properly advises on all issues and matters affecting the well being of the university. It is therefore important that the Committee of Deans be as representative as possible, i.e., be able and be seen as being able to speak effectively and equally for all parts of the academic community. This ability depends more on the composition of the committee, or on the basis on which faculties have been constituted, than it does on the actual number of faculties or of deans on the committee.

Some would claim that the Committee of Deans at present does not reflect as sensitively as it might, the extent of interests represented by the existing faculties, and that any change in the committee's composition and size should be directed at improving its representativeness. For example, two of the twelve faculties--Arts and Science-- account for nearly half of total student enrollments in the university, and several of their departments have more members and students than several faculties directly represented on the committee. The same two faculties, representing the university's programs in the liberal arts and the sciences, have the same voice on the committee as Agricultural Sciences and Forestry, which together account for less than four percent of university enrollments. The Health Sciences, with a little over six percent of total university enrollments, have three representatives on the Committee of Deans, and in the past have had four when the office of Co-ordinator of Health Sciences was held by someone other than an incumbent dean. Nine of the twelve deans represent professional faculties.

**GUIDELINE 6 --** The implications that the creation of an additional faculty has for the effective functioning of the Committee of Deans should be carefully considered. If they appear to increase present imbalance attributable to the different size of faculties or the strength of the representation some areas of the campus or academic community have on the committee, the benefits of a new faculty must be weighed against this disadvantage.

## **BUDGETARY IMPLICATIONS**

The possibility of enhanced resources may well be one of the motivations for a school to seek faculty status. In today's financial climate, budgetary demands may also explain why a faculty would be willing to accede to a school's wish to seek needed funding elsewhere. There may be a desire by the school to insulate its budget from retrenchment. The experience at UBC the past ten years or so clearly suggests that the smaller professional faculties have indeed fared better in this regard than have the large complex, multi-program faculties. Yet it is also true that the degree of retrenchment of the latter faculties has not always been reflected in cutbacks of schools' budgets.

It is difficult not to imagine that a new faculty would not represent a new spending centre for the university. The idea that granting faculty status does not have associated with it additional costs is not tenable. For example, cursory examination of faculty establishments indicate that the smallest faculties have one, or more frequently two, assistant or associate deans. There are also in most situations faculty or decanal funds which, with today's tight budgets, are unlikely to be apportioned, if at all, in a manner adequate to the needs of a fledgling faculty. The goodwill and aspirations attendant a new faculty are in themselves sufficient to give a boost to funding, and it would be foolish to assume that the university would not respond accordingly.

**GUIDELINE 7 --** The budgetary implications of granting faculty status to a school must be carefully considered and estimated, with an undertaking to keep costs within these estimates for a specified period of time. the estimated cost of establishing a new faculty should be prioritized in relation to the other demands and needs of other faculties.

## **THE EXAMPLE OF OTHER UNIVERSITIES**

Each university is organized into faculties, schools and other academic units in a way that reflects its unique history and the circumstances that have attended change and growth. A look at the organizational structure at major Canadian universities (Appendix B) suggests no norm or typical structure. UBC most closely resembles McGill and Dalhousie in the number of schools, although is probably unique in requiring that all schools be a constituent part of a faculty. Some schools, e.g., at Western, Toronto and Queen's, are schools in name only, with deans who report directly to the president or president's office. Half of the universities looked at are organized almost exclusively into faculties or schools that function as faculties. Not surprisingly, these are also the universities with the largest number of faculties.

The argument can and has been made that a school at UBC should be a faculty because most of its counterparts elsewhere in Canada are faculties with deans rather than schools with directors. This is essentially an argument for status and recognition, and for this reason should be examined

carefully for substance. The notion that a school's well being is tied to its name or perceived status within its university's structure is not held universally, as evidenced by the fact that some schools at Eastern universities have chosen to retain their name after being accorded what amounts to, from an organizational point of view of faculty status. As indicated in Table 1 (see below), no school at UBC is in an anomalous situation in terms of its designation or status as a school. Some schools' programs at UBC --music is a good example--are taught in departments at other universities, a fact that is not evident from the table.

Table 1

ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS OF UBC SCHOOLS AT SELECTED CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES		
<u>UBC School of</u>	<u>Faculty at</u>	<u>School at</u>
Architecture	Calgary, Manitoba, Toronto*	McGill
Audiology & Speech Sc.	N/A	N/A
Community & Regional Planning	N/A	McGill
Family & Nutritional Science	Manitoba	Alberta
Library, Archival & Info Sci	Toronto, U.W.O.	Alberta, Dalhousie
Music	McGill, Toronto, U.W.O	Calgary**, Manitoba
Nursing	Calgary, Alberta, U.W.O. Saskatchewan, Toronto, Queen's*	Dalhousie, McGill, Manitoba, McMaster
Physical Education	Calgary, Alberta, U.W.O., Manitoba, Saskatchewan,	Dalhousie, Toronto, Queen's
Rehabilitation Medicine	Alberta	Dalhousie, McGill, McMaster Queen's, Saskatchewan
Social Work	Calgary, Manitoba, Toronto	Dalhousie, McGill
* called a school                      ** in Faculty of Fine Arts		

The fact that some or even a majority of universities can be pointed to as an example is hardly compelling in the absence of other argument. The issue should be what is appropriate for UBC in the context of its governing structure and how it relates to, and contributes to the academic well being of, a particular school.

**GUIDELINE 8 -- The example of other universities where the counterparts of a school at UBC have faculty status, and/or are headed by a dean, is not a compelling argument for a change in organizational structure and governance at UBC. Acceptance of such an argument would require evidence of disadvantage of maintaining a school's present status, or of real benefits to be derived from changing it.**

## ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

Should it be concluded that, for whatever reason, the status of a school within its faculty is inappropriate, other remedies than granting it independent status as a faculty should be considered. UBC's organizational structure has grown by a process of accretion, without plan and regard to its ability to continue to accommodate growth and the changing needs and role of units within the structure.

The standard response should not be to create another faculty. This may not be the most appropriate solution for the school, or for the university as a whole, given the implication in which the university is governed. More fundamental change, such as the restructuring of the existing pattern of faculties and schools, including the amalgamation of present faculties, may be required to meet the need for change and to provide for it in the future. The transfer of a school to another faculty may also be a solution.

**GUIDELINE 9 --** Alternative solutions to granting a school faculty status should be carefully considered, in view of the appropriateness of faculty status in relation to the requisites of a conducive academic environment, and of the implications an increased number of faculties has for the governance of the university. The transfer of a school to another faculty, a restructuring of the existing pattern of faculties and schools, and the amalgamation or combination of existing faculties may be a more appropriate response to the need for change.

*Senate Academic Policy Committee  
April, 1993*

## APPENDIX A

EXCERPT FROM SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING OF FEBRUARY 16, 1949  
(pp 1476-1477)*Report of the Committee Appointed to Examine the Organization of the University*

Dean Chant, Chairman, presented the report of the Committee on the Organization of the University as adopted at the meeting of January 7th, which reads in major part, as follows:

*"Within a Faculty departments appear to fall, at present, into one or other of two categories. Generally speaking, those of the first category, with which this Committee is concerned, are characterized as follows:*

- (a) their courses are mainly professional or vocational in character;*
- (b) they offer a specialized curriculum leading to a distinctive degree;*
- (c) because their courses are ordinarily restricted to students following the specialized curriculum, their policies do not generally affect policies in other departments to any great extent;*
- (d) they have a relationship with outside professional bodies, which is not only desirable, but is necessary because of professional requirements which must be considered when designing the curriculum;*
- (e) they have, therefore, special problems which in many other universities have given rise to a somewhat different position than that belonging to a department.*

*The committee, therefore, recommends:*

- (1) that within a Faculty and under the Dean of the Faculty, departments falling in the first category described above may, on approval by Senate and the board of Governors, be designated as "schools" and their heads as "directors";*
- (2) that faculty consist of members of "faculty" status in all the departments and schools of which the Faculty is composed;*
- (3) that the Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with the Director appoint a council for each school consisting of all members of "faculty" status in the school and representatives of closely related departments;*
- (4) that any matters pertaining only to the school be referred to the council of the school; any matters dealt with by the council of the school may, at the discretion of the Dean, be referred to the Faculty;*
- (5) that all other academic matters be referred to the faculty;*
- (6) that Senate, at its discretion and on request of the council, permit the Director of the school to present in person to Senate matters of special interest to the school.*

*The committee wishes to point out that adoption of the above recommendations would not prevent any department or school from becoming a Faculty, if Senate and the Board of Governors so decide. It would, however, without additional cost, or alteration to the University Act, provide a wider latitude in meeting problems of organization.*

*Members of the committee feel that the scheme meets all the requirements considered desirable by those departments with special problems. Furthermore, by such an arrangement, the Director of a school would be relieved from the necessity of dealing with many matters which have no direct bearing on his school, and would be given greater freedom of action in dealing with his special problems more expeditiously than if all matters had to be referred to faculty."*

*Dean Chant  
Dean Gage*

*That this report be approved in principle.*

*Carried.*