

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Vancouver Senate Secretariat

Senate and Curriculum Services

Enrolment Services

2016–1874 East Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1

www.students.ubc.ca/senate

Vancouver Senate

MINUTES OF OCTOBER 18, 2006

Attendance

Present: President S. J. Toope (Chair), Mr. B. J. Silzer (Registrar and Secretary), Dr. A. McEachern (Chancellor), Dr. L. A. Whitehead (Vice-President, Academic & Provost), Dr. P. Adebar, Mr. B. Ahmadian, Mr. T. Ahmed, Dr. B. Arneil, Dr. N. Banthia, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dr. G. Bluman, Dean M. A. Bobinski, Dr. J. Brander, Dr. H. Burt, Dr. L. Chui, Mr. B. Danin, Dr. E. Dean, Dr. J. Dennison, Dr. W. Dunford, Ms. G. Eom, Dr. D. Fielding, Dr. I. Franks, Ms. M. Friesen, Mr. C. Funnell, Dean N. Gallini, Dr. S. Grayston, Dr. D. Griffin, Dr. P. G. Harrison, Associate Vice-President J. Hutton, Dr. R. Irwin, Dean M. Isaacson, Dr. J. Johnson, Ms. J. Khangura, Dr. S. B. Knight, Dr. B. S. Lalli, Mr. R. Lam, Mr. M. Lane, Dr. M. MacEntee, Dr. P. L. Marshall, Ms. K. McAllister, Dr. W. McKee, Dr. D. McLean, Mr. P. Orchard, Dean S. Peacock, Dean *pro tem.* A. Rose, Dean J. Saddler, Dr. J. Sarra, Ms. E. Segal, Dr. B. Stelck, Dr. D. Steyn, Dr. S. Thorne, Dean R. Tierney, Dr. M. Upadhyaya, Dr. R. Windsor-Liscombe, Dr. R. A. Yaworsky.

By Invitation: Prof. R. Gardiner, Head, Dept. of Theatre, Film, and Creative Writing; Mr. A. Glynn, Manager, Research and Trust Accounting, Financial Services; Dr. A. Kindler, Associate Vice-President, Academic Programs; Ms. N. Knight, Associate Vice-President, Campus & Community Planning; Ms. D. Merritt, Associate Vice-President, Finance; Mr. M. Pochurko, Director, Financial Reporting and Budgeting, Budget Office; Mr. J. Stott, Vice-Chair, Campus & Community Planning Project.

Regrets: Principal *pro tem.* L. Bainbridge, Prof. C. Boyle, Mr. P. T. Brady, Ms. S. Brkanovic, Mr. F. Fan, Dr. W. Fletcher, Dr. C. Friedrichs, Mr. C. L. Gorman, Dr. L. Gunderson, Dr. R. Harrison, Dr. R. Helsley, Dean *pro tem.* M. Isman, Ms. W. King, Mr. K. Liu, Mr. R. Lowe, Dr. A. McAfee, Mr. J. Mergens, Dean D. Muzyka, Dr. D. Paterson, Dr. P. Potter, Ms. C. Quinlan, Mr. B. Simpson, Dean R. Sindelar, Dean G. Stuart, Ms. A. Thamboo, Dr. S. Thorne, Mr. B. Toosi, Dr. D. Weary, Dr. R. Wilson, Dean E. H. K. Yen, Dr. J. Young.

Recording Secretary: Ms. L. M. Collins.

Note: The full text of some reports to Senate is not included in the Minutes. Copies are available from the Assistant Registrar, Senate & Curriculum Services.

Call to Order

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

<i>Dean Tierney</i>	}	<i>That the minutes of the meeting of September 20, 2006 be adopted as circulated.</i>
<i>Dr. Steyn</i>		

The Senate
acquiesced
without a vote.

Remarks from the Chair and Related Questions

None.

2005/2006 Financial Statements

Ms. Dana Merritt, Associate Vice-President, Finance, presented the highlights of the Financial Statements for the 2005/2006 fiscal year. She introduced Mr. Andrew Glynn, Manager, Research and Trust Accounting, and Mr. Martin Pochurko, Director, Financial Reporting and Budgeting.

The Financial Statements had been approved by the Board of Governors on May 23, 2006, and had received an unqualified audit opinion from the Auditor General. Fiscal highlights included:

- Significant institutional and residential construction;
- The opening of the UBC Okanagan campus;
- Donations of \$102 million;
- The upgrading of UBC's long-term debt rating by Moody's from Aa2 to Aa1;
- The market value of the Endowment Fund at \$829 million.

The total consolidated revenue for the University was \$1.57 billion, compared to \$1.25 billion in the previous year. Expenses were \$1.45 billion, compared to \$1.24 billion in the previous year. Total assets were \$3.1 billion, compared to \$2.5 billion in the previous year.

Financial Statements, continued

DISCUSSION

In response to a question from Dr. Bluman, Ms. Merritt confirmed that the expenditure for student awards had increased in 2005/2006 as compared to the previous year. A calculation error in 2004/2005 was to blame for the apparent decrease in the circulated document.

In response to a question from Dr. Bluman, Ms. Merritt explained that the increase in interest expense was primarily related to two bond issues.

Dean Tierney and several other Senators noted that the Financial Statements reflected prosperity at the University in its entirety at the same time that the academic enterprise had been asked to absorb budget cuts. Dean Tierney asked about budgetary futures for the academic side of the University, and whether consideration was being given to sharing some of the relative prosperity. Ms. Merritt noted that, while research activities brought large revenues and expenses, the teaching and learning enterprise was funded in large part by General Purpose Operating (GPO) fund. GPO funding was restricted due to provincial limits on tuition fees and government funding. Ms. Merritt reported that, following discussions with the provincial government, the University could more reliably estimate grant amounts for future years. The provincial government had also made the commitment to fund expenses associated with salary increases. Ms. Merritt stated that she could not predict the budgetary future for the Faculties for the following year, as those allocations were to result from an upcoming budgetary process.

Dr. McKee expressed interest in receiving data on actual and projected revenue and expenses focusing on the teaching and learning aspects of the University. Ms. Merritt stated that the circulated document consolidated data across the entire institution; she noted that the teaching and learning enterprise had finished the 2005/2006 academic year

Financial Statements, continued

with a surplus in the amount of \$300 000. Ms. Merritt noted that the Council of Senates Budget Committee customarily received the data requested by Dr. McKee, and suggested that this information could be made available to Senators.

In response to a question from Dr. Windsor-Liscombe about funding for undergraduate as compared to graduate students, Ms. Merritt stated that it remained a significant challenge to secure adequate funding for graduate students. Some student spaces unfortunately remained unfunded.

Responding to Dean Tierney, President Toope agreed that the financial situation for the academic portion of the University was not as positive as the consolidated statements appeared to suggest. He noted that the statements had been prepared for presentation to the Board of Governors and the provincial government. President Toope stated that the senior administration was about to engage in wide consultation about GPO funding and the relationship between GPO and capital, ancillary, and other funding. The provincial government had indicated that there would be no increase in base operating funds for the following fiscal year, with the exception of funds associated with salary increases, and possibly additional funded spaces for graduate students. President Toope stated that the budgetary situation would present significant challenges. He committed to bring more information to the Senate as it became available, and to seek the advice of Senators about how to move forward. President Toope thanked Ms. Merritt for her presentation.

Academic Building Needs Committee

UBC VANCOUVER CAMPUS PLAN

Dr. Adebar requested that the Chair recognize guest presenter Ms. Nancy Knight, Associate Vice-President, Campus and Community Planning. He suggested that Senators focus for the purposes of the present meeting on the process for formulating the campus plan,

rather than the content of the plan. He indicated that the Academic Building Needs Committee would be working very closely with the Project Team and would ensure that the Senate remained informed and was offered opportunities to contribute. The Academic Building Needs Committee planned to request time on a future Senate meeting agenda to discuss the content of the plan.

Ms. Knight gave an overview of the process that would ultimately determine the UBC Vancouver Campus Plan. She described the process as consultative and inclusive. She acknowledged the existence of some cynicism about the benefits of planning, and committed to addressing those issues. The Campus Plan would include room for growth in academic and research activities, as well as provisions for a more complete campus life. Ms. Knight stated that increasing the number of student, faculty, staff, and market residences on campus would greatly enhance the community. Ms. Knight invited Senators to visit the website at <http://www.campusplan.ubc.ca> and to participate in upcoming workshops.

Ms. Knight stated that the Campus Plan would cover approximately 60 percent of the campus. Some areas were designated as “housing reserve,” meaning that residential development could only proceed after it had been determined that the land was not required for academic and research activities. Ms. Knight noted that, compared to other urban universities such as McGill University and the University of Toronto, the Point Grey campus suffered from suburban sprawl due to its relatively generous size.

Ms. Knight gave an overview of the following six phases of the process, along with projected completion dates:

- Phase 1: Background (complete);
- Phase 2: Ideas and Issues (current phase);
- Phase 3: Talking About the Future (Winter - Spring 2007);
- Phase 4: Review Options (Spring - Summer 2007);

Academic Building Needs Committee, continued

Phase 5: The Preferred Option (Summer - Fall 2007);

Phase 6: Here's the Plan (Fall 2007 - Winter 2008).

Ms. Knight reiterated that consultation with the Senate would be important and was required.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Steyn stated that he was disturbed to find that some neighbours of UBC were cynical and disgusted with past UBC behaviour, and asked how these issues would be addressed.

Dr. Dunford agreed, stating that local residents were skeptical that their participation would make any difference to the final outcome. Dr. Dennison also agreed, adding that the University had appeared to be unconcerned about disturbing its neighbours during construction. Ms. Knight agreed that the attitudes of surrounding residents were of significant concern and hoped that, with improved community relations efforts, those people would come to see the value of residing proximate to the University. A number of public presentations and forums were planned to broaden the connection with neighbouring groups.

In response to a question from Dr. Steyn about engaging resident academic experts in the planning process, Ms. Knight stated that conversations had been initiated with the Directors of the School of Community and Regional Planning and the School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture. Ms. Knight was hopeful that both schools would find ways to integrate parts of the planning project into their curricula. She planned to also explore connections with the Civil Engineering Department.

In response to a question from Dean Isaacson, Ms. Knight stated that the target was to submit the final plan to the Board of Governors in the spring of 2008. In the interim period, there would be no development on the land designated as housing reserve.

Academic Building Needs Committee, continued

Dr. MacEntee requested clarification about the mechanism for consultation with the Senate. He was concerned that members of the Project Team would return to simply inform the Senate, rather than to seek meaningful input. Ms. Knight noted that there was one Senate representative on each of the Campus and Community Planning Project Steering Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee, and that the Academic Building Needs Committee would also be involved. She asked for advice from Senators about what forms of additional participation the Senate would prefer. Ms. Knight noted that many groups on campus felt they should be directing the plan, and that her job would be to ensure that all voices were heard. The Vice-President, External and Legal Affairs and the Board of Governors would be the ultimate directors of the plan. Dr. Adebar stated that the Academic Building Needs Committee believed participation in the planning project was one of their most important tasks, and that the Committee would report to Senate.

There were suggestions from several Senators that the project team conduct some consultation on how to best conduct effective community consultation before proceeding.

Dr. Stanley Knight thanked Ms. Knight for her presentation, and expressed hope for future consultation with the Senate. He noted the lack of overall campus ambience, the difficulty of moving people around campus, as well as the lack of protection from the rain and sun in outdoor spaces as areas needing attention in the plan.

Dr. Stelck suggested that, for improved community relations, the University might consider distancing itself from the UBC Properties Trust as the group responsible for controversial construction projects.

Dr. Adebar thanked Ms. Knight for her presentation and for her thoughtful responses to some difficult questions.

Academic Policy Committee

The meeting agenda was rearranged by consent such that reports from this Committee followed the report from the Ad hoc Committee to Consider Universitas 21 and U21 Global.

Admissions Committee

BACHELOR OF COMMERCE ADMISSIONS CHANGES

Committee Chair Dr. Berger presented the report, which proposed changes to admissions for College/University Transfer students effective September 2007 and for BC College Commerce Transfer students effective September 2008.

<i>Dr. Berger</i>	}	<i>That the admissions changes for the Bachelor of Commerce be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. R. Harrison</i>		

Carried.

Agenda Committee

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE SENATE AND THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Dean Isaacson presented the following report for the information of Senators. The Agenda Committee had been made aware of some concerns about the length of time it had taken in the past for Senate materials to be approved by the Board and the Senate notified, and the report suggested ways that communications between the two bodies might be enhanced. Dean Isaacson emphasized that the report contained words like “suggest” and “request,” and that the Agenda Committee was keenly aware that the Board would make its own decisions about its processes.

Communications Between the Senate and the Board of Governors

Senators may already be aware that the Senate Secretariat forwards certain items approved by Senate at each meeting to the Board of Governors for approval. The Agenda Committee has prepared this report for the information of Senators.

Agenda Committee, continued

Current Process

Items approved by Senate that require Board of Governors approval include such matters as new and changed curriculum, the establishment or renaming of academic units, and the establishment of chairs. For a complete list of Senate items that require approval by the Board of Governors, Senators may consult the *University Act*, Sections 37 (1) (i), (o), (r), and 38.

Following Senate approval, the Senate Secretariat sends copies of these items to the Office of the Vice-President Academic for inclusion on a Board of Governors meeting agenda. Soon after Board approval, the Secretary to the Board of Governors sends a letter of confirmation to the Senate Secretariat, and the Secretariat places a list of approved items on the following Senate meeting agenda to confirm final approval.

Enhancements to the Current Process

Some enhancements to this process have been suggested to the Secretariat. Given current procedures and timelines, Senators are not always informed in a timely manner about the status of items sent to the Board. In fact, the scheduling of meetings of Senate the Board of Governors is such that the notification back to Senate may take several months after Senate's initial approval of an item. The approval status of an item during this interim period is often unclear. For cases such as new programs, when Board approval is a prerequisite for submission to the provincial government for approval, this delay causes notable academic hardship for the Faculty or Faculties concerned.

Proposed Process

Accordingly, the Senate Agenda Committee has considered the matter and has requested that the Senate Secretariat to adopt the following procedures:

1. That the Secretariat forward to the Secretary of the Board, copied to the Office of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost, all items requiring Board approval. Under the University Act, the Board must receive the Senate materials within ten days of Senate approval.
2. That the Secretariat recommend to the Secretary to the Board that Senate items be presented to the Board as reports from the Senate, rather than as reports from the Vice President Academic, and that communication about the approval status of these items take place between the Board and Senate secretariats.
3. That the Secretariat request that the Secretary to the Board convey to the Secretariat the scheduling of the Board's consideration of all items brought to it by the Senate, and continue the practice of conveying to the Secretariat the disposition of all Senate items immediately following these decisions.
4. That the Senate Secretariat request the Secretary to the Board of Governors to seek all routine Senate business to be considered by the Board of Governors

Agenda Committee, continued

using the Board's established "approval by consent" procedure, which would see materials circulated to Board members independently of Board meeting agendas, and thus expedite the approval process.

cc Mrs. Nina Robinson, Secretary, Board of Governors and Ms. Charlotte Passmore, Office of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost

DISCUSSION

President Toope reported that he would convey the suggestions to the Board of Governors, consult with the two secretariats, and report back to Senate on the matter. In response to a question from Dr. P. G. Harrison regarding the submission of materials to the Board, Dean Isaacson indicated expressed the opinion that communications from the the Senate to the Office of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost and to the Board would most efficiently proceed in parallel, rather than in sequence. Vice-President Whitehead stated that, when presenting Senate items to the Board, Board members frequently asked him to comment on the nature of Senate discussion on a given topic. He added that the Board of Governors were open to suggestions about possible improvements.

Nominating Committee

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS TO THE COUNCIL OF SENATES

Committee Chair Dr. Windsor-Liscombe presented the following report.

Appointment of Senators to the Council of Senates

Senators have been canvassed for nominations and volunteers to serve on the Council of Senates. Several faculty members and one student have agreed to stand. As such, the Nominating Committee recommends the following to Senate:

"That the following Standing Committee appointments be made:

Committee	Senator
Council of Senates Vancouver Representative Committee One	Dr Perry Adebar

Nominating Committee, continued

Council of Senates Vancouver Representative Committee Two	Dr George Bluman
Council of Senates Vancouver Representative Committee Three	Dr Sue Grayston
Council of Senates Vancouver Representative Committee Four	Ms Gina Eom

And;

That these appointments made are until the conclusion of this Senate (August 31 2008), except in the case of Ms Eom, whose appointment is until March 31 2007, and are made with the understanding that should one of the above persons cease to be a member of Senate, he or she will be replaced on the relevant Committee by Senate at its earliest convenience."

Senators are reminded that despite the terms set above, Senators do serve on their Committees until a successor is appointed in accordance with Section 34 of the *Rules and Procedures of Senate*.

At this time, no nominee or volunteer has emerged from the cohort of deans on Senate. The Nominating Committee renews its call for a dean to volunteer or nominate one of his or her colleagues. A recommendation on how to proceed to fill this position will be made at the November 2006 meeting of Senate.

*Dr. Windsor-
Liscombe
Dr. Young*

*} That Senate accept the recommendations of
the Nominating Committee with respect to
appointments to the Council of Senates.*

Carried.

Tributes Committee

REGALIA COLOURS FOR THE BACHELOR OF BUSINESS IN REAL ESTATE

Committee Chair Dr. Thorne presented the report.

Dr. Thorne } *That Senate approve the regalia colours for*
Dr. Dennison } *the Bachelor of Business in Real Estate*
 (BBRE) as:

Hood: light grey
Cord: black and red.

Carried.

Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Universitas 21 and U21 Global

On behalf of absent Committee Chair Dr. Helsley, President Toope indicated that the ad hoc Committee was consulting with Associate Vice-President Craig Klafter about his availability to attend a future meeting of the Senate. The Committee planned to deliver its report to Senate by December 2006.

Academic Policy Committee

Committee Chair Dr. P. G. Harrison presented the reports.

GREAT NORTHERN WAY: ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION OF DEGREE PROGRAMS

Note: the full text of this report is not included in the Minutes. It is available from Senate & Curriculum Services or for download as part of the October 18 2006 meeting package at <http://www.students.ubc.ca/senate>.

Dr. Harrison introduced the report and its associated motion as a “bold yet cautious step.” Because the document belonged to all four consortium partners collectively, the Committee had been unable to amend the document as they might have wished. The doc-

Academic Policy Committee, continued

ument embodied a statement of general principles that would allow for the development of exciting new kinds of degree programs.

<i>Dr. P. G. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the general principles set out in the report entitled Academic Governance and Administration of Degree Programs with the proviso that Senate have ongoing oversight and right of approval for all academic programs, courses, regulations, and policies applicable to students who are candidates for degrees offered in part by the University of British Columbia at the Great Northern Way campus.</i>
<i>Dr. Burt</i>		

DISCUSSION

Dean Isaacson pointed out that the Committee report indicated that all activities and degree programs would necessarily involve all four partner institutions. He noted that there might be areas where one or more of the partners had no expertise. After some discussion, Prof. Robert Gardiner, upon recognition by the Chair, confirmed that this was an error in the covering report. In fact, while the first collaborative degree would involve all four institutions, other collaborative arrangements involving fewer institutions could come forward in future.

A Student Senator asked about the bureaucracy involved in having four institutions approve a common proposal. Dr. Harrison agreed that the approval process could be challenging.

The motion was
put and carried.

Academic Policy Committee, continued

REVISION: ACADEMIC CONCESSION POLICY

Dr. Harrison presented a proposed revision to the Academic Concession policy that added “military service” to the list of circumstances that might prompt a student to request academic concession under the policy published in the Calendar.

<i>Dr. P. G. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That the Senate approve the proposed revision to the Calendar entry on Academic Concession.</i>
<i>Dr. Burt</i>		

DISCUSSION

There was discussion about whether the list of circumstances should be expanded to include things like parental or family responsibilities or varsity athletics. Dr. Arneil suggested a broader discussion on the topic and was hesitant to support military service as taking priority over other circumstances. Dr. Bluman suggested that, while it would make sense to make accommodation for active military service, it seemed less reasonable to grant concession for reserves activities. In response to a question from Dr. Brander, Dr. Harrison confirmed that the list of circumstances was not intended to be exclusive.

After further discussion, Dr. Harrison recommended that the Senate proceed to approve the revision as presented, but agreed that the Academic Policy Committee would undertake further discussion about additional circumstances and any other desirable changes to the policy.

Mr. Silzer stated that he had been approached about this issue because students in the military reserves reported difficulty in having instructors recognize their requests for concession as legitimate. He noted that the proposed policy did not entail an automatic concession, but signalled military service as one legitimate circumstance that instructors might consider.

Academic Policy Committee, continued

AMENDMENT

There was general consensus that the statement should be modified to read “**or** military service” instead of “**and** military service.”

<i>Dr. Bluman</i>	}	<i>That the matter be laid on the table.</i>
<i>Dr. Young</i>		

The motion to lay
on the table was
defeated.

The main motion,
with the
amendment, was
put and carried.

REVISION: VIEWING MARKED EXAMINATIONS POLICY

Dr. Harrison presented a proposed revision to the Calendar entry entitled Viewing Marked Examinations. Student Senators had requested that the Committee consider revising the policy because some students had reported difficulty in implementing the current policy.

<i>Dr. P. G. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That the Senate approve the revisions to the Calendar entry on Viewing Marked Examinations.</i>
<i>Dean Isaacson</i>		

DISCUSSION

Senators made the following comments:

- “reasonable time” was too vague;
- while this revision would work well for examinations, it might be problematic if extended to all marked work;
- implementation by all instructors was an unrealistic expectation; and
- permitting students to view and handle all marked work would entail additional photocopying to prevent alteration and resubmission for additional marks.

Academic Policy Committee, continued

In response to general discomfort, President Toope suggested that the Committee further consider that paragraph of the proposed revised policy.

AMENDMENT

By consent, the first paragraph of the proposed revised policy was amended as follows:

Any examination, essay, problem set, laboratory report or other assignment should be marked in a reasonable time and although the work may be retained by the University the student shall receive feedback on expected and achieved outcomes. ~~If there is a provision for marked work to be returned to the student and then re-submitted for the correction of marking errors or omissions, the instructor must provide clear guidelines in advance to ensure that the academic integrity of the work is maintained.~~

The main motion,
including the
above
amendment, was
put and carried.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. The following regular meeting of the Vancouver Senate was scheduled to take place on November 15, 2006.