



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Vancouver Senate Secretariat
Senate and Curriculum Services
Enrolment Services
2016-1874 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
www.senate.ubc.ca

VANCOUVER SENATE

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 14, 1996

Attendance

Present: President D. W. Strangway (Chair), Vice-President D. R. Birch, Dr. D. R. Atkins, Mr. J. A. Banfield, Dr. J. Barman, Dean C. S. Binkley, Dr. A. E. Boardman, Mr. J. Boritz, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. D. G. A. Carter, Ms. L. Chui, Dr. T. S. Cook, Dr. M. G. R. Coope, Mr. D. Culhane, Ms. J. Dzerowicz, Dr. J. H. V. Gilbert, Mr. E. B. Goehring, Dean M. A. Goldberg, Dr. J. Gosline, Dean J. R. Grace, Dr. S. E. Grace, Mr. H. D. Gray, Dr. M. Isaacson, Dr. J. G. T. Kelsey, Dr. S. B. Knight, Ms. L. Lam, Mr. C. Lim, Dr. S. C. Lindstrom, Mr. S. Lohachitranont, Dr. D. M. Lyster, Dr. D. J. MacDougall, Dr. M. MacEntee, Dean J. H. McNeill, Dean A. Meisen, Dr. M. D. Morrison, Dr. R. J. Patrick, Mr. R. L. de Pfyffer, Dr. W. J. Phillips, Mrs. M. Price, Professor M. Quayle, Dr. D. J. Randall, Professor R. S. Reid, Dr. H. B. Richer, Dr. R. A. Shearer, Dean N. Sheehan, Mr. D. Shu, Dr. A. J. Sinclair, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Dean C. L. Smith, Ms. C. A. Soong, Ms. L. M. Sparrow, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. S. Thorne, Dr. W. Uegama, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Dr. R. M. Will, Dr. D. L. Williams, Mr. E. C. H. Woo, Dean E. H. K. Yen.

Regrets: Chancellor R. H. Lee, Mr. S. Arnold, Dr. A. P. Autor, Dr. S. Avramidis, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dr. D. M. Brunette, Dr. D. H. Cohen, Mr. D. G. Geros, Mr. I. Gill, Rev. J. Hanrahan, Dean M. J. Hollenberg, Mr. D. Khan, Professor V. J. Kirkness, Mr. A. Lau, Mr. T. Lau, Dr. M. Levine, Professor P. T. K. Lin, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Dean M. P. Marchak, Dean B. C. McBride, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Mr. A. Pederson, Professor J. A. Rice, Dean J. F. Richards, Dr. L. J. Stan, Mr. D. R. Verma, Dr. E. W. Whittaker, Dr. W. C. Wright Jr.

Minutes of the previous meeting

Mr. Woo	}	<i>That the minutes of the fifth regular meeting of Senate for the Session 1995-96, having been circulated, be taken as read and adopted.</i>
Mr. Lim		

Carried.

Chair's remarks and related questions

HONORARY DEGREES

President Strangway announced that the following had accepted invitations to receive honorary degrees at the 1996 Congregation ceremonies:

- Chun-Hak Ahn
- Mario Bernardi
- Rosemary Brown
- Bertram Neville Brockhouse
- Gordon Forward
- Gurdev Singh Gill
- Liou Jieh Jow
- Robert H. Lee
- John Hector McArthur
- Norman Pace
- Doris Shadbolt
- Carol Shields
- Richard B. Splane
- Verna Huffman Splane

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE

President Strangway announced that Dr. Michael Isaacson and Dr. Graham Kelsey had been elected by Senate to serve on a Presidential Search Committee.

From the Board of Governors

NOTIFICATION OF APPROVAL IN PRINCIPLE OF SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

Subject, where applicable, to the proviso that none of the programs be implemented without formal reference to the President; and that the Deans and Heads concerned with new programs be asked to indicate the space requirements, if any, of such new programs.

- i. Merger of the Department of Chemical Engineering and the Department of Bio-Resource Engineering into the Department of Chemical and Bio-Resource Engineering, effective April 1, 1996. (pp.11278-81)
- ii. That the new name of the amalgamated units, Resource Management and Environmental Studies and Westwater Research Centre, be Institute for Resources and Environment (IRE). (pp.11281-2)
- iii. Establishment of the Brain and Spinal Cord Research Centre (pp.11306-8)
- iv. Curriculum proposals from: the Faculties of Agricultural Sciences, Applied Science, Arts, Commerce and Business Administration, Dentistry, Education, Forestry, Graduate Studies, Medicine, Science, and the Schools of Human Kinetics and Rehabilitation Sciences. (11275-8, 11286-93, 11300-5, 11311-21)

Reports of Committees of Senate

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Fees for International Students

Dr. Williams, chair of the committee, presented the following report which had been circulated:

Background

In 1987, the President established a Task Force on Liaison, Recruiting, and Admissions. Among its recommendations, it proposed that UBC seek to increase its enrolment of international students to between 4% and 6% of its undergraduates. Only outstanding students were to be admitted and Vice President Birch proposed to Senate a minimum academic standing equivalent to a 3.5 GPA. (Senate Minutes, Feb. 1988, pp 9226-29). The Senate Admissions Committee was instructed to monitor these admission criteria, and indeed in Jan 1990, Dr Elder informed Senate that the committee felt that a 3.5 GPA was too high, in that fewer international students had been accepted in 1990 than in 1989. A motion was passed changing the 3.5 GPA to "superior academic standing". This is the present Calendar statement. Dr Elder further stated "the Admissions Officers are aware of the intention of Senate, which is to admit only superior international students, and not to displace any Canadian students." At that time the minimum GPA for most programs was between 2.5 and 2.7, and Dr Elder assured Senate that no international student would be admitted with a GPA of less than 3.1. Subsequently the minimum GPA for international student admission has been adjusted to 3.4 to reflect the general increase in admission GPA's in many programs.

Although the global figure of 4% to 6% of international students appears in the Strategic Plan, "Second to None", the Senate Academic Policy Committee presented for Senate's approval only a three page Mission Statement at the meeting of May 1989. This Mission Statement includes "The University will enrich the educational experience by enrolling students from many countries." This remains University policy, as do the Senate motions welcoming international students of superior academic standing provided they do not displace qualified Canadian students. One may infer that the percentage figures were intended as a guide.

Current International Enrolments

There are currently 970 undergraduate students on visas, representing 3.9% of the undergraduate population. Of these only 531 students (2.1%) pay the differential fee set by the Board of Governors at 250% of tuition for a Canadian student. Of the remaining students, 172 are exchange students whose numbers on average balance those of UBC students on reciprocal exchange at other institutions. Each group pays fees at the home institution. The other students for the most part pay regular fees under a variety of special agreements, although 99 students pay no fees at all.

Significant enrolments are 167 in Arts (2.2%), 136 in Applied Science (6.3%), 99 in Science (2.1%), and 82 in Commerce (6.2%). The additional income generated by the differential fee is estimated to be 1.8M\$.

This year UBC received 663 qualified applications from international undergraduates. 659 were admitted and 462 of these registered. However, of these 317 were either visiting or exchange students, leaving a net total of 145 new international students who might be expected to stay more than one year.

At the graduate level, there are 1237 visa students representing 19% of the total graduate enrolment. Programs with large enrolments are the Ph.D. with 701 (32%), the M.Sc. with 160 (16%), the M.A. with 120 (12%), the M.A.Sc. with 84 (26%), and the M.B.A. with 43 (17%). All the remaining programs together represent only about 10% of the international graduate students. At present no differential fee exists for graduate programs.

Market-Based Tuition for International Students

This proposal by the President has undergone several iterations. A version was first presented to both the Senate Academic Policy Committee and the Senate Budget Committee during the 1993-1994 Academic year. Both committees recommended that a proposal be brought forward from a specific Faculty to enable the committees to provide advice prior to proceeding with a Board policy (Senate minutes, May 1994, p. 10794). However no such proposal has been brought forward. The latest version of the Tuition Fee Proposal has incorporated several modifications following discussions with this committee and others. Nonetheless we record for Senate's information our concerns, whether or not they are addressed by the policy.

Briefly, the policy seeks to establish market-based tuition fees for international students enrolled in undergraduate programs, and also in professional programs and professionally-oriented graduate programs. An implementation plan has been developed to phase in these changes in a controlled fashion over three years.

Committee Comments

In principle, the committee supports the President's proposal to establish market-based tuition fees for certain international students under some circumstances. Such a policy may well have net long term benefits to the University as a whole. It may lead to a better educational experience for domestic students and it may enhance UBC's reputation abroad. Nonetheless the committee has a number of concerns regarding the policy.

The committee is concerned that, without other changes, raising the tuition fees will lower the number of international students. Even with the current fee structure, the University attracts very few at the undergraduate level. Any decrease in numbers might leave some programs with no foreign students at all, which would be worse than the status quo, from both an academic and a financial perspective.

The committee believes the international student body should be diverse. It should not be restricted to the offspring of wealthy families, nor to students from the more prosperous nations. There is also some concern in the committee that programs of social benefit to other countries may be at a fiscal disadvantage unless some special arrangements can be made. The committee welcomes the proposal that a portion of the fee revenue be used to provide awards to address these issues.

The committee believes the definition of a "professional" graduate program to be a gray area. In this it supports the position of the Dean of Graduate Studies who suggests that, while there are degrees that are clearly research degrees (and thus exempt from this proposal), and others that are clearly professional, there are many that combine elements of research and professional practice. Typically there is a thesis or a major project, combined with courses, at least some of which are practical or professional in nature.

Several professional graduate programs such as the M.B.A. and the Pharm.D. have already moved towards "full-cost" fees for all students and it seems possible that this ability serves to define "professional" ! The committee welcomes the involvement of both the Dean of the budget Faculty and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies in the identification of fee levels for different graduate degrees.

The committee believes that it is particularly appropriate to fill "surplus seats" in programs that are currently below minimum efficient size. On the other hand, in departments that are already at capacity, additional students could cause the educational quality to decline, at least until such time that the new revenue becomes available to restore the quality for all the students.

Current admissions policy requires that all international undergraduate applicants have a GPA of 3.4 for all programs, although the present minima for domestic applicants vary widely, from 2.5 to 3.39. The committee recommends that the Senate Admissions Committee review this policy in the light of the twin principles, that "superior academic standing is required for admission", and that no qualified Canadian student be displaced.

The new policy enables "the admission of an additional cohort of undergraduate students up to 10% of the current enrolment in any given program". This seems

to imply that the existing enrolments have both filled their admission quotas and include within these quotas approximately 5% of international students. We have seen that the percentage of international students within the existing quotas varies widely by faculty. In the documentation of Jan 10, 1996, we read "At maximum, international students would then constitute the equivalent of 15% of the previous enrolment quota." The committee believes that it is important to define these figures so that there is no confusion which may affect their implementation. For example, exchange students should not be included in these limits. Indeed, if there are programs with "surplus seats", the committee believes the 15% figure should be regarded with some flexibility.

The important principle is that no Canadian or B.C. student be displaced. This lies at the heart of the problem in implementing this proposal, since it hinges on the definition of the quota for such students. Is the quota 95% of the funded admissions in each program with 5% reserved for international students, if they are of "clearly superior academic standing" ? Admissions Officers will need clear operational guidelines to ensure that no domestic students are disadvantaged. The Senate Admissions Committee should include these guidelines within its review of appropriate admissions GPA's for international students.

In the future, the University may set up programs to accept students into the third or fourth year of our undergraduate programs, following two years at particular overseas institutions with which we have special agreements. The approval of any such program should specifically include consideration of whether such students would be subject to the new fee structure and if they would fall under the 15% ceiling.

Certainly, the committee supports the position that professionally-oriented graduate programs not be subject to the same quotas.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the committee supports the proposal for market-based tuition for international students if these concerns are addressed. Flexibility is important and the new policy should not be imposed unilaterally. Some faculties cannot, or may not wish to, increase the number of international students for reasons of space or simply because of the desire to maintain an optimum size or composition of class or program. Some undergraduate programs may not be appropriate participants. Graduate programs need to be carefully considered before imposing any differential fees. Adopting an incremental approach has the advantage that scarce resources can be targeted where they are likely to be the most effective. The committee welcomes the latest implementation plan which phases in these proposals over a three year period, thereby enabling the response to be monitored and appropriate modifications to be made. We believe this initiative to have potential long term benefits to the University if it is judiciously implemented.

Dr. Williams
Dr. Boardman

That the report be received and that the admissions concerns be referred to the Senate Admissions Committee.

Dr. Williams highlighted various aspects of the report, reiterating some of the committee's concerns with regard to the possibility that raising the tuition fees will lower the number of international students, which could have an adverse effect on the diversity of international students applying for admission to UBC unless some special arrangements can be made in the form of awards.

Dr. Williams drew attention to the important principle that no Canadian or B.C. student be displaced. In the past, the standards for international students have been significantly higher than the minimum for domestic students, so there was no question that those applicants were academically superior. It was important to ensure that this distinction be seen to be maintained. The committee wished to refer this particular issue to the Senate Admissions Committee for further consideration, not just for those Faculties whose admission standards are high, but also for those Faculties where the admission standards are not so high, and in fact who have the ability to accommodate more students but are perhaps prohibited from doing so by the requirement that international students have a 77% average.

Dr. Williams stated that it was not clear whether 95% of the enrolment quotas are for domestic students and 5% for international students, provided they meet the standards of being clearly superior, or, if there are not sufficient international students that meet that criteria, whether the whole 100% applies to domestic

students. Again, this was something the committee wished the Senate Admissions Committee to clarify.

Referring to Graduate Studies, Dr. Williams stated that the committee had questioned the definition of what constitutes a professional program. The Dean of Graduate Studies has considered the situation and has come up with a number of categories, one of which being professional programs. Dr. Williams stated that in a number of professional programs it is quite clear that the programs are moving towards market-based fees for all students. The committee welcomed the fact that any programs that are going to move towards market-based tuition for international students will do so at the joint initiative of the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

As stated in the report, Dr. Williams said that the committee supports the proposal for market-based tuition fees for international students if the committee's concerns are addressed. He stated that flexibility was important and that the new policy should not be imposed unilaterally for reasons noted in the report.

In response to a query by Mr. Banfield concerning the amount of increased revenue, Dr. Williams stated that the Budget Committee might be able to respond to that question but, in his opinion, at the undergraduate level, it would be unlikely that any significant increase in the university income would occur within the time span of a degree.

Dr. Grace asked if the committee had given any thought to the pressures and problems that could be brought to bear on an individual professor who has one or more students paying a market-based fee for their instructions.

Dr. Williams stated that the committee had been concerned that international students might request superior facilities to domestic students, but he felt that one should rely upon the academic integrity of faculty in resisting undue influences with regard to grading practices.

Dr. Grace commented that the University should not be taking this step without giving thought to the possibility of problems in assigning marks and final grades which have been experienced by academics at institutions in other countries where this policy is already in place. She stated that it is a very serious concern for people teaching and grading students and that it needs to be looked at.

In response to a further query by Dr. Grace concerning resources for the provision of language training by the Department of English, Dr. Williams stated that he assumed that the policies that currently exist for international students would be continued. He agreed that there is a budgetary concern, particularly for Departments and Faculties acting as service departments for the programs. He stated that if a professional Faculty brings in a significant number of international students that require English courses, then clearly there has to be some mechanism whereby resources are made available to compensate for this additional work. He said that it was his understanding that this will be the case but that it is a budgetary matter which the Senate Budget Committee should address.

Referring to the question of whether students paying differential fees have different demands, Vice President Birch commented on the experience of

universities in the United States, in each of which there are sharply differential fees for out of state students as well as international students, stating that students there neither expected nor experienced different treatment. He agreed that the issue raised was an important one and should be given attention, but he did not feel that there was reason for apprehension.

Commenting on Dr. Grace's question about resources, Vice President Birch explained that the balance of the international student tuition fee revenue will be allocated 70% to the Faculty enrolling the students and 30% will be allocated to the enhancement of support services for all students. Within the allocations going to the Faculties there is the provision and the expectation that if special services are required or special burdens put on another Faculty, those services will be purchased and there will be an appropriate allocation of funds.

In response to queries by Ms. Dzerowicz, it was confirmed that the report was to be forwarded to the Senate Admissions Committee and that the committee would be addressing the issue of clear operational guidelines for Admissions Officers. As far as the problem of attracting international students at the undergraduate level is concerned, Vice President Birch responded that among the initiatives being taken, the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration was in the process of concluding a memorandum of understanding with an organization in Malaysia where they will be working very specifically on a program which will involve two years there and two years here. One which, in addition to the

international student tuition rebate, there will be capital and other contributions to ensure that the quality of experience for Canadian students is enhanced. Beyond those programs where there is a specific strategy being evolved, the implementation plan calls for the Registrar and Director of Student Services to work with the Deans and representatives of the Faculties involved to develop a comprehensive plan. UBC is not currently actively recruiting international students, although many institutions round the world do actively recruit. Within the past few months a network of Canadian education offices has been established throughout the Pacific rim countries, with the participation of Canadian universities, and that will be one of the mechanisms that UBC will use. The University will be looking to participate more actively in the presentation of educational opportunities at UBC to potential students not only in the Pacific rim but elsewhere in the world. Vice President Birch said that these issues will be addressed systematically, which was one of the reasons for not moving to implement these fees in 1996/97.

In response to a query by Mr. Gray, Vice President Birch stated that the policy had already been approved by the Board of Governors, but the Senate Admissions Committee was being asked to look at those elements of the policy raised by the Senate Academic Policy Committee. In response to a further query by Mr. Gray, Vice President Birch explained that currently, within the quota of 1500 students admitted to the Faculty of Arts, they are encouraged to ensure that something in the general order of 5% are international students. The number of

places protected for Canadian students, therefore, is 95% of that 1500. The policy will allow Faculties to develop a proposal that would go beyond that, if they so wish. As stated in the proposal, the policy will not diminish the number of places protected for Canadian students.

Dr. Will stated that as the policy had been approved by the Board of Governors, Senate's options were limited. He realized that it was necessary to say that the implementation of this policy would not be at the expense of domestic students but felt that it would have been better if the policy published in UBC Reports had said something more specific as to the type of programs where this would be an easy achievement. He believed that there are programs with an excess capacity which could be filled without affecting domestic students. However, there had to be a mechanism to ensure that places for domestic students will be protected. He said that if the grade point average for international students were to go down to the level for domestic students, it does not guarantee that in Faculties already at capacity there will not be displacement.

Mr. Banfield said that it was incumbent upon the University administration to explain the policy properly and to correct any misconceptions the public might have about the policy in order to maintain goodwill.

Mr. Lohachitranont pointed out that international students who are granted landed immigrant status automatically become domestic students. Vice President Birch responded that although this happens it is usually no more than five students a year and once landed immigrant status is granted they are treated as Canadian

students. He pointed out that, technically, a student cannot change their status from within Canada.

Dr. Williams confirmed that the committee was asking Senate to receive the report with all of its concerns so that when the policy is reviewed these issues will be a matter of record, particularly the admissions policy and the way in which it is supposed to make absolutely clear that only "superior" international students are admitted and that no funded Canadian students will be displaced.

Ms. Chui drew Senate's attention to the fact that the reason given for the decreasing enrolment in Science was that with decreasing laboratory space, the same numbers of students cannot be accommodated. She said that she hoped that when increasing student quotas, the University administration and Faculties will take into consideration the availability of laboratories and classroom space and seats so that students do not have to sit on staircases. Ms. Chui said that there are classes in first year Science that have students sitting in the aisles.

Mr. Gray suggested that the Senate Admissions Committee comment more generally on the report than on merely the specific issues mentioned. Dr. Williams saw no reason to limit the input of the committee.

Ms. Dzerowicz expressed the hope that the Senate Admissions Committee would be in a position to report back to Senate very shortly .

The motion was
put and carried.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Enrolment quotas for 1996-97 (see Appendix A)

Dr. Will, chair of the committee, presented the report on enrolment quotas for 1996-7, which had been circulated. He informed Senate that apart from minor changes to enrolment quotas in Landscape Architecture, Commerce and Education, the quotas for 1996/97 remain unchanged.

<i>Dr. Will</i>	}	<i>That the enrolment quotas for 1996/97 be approved.</i>
<i>Dean Goldberg</i>		

Vice President Birch responded to a query concerning the reduction in the number of admissions to first year Science over the past decade. He explained that the biggest single factor was direct entry into engineering in that if engineering takes in more students directly, the Faculty of Science still has to teach them in first year. If the Faculty of Science continues to take in the same number of students but they do not go into engineering the following year, Science will have a bulge all the way through the four years of its degree program. In order to prevent this, the targets for the two faculties were looked at together.

The motion was
put and carried.

Broader Based Admission - Calendar Statement

The committee recommended that the following be added to the Admissions section of the Calendar under "Undergraduate Admissions - General Policy on Admissions" as the second paragraph of the section:

Academic criteria are the bases of admission for the majority of applicants offered admission, but additional criteria may be used in some programs in the selection of a limited number of qualified students. Programs to which admission may be based on both academic and other criteria are identified in the respective Faculty and School Calendar entries on admission.

Dr. Will explained that prior to 1993 a University-wide set of criteria was used in processing applications for admission from Grade 12. Due to increasing restrictions on enrolment, the University moved away from a single set of criteria for admission and established different admissions criteria for individual programs upon the recommendations of the various Faculties and Schools. UBC now has seven programs that admit directly from Grade 12. Dr. Will stated that the proposal before Senate was another step in the devolution of admission policy, whereby a more appropriate set of criteria for a particular program can be articulated. He stated that this broader-based policy was an important step because it introduces into the admissions process subjective factors and considerations that were not there before. Dr. Will suggested that while the proposal was a big step in the sense mentioned, it was not a radical step in that some professional programs, e.g. Rehabilitation Sciences and Landscape Architecture, which admit after one or more years of post-secondary education, already apply criteria in addition to marks.

Dr. Will informed Senate that the proposal to introduce a broader-based admission policy was in response to concerns that grade point averages were escalating and that it was possible that UBC, as a result of the sole emphasis on grades, was not getting the best students for particular programs. These concerns had been raised by Convocation members and Lieutenant Governor appointees to Senate, on behalf of those both inside and outside the University community, as well as by faculty and administrators directly concerned with admissions. Concern

had also been expressed by the high schools that the competition for grades was deflecting students' time and interest from extracurricular activities and programs, both in the schools and the larger community. It was disconcerting to the committee that the competition for higher grades was resulting in some of the successful applicants being less rounded, in that they were losing the opportunity to gain experience in other activities. It was thought that some experience in extracurricular activities would probably be an advantage to students applying for jobs at a future date.

Dr. Will assured Senate that the introduction of a broader-based admission policy was not a trade-off of extracurricular activities for lower academic achievement. He explained that the policy will only apply to those students whose grade point averages are well above the minimum and who might otherwise be denied admission to a program because the grade point average cut-off is much higher than the minimum. The number envisaged was a maximum 15% of total applicants accepted in any year. Dr. Will emphasized that the policy was intended to apply only to students who had excelled or distinguished themselves in non-academic activities, and that students would be asked to provide such information by completing a supplementary application form. A copy of a proposed supplementary application form had been circulated at the meeting for information. Dr. Will drew attention to a section of the form requesting information about any health or personal problems experienced by the applicant. He explained that this

section was being included in order that such matters can be taken into consideration when processing applications. Hitherto, the only way in which the University has been able to respond to an applicant's plea of extenuating circumstances is at time of appeal of a denial of admission. He noted that the added workload and the difficulty of processing applications in a more labour intensive way would be one of the main constraints in getting acceptances out in time for students to take advantage of an offer of admission.

In recommending approval, Dr. Will stated that the proposal had been considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Admissions Committee, including representatives from schools and faculties affected by the proposal, and that a great deal of research had been conducted prior to presenting the proposal to Senate.

<i>Dr. Will</i>	}	<i>That the Broader Based Admission Calendar Statement be approved.</i>
<i>Mr. Banfield</i>		

Dr. Isaacson suggested that it would be useful to list in the Calendar the Faculties that have adopted this approach. Dr. Will said that he had already made this suggestion and stated that it was important that such a list be updated each year.

In response to queries by Mr. Woo and Mr. Lim concerning the proposed letter and attached application form, Dr. Will stated that each faculty could use its own format, provided that the form includes a section requesting information on health

and/or personal problems. These forms would, of course, be brought to Senate each year, for information, to ensure that no inappropriate criteria are included.

Dr. Vanderstoep noted that the criteria would apply to approximately 15% of incoming students in a particular program and asked if that number was flexible. Dr. Will responded that the 15% was not part of the motion for approval, but that the understanding was that the 15% limit would or should apply, at least until such time as experience suggests it might prudently be changed.

The motion was
put and carried.

School of Rehabilitation Sciences

The committee recommended approval of the following changes to Calendar statements (changes in *italics*):

Selection is based on completion of prerequisites, *overall academic performance (including academic standing defined below)*, written and verbal communication skills, maturity and personal suitability.

...Because of the nature of the curricula, pursuit of the degrees offered by the School is normally on a full-time basis. *Students must complete the requirements for the B.Sc. (O.T.) and B.Sc. (P.T.) degrees within six years of admission to the program.*

Dr. Will noted that a proposed Calendar entry concerning a \$300 deposit to be required of all applicants for admission was a matter for relevant administrators and the Board of Governors, not the Senate, although the requirement of a deposit or fee could have academic implications.

Dr. Will
Dr. Shearer

}

*That the changes to Calendar statements
proposed by the School of Rehabilitation
Sciences be approved.*

Carried.

Faculty of Applied Science - Admission Broadening

The committee recommended approval of a proposal from the Faculty of Applied Science for a broader-based admission policy. The following statement will be included in the Calendar immediately after the "Admission from BC Grade 12 (or the equivalent)" section of the Calendar:

In addition to high academic standards, the Faculty of Applied Science recognizes the benefits of previous technical work and extra-curricular activities. Admissible applicants from BC and Yukon Secondary Schools whose interim grades (and final grades where available) fall below 85% will be sent a Supplementary Application Form. The form requests information from the applicant in areas such as:

- Career objectives in the context of the present application to enter engineering
- Experiences related to athletic, cultural, family, community or other activities requiring considerable personal initiative
- Science projects requiring design, construction and use of specialized equipment and/or software
- Summer jobs in technical organizations or environments
- Technical courses completed

This information will be used by the Admissions Committee of the Faculty of Applied Science in the selection of up to 15% of the students entering Engineering.

<i>Dr. Will</i>	}	<i>That the proposal of the Faculty of Applied Science for a broader based admission policy be approved.</i>
<i>Dean Meisen</i>		

Attention was drawn to the proposed letter and application form which had been circulated for information at the meeting. Dean Meisen agreed to take into consideration some of the suggestions made concerning those documents.

In response to a query by Mr. Boritz as to whether there was to be any consistency among the faculties concerning the percentage of students to be admitted under the broader based admission policy, Dr. Will stated that no set rule had been established because the larger faculties might find it difficult to process as large a percentage as smaller faculties in the required period of time.

The motion was
put and carried.

Faculty of Dentistry

The committee recommended approval of revisions to the Faculty of Dentistry Calendar entry. Dr. Will stated that it was essentially a re-write and that there were no substantive changes.

<i>Dr. Will</i>	}	<i>That the revised Calendar entry for the Faculty of Dentistry be approved.</i>
<i>Dean Yen</i>		

Carried.

Faculty of Forestry

The committee recommended approval of a Calendar statement on admission to the Wood Products Processing Major, which replaces the existing Wood Science and Industry Major. Dr. Will stated that as Chemistry 11 and 12 will be required for admission to this new program, the program will not go into effect until 1998, in order to give students enough time to fulfil the requirements for admission.

Dr. Will
Dean Binkley

}

That the proposed Calendar statement on admission to the Wood Products Processing Major, effective 1998, be approved.

Carried.

AGENDA COMMITTEE

Election of faculty members at-large to Senate

Senate was informed that in response to a call for nominations for ten faculty members at-large to serve on Senate, only nine were received.

The Agenda Committee recommended that a new election be held to fill the remaining position.

Dr. Slonecker
Dean McNeill

}

That a new election be held to fill the remaining position for a faculty member at-large to serve on Senate.

Carried.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

Dr. Isaacson, chair of the committee, presented the following report, which had been circulated:

Introduction

The terms of reference of this study derive from recommendation 4 of the report, 'Centralization and decentralization', from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on University Organization (we shall refer simply to the 'Second Report').

That the Senate Budget Committee be requested to study those centralized units that enjoy full or partial monopoly status on the campus, particularly ancillary units, and to bring recommendations to Senate and to the President not later than the December 1995 meeting of Senate, on a mechanism to ensure that each such unit defines its service in relation to the academic community's needs, provides that service to a standard that meets or exceeds that in the competitive marketplace, and justifies its operating costs and scale of charges in relation to the fair market value found in the greater Vancouver area.

The instructions given to the Senate Budget Committee were taken to imply that Senate was looking for guidelines; specific recommendations on individual units being outside the scope of the report. In a sense, this report is concerned with fleshing out the implementation details of the Second Report.

We draw attention to the following principle adopted in the Second Report.

In principle: There are good grounds for maintaining the centralized, campus-wide provision of many services at UBC. It is essential, however, that the units providing these services recognize the need, not only for cost minimization, but also for responsiveness to departments and to other users of their services.

The first three recommendations of the Second Report are relevant and are repeated for convenience:

Recommendation 1. That Senate request the President to ensure that the mandates of all centralized service units explicitly recognize the twin needs of cost minimization and responsiveness to academic departments and other users.

Although centralized service units are not directly engaged in teaching or research, they do have a direct impact on the academic functioning of the university through the service provided to academic units, and therefore they are a concern of Senate. Senate was concerned that the pursuit of greater degrees of decentralization might lead to the ancillary pursuing actions and purposes that were not entirely consistent with the academic mission of the university, and the rich interaction with the university community that had previously been common, could be an unanticipated casualty of

the drive to efficiency and self reliance. There was also the significant concern that an ancillary focused only on 'balancing the books' might experience no incentive to moderate prices or improve services.

***Recommendation 2.** That Senate request the President to require all centralized service units have a formal mechanism for regularly assessing their performance, including the extent to which they are satisfying the legitimate needs of academic departments, individual faculty members and students. In some cases this may be achieved with an advisory committee, but other mechanisms may be appropriate in other cases. Whatever the format, consultation with appropriate parts of the academic community should be required. The nature of the mechanism and changes in it should be reported to the Senate Budget Committee for review and comment, and the substance of evaluations and responses to them should be included in the unit's section of the annual Budget and Planning Narrative.*

***Recommendation 3.** That Senate request the President to require periodic reviews of all centralized units with a view not only to minimizing costs but also to enhancing responsiveness with which services are provided to the academic departments, individual faculty members and students, and that a copy of the recommendations of each review together with the administrators' response to them ... be sent to the Senate Budget Committee.*

It is recognized that many centralized service units perform a variety of service and/or regulatory functions. In particular, many units play a dual role of providing a service as well as regulating various aspects of that service. It is important that these two roles are clearly delineated in the unit's mandate, and in any mechanism relating to its service definition.

Principles

We lay out some basic principles:

- A. If a competitive market exists, setting prices for certain well defined services, then users have a right to an explanation as to why a centralized campus unit sets rates for similar services differently.
- B. In the absence of such a competitive market, a mechanism should involve users in reviewing rates and prices and the setting of service levels.
- C. Mechanisms should not involve the micro-managing of the unit and its professional staff.
- D. Mechanisms should avoid encouraging an "us and them" attitude, and, in particular, while encouraging a responsive attitude by suppliers of a service, any mechanism must also educate the user as to the real cost of providing a service and supply an incentive to eliminate unnecessary use.
- E. Mechanisms should assist those to whom units report, typically Vice-Presidents, and not result in an ambiguous reporting relationship.

Conclusions and Recommendations

We have been asked to consider "... those centralized units which enjoy full or partial monopoly on the campus...". Such units inherit the weight of the three recommendations of the Second Report above. Once fully implemented those recommendations will ensure "...that (their) mandates explicitly recognize the twin needs of cost minimization and responsiveness to academic departments and other users" (Recommendation 1). There will have been required to have a formal "...mechanism for regularly assessing their performance, including the extent to which they are satisfying the legitimate needs of academic departments, individual faculty members and students...." (recommendation 2), and the Senate Budget Committee will review these mechanisms. We have been asked to single out some mechanism(s) as particularly appropriate for that subset of units enjoying full or partial monopoly on campus. In thinking about possible mechanisms we have identified none that would apply to all units and all come so close to being management tools that they risk being in conflict with principles C and E above. We shall therefore not be recommending any of them as a single mechanism for implementation. Enhancing the responsiveness of units to their users could be a result of using several such techniques, but there is no single recommended formula. We have listed some possible mechanisms in an appendix as an assistance to those units struggling with the implementation of recommendation 2. When the Senate Budget Committee undertakes its part of recommendation 2 "... for review and comment...", it might well like to direct the attention of the parties concerned to this list to encourage any perceived lack of responsiveness.

Conclusion 1. That recommendations 1 and 2 of the Second Report provide a good foundation for encouraging unit responsiveness to users and we find no difference in kind between those mechanisms required for units with full or partial monopoly and those for other centralized units.

We deliberately do not specify that particular units should employ specific mechanisms. This would be to micro-manage the unit. We would much prefer unit heads to make this choice. Responsiveness would be recognised in the way it was defined in the second report as : " have sought an understanding of the needs of the academic community, is defining its service in relation to those needs (responsiveness), is providing that service to a standard which meets or exceeds that found in the competitive marketplace and that operating costs and scales of charges have been justified in relation to the fair market value found in the Greater Vancouver area (cost minimization)." How the unit chooses to be responsive; user groups, representatives, information dissemination etc., we feel is not crucial at this stage. Exactly what means they choose to justify their operating costs and performance should reflect the nature of their business; we are interested in the result.

Recommendation 3 of the Second Report required periodic reviews of all centralized units "...with a view not only to minimizing costs but also to enhancing responsiveness...". Again the issue for us here is whether any special provision needs to be made for the case of units enjoying full or partial monopoly on campus. We feel that the periodic review is the appropriate time to ask why such a full or partial monopoly should continue.

Recommendation: *That Senate request the President to include in the instructions for cyclical or ad-hoc reviews of centralized service units with full or partial monopoly on campus the following standing requests.*

- i. The review will require each unit to provide detailed explanations of why an activity or service needs to be provided by an on-campus supplier, why this should be the unit in question and, in the case of a sole supplier, why that is so. The subsequent report of the review committee will take particular care addressing these explanations.
- ii. In the case of a centrally funded unit, the review will need to be satisfied that resources to purchase their outputs are better not placed in the hands of the users.
- iii. The review should identify any impediments to either the use of external suppliers or privatization of the activities/services provided by the unit.

Appendix: A list of possible mechanisms to encourage responsiveness in centralized campus units:

Giving resources to users

Placing resources in the hands of users avoids unnecessary consumption and allows decisions on resource allocation to be made by those best able to make them. This has a direct impact when alternate sources of supply are available and no common good derives from joint supply arrangements. When a sole supplier exists, the user may have at least the limited option of using more or less.

The redistribution of computer "dollars" on campus led to most Faculties purchasing their own desk top computers and networks. They continue to support central computing services by the extent to which faculty and students are provided with Access accounts or purchase other computing services. This redistribution also gave them the choice to either reduce the total amount spent on computing by choosing to absorb budget "cuts" more heavily on that budget line than others or to reallocate more of the budget towards computing.

Placing resources in the hands of users is an elegantly simple idea but its implementation is fraught with difficulty. When alternate sources of supply are available but previously not permitted, the former sole supplier may need time for the transition. The facilities, skills and working conditions built up over many years, configured for a sole supplier may be quite inappropriate when plunged into a world of direct competition. When alternate suppliers are not available, pricing should be reviewed and may have to be regulated.

A particular problem can arise when the user has little ability to reduce its usage of a service. In a time of shrinking budgets and rising prices the supplier of the service may feel compelled to increase its rates while the user may have little or no capacity to reduce its level of consumption. This can put the user in a worse situation than would have occurred if the supplier had been a GPOF funded unit, while leaving the supplier, in the short term at least, insulated from most of the budgetary and price impacts. In such cases review and regulation is likely to be necessary. This should be done on an ad-hoc basis by the responsible Vice-President.

Service performance measures

Service performance measures can be both quantitative and qualitative. It is desirable that they correspond to the measurement of an output that is intimately linked to the mission or objectives of the unit involved. The difficulty of doing this often leads to either the measurement of some positively correlated activity or of some intermediate output. Such a measure could be linked to a target on an absolute scale, or could be used to compare improvements over time, compare units within the same organization or could compare with similar units in other institutions.

"The average processing time for requisitions reduced from 12 to 3-5 days from F92/93 to F93/94" , is a quantitative measure of an intermediate output, closely linked to the objectives of the unit, in this case Financial Services (Budget and Planning Narrative 94/95 p.113). This measure has intrinsic interest as an absolute number, as a comparison over time and also with other institutions. "The number of carpool vans in operation" would be an output measure directly linked to goal #4 for PASS, intended to "motivate to reduce the number of cars on campus" (BPN 94/95, p.165).

Qualitative measures of performance can be obtained from customer surveys, focus groups and user committees.

Service performance measures are easy to define and even easier to abuse. Once defined, they seem to take on a life all of their own, and good sound management of a unit can be abandoned in favour of simply improving the "score". Only in the simplest of enterprises can such a measure(s) capture the complexity of the task. What starts as a guide, signalling the importance that the University Community places on some aspect of performance, soon becomes a constraint on good management, an excuse by some to micro-manage and interfere with a unit and can distort the direction of total improvement of a unit by focusing efforts too much on only one aspect(s).

Performance measures also have other failings. When used for comparison, the assumptions that go into the measure are seldom consistent between institutions or even over time at the same institutions.

In the Budget and Planning Narratives of the last two years, units have been encouraged to maintain and publish performance measures, measures of activity plus a clear statement of objectives. During the preparation of the Fiscal 95/96 budget all ancillary units and many others were required to include such measures in their budget submission and many have subsequently been reprinted in the Budget and Planning Narrative for all to see. Despite their weaknesses, performance measures are essential for managing a unit and can be a valuable tool to signal the units' responsiveness to the users needs. The trick is to gain the advantages without allowing for the abuse. Good managers are very aware of their costs and of their performance records. Well intentioned, but often poorly informed outsiders, can however wreak havoc with the best managed concern by employing performance measure myopia.

Benchmarks

Benchmarks are typically quantitative standards of performance, often produced by industry associations, are widely publicized, and attempt to reflect 'best practice'.

The comparison of the cost and staffing levels for the physical plant function at a number of universities in table 2 of BPN 94/95 (p.118) is such an example, as also is table 3 (p.118) which compares UBC custodial costs with downtown Vancouver (typically contracted out operations).

Similar comments can be made concerning Benchmarks as were made for performance measures. Industry standards have typically attempted to be careful about controlling benchmark tests to enhance the level of reliability for comparison.

Information

A simple but crucial mechanism to enhance the responsiveness of any central unit, ancillary or not, is encouraging them to provide clear information on their services. In the case of sole suppliers, this should include a clear statement on what is only available through them and what services can be obtained off campus, and whether the off-campus supplier needs to be part of a list of approved vendors. A crucial part of this need for information includes who to contact for service. We would suggest that the provision of useful timely information is one of the most cost effective mechanism to enhance responsiveness.

Training

Motivated and committed employees will be responsive to users as well as keeping costs under control. Few mechanisms to enhance responsiveness are as efficacious as providing ongoing opportunities for customer service training.

Advisory Boards, User Committees and Advisory Committees

Extensive use is made on campus of tools such as User Committees, Advisory Boards and Focus Groups. The first two are usually permanent bodies with changing memberships, the last is more likely to be transitory and allied to either a special event or a special market segment. Advisory Boards are more likely to be used for policy issues and often contain off campus representatives.

Properly used, these bodies are an effective channel of information to management about the service expectations and performance of the unit as seen by users. They can alert the unit to shifting tastes or priorities, identify weaknesses, test ideas and warn users of changes to come. Their composition, reporting responsibilities and duties vary greatly with the unit and the tasks required. We would recommend that units seriously consider the use of these mechanisms to enhance their responsiveness to users.

Advisory committees are especially popular on campus, either elected or appointed. Scholarships, awards, Presidents Teaching and Learning Fund, Innovation Fund are just a few of the many on campus that make, or advise on the making of, allocation decisions concerning substantial single source supplies of a particular resource.

Representatives

Personalising the delivery of a service is often a real benefit. Otherwise a large centralized campus unit can appear unapproachable and cold. The result is often "unresponsiveness" by the unit. Responsiveness must also be active, not passive. Units can only be truly responsive when they actively and regularly contact users and ask questions:

"Are we providing you with what you need?"

"Is there some other service that could be better provided?"

"Have we been on time?"

The practice of having "our contact person in.....", is certainly not a new mechanism, but it remains a very powerful one. Without falling into the trap of either providing a token contact person or forcing faculty representatives onto a unit unnaturally, we would encourage service units to look seriously at this mechanism.

Deans as liaisons

A recent initiative has assigned Deans as liaisons between the academic community and ancillaries or other units. We have collected no evidence on the effectiveness of this initiative. We doubt this would function as the 'mechanism(s)' that Senate is asking for, but applaud the initiative as an additional channel of information between Faculties and service units.

Regulatory Panel or Board

An elected or appointed Board that meets together from time to time to hear submissions about pricing and products. The CRTC readily comes to mind. We believe that such mechanisms do little to engender the spirit of responsiveness and typically violate principle D above.

Periodic reviews

Most units on campus are now required to undergo a periodic review. Review committee members are typically appointed. Reviews can engage outside consultants if appropriate.

Five year Plans

Some units have developed long term plans, often to try and mitigate the myopia induced by the annual funding cycle under which the University operates. Such plans are valuable mechanisms for user groups to have input into the scale and nature of services provided. These also serve to inform users. A cautionary observation is that the development of such plans can take a wide variety of formats and level of detail involving unnecessary work and a plethora of incomparable plans across campus. Some university wide guidelines may be appropriate.

External Suppliers

The use of External suppliers for individual jobs or tasks during overload or peak times, or for activities requiring special skills, or needed on an ad hoc basis, is already common on campus. Many skills and functions are so critical to the support of the principal teaching and research mission of the University that maintaining a capability on campus is necessary, but many are not. Many of these skills and functions can be provided on campus at competitive rates, and many cannot. The expenditure of public money requires permanent vigilance that the best value is being obtained and the removal of unnecessary barriers to obtaining the required service at the best price.

The contracting out of a significant part of a central service (privatization) is always a consideration. This is more often successful when the outputs of the service can be measured unambiguously so that the performance of competing units can be fairly compared. It is also important to be able to define the service carefully so that contracts can be written that do not suffer from unintended consequences. In cases where "responsiveness" means obtaining a well defined level of service or product at a price, the use of an external supplier may be suitable. The "responsiveness" necessary for a supplier and user to develop a long term relationship of trust and mutual understanding to problem solve a joint issue of importance to the campus community is less likely a candidate for an external supplier. Many service units also perform regulatory functions as well, and it is often important to separate these out from just the delivery of the service.

Elimination of services on Campus

Relying entirely on the off campus provision of a service may be an option.

Dr. Isaacson spoke briefly to the report, summarizing the views of the committee as outlined in the document.

Dr. Isaacson
Dr. Atkins

}

That the report be accepted.

Carried.

Dr. Will asked if the Budget Committee had advised the President on full cost tuition for international students. Dr. Isaacson responded that the committee had considered earlier versions of the proposal some months ago and had made comments on that. However, the committee only received a copy of the actual version that went to the Board of Governors shortly before it was submitted to the Board, so the committee was unable to discuss the proposal until after it had been approved. The committee provided comments only at that stage, and took the view that it would be useful to consider specific proposals that would be coming forward in the near future.

COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AWARDS (SEE APPENDIX B)

In presenting the report, Dr. Cook, chair of the committee, noted that there was an increase in the number of donors supplying money for Education Abroad Programs. Dr. Cook drew attention to the most notable of three such scholarships being presented for approval, that being the Westcoast Energy awards totalling \$12,000.

Dr. Cook
Professor Reid

}

That the awards (listed in Appendix 'B') be accepted and forwarded to the Board of Governors for approval and that letters of thanks be sent to the donors.

Carried.

Dr. Cook asked Senate to join her in congratulating student senator Ms. Lica Chui on winning the Sherwood Lett Scholarship, and also on becoming a Wesbrook Scholar which is the first time ever that there has been a Sherwood Lett winner and a Wesbrook Scholar as a fellow senator. Members of Senate joined Dr. Cook in a round of applause.

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW TEACHING EVALUATION

Dr. Gosline, co-chair of the committee, presented the following report, which had been circulated:

The Senate established an Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation in 1990, and this committee reported to Senate in the Fall of 1991 with a series of recommendations for improving the process of teaching evaluation at UBC (attached as Appendix A). One of the recommendations of that report was "*that during the term of the Senate of 1993-96 there be established an ad hoc committee to review the progress made following these recommendations*". Accordingly, the current committee was established in the Fall of 1994, and we have conducted a review of procedures and policies related to teaching evaluation at UBC. To obtain information on teaching evaluation we conducted a survey of all teaching units at UBC. Questionnaires were sent to the Deans of all Faculties and to the Heads of individual teaching units, and the results of this survey provide the primary basis for this report. In addition, the committee interviewed members of the university community to obtain additional information where appropriate.

We found that all teaching units in the University carry out teaching evaluations and that significant improvements in evaluation procedures have occurred since Senate accepted the recommendations of the 1991 report. There are, however, areas relating to specific policies outlined in these recommendations where the committee feels that additional changes are needed to continue improvements in teaching evaluation. Accordingly, we provide a series of recommendations to Senate that we believe will further improve the teaching evaluation process, and through this will create an academic environment in which the quality of teaching will improve.

The underlying issue in a discussion of teaching and learning at UBC is the values that are held by the members of the University Community. UBC has a clearly established policy that teaching and research are given equal status and importance. But if the University's value system at all levels is such that teaching is given lower priority than other activities, such as research, then no amount of effort to improve teaching will ultimately be successful. It is a perception of some that good research drives promotion and tenure, whereas poor teaching is used to deny them. It is clearly crucial for the leaders of the academic community to ensure that this is not the case. The recommendations of the 1991 committee do not call upon the Deans and Heads of teaching units to take the initiative or show leadership in improving teaching, but rather they urge them to follow prescribed procedures for its evaluation. However, it is clear from our survey that there have been recent initiatives, both within and outside the university, that have raised the level of consciousness throughout the University community about the importance of good teaching, and several of these are worthy of mention.

Some six years ago, it was decided by the Committee of Deans that the former Master Teaching Awards should be revived as University Teaching Prizes. These prizes, worth \$5000 each and distributed proportionately among the faculties, have

been awarded every year since 1991. The prize winners are then honoured publicly by the University, in Faculty meetings and at the Spring Congregation ceremonies before the students they have recently taught. This public recognition encourages students and faculty to take seriously the University's commitment to improving teaching, and to cooperate in achieving that aim.

The TIPS (Teaching Improvement Project Systems) and TAG (Teaching and Academic Growth) programs, instituted by the Faculty of Medicine and the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services to enhance teaching skills, have provided extremely effective workshops and other programs for faculty and teaching assistants at UBC.

The Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund was set up in 1991 by the Board of Governors, and receives its income each year from a percentage of the increases paid in tuition fees. It is mostly dedicated to funding special projects. In addition to TAG programs, it supports instructional projects such as Introduction of Problem-based Learning in UBC Health Sciences Faculties and Schools (Health Sciences) and the Ethnographic Field School in Collaboration with the Sto:lo Nation (Arts). The fund is administered by the Vice President Academic and Provost with the help of an advisory committee whose members are all University Teaching Prize winners.

In addition to these large-scale initiatives, individual teaching units have been innovative in encouraging good teaching. One question that was included in our survey asked, "*What other measures, if any, have you taken to improve teaching in your unit?*" The committee received a broad range of answers to this question, although many units did not indicate any particular innovations. We were impressed by the enthusiasm of some department heads in their response and in their apparent commitment to excellence in teaching. It appears that leadership at the level of individual teaching units likely varies widely, and that those units with good leaders are making significant advances to ensure that teaching is given the value and importance that it deserves. The list in Appendix B is a summary of the kind of answers that we received to this question. We include it because the committee wishes to commend the high quality of leadership shown in a number of our teaching units, and because we hope that this list will provide inspiration to others.

One important theme that arises from this list is that many departmental leaders feel that good teaching should be rewarded, and the program of Faculty Teaching Awards plays an important role for the university as a whole. However, rewards at the department level, either in the form of prizes or in officially recognizing the importance of teaching quality in the assignment of annual merit increases, can play an equally important role.

Recommendation 1:

That Heads of teaching units, or their representatives, read all teaching evaluation materials and that this material, in addition to other information on teaching and other scholarly activities, be used in assessing annual merit increases for faculty.

I. TEACHING EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Our survey indicated that all teaching units are evaluating all their courses, and they all state that they are complying with the procedures recommended in the 1991 report. We have not, however, verified these assertions. The teaching evaluation processes endorsed by Senate requires that the instructor assign a student to collect the questionnaires, provide enough time for students to fill out the forms and then leave the room. Also, the instructors is not allowed see the evaluation results before the grading of exams is complete. Although our survey indicates general compliance with these procedures, the student Senators on our committee were concerned that these procedures are not followed in all classes. We believe that students will be more comfortable completing their evaluations if these procedures are followed fully.

There is a large variation in the nature of the questionnaires used in different faculties and in individual teaching units. The variation is not, of itself, a problem, as different departments and faculties face widely different educational goals and activities. However, it may prove valuable for more uniformity to be introduced in the future. For example, when all faculties publish a statistical summary of teaching evaluation results (as we recommend in this report), then it will be essential that all teaching units in a faculty employ a common set of questions to form the basis of this statistical summary. Similarly, it is essential that all teaching units in a faculty employ the same rating scale, again so that statistical summaries are intelligible by users. This level of uniformity is currently in place in most faculties, and relatively modest adjustments are required in only a few teaching units to achieve these goals. The only major exception this to is the Faculty of Medicine, where there is large variation in teaching evaluation forms from department to department. Also, the committee felt that a clearly defined area for written comments is a stimulus for students to provide additional concerns or praise, and a well-designed form, with a professional appearance, is likely to be taken more seriously by the students.

There are three major functions for the evaluation questionnaire: (1) To obtain summary information on overall teaching effectiveness that can be used to recognize excellence or to identify problems in the teaching performance of individual instructors. (2) To obtain information of a more detailed nature on teaching procedures that may help instructors to improve their teaching activities. (3) To obtain information on the quality, merit or relevance of the course material and its relationship to the curriculum. The questionnaires in some faculties are very brief and attempt only to obtain summary information on overall teaching performance. Other questionnaires have many questions, directed at all of the functions listed above. For example, the Faculty of Science form has 6 questions, all directed at overall teaching effectiveness, and all are used in the statistical summary published by the Science Undergraduate Society. Most departments in the Faculty of Arts use a questionnaire with more than 20 questions that cover detailed assessment of teaching method and the evaluation of course content, as well as summary information on overall teaching effectiveness. The committee feels that in most instances there should be a balanced range of questions directed at all three

functions. In addition, it is important to inform students which questions will form the basis of statistical summaries of overall teaching effectiveness. Appendix C provides a list of the kinds of question that are useful for forming the statistical summaries of overall effectiveness. They are provided as examples; it is not essential that all be included in the questionnaires of every faculty.

In general, the rating scales used in questionnaires are quite uniform within faculties, but between faculties we found systems ranging from 4-point to 7-point scales, with the 5-point scale being the most common. The committee does not see any inherent problem in having different scales, but greater uniformity might be desirable. For example, the use of an odd-number scale, which allows students to make a neutral response as well as positive or negative responses, might provide a useful standard for use across the campus. Certainly, the uniform use of a 5-point or a 7-point scale would make statistical summaries more comparable across campus, but the committee feels that rigid uniformity might inhibit important difference between the teaching activities in different faculties.

The large degree of variation in teaching evaluation questionnaires in the Faculty of Medicine reflects the enormous range of teaching activities undertaken in this faculty. We therefore, do not regard this variation as a problem that requires a major solution. Considering the fact that the Faculty of Medicine is currently shifting its curriculum to a problem-based learning system, there will likely be many changes in teaching evaluation procedures required to assess this transition. We anticipate, therefore, that departments will be adjusting their questionnaires in the near future, and we feel that the faculty as a whole will have a good opportunity to achieve an acceptable level of uniformity.

Recommendation 2:

That each Faculty ensure that there is a level of uniformity in the evaluation questionnaires used by individual teaching units to allow the Faculty to make available statistical summary data on overall teaching effectiveness in individual courses.

II. CRITERIA FOR 'LESS THAN SATISFACTORY' TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Recommendation 1 from the 1991 report requires that "*Deans, Directors and Department Heads take some action in response to results which show less than satisfactory teaching performance, that a report of such action be submitted annually to the Vice President (Academic) in the case of Deans and to the Dean in the case of Directors and Heads, and that the Vice President (Academic) provide annually to Senate a summary of these reports*". The recent report to senate by the Vice President Academic (Nov. 15, 1995) indicates that these procedures are in place and functioning, and the committee are impressed by the extent and breadth of information reported to Senate. However, to specifically address the issue of "less than satisfactory teaching", it is essential that faculties and departments have a way

of assessing what constitutes less than satisfactory teaching performance. Our inquiries indicate that all faculties collect information on faculty with less than satisfactory teaching performance, but the committee is concerned that some teaching units do not have established criteria for assessing unsatisfactory performance.

The methods used to determine less than satisfactory teaching vary somewhat from faculty to faculty. Most of the faculties and departments who stated they had set criteria for determining less than satisfactory teaching performance did so in one of two ways based on information from student evaluations. The first was to look at the qualitative comments given by students on the evaluation forms. If there were enough poor comments, then the Head of the Department or the Faculty would have a discussion with the teacher (professor, lecturer, or TA). The second method was to set a certain numerical rating as the threshold. For example, many unit heads said that if a teacher rated less than a 3 on a 5 point scale, a discussion with the teacher would take place. Furthermore, different faculties had different threshold ratings, and different consequences for a low rating. For example, some faculties said that teachers who rated poorly were referred to a professional development course, while other faculties stated that a teacher who scored poorly simply was not hired back. Some faculties considered peer evaluation in addition to student comments, but the use of peer evaluation was most frequently employed only after a problem was identified from student evaluations.

Some faculties stated that they had no criteria for determining less than satisfactory teaching performance. Indeed, one faculty stated that they did not need any criteria because they had never faced a teacher with unsatisfactory performance. This committee feels that this line of reasoning is unacceptable. If a faculty or department fails to establish criteria for determining unsatisfactory teaching, how is one to know when a teacher is performing poorly? For example, in a few faculties, in addition to having a rating threshold, the ratings were presented in such a way that teachers know how they scored in relation to everyone else in their faculty. Thus, department heads not only have discussions with those who score below the rating threshold, but also with those who score in the bottom quartile of the faculty. This is a good example of a situation where leadership and innovation can play a key role. Faculties and departments must take it on themselves to develop procedures that will allow them to maintain high standards of teaching quality.

Recommendations 3 & 4:

That each Faculty and Department establish clear, written criteria which will be used to assess unsatisfactory teaching performance. These criteria are to be made known to anyone who is working in a teaching capacity.

That each unit Head be responsible for ensuring that the criteria are set high enough to motivate teachers to work hard to improve the effectiveness of their teaching.

III. POLICY ON THE RELEASE OF STUDENT EVALUATION RESULTS

Recommendation 9 from the 1991 report states, "*That Deans, Directors and Department Heads give serious consideration to making statistical summary results of the evaluations in their units available for inspection by students and by other members of the University community who have a legitimate interest in them*". Our survey, however, indicates that this recommendation is not followed in many of the teaching units at UBC. There are some exceptions, but in most cases where evaluation results are available, their circulation is relatively restricted, and hence largely unused by students.

At present the only teaching unit that makes student evaluation results widely available is the Faculty of Science. The Science Undergraduate Society has published its guide to good teaching in the Faculty of Science. In the last few years, with the cooperation of the Faculty of Science which provides the statistical data from the Science course evaluations, the Society has published The Review, containing the name and evaluation data of the majority of instructors who have taught courses. This year, under the title of the official newspaper of the Society, The 432, a special number has appeared with the statistical analysis expanded to include all courses, and the distribution of the evaluation grades in each course. Copies of the publication have been sent to all the Faculty's students in Canada during the summer. The publication is funded by the Science Undergraduate Society, which believes that Senate's approval for making teaching evaluation results public means that they should be published.

Most other teaching units do not release student evaluation results, and one unit told us that they felt they were prohibited from releasing student evaluation results by the recently passed "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act", an act that might impose restrictions on the distribution of personal information about an individual and may, therefore, limit the release of student evaluation information. Before considering the implications of this act in detail, it is essential that we establish if there are valid reasons for the public release of student evaluation results in the first place.

We received several opinions from student senators and from the Dean of Science on the rationale for the release of teaching evaluation results, and all provided reasons that fall into two general categories: (1) that this information will help students select courses, and (2) that the public release of this information will encourage faculty to teach better. If this information is made available prior to the registration process, then it will assist students in selecting electives and in choosing an instructor for a multi-section course, and the committee regard this as a valid use of the evaluation information. This likely applies to a large number of classes in Arts and in Science, but certainly not to all classes, particularly in professional programs where options are limited. For all courses, however, the publication of evaluation results will very likely serve as a stimulus for faculty to maintain high standards of teaching. The publication of evaluation results will make

faculty openly accountable to those who are paying for courses. It will allow faculty to compare their performance with others, and it makes the evaluation process more credible in the eyes of the students. In light of these considerations, the committee was unanimous in the opinion that statistical summaries of student evaluations of teaching should be made widely available to all students, and that these summaries should include individual course, section and instructor information.

If student evaluation results are to be released, then the procedures for release of this information must comply with the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act". The committee sought assistance in this matter from Assoc. Vice President McClean, and the following is a summary of current opinion. The key part of this act which relates to the issue at hand deals with the collection and use of **Personal Information**. According to the act, personal information is defined as (amongst other things), *"anyone else's opinion about the individual"*. Since student evaluations are formed from student's opinions about the teaching of an individual instructor or professor, the act seems to include these results as personal information, and the collection and use of this information is therefore subject to the provisions of the act. Personal information may be collected if *"that information relates to and is necessary for an operating program of the public body"* (sect. 26.c.). Since the reappointment, tenure and promotion procedure requires the evaluation of an instructor's teaching by members of the instructor's teaching unit and by members of the University Administration, and this process requires student evaluation information (according to the agreement between the Faculty Association and the University), it is certainly acceptable for this information to be collected. However, the question about the use of this information for reasons not specified in the agreement between the Faculty Association and the University becomes more complex.

It is likely that the use of personal information from student evaluations for the publication of statistical summaries of evaluation results in the format currently used by the Faculty of Science is acceptable under the act; it is, however, possible that it is not. Until the Information and Privacy Commissioner makes a decision on a case arising from a complaint, we will not know if full publication is legal under the act. The act states that personal information can be used if it *"is necessary for the performing of statutory duties of, or for operating a legally authorized program of, the public body that uses or discloses the information"* (sect. 34.b). Thus, the publication of statistical summaries of teaching evaluation data for the purposes discussed above should be appropriate under the act. Alternately, *"a public body may use personal information if the individual the information is about has identified the information and has consented, in the prescribed manner, to the use"* (sect. 32.b.). Thus, the collection of a consent form from faculty would allow teaching units to release this information for use by students. Clearly, policies and procedures for ensuring adherence with the act will have to be carefully drafted and applied uniformly across the University. The committee felt that this was beyond the level of expertise available to us, and we regard the development of procedures for maintaining compliance with the act as an administrative responsibility of the University.

If we accept that all teaching units should release a statistical summary of teaching evaluation data, then this information must be released in a manner and at a time that will facilitate its use by students. The information could be distributed on a University wide scale by the Alma Mater Soc. or the Registrar. Alternately, it may be expedient for this information to be distributed on a smaller scale, perhaps by each Faculty, and the involvement of the student organizations, as in the case of the Science Undergraduate Society, would be desirable. Distribution by Faculty is likely to be more efficient, as students in Arts, for example, will not likely be interested in teaching evaluation results in Dentistry. Whichever organization actually publishes these data, it is essential that the manner of their publication reflect the privileged status of this personal information under the act.

There are, however, valid reasons for limiting the distribution of this information in some cases, and there may be problems in some specialized courses. First, we must acknowledge that many, indeed most, instructors and professors start their careers with little or no training in teaching methods, and that some are given large classes for their first teaching assignment. It would, therefore, not be surprising if new faculty received evaluation results that were low during the first years of their teaching careers when they are learning to teach "on the job". Teaching evaluations will certainly assist new instructors in this learning process, but the adverse impact of full publication of negative evaluation results might do more harm to the morale of a new teacher than would be lost by the students if they do not have access to evaluation results. We therefore feel that heads of teaching units should have the option of not publishing evaluation results during the first two years for first-time teachers.

Next, it is essential that evaluation results represent a significant fraction of the student population of a class if it is to be published. The decision as to what constitutes a significant fraction is somewhat arbitrary, and the committee suggest that one third of a class could be taken as the minimum sample. Obviously, it is the responsibility of the instructor to ensure that time is made available in class, and it is likely that samples well in excess of one third of the class could be collected. Where evaluation results are based on samples that are less than the minimum, the Dean could withhold results from publication and indicate that the sample size was too small. The Dean or Department Head must, in such cases, direct the instructor to alter procedures to ensure the collection of an adequate sample.

Finally, in courses at the upper level and in graduate or professional programs it is not uncommon for a large number of individual instructors to contribute to the teaching in a single term, and the publication of detailed statistics for each instructor in such courses may be an unnecessary burden. In this case the use of evaluation instruments specifically tailored to the multi-instructor course, such as those employed in the Department of Anatomy and others in the Faculty of Medicine, with a single, global evaluation for each instructor, may provide an acceptable alternative to more detailed statistical summaries. Clearly, the quality of the evaluation questionnaire plays a dominant role in establishing the value of evaluation results, and a major concern is that statistical summaries provide useful information.

Recommendations 5 & 6:

That each Faculty adopt policies which ensure that a statistical summary of appropriately collected teaching evaluation results be made available in a public form, in accordance with the principles of the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act", and at a time that allows students to make use of these results in the selection of courses and course sections.

That the President establish a committee to develop policies and procedures that can be applied uniformly across the University to ensure that the practices associated with the student evaluation of teaching meet the specific requirements of the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1993". IV.

IV. PEER EVALUATION

The objective of recommendation 5a from the 1991 report was to ensure that "*Peer evaluation is appropriately and systematically used*". The responses to our survey indicate that, in general, peer evaluation is used extensively in the procedures associated with faculty reappointment, tenure and promotion, and that some units employ peer evaluation in cases where the results of student evaluations indicate the possibility that an individual is showing "less than satisfactory teaching performance". Thus, peer evaluation appears to be used systematically to establish if faculty meet some minimum criteria for career advancement and also to assist in problem cases, but there does not appear to be any systematic use of peer evaluation for encouraging and assisting in the development of teaching skills for faculty in general. The committee feels that there are additional, important roles for peer evaluation which would help to create a climate in which teaching quality will improve.

In many parts of the University, faculty are hired in their first teaching position with very limited experience in teaching and usually with no formal training in teaching methods. All, however, have been exposed to the teaching methods of teachers, university professors and mentors over the course of their educational career, and in the past this kind of preparation has been largely sufficient, as there are many excellent teachers at UBC who have not had any formal training. Today, however, the educational and informational atmosphere at universities and in society in general is changing at an enormous pace. Our current students have been immersed in a TV-dominated society, and increasingly they will learn through interactions with machines (i.e. computers) as well as with teachers. These changes will have important impacts on the attitudes of our students and the ways that they respond to the methods employed by faculty to transmit information and, more importantly, to develop critical thinking skills. The committee feels it is likely that many (most) faculty are unaware of methods and technologies that can be employed to improve their teaching, and we feel that programs involving peer evaluation could play an important role in helping all faculty to improve the quality of their teaching.

The educational community has long appreciated the value of peer evaluation in teacher training, and there are now well developed programs in which peer evaluation can be used at the university level. It is well beyond the expertise and the mandate of this committee to design or recommend any specific program for the use of peer evaluation in teaching development, but one program we discussed, "Collegial Support for Professional Improvement: The Stanford Collegial Evaluation Program" provided the following statement which, we believe, clearly indicates the nature and philosophy of such programs. We hope this statement will encourage readers to accept the possibility that peer evaluation programs can play a significant role in improving teaching quality at UBC.

The purpose of collegial evaluation is to improve instruction, not to gather evidence of improper performance for disciplinary action. Teachers collect information about their performance from collegial observations, student questionnaires and self- assessment. Based on this information, they analyze the strengths and weaknesses in their teaching and prepare a plan for improvement.

One of the key ingredients to the effective use of peer evaluation to improve teaching is the interaction of faculty in a cooperative manner to share information and methods. A problem that we foresee in the application of peer evaluation-based methods is that few, if any, faculty in the majority of our teaching units have any specific skill or training in teaching methods. Faculty at UBC will, therefore, require guidance from professional staff, and, as discussed below, the committee believes that the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services, which already exists on our campus, is the ideal source for this guidance.

Recommendation 7:

That each Faculty develop policies and procedures that ensure access for their Professors, Instructors and Teaching Assistants to peer-based teaching development programs.

V. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT UBC

Department after department, faculty after faculty, pointed to TAG (acronym for Teaching & Academic Growth) workshops as a useful means, for many the most useful means, for improving the quality of teaching at UBC. One faculty which formerly ran its own workshops for new faculty and graduate teaching assistants told us that, given TAG services, it no longer needs to do so. Heads of units reported that they have encouraged new faculty and/or new teaching assistants to take advantage of TAG training, others that they direct faculty whose course evaluation scores are less than satisfactory to make use of TAG assistance. We were also told that many faculty and graduate students attend TAG sessions of their own volition, in order to learn new instructional skills and become better teachers. Part of their encouragement to do so is undoubtedly TAG workshops and seminars being free of charge to UBC faculty and graduate students.

The comments that we received concerning TAG services were so extensive and so uniformly complementary as to persuade us that TAG has become an indispensable component of academic life at UBC. Yet the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services, which is responsible for TAG workshops and related activities, remains peripheral to the university, supported by one-time appropriations as opposed to receiving operating funding. Beginning in 1987 under the auspices of the UBC Faculty Association, this initiative to improve the quality of teaching and learning later received matching funds from the President's Office and then from a variety of university sources. Today a considerable proportion of funding for TAG comes through the Centre's few staff scrambling for specialized grants pinpointed toward particular purposes.

If UBC is serious in its commitment to teaching, to ensuring the highest possible quality of instruction across the campus, then it becomes essential that the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services be recognized as integral to the university's mandate. For this to occur, TAG must be a line item in that budget. In a time of economic stringency when the function of the university is increasingly under scrutiny, it becomes even more imperative that UBC affirm, and be seen to affirm, its commitment to teaching as well as to research excellence.

With adequate funding assured, the Centre will be able to dispense with its secondary emphasis on fund raising and so take on some additional activities that our survey of units across the campus argue are essential, or desirable, to UBC's function as a teaching institution. Two of these additional activities are an expanded mentoring program for first-time teachers and ongoing peer-based, or collegial, teaching evaluation.

Recommendations 8 & 9:

That Senate recommend to the President and Board of Governors that the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services receive regular operating funding as a line item in the UBC budget.

That Senate encourage the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services, when adequate funding is assured, to examine the feasibility of expanding its mentoring program for first-time teachers and developing a program of ongoing peer-based teaching evaluation.

VI. THE FUTURE

The improvement of quality and effectiveness in teaching at UBC must be a continuous, ongoing process, and the recommendations of this report represent a series of incremental procedures that we hope will assist in this process. It is essential, however, that Senate remain attentive to issues of teaching evaluation and of teaching quality in general. Therefore, we recommend:

Recommendation 10:

That during the term of the Senate of 1996-1999 there be established an ad hoc committee to review the progress made by the University in the areas of teaching evaluation procedures and in the enhancement of teaching quality and effectiveness at UBC.

SUMMARY LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That Heads of teaching units, or their representatives, read all teaching evaluation materials and that this material, in addition to other information on teaching and other scholarly activities, be used in assessing annual merit increases for faculty.*
- 2. That each Faculty ensure that there is a level of uniformity in the evaluation questionnaires used by individual teaching units to allow the Faculty to make available statistical summary data on overall teaching effectiveness in individual courses.*
- 3. That each Faculty and Department need to establish clear, written criteria which will be used to assess unsatisfactory teaching performance. These criteria are to be made known to anyone who is working in a teaching capacity.*
- 4. That each unit head must be responsible for ensuring that the criteria are set high enough to motivate teachers to work hard to improve the effectiveness of their teaching.*
- 5. That each Faculty adopt policies which ensure that a statistical summary of appropriately collected teaching evaluation results be made available in a public form, in accordance with the principles of the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act", and at a time that allows students to make use of these results in the selection of courses and course sections.*
- 6. That the President establish a committee to develop policies and procedures that can be applied uniformly across the University to ensure that the practices associated with the student evaluation of teaching meet the specific requirements of the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1993".*
- 7. That each Faculty develop policies and procedures that ensure access for their Professors, Instructors and Teaching Assistants to peer-based teaching development programs.*
- 8. That Senate recommend to the President and Board of Governors that the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services receive regular operating funding as a line item in the UBC budget.*

9. *That Senate encourage the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services, when adequate funding is assured, to examine the feasibility of expanding its mentoring program for first-time teachers and developing a program of ongoing peer-based teaching evaluation.*
10. *That during the term of the Senate of 1996-1999 there be established an ad hoc committee to review the progress made by the University in the areas of teaching evaluation procedures and in the enhancement of teaching quality and effectiveness at UBC.*

Appendix A - Recommendations of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation, 1990/91

1. That Deans, Directors and Department Heads take some action in response to results which show less than satisfactory teaching performance, that a report of such action be submitted annually to the Vice President (Academic) in the case of Deans and to the Dean in the case of Directors and Heads, and that the Vice President (Academic) provide annually to Senate a summary of these reports.
2. That instructors whose evaluation results are less than satisfactory be strongly urged to avail themselves of services such as those available (or being developed) through the Faculty Development Program.
3. That Deans, Directors and Department Heads actively consider differentiated staffing so as to allow different kinds of teaching strength to be appropriately used.
4. That the collected policies and instruments now in the possession of the Committee be made available for perusal by Deans, Directors, Department Heads and interested members of the University community.
5. That Deans, Directors, Department Heads and members of relevant committees review the procedures and instruments for the evaluation of teaching in their units and, where necessary, obtain expert help in their revision so as to ensure that:
 - a. Peer evaluation is appropriately and systematically used,
 - b. Procedures for obtaining student evaluations are fairly managed and safe from intervention by the instructor who is being evaluated,
 - c. Adequate time is allowed for students to complete evaluations,
 - d. Results are not given to instructors until after they have submitted final marks for the course or courses in which they are being evaluated,
 - e. Instruments are of evident high quality and respectful of students' right to know why they are being asked to evaluate,
 - f. Instruments include a question designed to assess the instructor's overall performance and include open-ended space for comment.
6. That Senate cause the following statement to be inserted in the General Academic Regulations Section of the Calendar (p.24, col.2 of the 1991-92 Calendar): The

- University recognizes the importance of high quality teaching for the academic preparation of its students and accordingly requires that instructors be annually evaluated by procedures which include provision for assessments by students.
7. That the instruments used to obtain student evaluations carry a copy of this statement and indicate clearly what the results of the evaluation are used for.
 8. That Senate reaffirm its requirement for an annual evaluation of teaching, less because the pattern of results may change in one year, than because each year's students should have the opportunity to express their views.
 9. That Deans, Directors and Department Heads give serious consideration to making statistical summary results of the evaluations in their units available for inspection by students and by other members of the University community who have a legitimate interest in them.
 10. That all units give serious consideration to establishing committees whose function is to monitor the processes whereby teaching is evaluated and whose membership includes student representation.
 11. That our report be circulated to Faculties, Schools, Departments and the AMS Students' Council, and that a copy be lodged in the Library.
 12. That action based on these recommendations begin in January, 1992.
 13. That during the term of the Senate of 1993-96 there be established an ad hoc committee to review the progress made following these recommendations.
 14. That Senate discharge the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation (1990).

Appendix B -- INNOVATIVE PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING.

Heads of teaching units were asked in question 10 what further measures they had taken to improve teaching. The innovations were too many to list in their entirety, but some of the most interesting are mentioned below in the hope that the special techniques or procedures they have evolved to address specific problems may provide inspiration to others. The list is undoubtedly not exhaustive, nor is it intended to reveal any ranking of excellence.

Certain departments seem to be more imaginative than the rest in striving to improve teaching and address problems in their disciplines, and what seem to be the best departments have shown enthusiasm in their replies to this question. Notable for imaginative and effective procedures are Computer Science, Geography, Germanic Studies, Anatomy and Audiology & Speech Sciences. As is to be expected,

Psychology and the Faculty of Education take a professional interest in improving their own teaching and the evaluation of teaching. Other departments will be mentioned in the presentation of initiatives that follow.

Teaching Prizes: Special teaching prizes, some of them lighthearted, are given in certain departments. Geography assists the Geography Student Association in the running of a "Professor of the Year" competition and is about to start a scheme to recognize outstanding TAs. Human Kinetics gives an Outstanding Teacher award annually. Psychiatry gives awards for outstanding teaching during the annual faculty dinner. Computer Science awards five T-shirts a term, with "Incredible Instructor" and "Terrific TA" on them to the best in the department, and also gives "Honourable Mention" certificates. The "Robert Knox Teaching Award" was founded by members of the Psychology Department in 1988 to commemorate a colleague.

Teaching Prize Winners: The Faculty of Education and the Departments of Germanic Studies and Psychology have teaching prize-winners present their techniques to their colleagues in seminars of colloquia.

Seminars, Colloquia and Workshops: The English Department holds occasional colloquia on pedagogical questions. Rehabilitation Sciences holds a monthly teaching seminar. Political Science has had a series of Bag Lunches on Teaching (BLOT). Germanic Studies organized a series of language-teaching seminars and workshops for teachers of all the language departments during 1994/95. The department has been active in promoting the setting up and using of computers for language learning in the language laboratory.

Geography has organized its own workshop for creating an inclusive climate in class, and has produced TAs good enough to be employed by TAG. Creative Writing holds workshops for neglected creative forms. Members of the Faculty of Dentistry attend the annual Association of Canadian Faculties of Dentistry's Summer Teaching Institute, and hold faculty development retreats and workshops on curriculum, teaching methodologies and evaluation techniques. Family Practice has sponsored two one-day presentation skills workshops in arms-length conjunction with a pharmaceutical firm.

A very popular "Meet the Teachers" event is held by Computer Science twice a term. Students in all CPSC courses provide constructive suggestions for the improvement of teaching, and the meeting is begun by reading the last meeting's suggestions and discussing the actions taken by the department. Attendance is from 50 to 75 students, some 12 faculty members and the head.

Teaching Development Committees: The following departments have developed these or similar committees: Agriculture, Applied Science, Commerce, and, of course, Education.

Exit Surveys: These surveys of graduates or graduating students are being conducted by Geography and Audiology and Speech Sciences with a view to improving teaching.

Team Teaching: The departments of History, Chemical Engineering and Anatomy are using team teaching. History sees it as a stimulus to creative teaching. Chemical Engineering does not comment further. Anatomy comments that there are never any problems because there a tradition that all faculty involved in a course attend all the lectures irrespective of who is lecturing.

Merit Awards: All departments and faculties take teaching into account when considering promotions and tenure. The following departments declare that they also take it into account in calculating annual merit awards: Philosophy, Psychology, Electrical Engineering, Physics and Audiology and Speech Sciences.

Problem-Based Learning: The faculties of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Dentistry and Medicine are actively considering changes to their teaching system based on problem-based learning.

Rotation of Lecture Assignments: In order to prevent boredom and staleness in teaching, Chemistry rotates lecture assignments where possible every 4 to 6 years. Botany has a 5 year plan, taking into account faculty preferences.

Computer-assisted Instructional Material: The department of Germanic Studies has been active in promoting among all the language departments the setting up and using of computers in the Language Laboratories. Audiology and Speech Sciences has funded a computer- based speech analysis laboratory and other audiological equipment. Ophthalmology provides lectures on multi-media for teaching improvement.

Improvement of Unpopular courses: A complaint comes from Botany that certain courses may be consistently unpopular, regardless of the teacher. "Classes have strong reputations for being almost hostile 'on principle' ". Computer Science, also faced with this problem, supplies an answer: "Some of our required courses for majors had developed the (self-fulfilling) reputation of not getting high teaching evaluations among both students and faculty. After having exceptionally popular instructors teach these courses a few times, we have found more instructors not teaching these courses are getting good teaching evaluations." The change, Computer Science, feels, is due partly to a change in expectations, and partly to changes in the teaching and design of the course.

Appendix C - SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR USE IN ESTABLISHING OVERALL TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.

1. I would recommend this instructor to other students.
2. The instructor taught the material in a clear and understandable way.

3. The instructor taught the material in an interesting manner.
4. The instructor taught the course effectively.
5. The instructor was available outside of the classroom.
6. The instructor stimulated students to think.
7. The instructor responded to students questions and feedback considerately.
8. The instructor treated the students with respect.
9. The instructor demonstrated a comprehensive knowledge of the subject.
10. The instructor was interested in teaching.

Dr. Gosline reminded Senate that the committee was established to review the policies and procedures associated with teaching evaluation at UBC, and in particular to evaluate changes in these policies and procedures that have arisen since a previous Senate Ad Hoc committee brought forward a series of recommendations which were adopted in 1991. Before presenting the recommendations, Dr. Gosline recapitulated the committee's activities in evaluating how those recommendations had been implemented by the various teaching units on campus.

Recommendation 1

*Dr. Gosline
Dr. Coope*

}

That Heads of teaching units, or their representatives, read all teaching evaluation materials and that this material, in addition to other information on teaching and other scholarly activities, be used in assessing annual merit increases for faculty.

Dr. Isaacson expressed concern that department heads be required to read all teaching evaluations. Dr. Gosline responded that this was a reasonable concern, although, in response to a questionnaire, many department heads had indicated that they do read all the teaching evaluations for their department. He pointed out that the recommendation did state "...or their representatives...".

Dr. Will anticipated that problems could arise in a case where there was a negative decision on reappointment or tenure if all members of a committee had not had access to the same information as the department head. Dr. Gosline responded that it was not the intention that others would not have access to this information.

Dr. Kelsey noted that in the Faculty of Education, students have two kinds of evaluation, one being numerical answers to question and the other is a separate sheet on which students are invited to write comments that will be seen only by the instructor. He thought that, for this reason, Senate could not approve a motion that says heads should read all teaching materials. Dr. Kelsey proposed the following amendment.

IN AMENDMENT:

<i>Dr. Kelsey</i>	}	<i>That Heads of teaching units, or their delegates, use the results of teaching evaluations in addition to other information on teaching and other scholarly activities in assessing annual merit increases for faculty.</i>
<i>Dean Goldberg</i>		

Carried.

In response to a query by Mr. Boritz as to why the recommendation did not say anything about using the results of teaching evaluation for the purposes of promotion and tenure, Dr. Gosline stated that teaching evaluation is already well established in the conditions of appointment of all faculty as being an essential agreement in determining reappointment, tenure and promotion. He explained that the committee was trying to focus on an additional use of teaching evaluation in recommending that it be used in assessing merit increases.

The motion, as amended, was put and carried.

Recommendation 2

Dr. Gosline
Mr. Shu

}

That each Faculty ensure that there is a level of uniformity in the evaluation questionnaires used by individual teaching units to allow the Faculty to make available statistical summary data on overall teaching effectiveness in individual courses.

Dean Meisen said that the Faculty of Applied Science, which consists of three different units, Nursing, Architecture and Engineering, would have some difficulty with a uniform questionnaire as the mode of teaching is quite different in each unit. Dr. Gosline confirmed that it was not the intention that there be absolute uniformity in such cases.

The motion was
put and carried.

Recommendations 3 and 4

Dr. Gosline agreed to minor changes in wording to recommendation 4.

Dr. Gosline
Mr. Brady

}

That each Faculty and Department need to establish clear, written criteria which will be used to assess unsatisfactory teaching performance. These criteria are to be made known to anyone who is working in a teaching capacity.

That each unit head must be responsible for ensuring that the standards are set high enough to ensure effective teaching.

In response to a query by Mr. Boritz, Dr. Gosline confirmed that recommendation 3 also applies to graduate teaching assistants.

The motion was
put and carried.

Recommendations 5 and 6

Dr. Gosline

Mr. Woo

}

That each Faculty adopt policies which ensure that a statistical summary of appropriately collected teaching evaluation results be made available in a public form, in accordance with the principles of the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act", and at a time that allows students to make use of these results in the selection of courses and course sections.

That the President establish a committee to develop policies and procedures that can be applied uniformly across the University to ensure that the practices associated with the student evaluation of teaching meet the specific requirements of the "Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1993".

In response to a query by Dr. Isaacson concerning recommendation 5, Dr. Gosline confirmed that it was intended that each faculty ensure that statistical summaries of teaching evaluation data are made available prior to the registration process in order to assist students in the selection of courses.

Dr. Will drew attention to the committee's suggestion that a minimum of one third of a class would constitute an adequate sample of evaluation results, stating that there should also be an indication of the number registered in the class so that students are aware of the number of responses received. Dr. Will commented that evaluations are of little assistance to first year students in that many courses are filled by the time they are allowed to register. Dr. Will also pointed out that visiting lecturers usually teach for one year only, and that, in some cases, the name of the instructor teaching the course is not known at the time the Registration Guide is published.

Dr. Gosline responded that assisting students in their course selections was only one of the uses that the committee identified. He stated that another reason for making this information available is simply to be open about the quality of teaching evaluation assessments of individuals and to make the teachers at UBC responsible publicly to the students. He thought that the inadequacies pointed out by Dr. Will should not detract from the utility of releasing this information.

Dr. Shearer pointed out that recommendation 5 instructs faculties to make available statistical summaries of teaching evaluation results and that recommendation 6 recommends that a committee be established to see if it is in order to do this. He suggested that only the Commissioner of Protection of Privacy would be in a position to do this.

<i>Dr. Shearer</i>	}	<i>That recommendation 6 be tabled.</i>
<i>Mr. Gray</i>		

Carried.

Speaking to recommendation 5, Dean Sheehan stated that in addition to the limitations imposed by Telereg, some programs do not permit students to select their own courses and course sections. Also, those students who must take a package of courses cannot make use of evaluation results for the purpose of selecting courses. For these reasons Dean Sheehan thought the proposal was misleading to students.

IN AMENDMENT:

<i>Dean Sheehan</i>	}	<i>That recommendation 5 be amended by deleting the words "...and at a time that allows students to make use of these results in the selection of courses and course sections."</i>
<i>Dr. Isaacson</i>		

Mr. Brady spoke against the amendment, stating that the whole purpose of having students fill out evaluations is that they can use them to select courses. He agreed that perhaps not all students will be able to take advantage of these evaluations but he saw no point in having students complete evaluations if they are not to be made available in time to allow students to use them before they select their courses.

Mr. Woo also spoke against the amendment. Although he agreed that in first year, and in cases of block timetables, students' choices are limited, he still thought that having the evaluations available for the selection of courses would be very useful for many students.

Ms. Chui also thought that there was no purpose in having evaluations if they are not available on a timely basis. Ms. Chui said that evaluations could be sent out to students by the undergraduate societies. She stressed the importance, however, of receiving the information promptly, stating that there is no point in sending out this information in the summer.

Dean Binkley stated that evaluations are available to Forestry students in the summer but, due to lack of resources, he did not think that the Faculty would be able to mail them to students so they can have them when using Telereg.

Dr. Will pointed out that Arts and Science students would need evaluations from both Faculties as they take courses in both faculties.

Dean Smith informed Senate that the Faculty of Law makes course evaluations available in the Library, which she assumed filled the requirements of the recommendation. It appeared that the timing was the only issue.

Ms. Chui said that the Alma Mater Society is willing to publish evaluations if faculties will make them available.

Dean Binkley said that the AMS wished to publish only a short summary of evaluations which he felt could be misleading, and he had therefore been unable to release evaluations for publication by the AMS.

Ms. Chui responded that the AMS was willing to work with the faculties and that it was up to the faculties to decide what is appropriate to use.

Mr. Lohachitranont stated that the important issue was not whether evaluations are mailed out or whether they are made available in the Library or a faculty. The important point was that they be made available in time for students to make use of them.

The amendment
was lost.

The motion was
put and carried.

Motion to extend the meeting

Mr. Woo
Mr. Lim

}

That the time limit be extended.

Carried.

Recommendations 7, 8 and 9

Dr. Gosline
Mr. Lim:

}

That each Faculty develop policies and procedures that ensure access for their Professors, Instructors and Teaching Assistants to peer-based teaching development programs.

That Senate recommend to the President and Board of Governors that the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services receive regular operating funding as a line item in the UBC budget.

That Senate encourage the Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services, when adequate funding is assured, to examine the feasibility of expanding its mentoring program for first-time teachers and developing a program of ongoing peer-based teaching evaluation.

Dr. Gosline re-stated some of the issues outlined in the report. He said that an important aspect of peer evaluation that has not yet pervaded the various teaching units is the notion that it should be used broadly to encourage all faculty to teach better, whether or not they are already teaching very well.

The motion was
put and carried.

Recommendation 10

*Dr. Gosline
Mr. Banfield*

}

That during the term of the Senate of 1996-1999 there be established an ad hoc committee to review the progress made by the University in the areas of teaching evaluation procedures and in the enhancement of teaching quality and effectiveness at UBC.

In response to a query by Mr. Woo, Dr. Gosline stated that his perception of what had been the focus of evaluation processes had not directed itself to the types of examinations or evaluation procedures that are applied to students. He thought that it was an interesting issue and one that could be directed to the next ad hoc committee.

Dr. Gilbert informed Senate that for those involved in problem based learning in the Faculty of Medicine, since this is such a new exercise, the evaluation of the teaching format is being given high priority.

Dr. Will suggested that the means by which faculty evaluate students is in a different category and is not within the jurisdiction of a committee concerned with the evaluation of teaching.

The motion was
put and carried.

On behalf of Senate, the chair expressed thanks and appreciation for the work done by the committee.

Faculty of Graduate Studies

WITHDRAWAL FOR NON-ACADEMIC REASONS

Dean Grace spoke briefly to the following proposed Calendar statement on withdrawal for non-academic reasons which had been circulated:

The Faculty of Graduate Studies reserves the right to require a student to withdraw from a program of study if the Faculty, in consultation with the department, considers the student to be unsuited to proceed with the study or practice of his or her discipline or field of study. This withdrawal would not prevent the student from immediately applying for entry into a different program of study.

It was explained in the material circulated that Senate regulations can require a student to withdraw from the University for non-academic reasons but that the process is cumbersome. The new regulation permits withdrawal of a student for non-academic

reasons (e.g., criminal activity etc.), a decision that can be appealed to the Senate Committee on Appeals. The decision would normally be made by the Dean, upon recommendation by the department, unit or program. A student required to withdraw for academic reasons cannot re-enter UBC until one year has elapsed. This should not apply to students required to withdraw for non-academic reasons.

*Dean Grace
Dr. Randall*

}

The Faculty of Graduate Studies reserves the right to require a student to withdraw from a program of study if the Faculty, in consultation with the department, considers the student to be unsuited to proceed with the study or practice of his or her discipline or field of study. This withdrawal would not prevent the student from immediately applying for entry into a different program of study.

Dr. MacDougall stated that the wording "unsuited to proceed" was too vague in that it did not provide any objective criteria for making an evaluation and ran the risk of subjective decision making. Dr. MacDougall also drew attention to the statement in the material circulated that a decision can be appealed to the Senate Committee on Appeals stating that it was not clear whether this referred to the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing or the Senate Committee on Student Discipline. If the intention was that a student could appeal to the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Standing, Dr. MacDougall did not think this was appropriate as the committee is designed to deal with academic matters.

Mr. Gray also expressed concern, stating that the appeal procedures are ambiguous and the reasons for suspension unclear.

Dean Grace responded that the wording was virtually identical to the wording already in the Calendar for several other faculties.

Mr. Woo suggested that the Senate Academic Policy Committee should consider the appropriateness of the wording of the proposed statement.

Mr. Woo	}	<i>That the proposal be referred to the Senate Academic Policy Committee.</i>
Mr. Gray		

Lost.

The motion was then
put and carried.

Report on Community Plan

Dr. Quayle presented the following report for information.

I am reporting to you again as a member of the Official Community Plan Planning Advisory Committee, a Greater Vancouver Regional District Committee that has been formed to advise the political board of the Regional District on the preparation of an Official Community Plan (OCP) for UBC. I last reported to Senate's November meeting.

I want to address briefly our internal UBC process and then, the external community process.

Internal UBC Process

An early January letter from Dr. Birch in his capacity as Chair of the President's Advisory Committee on Space Allocation (PACSA) specifically invited the university community to provide written input to this committee. PACSA has received submissions from the following groups: The Animal Care Centre, Department of Animal Science, Department of Botany, Botanical Gardens, Discovery Park Corporation, Faculty of Forestry Department of Housing and Conferences, Paprican, Department of Plant Science and Triumf. In general, those concerned and vocal to PACSA and to the January 15 public open house held on campus have "academic real estate" on the south campus. The groups have presented their current situation, their ideal vision for the future and, in the spirit of cooperation, have generated some alternative strategies for their futures. This process has thereby instigated a positive discussion between Dr. Birch and the three

major faculties involved (Agricultural Sciences, Forestry and Science) about future academic planning. These UBC decisions are important to the overall planning process. To the extent there are academic implications to these discussions, Senate will no doubt be involved in the process.

The campus community, itself, has also been active within its scholarly realm. The Greening the Campus initiative coordinated by the Sustainable Development Research Institute has generated a considerable array of documents from classes studying issues around the Official Community Plan. For example, geography classes have undertaken Environmental Impact Assessments and have made recommendations about enacting environmental bylaws covering campus activities. Other topics include Waste Water Management strategies, sociological case studies of Hampton Place, and a debate on the cost of further land development -- natural environment development or conservation?. There is a lengthy list of completed and in-process projects which, including the presentations of campus units to PACSA, have been conveyed to the GVRD's consultant team to provide better knowledge about the campus we are planning. This comes from a belief that good planning and design comes from "knowing the territory". It is partly our responsibility, as the campus community, to ensure that the best information reaches the planning team.

It is important to say that the process is still open -- PACSA can and should receive input until the ink has dried on the final draft plan. Student input would especially be valued at this time.

External Process

Since November, the Planning Advisory Committee, PAC, which includes representatives from the campus and the surrounding community of interests, has met several times. Planning principles which direct the preparation of the land use plans have been tentatively agreed upon -- in other words they are still on the table for revision as necessary. These principles guide the preparation of the land use alternatives. We are currently in the process of debating these alternatives, as well as the implementation process for the plan. These wickets are indeed stickier than the general planning principles.

The tenor of the January 15 public Open House reviewing progress to date emphasized the polarized positions in the community. Community people are concerned about too much development at UBC as it might impact their lives -- traffic is a particularly contentious issue. As a result, the City of Vancouver has appointed a UBC Transportation Task Force to give recommendations on traffic problems surrounding UBC. It is interesting that the community has difficulty recognizing (a) the inherent value of UBC as a neighbour with all our diverse, high quality, public community services and amenities and (b) the fact that as part of the Vancouver Regional District, a community at UBC is obliged to accommodate some of the region's growth. We hope to do it carefully and well to improve our community.

In terms of the debate about the land use alternatives, many members of PAC, myself included, are very concerned about both the time line to allow for good planning and, perhaps more importantly, the lack of information that has been presented to date that provides a background rationale for the land use alternatives. At our next meeting on February 21st, we are looking forward to more information being provided.

This is an extremely difficult process on a very tight time-line. The best I can say to you is that those of us involved from UBC are trying our best to represent the interests of the UBC community, now and in the future. There are as many opinions about this planning issue as there are people in this room. Our task is to develop a framework for the plan that is flexible enough to respond to what the future holds, yet firm enough to ensure a responsible use of our land resource.

I still remain optimistic about the potential of our campus to be a more complete and therefore better community. The question is one of balance. I urge all of you to participate in the process, as you are able. More workshops will be held in March for feedback on the draft plan. Make your own voice heard.

Other business

POLITICAL SCIENCE GRADUATE ADMISSIONS

In response to a question by Ms. Dzerowicz, the Dean of Graduate Studies reported that the Department of Political Science had been engaged in a very active way since last October. He stated that three working groups had met and that all three had submitted reports. Two of the reports led to serious recommendations which have been adopted, with minor modifications. A third report is being debated in the department at the moment. Dean Grace also reported that the Faculty of Graduate Studies Graduate Council had recently passed a matrix of expected and desirable features in graduate programs, and that the Faculty of Arts would be debating some motions about procedures dealing with complaints. Dean Grace informed Senate that the first report being produced by the acting head of the department was due in February.

Adjournment

SENATE MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Lim referred to the low number of nominations received for students and faculty members at-large to serve on Senate. He stated that there was obviously a problem and suggested that Senate should promote what it does and the significant contributions it makes to the University community.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Next meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on Wednesday, March 20, 1996.

Appendix A – Enrolment Quotas for 1996-97

Appendix A – Enrolment Quotas for 1996-97

Faculties	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
Arts										
1 st Year	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500	1450	1450	1500*	1500
1 st Yr Synala Prg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	10	10
2 nd Year	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450
3 rd & 4 th Year	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	300	350*	350
Agricultural Science	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	150	125	125	125	125
Landscape Arch.										
1 st Year	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	25*	25	17*
2 nd Year	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23+**
Applied Science										
1 st Year	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450
2 nd Year	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	513**	513**	513**	513**	513**
Architecture	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Audiology & Speech Sc.	20	25	25	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Commerce & Bus.Admin.										
Year 2	390	390	395	395	395	395	360	360	360	375* ¹
Year 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100	100	100	85* ¹
Dentistry										
DMD	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
B.D.Sc. ('92 New Prog)	-	-	-	-	-	10	10	10	10	10
Education										
B.Ed (Sec.)	120	165	220	330	355	355	355	355	355***	355***/*
B.Ed (Sec – career prep)				-	-	-	-	-	20+***	-
B.Ed (Elem. 12mth)	125	225	290	414	336	350 }	216	216	216***	216***
B.Ed. (Elem 2yr)	-	-	-	-	-	- }	144	108	108***	114***/*
B.Ed. (Elem.) NITEP	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Family & Nutritional Sc.	n/a	n/a	n/a	36	36	36	36	50	-	-
Dietetics – Year 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(25)	10*	10
Dietetics – Year 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25+	25
Dietetics – Year 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5+	5
Home Ec. – Year 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(25)	25	25
Home Ec. – Year 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20+	20
Home Ec. – Year 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10+	10
Forestry										
BSF 1 st Year	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	65	65	65	65	65
B.Sc. (Nat.Res.Cons) Yr1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20	20	20	20	20
B.Sc. (Forestry) – Wood										
Products Processing – Yr1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20+	20
Human Kinetics										
1 st Year	n/a	n/a	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
2 nd Year	n/a	n/a	60	60	60	60	60	45	45	45
3 rd Year	n/a	n/a	45	45	45	45	45	60	60	60
Law	240	240	240	240	240	240	180	180	180	180
Library Archival & Information Studies	45	60	57	62	70	70	70	70	70	70
Medicine	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
Music										
1 st Year	56	67	62	60	56	250	250	250	250	250
2 nd & 3 rd Year	n/a	33	32	44	30	Global	Global	Global	Global	Global
4 th Year	-	-	-	-	-	Enrol-	Enrol-	Enrol-	Enrol-	Enrol-
Nursing	80	80	160	160	160	ment	ment	ment	ment	ment
Pharm Sc. Year 1	140	140	140	140	140	160	160	160	80*	80
Rehabilitation Medicine						140	140	140	140	140**
O.T.	24	30	35	35	35					
P.T.	26	30	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35
Science										
1 st year	1400	1400	1312	1312	1312	1200	1100	1100	1100	1100
2 nd year	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	250	250	250	250
3 rd year	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	150	150	150	150
Social Work										
Post B.A. 1 st year	35	35	35	30	-	-	-	-	-	-
Post B.A. 2 nd year	35	35	55	50	-	-	-	-	-	-
B.S.W.	30	30	12	30	85	75	75	65	40*	40

*Denotes changes

**Denotes total 2nd year enrolment including new admissions.

***Final numbers dependent on Teacher Education Expansion Funding

+New

¹ Commerce may be adjusted to 360 for year 1 and 100 for year 2.

Appendix B

AWARDS RECOMMENDED TO SENATE

Marion McCarroll AMES Memorial Prize in Music - A \$300 prize is offered in memory of Marion McCarroll Ames to an undergraduate student majoring in piano. The prize is made on the recommendation of the School of Music. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

AURORA Society Geoffrey Lane Nanson Scholarship - A \$1, 000 scholarship is offered by The Aurora Society in honour of Dr. Geoffrey Lane Nanson to a graduate student whose research work focuses on issues concerning women with chemical dependency or alcoholism. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

CANADIAN Folk Society William and Mary Black Memorial Bursary - A bursary of \$240 has been endowed by the Canadian Folk Society, Vancouver Branch, in memory of Dr. William Black and his sister Mary Black. The award is offered to a student in any year and faculty. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

Carol COATES Literary Prize - A \$300 prize has been endowed through the bequest of Carol Coates and supplemented by her daughter, Mrs. Sylvia Platt. The award is offered to a student in English literature on the recommendation of the Department of English, and in case of a graduate student, in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (\$225 Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

Patricia DYER Memorial Award in Education - A \$500 award has been endowed in memory of Patricia Dyer by her family, friends, and colleagues. The award is offered to a graduate student in Educational Studies who demonstrates enthusiasm for ideas and commitment to their practical application. Specifically the student is committed to building a sense of community and to ensuring equity in educational settings. The award is made on the recommendation of the Department of Educational Studies in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

FINE Arts Dental Laboratories Ltd. Bursary - Two bursaries of \$500 each are offered by Fine Arts Dental Laboratories Ltd. for students in the Faculty of Dentistry. One award each is offered to a student entering the first year and the second year of the D. M. D. program. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

FINE Arts Dental Laboratories Ltd. Prize in Prosthodontics - Two prize of \$500 each are offered by Fine Arts Dental Laboratories Ltd. for students in dentistry demonstrating proficiency in the field of removable and fixed prosthodontics. One award each is offered to a student in the third year and the fourth year, and is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Dentistry. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

FLETCHER Challenge Canada Limited Scholarship - Scholarships totalling \$30,000 have been endowed by Fletcher Challenge Canada Limited. The awards are offered to undergraduate students from Fletcher Challenge operating communities and surrounding areas. Preference will be given to students from communities outside the lower mainland. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Office of Awards and Financial Aid. (Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

FLETCHER Challenge Canada Limited Fellowship - Fellowships totalling \$30,000 have been endowed by Fletcher Challenge Canada Limited. The awards are offered to students from Fletcher Challenge operating communities and surrounding areas. Preference will be given to students from communities outside the lower mainland. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (\$15,000 Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

Dennis HARRIS Memorial Prize in Psychiatry - A \$300 prize is offered by Dr. Victoria Harris in memory of her father, Dr. Dennis Harris. It is awarded to a fourth year medical student who excels in psychiatry and is made on the recommendation of the Department of Psychiatry. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

J. D. HETHERINGTON Memorial Bursary - Bursaries to a total of \$1,500 have been endowed by his family in memory of J. D. (Jack) Hetherington (B.A.Sc '45), in recognition of his integrity, leadership, and trust in young people. The award is offered to an undergraduate student in Applied Science or Forestry. (Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

Margaret HO Scholarship in Medicine.- Scholarships to a total of \$1, 800 have been endowed by Margaret Ho for students in Medicine. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

Cynthia J. HORNER Memorial Prize - A \$500 prize has been endowed by her family in memory of Dr. Cynthia Horner, psychiatrist (M.D., UBC '89). The award is offered to an undergraduate medical student who excels in psychiatry and is made on the recommendation of the Department of Psychiatry. (\$375 Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

Hilda Ellen Silver KARST Memorial Bursary -. A \$300 bursary has been endowed by family and friends in memory of Hilda Ellen Silver Karst and is offered to a student in Education. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

KIEVELL Bursary - Bursaries to a total of \$14, 500 have been made available through the Vancouver Foundation by the late Myrtle Lorena Kievell in memory of her parents James Wesley and Margaret Gardiner Kievell and brother William Elder Kievell. The award is offered to female students entering third or fourth year Medicine. (Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

Harold KRIVEL Prize in Paediatrics - A \$300 prize has been endowed by the family of Dr. Harold Krivel in his honour. The award is offered to a student in third year medicine who excels in paediatrics. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine. (\$150 Available 1995/96 Winter Session, \$300 Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

MASUNO Travel Award - A \$2,400 award endowed by Toshiaki Masuno is offered in alternate years to an undergraduate student in the Landscape Architecture Program to assist with the study of garden design in Japan. The award is made on the recommendation of the School of Landscape Architecture to a student in garden design with an interest in Japanese gardens. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

MCQUID/Pacific International Securities Inc. Bursary - Bursaries to a total of \$1,000 are offered by the McQuid family and Pacific International Securities Inc. The award is made to students in fourth year Occupational or Physical Therapy in the School of Rehabilitation Sciences. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

MCRAE Holmes & King Prize in International Taxation - One or two prizes to a total of \$750 are offered by the law firm of McRae Holmes & King for high achievement in Law 410 (International Taxation). The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

James and Mildred OLDFIELD OSU-UBC Student Exchange Scholarship - A \$500 scholarship is offered by Dr. J.E. Oldfield, an alumnus of UBC and professor emeritus of Oregon State University. The award is offered to an undergraduate student in the College of Agricultural Sciences from Oregon State University who is attending UBC on the Education Abroad program. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences in consultation with the Study Abroad Program Coordinators at Oregon State University. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

RIX Bursary in Medicine - Bursaries to a total of \$600 have been endowed by Dr. Donald B. Rix and family. The award is offered to medical students who have completed first year of the Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) Program. (Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

James ROSE Prize in Landscape Architecture - A \$300 prize is offered by the James Rose Centre for Landscape Architectural Research and Design to a student in the M.L.A. or B.L.A. program who best applies the skills of landscape architecture to private garden design. The prize is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences and in the case of graduate student in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

ROYAL Canadian Legion - Shalom Branch 178 - Stanley Fisher Memorial Bursary - A bursary of \$500 is offered by the Royal Canadian Legion, Shalom Branch 178, in memory of Stanley Fisher. The bursary is awarded to an undergraduate student in any program of study. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

WESTCOAST Energy Inc. Education Abroad Language Scholarship - Awards to a total of \$12,000 have been endowed by Westcoast Energy Inc. The awards are offered to third year undergraduate students studying modern languages, with preference given to Asian languages, particularly Chinese, Japanese and Korean. Each award is valued between \$3,000 and \$5,000 and is made on the recommendation of the Education Abroad Advisory Committee in consultation with the Director, Office of Awards and Financial Aid. (Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)

Stella Chuk Quon WONG Scholarship in Law - Scholarships to a total of \$1,800 have been endowed by Stella Chuk Quon Wong for students in Law. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1996/97 Winter Session.)