



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 JANUARY 18, 1995

Attendance

Present: Dr. R. M. Will (Vice-Chair), Vice-President D. R. Birch, Chancellor R. H. Lee, Dr. D. R. Atkins, Dr. A. P. Autor, Mr. J. A. Banfield, Dr. J. Barman, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dean C. S. Binkley, Mr. J. Boritz, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. D. M. Brunette, Dr. D. G. A. Carter, Mr. P. G. Chan, Ms. L. Chui, Dr. D. H. Cohen, Dr. T. S. Cook, Dr. M. G. R. Coope, Ms. S. Y. Dawood, Mr. K. A. Douglas, 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, Rev. J. Hanrahan, Mr. A. G. Heys, Dean M. J. Hollenberg, Dr. M. Isaacson, Dr. J. G. T. Kelsey, Dr. S. B. Knight, Dr. M. Levine, Mr. H. H. F. Leung, Mr. C. Lim, Dr. D. M. Lyster, Dr. D. J. MacDougall, Dr. M. MacEntee, Dr. R. T. A. MacGillivray, Mr. K. R. MacLaren, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Dean M. P. Marchak, Dean J. H. McNeill, Dean A. Meisen, Mr. R. L. de Pfyffer, Mr. D. B. Preikshot, Mrs. M. Price, Professor M. Quayle, Mr. A. A. Raghavji, Dr. D. J. Randall, Professor R. S. Reid, Professor J. A. Rice, Dean J. F. Richards, Dr. H. B. Richer, Dr. R. A. Shearer, Dean N. Sheehan, Dr. A. J. Sinclair, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Ms. C. A. Soong, Ms. L. M. Sparrow, Mr. S. C. S. Tam, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. S. Thorne, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Mr. D. R. Verma, Dr. D. Ll. Williams, Dean E. H. K. Yen.

Regrets: President D. W. Strangway, Dr. S. Avramidis, Dr. A. E. Boardman, Ms. S. Chan, Mr. J. A. King, Professor V. J. Kirkness, Professor P. T. K. Lin, Dr. S. C. Lindstrom, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Dean B. C. McBride, Dr. R. J. Patrick, Rev. W. J. Phillips, Dean C. L. Smith, Dr. L. J. Stan, Mr. B. B. Telford, Dr. W. Uegama, Dr. E. W. Whittaker, Mr. E. C. H. Woo, Dr. W. C. Wright Jr.

Minutes of the previous meeting

*It was moved
and seconded*

}

*That the minutes of the fourth regular meeting
of Senate for the Session 1994-95, having been
circulated, be taken as read and adopted.*

Carried.

Chair's remarks and related questions

There were no remarks from the Chair.

In view of the fact that Dr. Will planned to present the Senate Admissions Committee report, he turned the chair over to Vice- President D. R. Birch.

Alma Mater Society

Dr. Birch announced that the Alma Mater Society, with the agreement and participation of the Graduate Student Society and a number of the union groups on campus, was planning a demonstration related to the Federal government's "Green Paper on Improving Social Security in Canada" proposing Federal government cuts in transfer payments to the provinces for post-secondary education. The demonstration was scheduled to take place on January 25th between 11:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. Employees wishing to participate in the event were permitted to take an unpaid leave of absence.

Reports of Committees of Senate

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Dr. Will, chair of the committee, presented the following reports:

Calendar Statement on Transfer Credit Policy

The committee recommended that the Calendar statement on transfer policy (p.22, col. 1, item 4) be revised as follows: [changes in *italics*]

"(4) ~~Maximum Credit Granted~~ Courses Taken at Other Institutions

~~Course transfer will be recognized for all appropriate~~ The University accepts for transfer credit courses taken at recognized colleges and universities (including the British Columbia Open Learning Agency/Open Learning Consortium) if the subject matter is in an area taught at UBC, or is applicable to the program being taken at UBC. ~~although~~ The amount of credit granted is limited...."

Dr. Will	}	<i>That the revised Calendar statement on transfer policy be approved.</i>
Dr. Rice		

Carried.

Revisions to Calendar statement (p.19) on English Language Proficiency Requirement and Language Proficiency Index (LPI) Examination

The committee recommended that the Calendar statement be revised as follows: [changes in *italics*]

[col. 2]

English Language ~~Proficiency Requirement~~ Admission Standard.

As English is the medium of instruction at the University of British Columbia all applicants, regardless of country of origin or of citizenship status, will be required to demonstrate ~~proficiency~~ *competence* in the English language prior to admission.

[relocate and change note, bottom of page, as follows:]

Note: This requirement is distinct from the Language Proficiency Index (LPI) requirement for first-year English courses at UBC. Please consult the following entry for further information about the LPI.

With the exception of applicants to the Faculty of Graduate Studies, applicants may demonstrate English language ~~proficiency~~ *competence* by one of the following:

- Five years of full-time education...
- Graduation from a recognized degree program at an accredited university at which English is the primary language of instruction and in a country where English is the principal language.

[replace col. 3 with the following:]

Language Proficiency Index

(LPI) Requirement for First-Year English

All programs require at least 3 credits of first-year English; most require 6.0 credits. Before enrolling in any first-year English course or Arts One, students must complete the Language Proficiency Index (LPI) and achieve a minimum score of level 5 (30/40) on the essay section of the examination.

Exemptions

Students in the following categories are exempt from the LPI requirement; all other students must complete the LPI and achieve a minimum score of level 5 (30/40) on the essay section of the examination:

- those with a final grade of "A" in English 12, English Literature 12, or OAC English at the time when they gain access to TELEREG;
- those with a grade of 5 in the Advanced Placement course in literature and composition, and those with a grade of six or seven in the International Baccalaureate course in English Literature;
- those who passed UBC's English Composition Test (ECT) prior to September 1992; and
- those who have completed six credits of first-year English studies for which UBC gives transfer credit.

Deadlines for Completion of the LPI

In order to be eligible for Term 1 English courses (English 110, 111, 112, or 120), students must complete the LPI by the following deadlines:

- B.C. Students: Thursday, August 3, 1995
- Out-of-Province Students: Wednesday, August 16, 1995

Any student who misses the deadline must contact Ms. Judy Brown, the Coordinator of First-Year English. For assistance, telephone (604) 822-5651 or (604) 822-4247.

Registration for the LPI

[Same as current, except that final paragraph of B.C. Students entry should be bold face.]

Dr. Will
Dr. Shearer

}

*That the revised Calendar statement on
English Language Admission Standard and
Language Proficiency Index (LPI)
Examination statement be approved.*

Carried.

Faculties of Arts and Science - changes to Calendar statements on English Requirement and admission

The committee recommended approval of the following changes in the Faculties of Arts and Science Calendar statements on English Requirement and Admission.

FACULTY OF ARTS

The English Requirement (Calendar, p.82, col.3)

[change entry to the following:]

- Successful completion of six credits of first year English or Arts One.

Students admitted to the BA program must take immediate steps to satisfy the English Requirement.

Notes:

1. Students admitted directly from secondary school are required to take English in their first year if eligible to do so. To be eligible, students must have written the Language Proficiency Index (LPI) examination and obtained a score of level 5. For details on this examination, and exemptions from it, see "Language Proficiency Index (LPI) Requirement for First-Year English" in the Admissions section of the Calendar.
2. Students admitted directly from secondary school who have not obtained a score of level 5 on the LPI should not register for more than 12 credits per term and are advised to take a non-credit course from the University Writing Centre.
3. Students who do not achieve a level 5 LPI score before completing 30 credits in Arts-eligible courses will not be permitted to register in any additional credit courses until they obtain a level 5 score on the LPI examination.
4. Effective September 1996, Students seeking admission to the BA program on transfer from another post-secondary institution, or readmission after being required to discontinue, must have met the English Requirement, or if not, be eligible to enrol in first-year English at the time of admission or readmission (i.e., must have obtained a score of level 5 on the LPI).

5. Students who do not complete six first year English credits in their first 60 Arts-eligible credits, taken either at UBC or another post-secondary institution, will not be permitted to enrol in courses other than first-year English until the English Requirement is met.
6. Students who fail a first-year English course (i.e., ENGL 110, 111, 112, 120 or 121) may repeat that course once only.
7. Once admitted to UBC students will not normally be permitted to satisfy the English requirement at another institution.

Cross-references to the changed English Requirement should also be made at the following points:

Admission (Calendar, p.81, col.1)

[add]

Students admitted to the BA or BFA programs by transfer from other post-secondary institutions must either have met the Faculty of Arts English Requirement or be eligible to enrol in first-year English at the time of admission (see English Requirement below).

Transfer Credit (Calendar, p.82, col. 1)

[add as second paragraph]

Students who are accepted by transfer from other post-secondary institutions must either have met the English Requirement or be eligible to enrol in first-year English at the time of admission.

Continuation Requirements and Academic Probation (Calendar, p.82, col. 1)

[add as new first paragraph:]

Students in the Faculty of Arts who have completed 30 credits of course work at UBC and who have not yet obtained an LPI score of level 5 will not be permitted to register in any additional credit courses until they obtain a level 5 score on the LPI.

FACULTY OF SCIENCE

English Requirement (Calendar, p. 248)

[change entry to the following:]

To qualify for the degree of B.Sc. students must satisfy the English Requirement of the Faculty of Science. To do this students must obtain

credit for two of English 110, 111, 112, 120 and 121, *or their equivalents if taken at another institution*. English 112 is recommended. Qualified students are encouraged to consider English 120 and/or 121.

All students admitted to the B.Sc. program must take immediate steps to satisfy the English Requirement.

Notes

1. Students admitted directly from secondary school are required to take English in their first year if eligible to do so. To be eligible, students must have written the Language Proficiency Index (LPI) examination and obtained a score of level 5. For details on this examination, and exemptions from it, see "Language Proficiency Index (LPI) Requirement for First-Year English" in the Admissions section of the Calendar.
2. Students admitted directly from secondary school who have not obtained a score of level 5 on the LPI will be permitted to enrol in no more than 12 credits of course work per term until a satisfactory LPI score is achieved. Students unable to enrol in a first-year English course because of an unsatisfactory LPI score are advised to take a non-credit writing course through the University Writing Skills Centre.
3. Students who do not achieve a level 5 LPI score before completing 30 credits toward the B.Sc. degree will not be permitted to register in any additional credit courses until they obtain a level 5 score on the LPI.
4. Effective September 1996, Students seeking admission to the B.Sc. program on transfer from another post-secondary institution, or readmission after being required to discontinue, must have met the English Requirement, or if not, be eligible to enrol in first-year English at the time of admission or readmission (i.e., must have obtained a score of level 5 on the LPI)
5. Students who have not met the English Requirement by the time they have completed 60 credits of course work toward the B.Sc. degree, taken either at UBC or at another post-secondary institution, will not be permitted to enrol in courses other than first-year English until the English Requirement is met.
6. Once admitted to UBC students will not normally be permitted to satisfy the English requirement at another institution.

[cross-references to the changed English Requirement should also be made at the following points:]

Admission (Calendar, p. 247, col. 1)

[second paragraph: changes in italics]

A standing of "C+" Mathematics 100 (or equivalent). (*See English Requirement below*).

Transfer Credit [*insert present item 6 under Faculty Requirements, Calendar, p. 248, col. 2*]

Required to Discontinue (Calendar, p.250, col. 1)

[add as new first paragraph:]

Students who do not achieve a level 5 LPI score before completing 30 credits toward the B.Sc. degree will not be permitted to register in any additional credit courses until they obtain a level 5 score on the LPI examination.

Dr. Will explained that this proposal ensured that students entering from Grade 12 and transfer students entering in their last 60 credits met the English requirement before completing fourth year. It was agreed that in order to provide the colleges with one year's notice, the implementation date of item 4 in both the Arts and Science sections should be September 1996.

Dr. Will
Dr. Cook

}

That changes in the Faculties of Arts and Science Calendar statements on English Requirement and admissions be approved subject to editorial changes.

Carried.

Faculty of Forestry - changes to Calendar statement on Admission Requirements

The committee recommended approval of the following changed Calendar statement on admission requirements:

Admission (Calendar p. 143, cols. 2-3)

[changes in *italics*]

B.S.F. and B.Sc. (Forestry)

The Faculty of Forestry will accept applications from students with varying educational preparation. Year placement in a degree program will be determined based on qualifications of the applicant. Students may apply to the Faculty from the following:

1. directly from secondary graduation;
2. following completion of university level work at UBC or the equivalent at another post-secondary institution;
3. after the completion of a two-year Forestry, Wood Products or Engineering diploma program at a recognized college or institute of technology; or
4. from an approved one- or two-year Forestry transfer program at a B.C. College.

Achievement of the minimum academic requirements outlined in this section of the Calendar and in the General Information Section, Admissions, does not guarantee admission to these programs. Should the number of applicants to first-year Forestry exceed the number of available spaces, the admission of applicants from other post-secondary institutions will be determined competitively on the basis of admission average. The majority of applicants from secondary school will also be admitted on the basis of admission average, calculated as the average of four specified Grade 12 subjects.

*However, approximately ten applicants from high school who meet minimum academic requirements, but who do not meet the requisite competitive average for admission, will be selected for admission by the Admissions Committee of the Faculty of Forestry on the basis of additional information provided on a **Supplementary Application Form**. Such applicants may also be interviewed. All applicants who do not meet the admission-average cutoff for early admission will be sent a copy of this form, with an invitation to submit it for possible consideration by the Admissions Committee. Submission is optional. The Admissions Committee will consider all applicants who submit a **Supplementary Application Form** and who have a final-grade minimum average equal to or above the minimum average for admission to the University (67%).*

Students entering from secondary school must have met the general University entrance requirement (see General Information section of the Calendar), including Mathematics 12, two of Biology 11, Chemistry 11, Physics 11 (all three are strongly recommended), and one of Chemistry 12 or Physics 12. Students entering the Wood Science and Industry major must have Physics 12.

Students who enter the B.S.F. or B.Sc.(Forestry) programs following the completion of university level work at UBC, or its equivalent at another post-secondary institution, must have attained an overall average of at least 60% in all credits attempted. Students entering with less than 30 credits of university level work must also meet the secondary school requirements outlined above.

On entry into the Faculty of Forestry, students must select one of four major programs - Forest Resources Management, Forest Operations, Wood Science and Industry, or Forest Science. To be eligible for second year of Forest Resources Management or Forest Operations, students must have completed 30 credits or more of university-level work including six credits of first-year English, Mathematics 100 and 101 (or 140 and 141 for the Forest Management major), Biology 120 (3 credits) and one of Biology 110 (3 credits), or Biology 115 (3 credits), or a mark of 80% or over in Biology 12, and either Physics (100 and 101 or 101 and 102) or Chemistry (103 or 110 or 121 and 122), or an equivalent. If either Chemistry or Physics has not been taken at the Grade 12 level, it must be the subject included in the above- stated requirements. Moreover, it is recommended that students include both Chemistry and Physics in their First-Year program. To be eligible for second year of the Forest Science major, students must have completed six credits of first-year English, Biology 120 (3 credits) and one of Biology 110 (3 credits), or Biology 115 (3 credits), or a mark of 80% or over in Biology 12, Mathematics 100 and 101 (or 140 and 141), and Chemistry (103 or 110 or 121 and 122). To be eligible for second year of the Wood Science and Industry major, students must have completed six credits of first-year English, Mathematics 100 and 101 (or 120 and 121, or 153 and 154), Chemistry (103 or 110 or 120 and 121) and Physics (101 or 170). Students lacking Biology 12 must also have completed Biology 110 or 115 for the Wood Science and Industry Major. The major programs are designed to allow completion in three years following at least one year (30 credits) of university-level work.

Applicants graduating from a two-year Forestry Technology diploma program must have achieved an overall average of at least 65% in their program. Provided that students have the science and mathematics

requirements from secondary school graduation as outlined above, consideration will be given to individual cases of study in determining the exemptions that may be applied to the Forestry degree program.

Application for admission by students or graduates of other universities, colleges, or other faculties will be reviewed individually. It may be possible to design study programs for such applicants that meet Forestry degree requirements in less than the full four years. Transfer students may be required to validate advanced standing in a given subject by passing an examination.

Applicants who are uncertain about the selection of a major, and those who lack some of the required courses but may have other advance credit, are urged to consult the Coordinator of Student Services of the Faculty of Forestry.

Undergraduate students with the necessary background and the permission of the instructor concerned may be allowed by the Dean to register in a regularly scheduled graduate course in Forestry.

Dr. Will stated that the first major step in moving away from the idea of a common, University-wide admissions policy will come into effect in September when each faculty and school will calculate admission GPA using different Grade 12 courses. With escalating GPAs that vary according to program supply and demand, the University has not had a common admissions GPA for all programs for many years. Also, two programs admitting directly from Grade 12 (Music and Landscape Architecture) already consider more than marks as the basis for admission. He reported that an *Ad Hoc* Sub-Committee On Broader Admissions Policy had been set up to look into the possibility of including interviews and decisions other than the GPA as the basis for entry from Grade 12. The sub-

committee hoped to bring a proposal to Senate for approval in the fall, for entry into the 1996 Calendar.

<i>Dr. Will</i>	}	<i>That the proposed changes to the Calendar statement on admission requirements to the Faculty of Forestry be approved, subject to editorial changes.</i>
<i>Dean Binkley</i>		

Mr. Banfield expressed his support for this type of discretionary admission but felt that 15% was too low. Dr. Will replied that this was consistent with a report from the Ontario Council of Universities and Colleges on current practices in Ontario.

Dr. Carter commended the Faculty of Forestry on expanding their admission criteria to become more multidimensional and suggested that other faculties consider a move in this direction.

Dr. MacDougall noted that the insert stating, "Biology 12 with a grade of 80% or better" was ambiguous and it was agreed to replace it with "a mark of 80% or over in Biology 12."

The motion was
put and carried.

School of Rehabilitation Sciences - changes to Calendar statement on Admission

The committee recommended approval of the following changes:

Admission (Calendar, p. 243, col.2)

[present text]

Written communication skill is judged by performance on a timed and supervised essay. Primary consideration is given to residents of British Columbia. Applicants will be notified if they qualify for the essay and interview.

[change to:]

Written communication skill is judged by performance on a timed test of competence in written English. Applicants will be allowed one attempt per application, with no appeal. Primary consideration is given to residents of British Columbia. Applicants will be notified if they qualify for an English test. Invitations for an interview may follow.

Program in Physical Therapy (Calendar, p. 243, col.3)

[present text]

- Minimum academic standing - in order to be considered eligible, applicants must:
 1. Achieve an average of 65% (2.5) for the pre-requisite courses (Biology, Chemistry, English, Psychology and Statistics); and,
 2. Obtain a minimum academic standing of 70% (2.8) in 30-60 credits which will be based on:
 - a) the pre-requisite courses and electives (a total of 30 credits) for applicants who have completed one year; or
 - b) all credits (to a maximum of 60) for applicants who have completed two years; or,
 - c) the most recent 30 credits and 30 credits from one other year in which the applicant has attained the best academic standing (a total of 60 credits) for applicants who have completed three or more years.

[change to:]

Minimum academic standing - 70% (GPA 2.8), calculated for the 30 credits of pre-requisite courses.

Program in Occupational Therapy and Program in Physical Therapy: (p. 243, cols. 2 & 3)

[changes in *italics*]

Pre-requisite courses...Biology, 6 credits, BIOL 110 and 120 or 115 and 120, *or BIOL 120 alone for students with at least 80% in BIOL 12 and exemption from BIOL 110 OR 115.*

Dr. Will
Dean Goldberg

}

That the changes to the Calendar statement on admission to the School of Rehabilitation Sciences be approved.

Carried.

Student Exchange Programs - Calendar changes

The following changes to the Exchange Programs section of the Calendar (p.33) were presented for information.

Change the first paragraph to read: [changes in *italics*]

Opportunities are available for the exchange of graduate and undergraduate students with other universities, *through the following Senate approved exchange programs:*

Education Abroad Programs (EAP)

Change the first sentence of the first paragraph to read:

Education Abroad Programs are reciprocal exchange programs based on institution-to-institution agreements with partner universities.

To the second paragraph, "To be eligible to participate...." add the following sentence:

Students who have already transferred credits from another institution towards their UBC degree must obtain written confirmation from their faculties of their eligibility for further transfer credit.

At the end of the section add:

The Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration Exchange Programs

Students registered in the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration are eligible to participate in the exchange programs with the following institutions (further information can be obtained from the Commerce Study Abroad and Exchange Office located in Room 102 in the Henry Angus Building):

Australia	Australian Graduate School of Management
	University of New South Wales
Austria	Wirtschaftsuniversitat Wien
Belgium	Université Catholique de Louvain
Brazil	Escola de Administracao de Empresas de Sao Paulo da Fundacao Getulio Vargas
Canada	École de Hautes Études Commerciales, Montréal
Denmark	Copenhagen Business School
France	Hautes Études Commerciales, France
Hong Kong	Chinese University of Hong Kong
	Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
Italy	Universita Commerciale Luigi Bocconi
Japan	Osaka University
	University of Tokyo
Korea	Korea University
Norway	Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration
Singapore	National University of Singapore
Spain	Escuela Superior de Administración Y Direccion de Empresas (ESADE)
Sweden	Stockholm School of Economics
Switzerland	Hochschule St. Gallen
Thailand	Thammasat University
The Netherlands	Erasmus University
United Kingdom	Lancaster University
	London Business School
	Manchester Business School
	European Business Management School, University of Wales, Swansea

[add the following sections:]

Canadian Exchange Programs

There are two consortium agreements under which students may apply to study at another Canadian university as an exchange student. The purpose of these exchanges is to encourage students to experience cultural and academic life in a different region of Canada. UBC

students who are selected to participate in these programs remain registered at UBC, pay tuition and student fees to UBC and remain eligible for UBC awards, scholarships and financial aid. Students pursue academic programs which are planned in consultation with their faculties.

Eligibility requirements are the same as for EAP programs.

Group of Ten Student Exchange Program (GOTSEP)

This is an institution-to-institution agreement in which UBC participates with nine other universities.

Interested students should contact the Student Exchange Programs office for more information. The deadline for GOTSEP applications is the last day of January.

Canadian Universities Student Exchange Consortium (CUSEC)

This is a larger consortium agreement which links UBC with 27 universities across Canada. Exchange agreements are negotiated and administered by individual departments.

Information regarding these exchange programs is available from participating UBC departments. Calendars are available in the Student Counseling Resource Centre, Brock Hall. At the time of publication, an agreement exists between the program of Landscape Architecture at UBC and the Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of Guelph.

Dr. Will informed Senate that the Faculty of Commerce had administered its own exchange program for many years without a Calendar entry.

Dr. Birch noted that to expedite the approval of new exchanges, the Senate Admissions Committee reviews and approves exchange programs on Senate's behalf.

Having completed the report, Dr. Will returned to the chair.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (SEE APPENDIX)

Dr. Berger, chair of the committee, presented the following report:

Faculty of Agricultural Sciences

The committee recommended approval of curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, subject to the editorial changes previously brought forward to the Curriculum Committee.

*Dr. Berger
Dean Richards*

}

*That the curriculum proposals be approved
subject to the editorial changes previously
approved by the Curriculum Committee.*

Carried.

Faculty of Applied Science

The committee recommended approval of curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Applied Science.

*Dr. Berger
Dean Meisen*

}

*That the curriculum proposals be approved
subject to editorial changes previously
approved by the Curriculum Committee.*

Carried.

Faculty of Graduate Studies

The committee recommended approval of curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

*Dr. Berger
Dean Meisen*

}

*That the curriculum proposals be approved
subject to editorial changes previously
approved by the Curriculum Committee.*

Carried.

Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences (continued)

The committee recommended approval of curriculum proposals from the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

School of Rehabilitation Sciences

The committee recommended approval of curriculum proposals from the School of Rehabilitation Sciences.

Dr. Berger
Dean McNeill

}

*That the proposals of the Faculty of
Pharmaceutical Sciences and the School of
Rehabilitation Sciences be approved.*

Carried.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION

Dr. Shearer, chair of the committee, presented the Second Report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on University Organization.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Committee's mandate requires it to examine and report on the administrative structure for the delivery of academic programs of the University, with a view to improving efficiency and academic effectiveness. The nature, activities and performance of service units *per se* is not within the mandate of the Committee (or of Senate). However, the delivery of certain services may impede or enhance the ability of academic units and individual faculty members to fulfill their academic responsibilities. For this reason, in its solicitation of submissions from deans, heads and directors of academic units in the Fall of 1993, among other questions the Committee asked:

With what other units in the university (academic and service) do you interact, and can you suggest changes in administrative arrangements relating to your interaction that would, in your view, improve efficiency without impairing academic effectiveness.

A review of the responses suggest that the degree of centralization or decentralization in the delivery of support services to academic units is perceived to have a significant impact on the delivery of academic programs of the University and for this reason it is an issue of considerable importance. This concern is the subject of this report.

The report is based on a review of submissions made to the Committee since it began its work in the summer of 1993 and subsequent deliberations within the committee. We have not conducted further surveys, attempted to verify the various complaints contained in the submissions to the Committee, or attempted to assess the performance of any individual service units. Rather, we have attempted to address general principles that relate to the interaction between service units and academic units. To the extent that particular service units are mentioned in the report, they are intended as examples of general issues. They are not intended as a commentary on the performance of the named units.

In this report, we first provide a brief examination of some theoretical considerations, following which we present and discuss several issues that have been drawn to our attention. We conclude with a few principles which we believe should underlie the provision of centralized services at UBC and specific recommendations which arise from these principles.

2. SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is useful at the outset to sketch some broad considerations that governed our approach to this analysis.

2.1. The Concepts of Centralization and Decentralization

The terms centralization and decentralization are commonly used as short hand for a range of decision-making structures that usually include less than full centralization and almost never show complete decentralization. It important to recognize that there can be degrees of centralization or decentralization. Moreover, there are at least two ways in which decisions can be centralized or decentralized:

- a) in the *level of organization* at which decisions are made, and
- b) in the *areas of decision-making* in which discretion is given to academic and service units. Thus, a wide range of organizational subtleties and complexities are possible.

Questions of the appropriate degree of centralization arise both in decisions directly involving academic programs (curriculum, appointments, promotion and tenure, faculty salaries, etc.) and in the provision of support services to academic units. In this report we are only concerned with the latter.

In this connection we mean by *centralization*:

the assignment of responsibility for the provision of a service to a specialized unit within the University which has a mandate to provide the service to the entire campus or to a substantial portion of the academic units in the University.

We mean by *decentralization*:

the assignment of responsibility for provision of the services to academic departments or individual faculty members.

Clearly, degrees of centralization or decentralization are possible. Some services may be performed by Faculties for component departments; some may be provided on the basis of location (e.g., all inhabitants of a building); some may be provided through a mixture of centralized and decentralized arrangements. The problem is to find the most effective balance.

2.2. Pressures to Centralization

Four key elements seem to create pressures for centralization in the University: concerns about (a) coordination, (b) control, (c) accountability and (d) minimization of financial costs.

- a) **Coordination.** By one analysis, two functions are inevitably involved in any organization, the division of work and its coordination. The division of work usually results in the creation of specialized units within the organization with defined responsibilities (academic departments and faculties, service units), each requiring (or desiring) some autonomy in the performance of its responsibilities. Coordination is required to ensure that all units contribute to the achievement of the overall purpose of the organization. Although coordination need not always be centrally done, its design and the mechanisms by which it is achieved need to reflect the mandate and purpose of the total organization. Coordination, therefore, usually involves centralization.

It also needs to be recognized that units in an organization are in different ways interdependent. Coordination will take different forms, often depending on the nature of the interdependence among the units being coordinated.

- b) **Control.** In the classic view of a bureaucratic organization, some control mechanism is present to ensure that locally taken decisions do not depart from the range of actions considered suitable for the organization as a whole. Where decision-making is centralized, control by the central authority is assured; where decision-making is decentralized, some mechanism exists to monitor and evaluate performance and force compliance with broader organizational objectives. Such mechanisms may be more or less effective and may include, for example, review and

approval of sub-unit budgets, review and approval of annual goals or targets, and periodic reviews of performance.

- c) **Accountability.** A pressure toward centralization that has increased greatly in recent years, is the collection of information about the organization and its dissemination to a variety of agencies, especially governmental ones. This requires both the collection of data and the standardization of data and data formats so that demands for accountability can be accurately met.
- d) **Financial Costs.** Centralization in the provision of support services is often based on a concern for the minimization of financial costs. This may involve an assumption that there are economies of scale in functions like purchasing, or that there would be wastefulness in the duplication of functions among a number of different sub-units.

2.3. Financial Costs and Efficiency.

Each of these elements is important and a legitimate consideration in decisions on the organization and reorganization of the University. However, based on the evidence before us, the Committee is concerned that with respect to certain services a broader concern for efficiency that reflect the interdependence of units within the whole organization has not been given sufficient weight.

Efficiency of a service unit is usually interpreted as minimization of financial costs within that unit, and many of the organizational arrangements for the delivery of services at UBC are predicated on this unidimensional view of efficiency. Without denigrating the importance of concern for financial costs, it is important to ask if this concept provides a sufficient perspective on efficiency in the university.

As noted above, some degree of centralization may be necessary for coordination, control and accountability, and some centralized units in a modern university must perform some or all of these functions and provide services to academic departments, faculty members and students as well. We are well aware of the complexity of the organization.

However, to the extent that the purpose of a unit is coordination or control, efficiency implies cohesiveness of the performance of these functions in a manner consistent with the overall objectives of the university. To the extent that the purpose is accountability, efficiency implies the collection of data in the least disruptive and most cost-effective way as well as the standardization of data and data formats so that demands for accountability can be accurately met. Similarly, when the purpose is the provision of a service, efficiency implies effectiveness in providing that service to the relevant parts of the university community.

In the traditional view of the university, academic departments, faculty members and students are at the core of the enterprise, and the purpose of most centralized service units is to provide a service to them. To the extent that this is the case, efficiency cannot be assessed in terms of financial costs within the service unit alone. Efficiency also implies a high level of responsiveness to the legitimate needs of academic departments, faculty members and students and hence the enhancement of the functioning of academic programs.

The problem is that many units are intended to play several roles simultaneously, and this may lead to misconceptions about their mandate and conflicting judgments about their effectiveness.

2.4. Where One Sits

It is often the case that one's view of centralization (its extent, its oppressiveness, its usefulness, its effectiveness) is dependent on the position one has in the organization. Thus, those at the top of a hierarchy may see little threat and much efficiency in a degree of centralized control which, to those in organizationally subordinate roles seems an outrageous intrusion upon legitimate autonomy. One's view, moreover, is not a function only of one's position in a hierarchy; it is also affected by the traditions and customs of particular units or particular fields of professional expertise. As one dean writes, "The unique organization of UBC into constituent academic units has historical and legislative determinants, but is perhaps most influenced by a territorial mindset and a lack of tradition of centrally-led co-operative forward planning." Moreover, we see at UBC, practices readily accepted in one faculty are simply not considered appropriate in another. Attempts to change organizational decision-making structures need to take account of such deeply held differences.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the following paragraphs we present an overview of the comments found in the submissions to the Committee, followed by notes on particular issues which emerge as being of concern to at least some respondents.

3.1. Overview of Comments

In general, the comments appear to fall within three categories:

- a) There is *too much* central presence at UBC and what is needed is an increase in decentralization, with a corresponding reallocation of resources.
- b) There is *not enough* centralization at UBC, in the sense that administrative tasks are being "downloaded" to units which do not have the resources to discharge them.

- c) The present level of centralization at UBC may be *appropriate*, but many of the units providing centralized services need to be made (i) more cost effective and (ii) more responsive to the academic units.

Although in one sense these three positions are caricatures, they do reflect three discernible positions found in the campus community, often reflecting different views of the purpose of centralization sketched in Section 2.2. On the one hand is the concern about service to academic departments, faculty members and students, and, on the other, concern for coordination, control, accountability and financial cost minimization. The apparent irreconcilability of the polar extremes is misleading -- all of the elements are important. The extent to which they are in fact reconcilable can be assessed through an examination of the way they apply to a number of particular issues. We examine first some issues related to the *level of centralization*. Second, we consider some issues related to the *kinds of decisions* which are taken. Finally, we discuss the issue of costs and where they should be borne.

3.2. Issues Related to the Level of Centralization

The degree of centralization of support services at UBC varies widely. Some services are centrally provided to the entire university or substantial portions of it. Others are provided within faculties, departments, schools and similar academic units.

We may distinguish two kinds of units which serve the entire campus or large portions of it: those designated as *ancillary enterprises* which are expected to generate income sufficient to meet their direct and indirect operating expenses, and those which provide support services for the core functions of the university and which are *funded at least in part from the General Purpose Operating Fund*.

As the university has grown and as the society it serves has become more complex, we have seen an increase in the number of units providing campus-wide services. The impression given by some of the submissions is that we have also seen an increase in bureaucratic inflexibility and cumbersome procedures and the imposition of costs on academic units. It is worth noting, however, that not all centralized units evoke censure. The submissions to the committee contain few, if any, references to units such as the Bookstore, Campus Mail, Food Services, and Ceremonies and Community Relations. This, of course, may be less a reflection of the effectiveness of those units than of the fact that they play a less central part in the life of academic department heads than do some other units. We have received a number of comments about exasperation with service provided by Campus Planning and Development, Human Resources, Financial Services, and Research Services.

We reiterate that we have not investigated these complaints, and so we do not comment on their substance. The point to be made is not that the services provided by these or other units is substandard and should be decentralized; rather, it is that the University must be continually mindful of the need for

monitoring performance with a broad concept of efficiency in mind (that includes responsiveness to the needs of departments, individual faculty members and students, as well as concern for financial costs). We note that the system of periodic reviews recommended in the Dupré report may be helpful in this regard.

The submissions to the committee include reference to one kind of campus-wide problem which will not be solved either by reducing the financial costs of these centralized units, or by enhancing their responsiveness. This is the problem of the restrictions imposed by the contracts and agreements negotiated with the University's employee groups. We do not refer here to the salary agreements, but to the regulation of conditions of work. This problem is seen as limiting administrative efficiency in academic units and thereby on academic effectiveness. Thus, we read of maintenance work which must be delayed because of restrictions on contracting out. We hear of support staff vacancies going undeclared or being modified because it is known that bumping rights will remove one's ability to select the person best suited to the position. We hear that required procedures relating to faculty tenure and promotion cases are cumbersome, time-consuming and difficult to follow. The aspect of centralization which is dominant here is that of control. Many of these centrally negotiated conditions are an attempt to control the environment in the interests of employee job security. The irony is that by robbing the institution of flexibility, they may ultimately jeopardize the very jobs on which any security is based.

It appears that there is considerable variability across campus in the functions carried out at the faculty and department levels. In some Faculties, such services as providing and maintaining audio-visual services, managing computer communications, providing liaison with Human Resources and Parking and Security, managing and staffing stores and technical services, and monitoring and providing information on accounts, are done at a faculty level. Where this happens, it seems to work well and department heads find it a useful feature of their working environment. In other parts of the campus there is no tradition of doing such things in any other way than at the department level. In consequence, there is sometimes either a duplication of effort or an absence of service. Some reduction in costs may well be possible by carrying out such functions at the faculty level (or on behalf of a cluster of departments), so that the level of duplication and the level of specialized expertise needed within individual departments is minimized, while, at the same time, the function is not carried out so remotely and on such a scale so as to alienate departments or to fail to meet their needs efficiently. Such activities might include: sharing an administrative assistant; handling room booking requests; preparation of faculty timetables; management of shops; staff recruitment; interacting with some university units such as Campus Planning and Human Resources; etc.

As referred to above, these considerations of a shared service may also apply not only to a faculty as a whole, but also to a cluster of departments. Thus, in submissions to the Committee, one example given is that of two or more small departments sharing an administrative assistant; and another relates to the

possibility of the joint operation of workshops and stores, as is done in Botany and Zoology.

In summary, discussions of centralization tend to focus on all or none -- functions are thought of as being provided either campus-wide or in departments. Some parts of the University, however, provide evidence to show that an intermediate level of centralization can be both efficient, properly responsive and non-controversial.

3.3. Issues Related to the Kind of Functions Centralized

Some of the letters received by the Committee take the view that as much as possible of the operation of the University should be decentralized to departments. Thus, one writer states, "Administrative effectiveness decreases in bigger units. It is best to set university-wide standards and then delegate as much autonomy as possible". Others take a different view. "A lack of adequate management information systems requires significant duplication of records maintained by central agencies. Attacking the problem at the department level is not the solution."

What is at issue here is not a question of the level of decentralization, but of the kind of function or the kind of decision which is best taken at different levels. Three kinds of criteria seem to emerge as one considers this question: (a) the need for minimizing costs, (b) the extent to which academic units are interdependent, and (c) the extent to which agendas are driven by the demands of outside agencies. A review of the centralized units on campus suggests that one or both of the first two criteria apply in every case. Thus, central purchasing allows for cost reductions through bulk purchases and continual review of the quality of suppliers, conforming to the first of the criteria above.

The second of these criteria (the degree of interdependence of academic units) is clearly at work at two levels in the University: campus-wide and within Faculties. At the campus-wide level, the central control of classroom space allocation is justifiable on grounds of interdependence. Student timetables cross faculty and department boundaries. The capacities of rooms, their locations, and the times of their peak demand make anything other than centralized coordination inefficient and frustrating.

Centralization may exist at the faculty level for certain functions involving the interdependence of units within the faculty. The fact that departments in the Faculty of Education, for example, are all called upon to deliver components of the various Teacher Education Programs, gives them an interdependence in some respects which makes faculty level functions like the central provision of A-V services very appropriate. What is interesting about this example, however, is that some functions which are done centrally in the Faculty of Education do not reflect the interdependence of the departments (coordination of computer communications, for example and central accounting) and yet are not at all

controversial in the faculty. It is perhaps the case that a central operation which is necessitated by interdependence, if efficiently done, can increase acceptance for more extensive centralization.

With respect to the third criterion, (the extent to which agendas are driven by demands from outside agencies), it is arguably the case that UBC has not yet become adequately centralized. The difficulties of compiling certain kinds of data from different units whose data systems reflect the idiosyncrasies of their programs and their history is well known to officials whose work requires them to provide institution-wide information. In the more successful cases, a good working data and information system (for example the student information system) has taken many years to institute. The cost of instituting such systems is that it breeds resentment as departments are asked to provide information they previously did not have to provide, or to supply it in ways to which their data collection is not suited. The demands placed on faculties, academic departments and individual faculty members by repeated, often uncoordinated demands for information from various centralized units within the university is a matter of serious concern. One of the more frequently noted complaints is that requirements are laid upon departments without the allocation of any resources to meet them.

3.4. Issues of the Incidence of Costs and Monopoly

The requirement to provide information for central offices when one is given no extra resources with which to discharge the requirement is one of the contentious issues raised in the submissions to the Committee. Another is the practice (it seems to have increased in recent years) on the part of some centralized units of asking departments to assume certain functions, and making less than full provision for the resources need to perform them. ~~Thus, for example, an allocation is provided for a fundraising officer at the faculty level, but not for the provision of related space, telephone, equipment, and supplies.~~

Not all cost issues associated with centralized operations, however, are of this kind. There is a major issue in the question of how and at what level those services are to be paid for, which are centrally managed and which provide an essential service. Prime examples here are Computing and Communications, Media Services, and Campus Planning and Development. These centralized units are usually justified on the grounds of containing financial costs, rather than on grounds of interdependence or information needs. However, some of these services are provided by units that have a virtual or actual monopoly over the provision of the service on campus. There is no self-evident guarantee that maximum cost effectiveness will be sought or achieved in these circumstances. To the extent that it is not, departments and faculty members may be obliged to spend more than they should.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

In preparing recommendations, we have first identified a small number of principles which we believe should underlie the provision of centralized service at UBC. For each principle, we provide a number of examples either of how it should work or of how it apparently fails to work at present. Following the examples, we present specific recommendations.

4.1. Centralized Services: Cost Minimization and Responsiveness

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.

Almost every complaint which is expressed in our data or voiced in anecdotal exchanges among heads and other faculty provides an example of how some unit or other has either failed or been unable to be fully responsive to a unit or a client or a client group. It is difficult to provide examples without appearing to be creating a hit list of particular units, and we have no reason to suppose that any given unit deserves targeting more than another. Nevertheless, in the interest of illustrating our point, we note some examples from submissions to the Committee.

It may often seem to be the case that the necessity for staff in Human Resources to attend to contract and regulatory issues makes their work seem to heads less supportive than either they or Human Resources would like it to be. The Office of Research Services must meet the demands of a wide variety of outside agencies as well as those of its campus community, but the procedures which this necessitates often seem to lead either to delays in the processing of new grants and contracts or to the imposition of unduly early internal deadlines. The control mechanisms established by Parking and Security for the issue of keys works well inside that department, but provides no control of the loss or return of keys with the result that departments are often frustrated by their awareness of the large number of unaccounted for keys to areas in their jurisdiction. Our examples could extend to virtually every one of the centralized units on campus. In many cases, the issue is not the undisputed difficulty of the unit's operation, it is that more attention seems to be given to cost minimization than to the need to be responsive to users.

Accordingly, we make three recommendations:

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.

Recommendation 2. That Senate request the President to require all centralized service units 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. 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 summary and a copy of the recommendations of each review together with the administrators' responses to them (excluding confidential personnel material) be sent to the Senate Budget Committee.

4.2. Monopolistic Services and Charges

In principle: Units which enjoy full or partial monopoly status on the campus should define their service in relation to the academic community's needs, should provide that service to a standard that meets or exceeds that found in the competitive marketplace, and should justify their operating costs and their scale of charges in relation to the fair market value found in the Greater Vancouver area.

Once again there are several examples illustrating how, in the present operation, this principle is not always fully observed. Thus there is at present no requirement in the mandate of Media Services to provide equipment and service to classrooms, except by request. The consequence is that we have no minimum and consistent provision of audio-visual service and equipment in all teaching areas. In the matter of standards, we find that Campus Planning and Development, in carrying out renovations and minor projects, is not answerable for cost overruns and late completion of projects to the units for whom the projects are done and who are the ones inconvenienced by the consequences. As an example of the need for fair pricing, we cite Parking and Security whose rate structure in some categories is high by "downtown" standards and is poorly designed to meet the needs of some clients -- for example the many part-time students whose classes begin at 4.30 p.m. We note, in respect of this example, that the ancillary status of the unit and the consequent requirement that it cover both direct and indirect operating expenses is almost certainly responsible for the present rate structure.

Recommendation 4. That the Senate Budget Committee be requested to study those centralized units which 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 which meets or exceeds that found 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.

4.3. Control of Working Conditions

In principle: Agreed upon working conditions should be such as to ensure not only a reasonable level of security for employees, but also enough flexibility for the institution and its academic units to maintain a reasonable level of administrative efficiency and to respond to changes and innovations.

At UBC, successive contracts over the previous two decades appear to have unnecessarily constrained the University's ability to deal creatively with the changing financial environment. Examples of the limitations associated with present working conditions have been given in the preceding text. These include the inability to obtain efficient and cost effective services relating to construction, renovations and maintenance; procedures relating to filling staff vacancies; and faculty tenure and promotion procedures.

Recommendation 5. That Senate recommend to the President and the employee groups that they jointly undertake a serious review of the contract provisions which are the basis for regulating work and working conditions at the university, and that this review focus on the need to provide for the improved administrative efficiency of academic units and for a degree of flexibility which permits innovation and ~~the~~ timely response to change in academic units *with the goal of serving the university's academic needs in the best possible way.*

4.4. Intermediate Levels of Centralization

In principle: In certain cases, which depend partly on unit size and partly on the nature of the function, some centralization from the department level to the faculty level may well be appropriate.

Certain administrative functions may be carried out at the faculty or department level, and practice varies among Faculties. Examples of administrative functions that are carried out in different Faculties at either department or faculty levels include liaison with Human Resources for matters such as staff hiring and interpreting contract provisions; management of computer communications; provision of audio-visual services; room bookings and timetable preparation; and information gathering. Examples of services that may be shared between departments include the appointment of a single Administrative Assistant for more than one department, and the joint operation of stores and workshops.

Recommendation 6. That Senate ~~recommend to deans that (i) they give serious consideration to moving~~ move some administrative functions from the department level to the faculty level if this would improve administrative efficiency; and ~~(ii) where there is no faculty-level provision of functions which need to be performed in several departments, the deans request heads to consider the possibility of pooling resources and operating shared services.~~

4.5. Resource Aspects of Centralization Level Changes

In principle: From time to time, the level of centralization or de-centralization relating to certain administrative services is changed. When this occurs, particularly when functions are decentralized to academic units, the impact on the academic work of that unit should be assessed and a realistic budget should be allowed to cover both the direct and indirect costs of carrying out the service.

Administration relating to the admission of *some* graduate students provides an example in which an administrative function has been transferred from a centralized level (the Faculty of Graduate Studies) to the department level. *One half of* the application fee charged to applicants has been transferred ~~fully~~ *partially* to departments, illustrating the ideal application of the above principle. ~~At the same time, the monetary value assigned to the function being transferred may or may not be viewed as a realistic one.~~

Recommendation 7. That administrators who intend to devolve any function to lower level units ensure that (i) the proposal be assessed, in consultation with the units affected, for its impact on the academic work of those units; and (ii) any such devolution be accompanied where necessary by a budget transfer sufficient to offset its effect on the units' academic functioning.

Dr. Shearer commended the committee and a Sub-Committee consisting of Drs. Kelsey and Isaacson for their contribution in producing the report.

Dr. Shearer stated that the committee focused on the interface between the academic programs and the activities of the service units, keeping in mind the basic principle that academic programs are at the core of the university. Striving for efficiency means seeking to integrate the concerns about costs as well as the impact on academic functioning. He also reminded Senate that the committee's mandate does not go beyond

the power of making recommendations, and that the proposals are generally consistent with the recommendations Dr. Dupré delivered to the President a number of months ago.

Dr. Shearer

Dr. Carter

}

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.

That Senate request the President to require all centralized service units 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. 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.

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' responses to them (excluding confidential personnel material) be sent to the Senate Budget Committee.

In response to a query, Dr. Shearer replied that centralized service units include all the ancillary units as well as units that are part of the general purpose operating fund, i.e., Financial Services.

Referring to recommendation 3, it was agreed to follow Dean Meisen's recommendation that a summary be submitted together with the recommendations to enable the Senate Budget Committee to make a more informed response. The third paragraph now reads, "....individual faculty members and students, and that a *summary and a* copy of the recommendations of each...."

At Dean Grace's suggestion, it was agreed to: (a) remove the last sentence of the first paragraph in item 3.4, (b) change the wording of the second paragraph in item 4.5 to clarify the fact that the change in application fees relates only to Canadian and American students who represent approximately 40% of applicants, and to remove the last sentence of the second paragraph of item 4.5.

Dr. Richer expressed concern that this report lacked the "hard hitting, clearly defined" recommendations contained in the first report dealing with academic programs. Agreeing, Dr. Shearer reminded him that Senate's jurisdiction was limited to making recommendations.

Dean Hollenberg expressed concern that these recommendations may go beyond the legal purview of Senate and requested an opinion from the chair. Dr. Will stated that in his view making recommendations relating to the interface between academic units and service supporting units is well within Senate's interest and jurisdiction.

Dr. Birch noted that the President had requested all centralized service units to be reviewed periodically and that several major units were already under review. The *University Act's* single term of reference for the Senate Budget Committee is to assist

the President in the preparation of the University's budget.

The amended motion
was put and carried.

Dr. Shearer
Dr. Isaacson

}

That the Senate Budget Committee be requested to study those centralized units which 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 which meets or exceeds that found 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 motion was
put and carried.

It was noted that the Budget Committee had already begun their study of the activities and roles of the ancillary units and those units with monopolies.

Dr. Shearer
Dr. Goldberg

}

That Senate recommend to the President and the employee groups that they jointly undertake a serious review of the contract provisions which are the basis for regulating work and working conditions at the university, and that this review focus on the need to provide for the improved administrative efficiency of academic units and for a degree of flexibility which permits innovation and the response to change in academic units.

Speaking to the motion, Dr. Shearer explained that the committee felt seriously constrained due to collective bargaining and sensitivity over employment security and

work style. He pointed out that the Faculty Association was included under the broad umbrella of employee groups.

At Dr. Autor's suggestion it was agreed to make the following change in the last sentence of recommendation 5: (a) insert the word "timely" before the word "response" and (b) add "*with the goal of serving the university's academic needs in the best possible way*" at the end of the sentence.

The amended motion
was put and carried.

Dr. Shearer
Seconded

}

That Senate recommend to deans that

- i. they give serious consideration to moving some administrative functions from the department level to the faculty level if this would improve administrative efficiency; and*
- ii. where there is no faculty-level provision of functions which need to be performed in several departments, the deans request heads to consider the possibility of pooling resources and operating shared services.*

Dean Marchak felt that the recommendation did not provide either "the teeth to do it" or an obligation to take the recommendation seriously. It was agreed that the motion be amended to read, "That Senate recommend to deans that they *"move"* some administrative functions from the department level to the faculty level if this would improve administrative efficiency....

The amended motion
was put and carried.

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| <i>Dr. Shearer</i> | } | <i>That administrators who intend to devolve any</i> |
| <i>Dr. Berger</i> | | <i>function to lower level units ensure</i> |
| | | <i>i. that the proposal be assessed, in</i> |
| | | <i>consultation with the units affected, for</i> |
| | | <i>its impact on the academic work of</i> |
| | | <i>those units; and</i> |
| | | <i>ii. that any such devolution be</i> |
| | | <i>accompanied by a budget transfer</i> |
| | | <i>sufficient to offset its effect on the units'</i> |
| | | <i>academic functioning.</i> |

Following a discussion on the issue of budgetary implications of devolution, it was agreed to change the words "lower level" to "*other*" and that (ii) be changed to read, "that any such devolution be accompanied "where necessary" by a budget transfer sufficient to offset its effect on the units' academic functioning."

The amended motion
was put and carried.

Discrimination and Harassment Policy

The following policy on Discrimination and Harassment Policy had been circulated for information:

INTRODUCTION

- (1) The University of British Columbia is committed to providing its employees and students with the best possible environment for working and learning, an environment that allows friendship and collegiality to flourish. The University therefore does not condone discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, of any kind. Indeed, the University regards discrimination and harassment as serious offenses that are subject to a wide range of disciplinary measures, including dismissal or expulsion from the University.
- (2) The fundamental objectives of this University policy are to prevent discrimination and harassment from occurring, and to provide procedures for handling complaints and imposing discipline when they do occur. These objectives are to be achieved in a number of ways. The University is committed to providing programs that raise campus awareness of the

- nature of and problems associated with discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, and to educating administrators in the objectives and implementation of the policy. The University also provides support and counselling for those affected by discrimination and harassment and establishes procedures for handling complaints.
- (3) In addition, the University has the obligation to ensure that its policy and procedures are fair and are applied fairly. It is therefore necessary to provide an environment in which victims of discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, feel free to bring complaints forward. It is equally important that those against whom allegations are made have a full and fair opportunity to meet those allegations.
- (4) In this policy, the word discrimination refers to intentional or unintentional treatment for which there is no *bona fide* and reasonable justification. Such discrimination imposes burdens, obligations, or disadvantages on specific individuals or groups as defined by the *British Columbia Human Rights Act* (1984, amended 1992.) The grounds protected against discrimination by the *British Columbia Human Rights Act* include age, race, colour, ancestry, place of origin, political belief, religion, marital status, family status, physical or mental disability, sex, sexual orientation, and unrelated criminal convictions. The *Act* contains a number of exemptions and defenses. For example, the University's Employment Equity Policy, which has as its object the amelioration of conditions of disadvantage, is exempt from a complaint of discrimination under the *Act*. Similarly, the Supreme Court of Canada upheld the University's policy on mandatory retirement, and therefore, it also is exempt under the *Act*. See Appendix for examples.
- (5) In this policy, the word harassment refers to physical, visual or verbal behaviour directed against a person for which there is no bona fide and reasonable justification. Such behaviour adversely affects specific individuals or groups as defined by the *British Columbia Human Rights Act*. (See paragraph 4 for protected grounds.) See Appendix for examples.
- (6) In this policy, sexual harassment refers to comment or conduct of a sexual nature, when any one or more of the following conditions are satisfied:
- the conduct is engaged in or the comment is made by a person who knows or ought reasonably to know that the conduct or comment is unwanted or unwelcome;
 - the conduct or comment is accompanied by a reward, or the expressed or implied promise of a reward, for compliance;
 - the conduct or comment is accompanied by reprisal, or an expressed or implied threat of reprisal, for refusal to comply;
 - the conduct or comment is accompanied by the actual denial of opportunity, or the expressed or implied threat of the denial of opportunity, for failure to comply;
 - the conduct or comment is intended to, or has the effect of, creating an intimidating or hostile environment.

Such comment or conduct may include sexual advances; requests for sexual favours; suggestive and/or derogatory comments or gestures emphasizing sex or sexual orientation; or physical contact. See Appendix for examples.

- (7) Discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, can occur between individuals of the same or different status, and both men and women can be the subject of harassment by members of either gender. Discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, can involve individuals or groups; can occur during one incident, or over a series of incidents including single incidents, which, in isolation, would not necessarily constitute harassment; and can occur on campus or off, during working hours or not.
- (8) The impact of behaviour on the complainant defines the comment or conduct as discrimination and harassment, subject to the test of a reasonable person.
- (9) This policy is to be interpreted in a way that is consistent with the UBC Calendar statement on academic freedom. (See definition section) Neither this policy in general, nor its definitions in particular, are to be applied in such a way as to detract from the right of faculty, staff, and students to engage in the frank discussion of potentially controversial matters, such as age, race, politics, religion, sex and sexual orientation. These are legitimate topics and no University policy should have the effect of limiting discussion of them or of prohibiting instructional techniques, such as the use of irony, the use of conjecture and refutation, or the assignment of readings that advocate controversial positions, provided that such discussion and instructional techniques are conducted in a mutually respectful and non-coercive manner.
- (9a) Neither this policy in general, nor its definitions in particular, are to be applied in such a way as to detract from the right of those in supervisory roles to manage and discipline employees and students subject to managerial and instructional practices.

PURPOSE

- (10) To provide and maintain a study and work environment free from discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment.

POLICY

- (11) Every student and member of faculty and staff at the University of British Columbia has the right to study and work in an environment free from discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment. The University and all members of the University community share responsibility for ensuring that the work and study environment at UBC is free from discrimination and harassment. Specifically, Administrative Heads of Unit bear the primary responsibility for maintaining a study and work environment free from discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment; Administrative Heads of Unit are free to act, and

should act, on this responsibility, whether or not they are in receipt of individual complaints; and the knowledge and experience of the Equity Office are available to all members of the University community.

ACCESS TO COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

- (12) A complaint of discrimination or harassment pertaining to University work, studies, or participation in campus life may be lodged by any member(s) of the University community against other member(s) of the University community and/or the University.
- (13) A complaint may be lodged even when there has been apparent acquiescence of the complainant in the conduct or comment in question.
- (14) Contractors, their employees and agents, and visitors to the University also are expected to conduct themselves in any University-related activity in a manner consistent with this policy. Allegations of discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, against such persons will be dealt with by the University as potential breaches of contract, and/or may result in suspension of University privileges, such as access to the campus.
- (15) Although contractors, their employees and agents, and visitors to the University who suffer discrimination or harassment do not have access to these complaint procedures, such individuals are encouraged to consult with an Equity Advisor or express their concerns directly to the Associate Vice President Equity.

COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

- (16) Complaints of discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, can be resolved by employing any or all of the following procedures: (A) informal resolution, (B) mediation, (C) investigation and decision.

A. Informal Resolution

- (17) Informal resolution is a resolution to which the complainant consents, and is arrived at with the assistance of an Administrative Head of Unit and/or an Equity Advisor, but without the use of either mediation or adjudication.

The possible means of achieving informal resolution are numerous. Examples include advice to the complainant, referral for counselling, investigation by the Administrative Head of Unit, letter to the respondent, relocation of the complainant and/or the respondent, disciplining the respondent, or any other appropriate and just measures. Informal resolution can occur without knowledge to anyone other than the complainant and the Administrative Head of Unit, or the Equity Advisor who receives the complaint.

- (17a) In all cases, the Administrative Head of Unit considers whether the complaint arises from a systemic problem, and if so, seeks the assistance of the Equity Office to resolve it.

- (18) No informal resolution of a complaint that adversely affects the academic, employment, professional, or other interests of the respondent shall proceed without the consent of the respondent.
- (19) The Equity Advisor or the Administrative Head of Unit (or designate) assists the complainant in clarifying the allegations, and their related consequences, and in considering the applicability of various options, such as an apology from the respondent or reassignment of duties. See Appendix for additional options for informal resolution.
- (20) Written records of informal resolutions are kept in confidential files of the Equity Office.

B. Mediation

- (21) At any time after a complaint has been received, the parties can attempt to resolve the complaint through a process of mediation, provided that both parties consent to such a process. Mediators are drawn from the Equity Resource Group and are selected by the Associate Vice President Equity. They are trained in alternate dispute resolution techniques that relate to the issues covered by this policy. Appointed mediators and the format of the mediation process must be acceptable to both the complainant and the respondent.
- (22) A mediated settlement arrived at between the complainant and the respondent is written out, signed by the complainant and the respondent, and counter-signed by the mediators. If a potential settlement entails action to be taken by the University, the University becomes a third party to the mediation and also must agree for there to be a settlement.
- (23) A copy of any agreement reached during mediation is provided to each of the signatories and to the Equity Office, and remains confidential.
- (24) No person involved in a mediation proceeding shall give evidence or introduce documents from that proceeding during any other subsequent University proceeding where that evidence or those documents would disclose that any person had agreed or refused to agree to mediation or, if mediation occurred, what took place during the mediation.

C. Investigation and Decision

Request for Investigation and Decision

- (25) At any time after the complaint has been made, if the complainant wishes to have the complaint investigated and decided, the complainant has the right to file a written request with the Equity Office. Requests include detailed accounts of the conduct or comment on the part of the respondent that forms the basis of the complaint.
- (26) Within five working days, the Equity Office delivers a copy of a request for investigation and decision to the respondent.

- (27) The respondent has the right to respond to the request in writing, provided such right is exercised within ten working days from receipt of that request. The respondent may acknowledge or deny the validity of the complaint in whole or in part, provide new information, or propose a resolution of the complaint.
- (28) Within five working days from receipt of the respondent's written reply to a request for investigation and decision, the Equity Office delivers a copy of that reply to the complainant.
- (29) On receipt of the respondent's written reply, the complainant may accept the reply as full resolution of the complaint, or on the basis of the respondent's written reply, the complainant may choose to pursue either informal resolution or mediation, in which case an Equity Advisor puts into effect the appropriate procedures.

Investigation

- (30) When informal resolution or mediation has failed to resolve a complaint, the Equity Office informs the respondent's Administrative Head of Unit, and the Associate Vice President Equity assigns a member of the Equity Resource Group to investigate.
- (31) The investigator interviews the complainant, the respondent, and such other persons as she or he considers may have information pertaining to the complaint. The investigator re-interviews or seeks additional witnesses in order to confirm evidence or explore discrepancies. The investigator prepares a written recommendation indicating whether or not in his/her opinion the policy applies to the complaint and the facts of the case.
- (32) Interviews are private and held away from the work areas of those involved.
- (33) The investigator submits and discusses the report with a Panel comprised of three people (one of whom is external to UBC) appointed for two-year renewable terms by the Associate Vice President Equity. This Panel meets with the complainant and with the respondent to discuss the contents of the report. At its discretion, but especially in cases of relevant, new information arising that has not been explored with both the complainant and the respondent, the Panel may request supplementary reports from the investigator. In addition, the Panel may request a history of any previous discipline.
- (34) The Panel decides on the following:
 - whether the policy applies in the circumstances;
 - whether on the balance of probabilities, and with the onus of proof being on the complainant, there has been a violation of the policy;

- whether discipline or remedies are appropriate.
- (35) If the Panel concludes that other University policies or procedures bear on the complaint, the Panel identifies them and refers the relevant parties to the University office with responsibility therefor.
- (36) In the event that the Panel recommends that the complaint be upheld, it may recommend both a form of discipline for the respondent and a remedy for the complainant. It also may recommend any other measures it considers appropriate in the circumstances. Such recommendations are made in writing and supported by reasons.
- (37) In the event that the Panel recommends the complaint be dismissed, it may recommend counselling, support, education, and such other measures as it considers appropriate for the complainant and/or the respondent. It also may recommend such measures as it considers appropriate to restore the complainant's or respondent's unit to effective functioning. Such recommendations are made in writing and supported by reasons.
- (38) In the event that the Panel recommends not only dismissal of the complaint but contemplates finding the complaint to have been made in bad faith, it shall meet with the complainant and provide an opportunity for the complainant to respond prior to making its recommendation. It may recommend both a form of discipline for the complainant and a remedy for the respondent. The Panel also may recommend any other measures it considers appropriate in the circumstances. Such recommendations are made in writing and supported by reasons.
- (39) The Panel distributes its recommendations and reasons to the Associate Vice President Equity, the complainant, the respondent, and their Administrative Heads of Unit.

Decision

- (40) For students, the Administrative Head of Unit with authority to receive the Panel's recommendations is the President; for members of staff, it is the Director or Head of Department; for faculty, the authority may be either the President or the Dean/Head, depending on the nature of the discipline contemplated. The Agreement on Conditions of Appointment states that only the President may discipline a faculty member by dismissal or suspension without pay. The individual receiving the Panel's recommendations meets with the complainant and with the respondent, confers with the Associate Vice President Equity and his or her own Vice President, and considers the Panel's recommendations.
- (41) The individual receiving the Panel's recommendations may take such disciplinary and remedial measures as he or she considers appropriate. A written report of measures taken with supporting reasons is distributed to the Associate Vice President Equity, the complainant, the respondent, their Administrative Heads of Unit, the investigator, and the Panel.

Appeal

- (42) A student who denies that a violation of the policy took place or who disagrees with an imposed penalty has recourse through the Senate Committee on Appeals on Academic Discipline. A member of staff or faculty has recourse through the provisions of the collective agreement or terms and conditions of employment. To the extent provided for in collective agreements, complainants also may have recourse to appeal the decision. As well, the complainant and respondent may have recourse to extra-University processes.

INITIATION OF COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

- (43) While it is possible for anyone to seek anonymously the advice and assistance of an Equity Advisor, only those complaints in which the complainant's identity is disclosed may be taken through the mediation and investigation/decision stages.
- (44) Only those complaints lodged within one calendar year of an event, or in the case of a series of events, the last event in a series are processed. The Associate Vice President Equity may grant extensions beyond this one-year limit.
- (45) The procedures in this policy can be initiated by persons directly affected (by the conduct or comment that forms the basis of the complaint) or by Administrative Heads of Unit.

A. Initiation of Procedures by Persons Directly Affected

- (46) Persons directly affected by the conduct or comment that forms the basis of the complaint may lodge the complaint with either an Administrative Head of Unit or with an Equity Advisor.
- (47) At any time, complainants may choose to withdraw from these complaint proceedings. Nevertheless, the University's legal responsibility to provide an environment free from discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, may obligate the University to proceed in the absence of a complaint from the persons directly affected. In such cases, the Administrative Head of Unit and the Equity Advisor decide whether to proceed, taking into account the need for protection against retaliation on the part of witnesses and the need for due process on the part of respondents.

Response of Administrative Heads of Unit

- (48) In responding to complaints of discrimination or harassment including sexual harassment, Administrative Heads of Unit are encouraged to seek the assistance of the Equity Office.
- (49) Administrative Heads of Unit deal immediately with allegations of discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment, by investigating, and when appropriate, ordering the behaviour to stop, and taking preventive, interim, and/or remedial measures.

- (50) The Administrative Head of Unit provides the complainant with a copy of this policy and explains available options. In addition, with the consent of the complainant, the Administrative Head of Unit attempts to effect an informal resolution of the complaint.
- (51) If the complaint cannot be resolved informally, and the complainant wishes to access mediation or to make a written request for investigation and decision, the Administrative Head of Unit directs the complainant to the Equity Office.
- (52) If the Administrative Head of Unit believes that these complaint procedures do not apply, the Administrative Head of Unit confers with an Equity Advisor about the matter and explains to the complainant why this policy has no application. In addition, the Administrative Head of Unit deals with the complaint on the basis of the appropriate University policy, if necessary by referring the complainant to another University office or support service, and informs the complainant of the existence of extra- University support and complaint services.
- (53) If at any time, the complainant is dissatisfied with the actions taken by an Administrative Head of Unit, the complainant can lodge the same complaint with an Equity Advisor or extra- University agencies.

Response of Equity Advisors

- (54) The Equity Advisor provides the complainant with a copy of this policy and explains available options. In addition, with the consent of the complainant, the Equity Advisor attempts to effect an informal resolution of the complaint. As well, the Equity Advisor recommends to the Administrative Head of Unit measures to protect the safety, academic, and other interests of the complainant pending resolution of the complaint.
- (55) If the complaint cannot be resolved informally, and the complainant wishes to access mediation or to make a written request for investigation and decision, the Equity Advisor assists the complainant in so doing.
- (56) If the Equity Advisor believes that these complaint procedures do not apply, the Equity Advisor explains to the complainant why this policy has no application. In addition, the Equity Advisor refers the complainant to another University office or support service and informs the complainant of the existence of extra- University agencies.

B. Initiation of Procedures by Administrative Heads of Unit

- (57) Administrative Heads of Unit may lodge complaints with an Equity Advisor to resolve allegations of discrimination or harassment, including sexual harassment. An Administrative Head of Unit who lodges a complaint is identified as the complainant, and the persons directly affected by the conduct or comment that forms the basis of the complaint may be called upon as witnesses in any subsequent investigation or decision.

- (58) When an Administrative Head of Unit becomes a complainant, she or he surrenders any rights or responsibilities assigned to administrators by these procedures. The individual to whom this complainant reports assumes the latter's rights and responsibilities. Any disputes that arise over the applicability of any of the procedures shall be referred to the Associate Vice President Equity, whose decision shall be final.
- (59) If an Administrative Head of Unit lodges a complaint with an Equity Advisor, and the Equity Advisor believes that these complaint procedures apply, the Advisor, in consultation with the complainant, considers the appropriateness of an informal resolution of the complaint, and where appropriate follows the procedures provided for informal resolution or mediation; advises and assists the complainant in taking necessary measures to protect the interests of those directly affected by the complaint; and if the complaint cannot be resolved informally or by mediation, and the complainant wishes to make a written request for investigation and decision, assists him or her in so doing.
- (60) If the Equity Advisor believes that these complaint procedures do not apply, the Advisor explains to the Administrative Head of Unit why this policy has no application and refers him or her to another University office or extra-university agencies.
- (61) Where the identity of the persons responsible for acts of harassment is unknown to the Administrative Head of Unit, the Associate Vice President Equity arranges an investigation and notifies appropriate authorities both inside and outside the University. In addition, the Administrative Head of Unit, in consultation with the Associate Vice President Equity, arranges for measures intended to restore the unit to effective functioning.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Right of Parties to Support and Assistance

- (62) The complainant and respondent are at all times during these procedures entitled to support and assistance.
- (63) The complainant is entitled to the support and assistance of an Equity Advisor.
- (64) The respondent is entitled to the support and assistance of a member of the Equity Resource Group.
- (65) Members of unions and employee associations have all rights to representation that their collective agreements confer.

Obstructing the Process

- (66) Any person whose willful actions or inactions obstruct the application of these procedures or who willfully breaks an undertaking or agreement shall be subject to discipline.

Retaliation

- (67) No one shall suffer reprisal for refusing to violate this policy or for bringing forward, in good faith, a complaint or concern about discrimination or harassment, including sexual harassment. The University considers retaliation or the threat of retaliation at any stage to be a serious offense because it prevents potential complainants, witnesses, and administrators from acting on their concerns. See Appendix for examples of retaliation.
- (68) All persons involved in these procedures shall report threats and other safety concerns immediately to the Equity Office and relevant administrators.
- (69) Administrative Heads of Unit deal immediately with allegations of retaliation by investigating, and when appropriate, ordering the behaviour to stop, and taking preventive, interim, disciplinary and/or remedial measures.
- (70) In its deliberations and recommendations, the investigative panel shall consider any allegations of retaliation.

Confidentiality

- (71) All members of the University community involved in a case are expected to maintain confidentiality, particularly within the work or study area in question and in shared professional or social circles. These members include Equity Advisors, support staff, Administrative Heads of Unit, and witnesses, as well as the respondent and the complainant. Although at times difficult to avoid, the breach of confidentiality undermines the provision of due process, and thus proves a disservice to both the complainant and the respondent.
- (72) Confidentiality is not the same as anonymity: For a complaint to go forward to mediation or investigation and decision, the identity of the complainant and the details of the complaint must be released to the Equity Advisor, the respondent, and those involved in the application of these procedures.
- (73) Terms of confidentiality, including the need to disclose information that restores a unit to effective functioning, may be agreed on in informal or mediation agreements between the complainant(s) and respondent(s), or recommended by the Panel, or ruled on by the Administrative Head of Unit.
- (74) The University, through the Associate Vice President Equity, may take necessary steps to ensure the health, safety, and security of any member of the University community.
- (75) For educational purposes, the Equity Office may discuss specific cases and their resolutions without identifiers.

- (76) Confidentiality may not apply to persons subject to extra- University judicial processes.

Use of Documents

- (77) Documents are used only for the purpose for which they were created and are retained by the Equity Office. Access to Equity Office files is restricted to current members of the Equity Office staff. In cases involving repeat complaints or security and safety issues, a University Vice President may review Equity Office files.
- (78) Documents may be required by law to be released to extra- University processes.

Multiple Proceedings

- (79) A complaint under this policy may also be pursued in extra- University processes.
- (80) The fact that a complaint is being pursued under these procedures does not preclude the complainant from pursuing an extra-University process.
- (81) Where there are multiple complaints against an individual, a unit, or the University, the complainants shall clarify whether the complaints comprise a systemic complaint or a series of individual complaints.
- (82) Where two or more complaints have been lodged against the same respondent, these complaints may be dealt with by a single investigative panel.

Limited Role of Resource Group Members

- (83) No member of the Equity Resource Group shall act in more than one capacity in any given case.

Conflict of Interest

- (84) Members of the University community are governed by the terms of the University Conflict of Interest Policy. Individuals in an intimate or sexual relationship with a person in a subordinate position shall disclose the relationship to the Administrative Head of Unit and shall cooperate with those measures the Administrative Head of Unit considers appropriate to avoid conflict of interest in matters such as supervision and evaluation.
- (85) When power differentials exist amongst or between faculty, staff, and students, those holding positions of authority shall not abuse, nor seem to abuse, the power with which they are entrusted. Such relationships include, but are not limited to, those between a coach, an academic advisor, an instructor/professor, a counsellor, a residence advisor, a tutor, a thesis/practicum supervisor, a research head, or a director and his or her subordinate, junior colleague, or student. Anyone who enters into a sexual relationship with a person where a professional power differential exists must realize that, if a charge of sexual harassment is subsequently

lodged, it will be extremely difficult to defend the conduct on grounds of mutual consent.

- (86) An inappropriate sexual relationship may create a negative work or study environment for others and give rise to a complaint under this policy.

Interim Solutions

- (87) The complainant, respondent, or unit may require immediate measures to preserve safety, morale, or efficiency while a situation is being resolved, investigated, or decided. Such measures, whether carried out by the Administrative Head of Unit or by the Equity Advisor, should not be viewed as judgment of the credibility of the complainant or respondent, who may appeal such measures with the Associate Vice President Equity. His or her decision is final, subject to the provisions of collective agreements. See Appendix for examples of interim solutions.

Remedy Options

- (88) Once a case has been decided, the complainant or the respondent may require measures be taken to correct damage done to her or his career development, academic record, physical or emotional health, reputation, or finances. Arrangements are negotiated with the appropriate University officer. See paragraph 40. See Appendix for examples of remedy options.

Discipline Options

- (89) Discipline is be appropriate to the offense and relevant circumstances of the case, and is applied after an admission or judgment of wrongdoing. Considerations in determining discipline include, but are not limited to, work history, previous discipline, past cases, respondent's acknowledgment of wrong, relationship of parties, degree of aggression and physical contact, number of events, impact on the complainant, and intent of the respondent. See Appendix for examples of discipline.

Options Available Outside the University

- (90) Nothing in this policy shall be construed to remove any rights of appeal or rights to grieve that members of the University community have independent of this policy, or to remove any rights to take action against the University or members of the University community in other processes within or without the University.

Concerns and Complaints about Procedures

- (91) General or specific complaints about the application of these procedures may be addressed to the Associate Vice President Equity.

THE EQUITY OFFICE

- (92) The Equity Office has responsibility for
- providing advice and assistance to Administrative Heads of Unit and others seeking direction in the handling of cases;

- advising and assisting those who bring forward complaints during all stages of the procedures, including the initiation of a complaint, as well as the undertaking of informal resolution, and arranging for mediation or investigation;
- ensuring that the policy and procedures in this document have been appropriately and effectively implemented;
- providing information and advice on the complaint process and limitations to confidentiality to any member of the University community;
- providing education on the prevention and remediation of discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment;
- publishing annually in UBC Reports statistical and summary reports on the number of complaints made, types of complaints, outcomes, educational activities, and an evaluation of this policy and its procedures.

EQUITY RESOURCE GROUP

- (93) The Associate Vice President Equity appoints knowledgeable professionals who do not work at UBC to serve as members of the Equity Resource Group for renewable terms of two years.
- (94) The Associate Vice President Equity ensures that at least four members of the Equity Resource Group are available to advise respondents, mediate cases, and investigate cases.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT

- (95) The Associate Vice President Equity ensures that the President's Advisory Committee on Discrimination and Harassment reflects the diversity of members of the University with regard to gender, culture, ethnicity, disability, and sexual orientation.
- (96) The tasks of this Committee are to
 - a) advise and assist the Associate Vice President Equity in creating and implementing an educational program designed to make all members of the University aware of
 - the nature of discrimination and harassment, including sexual harassment;
 - measures that should be taken to prevent discrimination and harassment from occurring; and
 - the procedures to be followed and possible outcomes involved in the event of a complaint.
 - b) advise and assist the Associate Vice President Equity in the evaluation of Equity Office services, procedures, and educational programs.

DEFINITIONS

Academic freedom at UBC is defined in the UBC Calendar: "The members of the University enjoy certain rights and privileges essential to the fulfillment of its primary functions: instruction and the pursuit of knowledge. Central among these rights is the freedom, within the law, to pursue what seem to them fruitful avenues of inquiry, to teach and learn unhindered by external or nonacademic constraints, to engage in full and unrestricted consideration of any opinion. This freedom extends not only to the regular members of the University but to all who are invited to participate in its forum. Suppression of this freedom, whether by institutions of the state, the officers of the University or the actions of private individuals, would prevent the University carrying out its primary functions. All members of the University must recognize this fundamental principle and must share responsibility for supporting, safeguarding and preserving this central freedom. Behavior which obstructs free and full discussion, not only of ideas which are safe and accepted, but of those which may be unpopular or even abhorrent, vitally threatens the integrity of the University's forum. Such behavior cannot be tolerated."

Administrative head of unit is Director of a service unit; Head of an academic department; Director of a centre, institute or school; Principal of a college; Dean; Associate Vice President; University Librarian; Registrar; Vice President; or President.

Complaint for investigation and decision under these procedures means a written complaint by an individual or group that he/she/they have been discriminated against or harassed including sexually harassed; or that there has been retaliation for consulting with an Equity Advisor or for participating in proceedings under this policy; or that there has been a breach of an undertaking as to future conduct.

Contractors include vendors of goods and services to the University, volunteers, homestay families, persons in the community guiding practicum and internship placements, and others with similar connections to the University.

Discrimination refers to intentional or unintentional treatment for which there is no *bona fide* and reasonable justification. Such discrimination imposes burdens, obligations, or disadvantages on specific individuals or groups as defined by the *British Columbia Human Rights Act* (1984, amended 1992.) The grounds protected against discrimination by the *British Columbia Human Rights Act* include age, race, colour, ancestry, place of origin, political belief, religion, marital status, family status, physical or mental disability, sex, sexual orientation, and unrelated criminal convictions. The *Act* contains a number of exemptions and defenses. For example, the University's Employment Equity

Policy, which has as its object the amelioration of conditions of disadvantage, is exempt from a complaint of discrimination under the *Act*. Similarly, the Supreme Court of Canada upheld the University's policy on mandatory retirement, and therefore, it also is exempt under the *Act*.

Harassment refers to physical, visual or verbal behavior directed against a person for which there is no bona fide and reasonable justification. Such behavior adversely affects specific individuals or groups as defined by the *British Columbia Human Rights Act*. (See definition of discrimination for protected grounds.)

Member of the University community is a student, a member of faculty, or a member of staff.

Reasonable person test gives unprejudiced and as neutral as possible consideration to a complaint. Without limiting the scope of issues relevant to the case, the investigative panel and the Administrative Head of Unit must take into account the perspectives of both the complainant and respondent.

Sexual Harassment refers to comment or conduct of a sexual nature, when any one or more of the following conditions are satisfied:

- the conduct is engaged in or the comment is made by a person who knows or ought reasonably to know that the conduct or comment is unwanted or unwelcome;
- the conduct or comment is accompanied by a reward, or the expressed or implied promise of a reward, for compliance;
- the conduct or comment is accompanied by reprisal, or an expressed or implied threat of reprisal, for refusal to comply;
- the conduct or comment is accompanied by the actual denial of opportunity, or the expressed or implied threat of the denial of opportunity, for failure to comply;
- the conduct or comment is intended to, or has the effect of, creating an intimidating or hostile environment.

Such comment or conduct may include sexual advances; requests for sexual favours; suggestive and/or derogatory comments or gestures emphasizing sex or sexual orientation; or physical contact.

Dr. Birch stated that the report would be presented to the Board of Governors on January 20, 1995 for approval for a period of two years. It was brought to Senate's attention for review and comment because it will have an important effect on the lives of many students and members of faculty and staff. Dr. Sharon Kahn, Associate Vice- President, Equity, and Ms. Libby Nason, Vice-Provost, were responsible for a broadly consultative process in developing the policy and procedure. They were present to answer questions.

Dr. Shearer stated that although it was not his wish to delay implementation of the policy, a document with such far reaching academic implications should be examined by the Senate Committee on Academic Policy before bringing it to Senate for review and comment.

<i>Dr. Shearer</i>	}	<i>That the report on Harassment and Discrimination be referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy for review and comment and that the Academic Policy Committee be instructed to report back to Senate on this document no later than the March Senate meeting and that the Board be informed of this decision.</i>
<i>Mr. Gray</i>		

The chair noted that this motion contained two separate parts: a motion to postpone, which permits discussion only of the merits of postponement; and a motion to refer, which permits discussion of the substance of the report. A motion to postpone, however, takes precedence over a motion to refer, which means that the substance or content of the report cannot be discussed.

Not wishing to prevent discussion of the report, Dr. Shearer, with the agreement of Dr. Goldberg, withdrew the motion.

In response to Dr. Hollenberg's concern, Dr. Birch stated that actions taken to ameliorate conditions of disadvantage of visible minorities, native Canadians and the disabled are not considered discriminatory. He emphasized that the university's commitment is to enhance the representativeness of its student body and employees and the participation of those people identified as members of equity groups.

Dr. Kahn noted that the University's Employment Equity Policy is exempt from a complaint of discrimination under the Act.

Dr. Cook felt it was important to note, that in 1990, Senate had approved an Awards and Financial Aid policy to take affirmative action by providing financial support for particular groups such as women, native students, the disabled and other visible minorities, as well as for students from outside the Lower Mainland.

<i>Dr. Shearer</i>	}	<i>That the report on Harassment and Discrimination be referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy for review and comment and that the Academic Policy Committee be instructed to report back to Senate on this document no later than the March Senate meeting and that the Board be informed of this decision.</i>
<i>Dean Goldberg</i>		

Dean J. Grace opposed the motion to postpone the report to the March Senate meeting because it had already been widely debated and published and that it did not fall within the purview of the Senate Academic Policy Committee.

The motion was
put and defeated.

Dr. Kahn reported that the equity office staff includes three advisors each of whom has a Master's degree, two in Counselling Psychology and one in Social Work.

Dean Goldberg expressed concern over the implications of this policy on academic freedom. Ms. Nason referred to paragraph 9 which dealt with such issues.

In response to Dr. S. Grace's suggestion of including a reference to grading practices, Dr. Kahn replied that paragraph 9 (a) had been added specifically to cover this issue. The right to mark and evaluate students was considered a bona fide occupational requirement in a professorial role. The statement on instructional practices covered the right to evaluate students on the basis of their classroom performance.

Dean Hollenberg felt that senators should "stand up and be counted" on a policy with such profound implications for the academic functioning of the university and was prepared to move a motion be made for approval.

Dr. Birch recognized that there seemed to be some discomfort dealing with the report without prior consideration by the Senate Academic Policy. He stated that during the developmental process, he had asked the Senate Academic Policy Committee to make recommendations, but the chair of the committee did not consider it appropriate to do so.

<i>Dr. Hollenberg</i>	}	<i>That we approve the policy on Harassment and Discrimination.</i>
<i>Dr. Kelsey</i>		

Carried.

Policy on Scholarly Integrity

Dr. Birch presented the following policy and procedures for information:

PREAMBLE:

The University recognizes that teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity are most likely to flourish in a climate of academic freedom. Since the conditions for proper teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity are quite different depending upon the discipline, individual investigators are expected to assume direct responsibility for the intellectual and ethical quality of their work.

The university community has always recognized the necessity for maintaining the highest ethical standards in the conduct of scholarly activities. The University of British Columbia has developed this policy to communicate expectations, increase awareness of integrity issues, and encourage scholars (be they students or members of faculty and staff) to assume personal responsibility.

PURPOSE:

- to promote scholarly integrity among scholars, in order to maintain and enhance the value of impartiality that universities offer society;
- to proscribe activities which breach generally acceptable standards of scholarly conduct;
- to provide a process for dealing with allegations of scholarly misconduct quickly.

POLICY:

UBC is responsible for developing awareness among all students and members of faculty and staff involved in teaching and scholarly activities of the need for the highest standards of integrity, accountability and responsibility.

UBC holds scholars responsible for scholarly and scientific rigour and integrity in teaching and research, in obtaining, recording and analyzing data and in presenting, reporting and publishing results, through such means as:

- evaluating the work of students in a fair manner;
- giving appropriate recognition, including authorship, to those who have made an intellectual contribution to the contents of the publication, and only those people; using unpublished work of other researchers and scholars only with permission and with due acknowledgment; and using archival material in accordance with the rules of the archives;
- obtaining the permission of the author before using new information, concepts or data originally obtained through access to confidential manuscripts or applications for funds for research or training that may have been seen as a result of processes such as peer review;
- maintaining confidentiality guarantees to research subjects;
- using research funds in accordance with the terms and conditions under which those funds were received;
- revealing to the University, journals, sponsors, funding agencies or those requesting opinions, any conflict of interest, financial or other, that might influence their decisions on whether the individual should be asked to review manuscripts or applications, test products or be permitted to undertake work sponsored from outside sources. (See Policy #97, Conflict of Interest.)

UBC investigates allegations of scholarly misconduct in a timely, impartial and accountable manner and takes appropriate action, including any necessary steps to preserve evidence, when it finds that scholarly misconduct has occurred.

PROCEDURE SUMMARY:

In order to maintain integrity in teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity and to avoid misconduct, members involved in teaching, research, scholarship and professional/creative activity shall in particular:

- evaluate the work of students fairly;
- recognize and acknowledge the intellectual contribution of others;
- not use new information obtained through access to confidential manuscripts or applications seen as a result of peer review;
- use scholarly and scientific rigour in obtaining, recording and analyzing data and in reporting results;

- ensure that authors of published work include all and only those who have intellectually contributed;
- maintain integrity in using research funds.

Acts of scholarly misconduct may be committed with varying degrees of deliberateness. It is recognized that the borderline between carelessness and negligence, on the one hand, and intentional dishonesty, on the other, may be very narrow. The result is objectionable in any case, even if different degrees of discipline are appropriate.

Careful supervision of new members of faculty and staff by their supervisors and department heads is in the best interest of the institution, the supervisor, the trainee and the scholarly/scientific community. The complexity of scholarly and scientific methods, the necessity for caution in interpreting possibly ambiguous data, the need for advanced analysis, and the variety of protocols for reporting research data all require an active role for the supervisor in the guidance of new investigators.

Principal and co-investigators who have failed to exercise reasonable care in directing and supervising researchers who have committed academic misconduct share in the blame and should be disciplined accordingly.

A factor in many cases of alleged scholarly/scientific misconduct has been the absence of a complete set of verifiable data. The retention of accurately recorded and retrievable results is of utmost importance. For instance, in many scientific departments, a record of the primary data must be maintained in the laboratory and cannot be removed.

A gradual diffusion of responsibility for multi-authored or collaborative studies could lead to the publication of papers for which no single author is prepared to take full responsibility. Two safeguards in the publication of accurate reports are the active participation of each co-author in verifying that part of a manuscript that falls within his/her specialty area and the designation of one author who takes responsibility through reasonable care for the validity of the entire manuscript.

Formal procedures for the investigation of allegations of scholarly misconduct are essential to assure the protection of the rights of all those involved in the case until the basis of the allegations can be examined and a resolution of the problem can be determined.

DETAILED PROCEDURES:

Source of Allegation(s)

The initial report of suspected misconduct may come from various sources within or without the University. For example, the allegation may come from an individual member of faculty or staff, a student, a member of the general public, a media report, a group of individuals, a granting source or from a University administrator.

Initial Disposition of Allegations

Allegations of scholarly misconduct received by an Administrative Head of Unit may be handled in one of three ways:

- the Head may look into the matter and deal directly with it, reporting the disposition of the case to the Dean;
- the Head may look into the matter and make a recommendation for its disposition to the Dean;
- the Head may make a recommendation to the Dean that it be referred to the Vice President Academic & Provost for investigation.

Authority of the Dean and Vice President Academic & Provost

The Dean and the Vice President Academic & Provost have the authority: to close down and declare "off limits" facilities used for research; to obtain and retain relevant documentation (e.g., lab notes, computer disks, hard drives) related to an investigation; to request that members of the university community appear before an investigative committee and answer its questions or supply materials to it.

Allegations Referred to the Vice President Academic & Provost

The Vice President may choose to refer the matter back to the unit or to dismiss the allegation. If in the judgement of the Vice President or designate the allegations have sufficient substance to warrant investigation, he/she informs the student(s) and/or employee(s) named in the allegation, in writing. The written notice summarizes the allegation in sufficient detail to allow the individual(s) concerned an opportunity to respond. Responses received are forwarded to the investigative committee if established.

Appointment of Investigating Committee

The Vice President Academic & Provost or designate appoints an Investigative Committee consisting of three experienced members, one external to UBC, and all at arms length from both the person(s) alleging misconduct and the person(s) alleged to have misconducted themselves. The terms of reference of the Investigative Committee are to determine if scholarly misconduct has occurred, and if so, its extent and seriousness. The Committee elects one of its members as Chair.

As this is an internal investigative process, proceedings are conducted in private and persons alleged to have misconducted themselves are not entitled to representation by legal counsel when they meet with the Investigative Committee.

In cases of collaborative research involving other institutions, it may be desirable to conduct either parallel investigations, or a joint investigation, with appropriate changes to the procedures outlined below. Whichever method is chosen, UBC will cooperate fully with other institutions.

Investigation within Sixty Days

Due to the sensitive nature of allegations of scholarly misconduct, the inquiry by the Investigative Committee should be completed and a draft report prepared within sixty days of the initial written notification to the

respondent(s). In complex cases a full report may not be possible in this time frame, but some assessment must be prepared within three months.

Considerations for the Investigative Committee

The Committee aims to review all scholarly activity with which the individual has been involved during the period of time considered pertinent in relation to the allegation, including any abstracts, papers or other methods of scholarly communication. A special audit of accounts may also be performed on the sponsored research accounts of the involved individual(s).

The Committee has the right to see any University documents and question any students or members of faculty and staff during its investigation.

The Committee ensures that it is cognizant of all real or apparent conflicts of interest on the part of those involved in the inquiry, including both those accused and those making the allegations.

It may seek impartial expert opinions, as necessary and appropriate, to ensure the investigation is thorough and authoritative.

In the investigation process, the persons alleged to have engaged in misconduct have the right to know all allegations against them and the right to respond fully.

Review of Draft Report

The involved individual, any collaborators or supervisor related to the investigation are given reasonable opportunity to review and comment on the draft report.

Findings and Recommendations of the Investigative Committee

The Investigative Committee, upon reviewing all the elements in the case, will report on its finding of whether or not scholarly misconduct occurred, and, if so, its extent and seriousness. If the allegations are proven on a balance of probabilities, the Investigative Committee shall also make recommendations in its report on the need to:

- withdraw all pending relevant publications;
- notify editors of publications in which the involved research was reported;
- redefine the status of the involved individuals;
- ensure that the units involved are informed about appropriate practices for promoting the proper conduct of research;
- inform any outside funding agency of the results of the inquiry and of actions to be taken;
- recommend any disciplinary action to be taken.

If the allegations are not substantiated, the Committee may make recommendations in its report on the need for remedies.

The report is considered a private, not public document.

Materials from the Investigation

The Chair of the Committee will keep copies of all materials that have been collected and hand them over to the Vice President Academic & Provost or designate within the President's Office, along with the Committee's report.

Report to the Appropriate Administrative Head of Unit within 75 days

For students, the Administrative Head of Unit with authority to receive and act on the Committee's report is the President; for members of staff, it is the Director or Head of Department; for members of faculty, the authority may be either the President or the Dean/Head, depending on the nature of the discipline contemplated. (The Agreement on Conditions of Appointment states that only the President may discipline a faculty member by dismissal or suspension without pay.) The individual receiving the Committee's report consults with the President, the Vice President Academic & Provost, the Vice President Research, the Dean, and if appropriate the Head of Department, about its report. In cases where scholarly misconduct is judged to have occurred, the Vice President Academic & Provost, the Vice President Research, the Dean, the Head and the President will discuss appropriate action based on the nature and seriousness of the misconduct.

Appeal of Discipline

Discipline imposed for scholarly misconduct may be appealed:

- By Faculty members in the Bargaining Unit: through the grievance procedure outlined in Section 21 of the Agreement on the Framework for Collective Bargaining with the Faculty Association or Section 10 of the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment.
- By Staff Members in Unions: through the grievance procedure established in the relevant collective agreements.
- By Management and Professional Staff: through the grievance procedure established in the Framework Agreement (yet to be negotiated).
- By Employees not covered above: directly to the President in writing.
- By Students: through the Senate Committee on Student Appeals on Student Discipline.

Protection of Reputation

When no scholarly misconduct is found, every effort will be made by the Vice President Academic & Provost to protect the reputation of the individual named from undue harm, as well as the reputation of the University. The Provost, Dean and Head may consult about any remedial steps that need to be taken in the circumstances.

Good Faith

In all proceedings and subsequent to a final decision, the University will undertake to assure that those making an allegation in good faith and without demonstrably malicious intent are protected from reprisals or harassment. False allegations made purposefully will give lead to discipline for the individual making the allegation by the University.

Annual Report

In order to disseminate information about issues this policy is intended to address, the Vice President Academic and Provost publishes annually a report summarizing the facts of cases of scholarly misconduct and their disposition.

Cross-References

See also, Policy # 87 - Research, Policy #88 - Patents and Licensing, Policy # 97 - Conflict of Interest, Statement on Academic Freedom in UBC Calendar.

DEFINITIONS:

Scholarly misconduct includes:

- plagiarism;
- fabrication or falsification of research data;
- conflict of scholarly interest, such as suppressing the publication of the work of another scholar;
- the unfair evaluation of a student's work;
- failure to obtain approvals for research involving animal and human subjects or to conduct such research in accordance with the protocols prescribed;
- other practices that deviate significantly from those which are acceptable as appropriate within scholarly communities;
- specific definitions or clarifications adopted by a Faculty of any matter in the points above and any other matter specifically defined by a Faculty as misconduct in scholarly activity, in order to ensure proper recognition of the standards appropriate to the scholarly communities within that Faculty, taking into account Codes of Professional Conduct where applicable; but
- "misconduct" does not include any matter involving only an honest difference of opinion, mistake or an honest error of judgment.

Scholarly Activity includes all activity that were it to be undertaken by a faculty member would be appropriate for inclusion on a curriculum vitae or in an Annual Report to the Head as teaching, scholarship, research or other creative/professional activity.

Falsification means alteration, selective omission or misrepresentation of research data or citations.

Fabrication means inventing or forging of research data or citations.

Plagiarism means representing the thoughts, writings or inventions of another as one's own.

Principal Investigator means the person who has ultimate responsibility for a research project. In the case of a project funded by an external or internal grant, normally the holder of the grant. In the case of a project that is not funded, the initiator of the project. The principal investigator is usually the supervisor of the research team (which may include other faculty members) and is usually a faculty member.

Dr. Birch stated that in 1994, the universities were notified by the granting Councils that a Policy On Scholarly Integrity must be in place to qualify for research grants . Ms. Nason was responsible for a very consultative process in the development of UBC's policy.

<i>Dr. Hollenberg</i>	}	<i>That the Policy on Scholarly Integrity be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. Grace</i>		

Mr. Brady commented that the policy appeared to focus on research, with little emphasis on teaching. Dr. Birch replied that integrity was used in the broad sense of honesty in the use of data, the use of evidence, and in the interaction with other scholars when they are peers or students.

In reply to a query about the definition of balance of probabilities, Dr. McDougall replied that it means "more likely to be one than the other," compared with "beyond reasonable doubt." Ms. Nason stated that in a court of law, matters of employment and discipline would be subject to a civil test, and the balance of probability would apply.

In reply to a query regarding financial conflict of interest, Ms. Nason stated that the "degree of interest" would be considered when reporting outside involvement and that the Conflict of Interest Policy approved in 1992 deals with this issue more comprehensively.

The motion was
put and carried.

Five Year Review of UBC's partnership agreements with the University Colleges

Referring to the report which had been circulated for information, Dr. Dr. Birch announced that many members of Senate had been involved in the development of the partnership agreements. He noted the early involvement of the chair and Dr. Shearer and more recently, Drs. Wynne, Sams and Ungerleider, who together with Ms. Nason, coordinated the preparation of budgets for submission to Victoria as well as the review report.

It was noted that legislation had been passed giving the university colleges the right to grant degrees independently. Preliminary discussions had taken place, but implementation had not yet occurred. Students who entered the third year of a degree program under UBC's aegis would be permitted to complete the program and receive the UBC degree.

Dr. Birch expressed deep appreciation to the faculty coordinators and to Ms. Nason for their important contribution.

The chair thanked Ms. Nason and Dr. Kahn for attending and participating in the discussions.

Senate then proceeded into in camera session.

Report of the Tributes Committee

Dean Goldberg, representing Dean McBride, chair of the Tributes Committee, recommended approval of Emeritus status for the following faculty members.

Anderson, John	Medical Microbiology	Professor
Brawner, Carroll O.	Mining & Mineral Process Eng.	Professor
Cayford, Afton H.	Mathematics	Assoc. Professor
Conway, John S.	History	Professor

Adjournment

Davies, Sandra Jo	Visual & Performing Arts in Educ	Ass't Professor
Dooling, Peter J.	Forest Resources Management	Assoc. Professor
McClelland, Paul Ross	School of Social Work	Ass't Professor
Modi, Vadilal J.	Mechanical Engineering	Professor
Niskala, Helena	Nursing	Assoc. Professor
Pennington, Garfield	Dep't of Curriculum Studies	Assoc. Professor
Pincus, Debra	Fine Arts	Assoc. Professor
Sobrino, Luis	Physics	Professor
Swanson, Charles A.	Mathematics	Professor
Szasz, George	Psychiatry	Professor
Thurlbeck, William M.	Pathology	Professor
Wall, Richard A.	Pharmacology & Therapeutics	Assoc. Professor
Vogt, Eric	Physics	Professor
Bogoch, A.	Medicine	Clinical Professor

Dean Goldberg } That the faculty members be awarded
Dr. Sloenecker } Emeritus status.

Carried.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Next meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on Wednesday, February 15, 1995.

Appendix

COURSE AND CURRICULUM PROPOSALS (PP. 11028-11037)

Note: The full text of this report to Senate is not included in the Minutes. Copies are available from the Associate Registrar, Senate & Curriculum Services. Many reports are also available on the Vancouver Senate website at www.senate.ubc.ca.