



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 MARCH 19, 1997

Attendance

Present: President D. W. Strangway, (Chair), Vice President Academic D. R. Birch, Dean F. S. Abbott, Dr. P. Adebar, Mr. P. J. Andru, Dr. D. R. Atkins, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dr. G. W. Bluman, Mr. J. Boritz, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. P. C. Burns, Ms. L. Chui, Dr. V. Froese, Dr. J. H. V. Gilbert, Ms. J. K. Gill, Mr. C. L. Gorman, Dean F. Granot, Rev. J. Hanrahan, Dr. P. G. Harrison, Dr. F. G. Herring, Dr. M. R. Ito, Mr. M. Kirchner, Dr. S. B. Knight, Mr. A. Legge, Mr. D. K. Leung, Dr. M. Levine, Professor P. T. K. Lin, Mr. T. P. T. Lo, Mr. S. Lohachitranont, Dr. D. M. Lyster, Dr. D. J. MacDougall, Dr. P. L. Marshall, Dr. K. May, Dean B. C. McBride, Mr. B. G. McDonald, Dr. W. R. McMaster, Mr. W. McMichael, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Dean A. Meisen, Mr. J. Murray, Dean S. Neuman, Mr. J. Nobbs-Thiessen, Mr. V. Pacradouni, Mr. T. Pang, Mr. R. L. de Pfyffer, Professor M. Quayle, Dean J. F. Richards, Dr. H. B. Richer, Dr. D. P. Rolfsen, Dr. H. J. Rosengarten, Dr. R. W. Schutz, Dean N. Sheehan, Mr. D. Shu, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Dean C. L. Smith, Ms. N. Sonik, Mr. A. H. Soroka, Ms. L. M. Sparrow, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. S. Thorne, Dr. W. Uegama, Dr. B. J. van der Kamp, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Mr. D. R. Verma, Dr. P. A. Vertinsky, Dr. D. Ll. Williams.

Regrets: Chancellor W. L. Sauder, Mr. S. Arnold, Dean C. S. Binkley, Professor P. T. Burns, Dean J. Cairns, Dean M. Goldberg, Dr. V. Gomel, Mr. H. D. Gray, Dr. A. G. Hannam, Dr. V. J. Kirkness, Mr. O. C. W. Lau, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Dr. M. MacEntee, Dr. R. J. Patrick, Dr. W. J. Phillips, Dr. M. Thompson, Dr. W. C. Wright Jr., Dr. R. A. Yaworsky, Dean E. H. K. Yen.

Agenda

Mr. Brady drew attention to the fact the Dr. Rolfsen's notice of motion had not been included on the agenda. He pointed out that section 3.5.6 of the Rules and Procedures of the Senate states that a notice of motion shall be on the agenda of the next regular meeting of Senate. It was agreed that the motion be placed on the agenda under business arising, and at that time the Chair would rule on whether or not the motion was out of order.

Senate membership

REPLACEMENT (*UNIVERSITY ACT*, SECTION 35(6))

Ms. Neena Sonik - replaces Mr. Anthony Briggs as student representative at-large

Minutes of the previous meetings

Dean Smith

Dr. MacDougall

} *That the minutes of the fifth regular meeting of Senate for the Session 1996-97, and minutes of the special meeting of February 5, 1997, having been circulated, be taken as read and adopted.*

Carried.

Business arising from the January 15, 1997 meeting

NOMINATING COMMITTEE (P.11585)

Senate representatives to serve on a Presidential Advisory Committee for the selection of a Vice-President Academic

Dr. Williams, chair of the committee, presented the report.

It was explained in the material circulated that, in February 1975, the Board of Governors and the Senate agreed to the following terms of reference and composition in establishing a committee for the recommendation and selection of candidates for the position of Vice-President:

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. To consider candidates for a Vice-President (Senior Academic Administrator) position.
2. To advise the President on the choice of a Vice-President (Senior Academic Administrator) in order that the President may make an appropriate recommendation to the Board of Governors.

MEMBERSHIP

To be composed as follows:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Chair | President-designate. |
| Secretary | To be chosen by the committee from its members. |
| Members | Three members of the Board of Governors, appointed by the President in consultation with the President-designate.
Three members of Senate, elected by Senate. |

The Nominating Committee nominated the following members of Senate to serve on the Presidential Advisory Committee for the selection of a Vice-President Academic:

- Mr. Christopher L. Gorman
- Professor Moura Quayle
- Dr. Harvey B. Richer

<i>Dr. Williams</i>	}	<i>That the recommendations of the Nominating Committee be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. MacDougall</i>		

Carried.

CHILD STUDY CENTRE

The Chair ruled that the notice of motion given by Dr. Rolfsen at the January 15, 1997 meeting, concerning the closure of the Child Study Centre, did not fall within the purview of Senate.

In accordance with section 3.7.13, Mr. Brady challenged the decision of the Chair. Senate voted in favour of allowing the motion to be presented.

<i>Mr. Brady</i>	}	<i>That Senate affirm its authority in decisions to close an academic unit and direct the President's Office to take no concrete actions or budgetary decisions regarding the Child Study Centre unless and until its closure has been approved by Senate; and</i>
<i>Mr. de Pfyffer</i>		
		<i>That Senate strike an ad hoc committee to study possibilities for restructuring the Child Study Centre for continued operation as an interdisciplinary or community-based facility. This committee shall report to Senate at its next meeting.</i>

It was agreed that the motion be considered seriatim. Therefore, if the first part of the motion were to be defeated, it would not be necessary to vote on the second part.

The Chair invited the Dean of the Faculty of Education to speak to the following report, which had been circulated:

The Child Study Centre at the University of British Columbia was established in 1961 by Dean Neville Scarfe. It was established at a time when there were few facilities in place for the study of young children. Pre-school programs and facilities offering daycare were not common in British Columbia in 1961 and the public school system did not include kindergarten. It was difficult for researchers to study young children. The establishment of the Child Study Centre provided research opportunities as well as the ability to demonstrate programs for young children.

In the intervening years lifestyles for parents and their children have changed, as has the interest in early education of children. There are today a variety of places where young children receive care and education and where researchers and people interested in program development can observe these activities. On the UBC campus there are the centres operated by UBC Child Care Services

and the Berwick Memorial Centre operated by the Vancouver/Richmond Association for Mentally Handicapped People. Within the City of Vancouver there are a variety of programs: daycare, pre-school, and a combination of these. Kindergarten has become a part of the public school system.

Most child study centres associated with major research institutions (and there are fewer and fewer of these today) have a three-fold mandate. That mandate includes:

- research (that is, a site available for faculty and student research);
- program demonstration/training for both pre-service and in-service students and for curriculum development; and
- leadership in the early childhood education field through institutes, conferences, development of multi-media resources, and the dissemination of materials.

The Child Study Centre has operated with this three-fold mandate.

A recent external review conducted by Dr. Patricia Canning, Associate Dean of Graduate Programs and Research in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University of Newfoundland, and Dr. Douglas Powell, Professor and Head of the Department of Child Development and Family Studies at Purdue University, Indiana, has indicated that the Child Study Centre is having difficulty meeting this three-fold mandate. There are a number of constraints on the Centre which interfere with the full realization of the goals for such a centre.

A major constraint with respect to research at the Child Study Centre is the absence of a population from which research results would be generalizable. Although the Centre's student population has included a few children with special needs and children for whom English is a second language, the students are "drawn" from a group which is relatively homogeneous in terms of its educational and socio-economic characteristics. Even the special needs children and the children for whom English is a second language do not approximate their distribution in the larger population of children. As a consequence, generalizing from results of studies conducted at the Centre would be difficult, if not impossible. It would be fair to say that some researchers in our Faculty have not conducted research at the Centre because of this limitation.

A second constraint is the lack of degree programs in early childhood education. This means that there are few faculty or students to provide support and assistance, and do research. It means that the facility is not used as a practicum and demonstration site by our students and faculty do not have a major interest in studying or developing innovative curriculum approaches to working with young children.

Third, there is a weak infrastructure, including a lack of financial resources within the Institution and the Faculty to generate and support research and innovative program development work.

The review concluded: "It is difficult to justify continued university support of the Child Study Centre in its current condition. It must be emphasized that

parents hold the Centre in high regard, teachers are well trained and dedicated, and the programs appear to be stimulating, creative and appropriate. The reviewers' concerns result from the fact that the Centre is not able to fulfill its clearly articulated mandate. Its role as a university-based centre must be questioned. Many of these criticisms would not apply if the UBC Child Study Centre were a community-based program."

Given the mandate of the Child Study Centre, the constraints in fulfilling that mandate as identified most recently by the reviewers but which have been discussed over the years by faculty and administrators within the Faculty of Education, the decision was taken to close the Centre effective June 30, 1997. In making this decision the Faculty wishes to reaffirm its commitment to early childhood education and to the inclusion of a variety of different approaches to the education of young children. We believe that we need to focus our work on critical and emerging needs in the early childhood field through our graduate programs and to test these ideas in many existing community facilities.

The Child Study Centre building, which was developed for the use of young children, will continue to be used for that purpose. The Board of Governors, at its meeting of February 6, 1997 passed a resolution which referred "the question of appropriate use of the Child Study Centre in the future for early childhood education or daycare to the University Administration for its decision...." Darcelle Cottons, Director of UBC Child Care Services and Mary Risebrough, Director of Housing and Conferences have invited input from the University Community on the kinds of programs which should be offered in September. They have had a first meeting with the current CSC parents whose children will be given priority in the program and they have had meetings with some faculty members from Education who have suggestions for the operation of the facility.

I am confident that programs, e.g. kindergarten, pre-school, day care, will be operating in the facility in September and available to more children for longer periods of time. It is expected that any programs housed in the Child Study Centre building will provide a climate hospitable to research and education.

I regret that it was necessary to make the decision to close the Child Study Centre. I believe this decision is in the best interests of the early childhood education program in the Faculty, one that will encourage research and scholarship on the education of young children using a number of approaches and in a variety of settings.

Dean Sheehan elaborated on the report stating that in making this decision, the Faculty wished to reaffirm its commitment to early childhood education and to the inclusion of a variety of different approaches to the education of young children. The Faculty believed that their work should be focussed on critical and emerging needs in the early childhood field through graduate programs and to test these ideas in many existing community facilities.

Dean Sheehan explained that there are differing views about childhood and early education that are based on philosophical, theoretical and cultural notions about young children. She stated that these differing view are especially important in a multicultural society and they produce a variety of orientations and program models. For example, some programs are of the direct instruction type, teacher-taught programs often with an academic or a literacy base. Others are developmentally based. That is, they use practices and policies that reflect the nature of the child. Some programs support an environmentalist theory. The teacher's role is to structure the environment for learning, but then have little direct involvement in that learning. Others have a play-based orientation. Many programs are a mixture of these theories and models. Based on this background, Dean Sheehan made three points:

1. The Faculty believes that its researchers and graduate students need to continue and to increase research in early childhood education through involvement in a wide range of programs, based on a variety of theoretical constructs, and which house different groups of children. This research needs to be longitudinal. For example, following groups of children through pre-school, kindergarten and primary. It needs to be comparable so that various approaches can be assessed, and needs studies that build on previous research. These approaches are critical when considering the differential impact of pre-school programs, multicultural populations, and children in the inner-city, or on those with a range of disabilities. Graduate students should be provided with exposure to the range of theories and programs available in the lower mainland, as well as having the opportunity to conduct research, either within the single paradigm of ECE or across program lines.
2. While employing graduate students is an important training in any research intensive Faculty, using them as assistant teachers may not be the most conducive assignment for their growth. A research intensive or academically oriented graduate program in early childhood education uses graduate students in research or academic assistant roles. These assignments provide the experience necessary for learning the breadth and depth of the field of pre-school education. A vibrant ECE program with a pre-school emphasis is necessary, and this includes faculty with doctoral level training in the pre-school aspects of early childhood, as well as a critical mass of faculty and graduate students conducting research specifically in pre-school settings.
3. There are opportunities to enhance the diploma and teacher education programs. Observation in the diverse types of pre-schools available in the Vancouver area would be a natural consideration for the diploma courses, for example ECED 343 Pre-Kindergarten Instruction, and ECED 43A Observation and Reporting. Even

more exciting is the opportunity to enhance the teacher education program. As of September 1996, the UBC elementary two-year program provided students with the opportunity to acquire broad preparation for teaching in the elementary classroom as well as specialized preparation in one of six areas, one being early childhood/primary. This specialization helps to develop knowledge and skills in meeting the learning needs of young children. The courses in that specialization are ECED 405 Introduction to Curriculum Development in the Primary Program, ECED 415 Introduction to Instruction in the Primary Program, Language Education 333 Primary Drama and 341 Introduction to Teaching Children's Literature. The Faculty believes that if there is continued interest in this initiative, arrangements might be made for student teachers in this specialization to visit, observe, and work with children in the daycare and pre-schools connected with the elementary schools hosting their practica. This will provide student teachers with a seamless approach to the learning needs of young children from pre-school and kindergarten to the primary grades. This makes sense in preparing teachers to understand the pedagogical requirements and the learning needs of children in primary grades.

Dean Sheehan felt that the encouragement of research and observation in a wide range of programs, the employment of graduate students in research or academic assistant roles rather than as assistant teachers, and a more seamless approach to teacher education for those interested in teaching at the primary level, were positive implications for research and teaching. These, she said, are examples of what the Faculty needs to encourage and support as it moves away from a reliance on the Child Study Centre, which has been convenient for researchers and graduate students, and which has drained energy from a broad and more comprehensive approach to early childhood education in the Faculty.

Senate agreed with the decision of the Chair to allow Mr. J. Stuart Clyne, a lawyer acting for the Parents' Association, to make a presentation to Senate.

Mr. Clyne explained that the Child Study Centre was established in 1961 and that the present site was constructed by the government and handed over to the Faculty of Education for the express purpose of a child study centre to be operated by the Faculty. He stated that the centre involved approximately 153 children and approximately 250 parents. The staff includes a director, associate director, four full-time teaching

positions and eight graduate assistants. The centre is used not only by those in the centre but also by faculty members. Mr. Clyne referred to the section of the *University Act* that gives Senate the power to recommend to the Board of Governors the establishment or discontinuance of any faculty, department, course of instruction, etc. He noted that Board of Governors had stated that action or debate by Senate of the academic issues was not precluded. He stated that the issue was whether or not the Centre is an academic unit. Mr. Clyne felt that the following points were evidence that the Centre had been treated as an academic unit:

1. UBC Policy and Procedure Handbook - Policy #22 concerns reappointment of Heads of academic units (Head may include Director of Centre). Mr. Clyne noted that Dr. Dixon is the Director of the Centre.
2. CSC is subject to internal evaluation like other centres which are academic units in the Faculty of Education.
3. CSC is subject to external evaluation process like any other University or Faculty academic unit.
4. The external review report identified three mandates of the CSC which are academically oriented. (Noted on page 3 of the external evaluation report.)
5. At the CSC, 5 undergraduate courses were taught by Centre staff up to the end of 1966. Two post-graduate courses are still taught there.
6. The Academic Equipment Fund monies available to academic units and centres in the Faculty of Education are also available to the CSC.
7. The holiday closures of the Centre coincide with the University schedule ("The University sees the CSC as a Centre not as a preschool". Extract from 1991 memo to Dr. Dixon from Assoc. Dean of Education.)
8. The CSC has three Advisory Committees: Parent, Research, and General Advisory. (Parents are involved in two of the three committees.) Mr. Clyne suggested that advisory committees are all part of the trappings of academic units.
9. The Faculty of Education Internet web site publication includes the CSC as one of the five Centres listed as academic units within the Faculty.

Mr. Clyne suggested that the above points indicate that the Centre is indeed an academic unit, particularly point 9.

Mr. Clyne drew attention to the conclusions of the external evaluation report, which he said was the basis for the Dean's action in closing down the Centre. It was stated in the report that it was difficult to justify continued University support of the Child Study Centre in its current condition. It was also stated that its role as a university-based centre must be questioned. However, the report did not say that the Centre must be closed down. Mr. Clyne said that discussions about the future of the Centre never occurred, although the external reviewer said these discussion should take place to determine whether the unit is viable. Mr. Clyne gave Senate information about the heterogeneous population, stating that 46% are ESL children, 14% are special needs children, and 12% are children of parents living in student housing at UBC. He stated that if this is a concern, it was never discussed. Among other points raised by Mr. Clyne was the fact that in March 1995, the Dean had sent a memo to the Director of the Centre stating that the University and the Faculty of Education had no intention of closing the Child Study Centre. In December 1996, however, after receiving the report, the Dean informed the Director that the Centre was closing. The normal procedures of circulating reviews to those concerned to give them an opportunity to respond were not followed in this case. Mr. Clyne stated that parents were given six months notice, and they are naturally concerned as they will have difficulty finding anything similar to this Centre. Mr. Clyne said that it was not just parents who were concerned, and referred to the many letters of concern sent to the University, mostly by educators, school trustees, early childhood educators, and teachers at various community colleges. Mr. Clyne noted that parents and staff were involved by the external evaluation committee before it wrote its report. However, after the report was delivered, neither the parents nor the staff were consulted again, and within two weeks the Centre was disbanded.

On behalf of the parents and staff, Mr. Clyne suggested that Senate consider a resolution that this whole matter of the closure, and the academic outcome of the closure, be referred to a committee to review the matter with the parties concerned and report its conclusions at the next meeting.

Vice President Birch informed Senate that the Child Study Centre had not been established by Senate and the Board, which is the usual procedure for the establishment of an academic unit. In 1956, at the request of the B.C. Pre-School Education Association, a Senate committee was established to consider the question of approaches to supporting research with young children. That committee declined to act on the establishment of a child study centre, but agreed that the then Dean of the Faculty of Education could establish one, provided it did not come out of the University budget. Vice President Birch therefore disagreed with Mr. Clyne's arguments that the Centre was an academic unit. He stated that the appointment of the Director of the Child Study Centre is not approved by the Board of Governors and is not handled under Policy #22, as is the case with appointments of Directors of academic centres. With regard to internal and external evaluations, Vice President Birch explained that many non-academic units on campus are subject to such evaluations but that no-one would argue that they are academic units. As far as courses being taught by Centre staff is concerned, Vice President Birch stated that the staff had academic appointments as lecturers, which was appropriate. He explained that many people, including School District staff, do that, but you would not call the School District a university academic unit because its staff are appointed to teach education courses. Vice President Birch went on to refute the remainder of the points made by Mr. Clyne that the Centre is an academic unit.

Vice President Birch referred to the motion passed by the Board of Governors, stating that he wished to make it clear that the closure of the Centre was not a Board

action. He stated that the Centre is a facility supporting the academic mission of the Faculty of Education, and the decision lay within the Faculty of Education. The Board, after hearing a great deal of input, chose to pass a motion endorsing the Dean's decision but did not make it a closure by decision of the Board. The Board noted that the Senate had requested a report from the Dean on the academic issues related to the Centre. This did not, however, make the Centre an academic unit and did not make the closing of the Centre within the purview of Senate. He agreed that it was within the purview of Senate to express its concerns about the impact on academic matters, and that was the meaning of the Board's motion when it said that its endorsing of the Dean's decision did not preclude Senate taking action on the academic issues.

In response to a query, the chair of the Senate Agenda Committee, Dean Richards, stated that the primary reason for the Agenda Committee's recommendation was that the Centre was not created by the Senate, and that the creation of an academic unit requires the approval of the Senate and the Board of Governors. As this was not the case, it seemed clear to the committee that this was not an academic unit and therefore, by definition, the closing of the Centre was not a matter for discussion in Senate, although the academic implications from such a closure were within the purview of Senate.

Dean Sheehan stated the decision to close the Centre had been very difficult. She had made it based on the review report, and based on the fact that she did not know how this kind of a decision could be debated. Dean Sheehan informed Senate that on February 25th, the Faculty of Education defeated a motion to the effect that the President's Office and the Board of Governors take no further action or budgetary decisions regarding the Child Study Centre until the closure of the Centre had been approved by the Faculty of Education.

Dr. Thorne stated that whether or not the Centre was technically an academic unit, there were clearly teaching and research implications. She expressed concern at the lack of appropriate consultation, particularly in this case where the issue is of social concern. Dr. Thorne said she had not found reasons in any of the reports that the decision to close the Centre needed to be made immediately, and felt that appropriate consultation was an issue Senate ought to continue to consider.

In response, Dean Sheehan explained that the decision to close the Centre was not taken without thought or without listening to people in the Faculty who had talked about the Centre over the years. She stated that many times since 1961 there had been attempts within the Faculty to debate whether or not the Child Study Centre should close. Those debates took place because the Faculty was concerned about the type of research and about the limited heterogeneity of the population in the Centre. Discussions took place during the 1970's, in 1982 and in 1985. Each time the Faculty began to put a committee together to look at the future of the Child Study Centre it backed away from the debate because of the concerns in the community, and because of the pressure that began to be made on the faculty members. Dean Sheehan said as she looked at this history, at the report that she had received, and at the difficulties that were continuing in the Centre despite attempts over the years to rectify them, she did not feel that this was a decision that could be taken in consultation.

Mr. McDonald expressed his frustration that despite the fact that Senate was discussing this issue, the decision had already been made and it appeared there was nothing Senate could do about it. He agreed that perhaps all the problems that the Dean and the external review talked about were completely valid and that the best thing would be to close the Centre eventually, but to close it with only nine months notice for students to find new places to do their theses, and for parents to find spots for their children was ludicrous, in his opinion.

Dr. May spoke in support of the decision made by the Dean of Education, stating that she would be loathe to take an action as a senator which overrides a decision previously taken in the Faculty of Education.

Mr. Lin felt that the wrong issue was being debated. He thought that what was at issue were the goals and priorities of the University. He was concerned that by closing the Centre it could appear to educators that UBC might be backing away from its commitment to educating educators in the very crucial and important area of early childhood research. He suggested that the focus of discussion should be on how to find ways of making up for what the Centre performed.

Dean Sheehan reaffirmed the Faculty's commitment to improve the early childhood program, and emphasized that early childhood education should not be confused with the Child Study Centre, which is only one facility which offers pre-school and kindergarten programs.

In response to a query by Rev. Hanrahan, Dean Sheehan stated that, in discussions with Ms. Mary Risebrough, the Director of Housing, a commitment had been made that children now in the Child Study Centre would have priority for the programs that will begin there in September. Dean Sheehan noted that on March 11, there had been a meeting at the Centre with the parents of children currently enrolled there to discuss the kinds of programs that might be available in September and what parents would like. She felt that the University was reaching out to accommodate their needs.

Dean Sheehan said she could not guarantee that the 153 children enrolled at the Centre could be accommodated, but stated that the University would do its best to accommodate parents who wished their children to attend the Centre. She said that some parents had found other places for their children.

Vice President Birch informed Senate that one of the things that had been done with the input received so far, was to define an initial set of programs so that demand and interest could be ascertained. He said Senate should be clear that parents who had placed their children in the Child Study Centre in many instances had done so because they were not interested in things which appeared more like child care, so in talking about accommodating children in the Centre it should be realized that although there will be a variety of programs they will not be identical to the program that had existed. He did not want to underestimate the level of concern of parents, but at the same time the University had committed to giving priority to any of the children registered this year. Vice President Birch said that an initial set of four programs had been defined, and approximately half the capacity of the Child Study Centre is being retained to develop further programming in consultation with those who are interested in early childhood education, either parents in the community or others who are interested.

In response to a query by Dean Granot, Dean Sheehan confirmed that graduate and undergraduate students currently using the Centre as a laboratory would be able to continue the research they are now doing.

Mr. Clyne said that it was his understanding that only approximately 20 children could be accommodated in the new programs.

Senate agreed that the Director of Housing could respond to this statement. Ms. Risebrough informed Senate that the purpose of the meeting held with the parents last week was to define programs that might be offered and was not a meeting to present programs already defined. She explained that Ms. Darcelle Cottons had drawn up some concepts for discussion. They talked about a toddler activity program, which would be a four-and-a-half hour program, with a maximum of eight children. This is the type of

care, she said, that student families most desperately need on campus, and for which there is the longest waiting list. With a program of that length they would be eligible for full child care subsidy from the provincial government. However, this was a program that parents with children currently enrolled in the Child Study Centre had very little interest in because it did not meet their specific needs. A four-hour per day pre-school program for two to four year olds was also proposed, with a maximum of 20 children, and if there was demand, a junior kindergarten class that would have a maximum of 20 children and a two-and-a-half-hour pre-school program in another classroom. All of these were options for discussion. Some parents said their only interest was a two-and-a-half-hour pre-school program, part or full-time. Ms. Risebrough stated that if they were looking at the four programs presented that night, there was only one program that met that specific need, but all of those programs, four classes, were available first to the children currently enrolled in the Centre. Ms. Risebrough said that opportunities were there to collaborate and the parents at the meeting know that that was what was stated.

The question was called, and the first part of the motion, "That Senate affirm its authority in decisions to close an academic unit and direct the President's Office to take no concrete actions or budgetary decisions regarding the Child Study Centre unless and until its closure has been approved by Senate." was put and lost.

As previously agreed, it was now unnecessary to discuss the second part of the motion.

Chair's remarks and related questions

HONORARY DEGREES

President Strangway announced that the following had accepted invitations to receive honorary degrees at the 1997 Congregation ceremonies:

Proposal for a new student orientation day on the first day of classes

- Sally Aw Sian
- Cheung-Kok Choi
- J. Haig deB. Farris
- Richard J. Goldstone
- Thomas Bernard Heppner
- Clarence Thomas Jules
- Raymond Urgel Lemieux
- David Lemon
- Shinroku Morohashi
- Masateru Ohnami
- Alfred John Scow
- Roy Lewis Taylor
- P. Roy Vagelos, M.D.

STUDENT SENATORS

On behalf of Senate, President Strangway expressed thanks and appreciation to those student senators who were attending their last meeting, and presented them with certificates in recognition of their service to Senate.

Proposal for a new student orientation day on the first day of classes

Dr. Neil Guppy, Associate Dean of Arts, was invited to speak to this item. Dr. Guppy explained that the intent of the proposal was to start a new tradition at UBC, commencing September 2, to welcome all new students, in particular first year students and students transferring from other institutions, in an effort to make them feel part of the UBC community. He said that this would be integrated with a variety of orientation programs that already exist, run by the Alma Mater Society and Faculties, in order to let students know that the undergraduate program is important. Dr. Guppy presented overheads to illustrate the proposed orientation program, emphasizing that the first day that students attend UBC is one of the most important days of their lives. He stated that UBC would like to celebrate this by telling students what they need to know to be successful academically and to integrate into the university community. First-Year Arts student Danny Nguyen was then introduced to Senate and Danny shared with Senate his experiences on his

first day at UBC, stating that he was very proud and excited at having been accepted as a UBC student. However, his first impression was not as special as he had hoped it would be in that he was not aware of any programs that were in place to welcome students and help them navigate their way around campus. He felt that the introduction of a new orientation day program would make the transition from high school to university less daunting and that students would be able to maintain the feeling of excitement at becoming a UBC student.

Ms. Lica Chui, student senator, congratulated the University on taking this step towards orienting new students in order to give them a sense of pride and spirit at becoming a part of UBC, which she felt was something UBC had lacked in the past.

From the Board of Governors

NOTIFICATION OF APPROVAL IN PRINCIPLE OF SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- i. Change in name of the Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (p.11584)
- ii. Establishment within the Faculty of Arts of the Sing Tao School of Journalism (pp.11576-8)
- iii. Curriculum proposals from the Faculties of Agricultural Sciences, Arts, Commerce, Dentistry, Graduate Studies, School of Human Kinetics, Law, Medicine, School of Nursing, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, and the School of Rehabilitation Sciences. (11577-83 & 11587-95)

Reports of Committees of Senate

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Dr. Burns, chair of the committee, presented the report. The committee recommended adoption of the following policy:

Senate reaffirms the value of the long standing policy of not scheduling classes between 12:30 and 2:30 p.m. on Thursdays whenever possible. Department Heads should ensure that their staff adhere to this policy. When classes are held at this time they should be reported to the Registrar who will inform the Department Head.

<i>Dr. Burns</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the adoption of the above policy.</i>
<i>Dean McBride</i>		

Dr. Burns explained that the issue of whether to continue the policy of not scheduling classes between 12:30 and 2:30 p.m. on Thursdays had been brought to the committee by the Registrar in response to a request from a faculty member who wished to use that time slot. The committee considered the matter carefully from the point of view of students, for whom this policy was primarily designed, in order to give them an opportunity to schedule other activities for those who wished to take part. He also noted that faculty have found this a very useful time slot for scheduling discussions with visiting scholars. The committee could find no evidence to confirm that the pressures have increased to such a level that the University must regrettably remove this established custom from its Calendar format. The committee therefore recommended maintaining the practice. He suggested that people who find that they cannot schedule classes at any other time should inform the Registrar's Office and the Department Head so that at least there is a body of objective evidence should the committee have to revisit this issue at a future date.

Dean McBride spoke strongly in favour of the motion, stating that it would be a mistake to change the policy. He did not doubt that the evidence to use this time slot was already available, but he thought that there were better alternatives, such as lengthening the day by starting earlier. He felt that it would be to the detriment of both students and faculty if Senate were to change the policy and urged Senate to look for other means to solve the problem.

The motion was
put and carried.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Dr. Harrison, chair of the committee, presented the report.

School of Nursing

Dr. Harrison reminded Senate that in January it had approved a major reorganization of the School of Nursing curriculum. He explained that the proposal before Senate will bring the admission procedures and requirements into line with the new curriculum. He noted that on page 1a. of the proposal, French 11 should read "French 11 or other language 11".

<i>Dr. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That the revised admission requirements for the School of Nursing be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. Berger</i>		

Carried.

Faculty of Forestry

Dr. Harrison reported that the proposal from the Faculty of Forestry was to add Chemistry 12 as a requirement for students applying for admission to the B.Sc. in Natural Resources and Conservation.

<i>Dr. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That the addition of Chemistry 12 as a requirement for admission to the B.Sc. program in Natural Resources and Conservation be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. Bluman</i>		

Carried.

CONTINUING STUDIES

Review of Continuing Education at UBC April 1, 1995 - March 31, 1996

Dr. Vanderstoep, chair of the committee, spoke briefly to the report which had been submitted to Senate for information. Dr. Vanderstoep noted that the report had been streamlined in comparison to the previous format. The intent was to provide an overview of continuing education activities presented at the university, many of which had been developed by, or in partnership with, academic units.

Dr. Vanderstoep encouraged members of Senate to read the report in order to gain a greater appreciation of the extent of continuing studies activities at UBC.

<i>Dr. Vanderstoep</i>	}	<i>That the report be received.</i>
<i>Dr. Uegama</i>		

Carried.

STUDENT AWARDS (SEE APPENDIX)

Dr. Bluman, chair of the committee, presented the report.

<i>Dr. Bluman</i>	}	<i>That the awards (listed in the Appendix) be accepted and forwarded to the Board of Governors for approval and that letters of thanks be sent to the donors.</i>
<i>Dr. Richer</i>		

Carried.

Sherwood Lett Scholarship Group Winners and Wesbrook Winners for 1996

A list of Sherwood Lett Scholarship Group Winners and Wesbrook Winners for 1996 had been circulated for information. Dr. Bluman explained the criteria for the Sherwood Lett Awards and noted that there were five winners. He stated that the criteria for the Wesbrook awards was different in that there is no monetary reward associated with these. All Sherwood Lett award winners are automatically Wesbrook Scholars but in addition there can be 15 more Wesbrook awards each year. Such students are entering a penultimate or final year of a baccalaureate program or are in a professional school program. These awards are not open to first-year graduate students, and athletics is not part of the criteria. These students are presented with a certificate, and are designated as Wesbrook Scholars, which appears on their permanent record.

Dr. Bluman noted that none of the Sherwood Lett winners, or the nominees, were from Graduate Studies, and suggested that the Faculty was not aware that, unlike the Wesbrook awards, the Sherwood Lett awards are open to first year Graduate Studies students who have completed two years of study at UBC. He stated that there had been very few nominees for the Wesbrook awards, and suggested that more "well-rounded" nominees were needed, as many of the nominees had been just for scholarship.

Faculty of Dentistry

A proposal to disestablish the Departments of Clinical Dental Sciences, Oral Biology, and Oral Medical and Surgical Sciences, and a proposal to establish a Department of Oral Biological and Medical Sciences and a Department of Oral Health Sciences, had been circulated. It was explained in the material circulated that this reorganization of departments was precipitated by the Senate resolution of May 1994 that the minimum size for departments, schools and divisions be 15 full-time faculty members.

Dr. Birch
Mr. Gorman

}

That the Departments of Clinical Dental Sciences, Oral Biology, and Oral Medical and Surgical Sciences be discontinued, and that a Department of Oral Biological and Medical Sciences and a Department of Oral Health Sciences be established.

Carried.

Faculty of Law

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A CENTRE FOR FEMINIST LEGAL STUDIES

Dean Smith explained that the proposed centre was designed to grow out of the existing strength in the Faculty, to enhance its activities in the area, and to attract resources. She stated that the Faculty already has an endowed chair in Feminist Legal Studies, faculty members with international reputations in the area, and that the Faculty

has just become the location of the English language side of the Canadian journal "Women and the Law". Dean Smith reported that the Faculty of Law had approved the proposal unanimously. She stated that the centre is resource neutral as far as the Faculty is concerned, and that it is hoped that creating a focus for this kind of activity will attract new resources and grants. Similarly, the proposed centre, built on existing strength in the library, will have no new resource implications for the library.

*Dean Smith
Mr. Leung*

}

That Senate approve and recommend approval by the Board of Governors of the establishment of a Centre for Feminist Legal Studies in the Faculty of Law (with provision for appropriately qualified affiliated members from other UBC facilities and from outside UBC).

Carried.

Student Discipline

The following proposed addition to the Offences section of the Calendar was presented for information by the Registrar, Dr. Richard Spencer.

For information: Dennis Pavlich, Associate Vice-President, Academic and Legal Affairs, has requested the addition of the new paragraph 9. in the Offences section of the Calendar entry on Student Discipline and a new paragraph in the Procedures section. The revised section will read as follows (additions are in italics):

Student Discipline

The President of the University has the right under the *University Act* (Section 58) to take whatever disciplinary action is deemed to be warranted by a student's misconduct. The specific provisions as to Offences, Penalties and Procedures which are set out below should not be construed as limiting the general authority of the President under the *University Act*.

Offences

Misconduct subject to penalty includes, but is not limited to, the following offences:

1. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct in which an individual submits or presents the work of another person as his or her own. Scholarship quite properly rests upon examining and referring to the thoughts and writings of others. However, when excerpts are used in paragraphs or essays, the author must be acknowledged through footnotes or other accepted practices.

Substantial plagiarism exists when there is no recognition given to the author for phrases, sentences, and ideas of the author incorporated in an essay.

Complete plagiarism exists when an entire essay is copied from an author, or composed by another person, and presented as original work.

(Students in doubt as to what constitutes a case of plagiarism should consult their instructor.)

2. Submitting the same essay, presentation, or assignment more than once whether the earlier submission was at this or another institution, unless prior approval has been obtained.
3. Cheating on an examination or falsifying material subject to academic evaluation. Cheating includes inter alia, having in an examination any materials other than those authorized by the examiners.
4. Impersonating a candidate at an examination or availing oneself of the results of such impersonation.
5. Submitting false records or information, in writing or orally, or failing to provide relevant information when requested.
6. Falsifying or submitting false documents, transcripts or other academic credentials.
7. Disrupting instructional activities, including making it difficult to proceed with scheduled lectures, seminars, etc., and with examinations and tests.
8. Damaging, removing, or making unauthorized use of University property, or the personal property of faculty, staff, students or others at the University. Without restricting the generality of the meaning of "property" it includes information, however it be recorded or stored.
9. *Students registered at UBC may use boards designated for the conduct of personal (but not commercial) business (such as the sale of used, personal articles, offers for board and lodging, solicitations for travel, etc.) Notices considered objectionable will be summarily removed and could result in disciplinary action. (The University does not vet notices and is not a party to any offer, solicitation or transaction. The University accepts no liability for any damage or injury connected with any notice or information on this board.)*
10. Assaulting individuals, including conduct which leads to the physical or emotional injury of faculty, staff, students, or others at the University, or which threatens the physical or emotional well-being of faculty, staff, students, or others at the University.
11. Attempting to engage in or assisting others to engage in or attempt to engage in conduct in respect of which disciplinary action may be taken.
12. Failing to comply with any penalty imposed for misconduct.

Penalties

The penalties which may be imposed, singly or in combination, for any of the above offences may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. A failing grade or mark of zero in the course, examination, or assignment in which the academic misconduct occurred.
2. Suspension from the University for a specified period of time, or indefinitely. Students will not receive credit for courses taken at another institution during a suspension.
3. Reprimand, with letter placed in student's file.
4. Restitution in the case of damage to, or removal or unauthorized use of, property.
5. A notation on the student's permanent record of the penalty imposed.

Warning

1. The penalty for substantial or complete plagiarism, or for cheating, normally is suspension from the University.
2. The laying of charges under federal or provincial legislation, or the commencement of civil proceedings, does not preclude disciplinary measures being taken by the University.

Procedures

Section 58 of the *University Act* gives the President of the University the power to suspend students and to deal summarily with any matter of student discipline. To advise him on measures to be taken, the President has established the President's Advisory Committee on Student Discipline. An alleged instance of student misconduct deemed serious enough for action by the President shall be referred to this Committee. After an investigation and a hearing at which the student is invited to appear, the Committee reports to the President. The student then has the opportunity to meet with the President, if he or she wishes, before the President arrives at a decision.

A student suspected or apprehended in the commission of an offence shall be notified within a reasonable period of time of intention to report the alleged offence to the department head, dean, or other appropriate person. The student shall also be given the opportunity to explain the incident and, if he or she requests, to meet with the department head, dean, or other appropriate person, before the alleged offence is reported to the President.

A student who is a respondent in proceedings under the University's Policy on Discrimination and Harassment may be the subject of a disciplinary recommendation made to the President by a Panel constituted under that Policy. Before making a decision whether to act on a recommendation of discipline by the Panel, the President will afford the student an opportunity to meet together before making a decision.

Appeals

A student has the right to appeal the decision of the President to the Senate Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline.

A student who wishes to appeal the decision of the President must notify the University Registrar in writing and must provide a full explanation of the reasons for appealing.

Appeal hearings are relatively informal. They take place before several members of the University Senate. A student is entitled to be represented or assisted throughout the appeal process by an advocate who may be a friend, a relative or legal counsel. The student is entitled to explain the reasons for appealing either orally or in writing, and may call witnesses. The President is represented by his representative who presents the reasons for the President's decision.

The members of the Committee may ask questions of both the student and the President's representative. As soon as possible after the hearing is completed, the Committee will notify the student of its decision in writing.

Student senator, Mr. McDonald, drew attention to item 9. and the use of bulletin boards. He suggested that the first sentence in that paragraph, which says that a student can use boards for personal but not commercial use, is very ambiguous as to what might or might not be excluded. He stated that many students use bulletin boards to advertise tutoring services to raise money for their tuition, and to provide a service to other students. Also many students are hired by the various taverns and bars to advertise for them, which is commercial use. He said that this raises the question of whether or not advertising by student societies, and student groups who advertise events that raise money, would be allowed, and suggested that the first sentence be struck.

Dr. Spencer thanked Mr. McDonald for his comments, stating that although the document did not require Senate approval, the reason for bringing such entries to Senate was to allow members to comment and to ensure that there is a clear record in the minutes of Senate of how these entries came to be in the Calendar, and/or when they were changed. Dr. Spencer stated that he would pass Mr. McDonald's comments on to the Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs, who had drafted the paragraph referred to.

In response to a further query, Dr. Spencer stated that enforcement is provided for in the Offences section of the Calendar, and that those powers could be used in cases where material posted is considered to be objectionable. He agreed that it is difficult to ensure that notice boards are not mis-used.

Mr. James Boritz, student senator, pointed out that the wording of item 9. differed from that of the rest of the document in that instead of outlining what a misconduct is, it talks about who might or might not do something, while the other other items are worded in the sense of offences.

Mr. Boritz also expressed concern about the growth of the Internet and the World Wide Web, stating that he felt it was incumbent upon the University to include electronic forms of communication in this policy, in terms of the kind of material that is appropriate for posting on electronic notice boards.

Dr. Spencer responded that item 9. was directed at physical notice boards on which things can be posted and that there were other policies concerning the appropriate use of the University's electronic computer systems.

Dr. Berger stated that questions had been raised about the appropriateness of material posted as part of a departmental set of web pages, and that while policies exist, they are not easy to find. He suggested that it would be helpful if they could be made available in places where they can be easily located.

Report of the Tributes Committee (in camera)

EMERITUS STATUS

Dean McBride, chair of the committee, presented a report recommending that the following be offered emeritus status:

Dr. G. H. Anderson	Clinical Professor Emeritus of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
Dr. Bedford Z. Aylward	Clinical Assistant Professor Emeritus of Family Practice
Dr. Richard M. Beames	Professor Emeritus of Animal Science
Mr. Inderjit S. Bhugra	General Librarian Emeritus
Prof. R. Earl Blaine	Associate Professor Emeritus of Commerce and Business Administration
Dr. John C. Brown	Professor Emeritus of Physiology
Dr. Alan D. Chambers	Associate Professor Emeritus of Forest Resources Management

Adjournment

Dr. Alexander N. Cherkezoff	Clinical Professor Emeritus of Family Practice
Dr. Raymond Corteen	Associate Professor Emeritus of Psychology
Dr. Frank L. Curzon	Professor Emeritus of Physics and Astronomy
Dr. John D. Friesen	Professor Emeritus of Counselling Psychology
Dr. Francis C. W. Ho	Clinical Professor Emeritus of Family Practice
Dr. Akira Horii	Clinical Professor Emeritus of Family Practice
Dr. Louise Jilek-Aall	Clinical Professor Emerita of Psychiatry
Dr. Guy J. Johnson	Assistant Professor Emeritus of Psychology
Dr. Robert F. Kelly	Associate Professor Emeritus of Commerce and Business Administration
Dr. Paul H. LeBlond	Professor Emeritus of Earth and Ocean Sciences
Dr. Ernie K. Murakami	Clinical Associate Professor Emeritus of Family Practice
Dr. Donald E. Newman	Professor Emeritus of Radiology
Dr. Margaret Norman	Professor Emerita of Pathology
Dr. Peter H. Pearse	Professor Emeritus of Forest Resources Management
Dr. Dwight Peretz	Clinical Professor Emeritus of Medicine
Dr. Anthony M. Perks	Professor Emeritus of Zoology
Dr. Peter Rastall	Professor Emeritus of Physics and Astronomy
Ms. Mary Regester	Senior Instructor Emerita of Nursing
Dr. Roy Schofer	Clinical Associate Professor Emeritus of Anaesthesia
Mr. Frank Smith	Senior Instructor Emeritus of Athletics & Sports Services
Dr. Robert F. Snider	Professor Emeritus of Chemistry
Dr. K. D. Srivastava	Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering and Vice President Emeritus of Student Services
Dr. Wendy K. Sutton	Assistant Professor Emerita of Language Education
Dr. Roger S. Tonkin	Professor Emeritus of Paediatrics
Prof. Patricia M. Wadsworth	Clinical Professor Emerita of Health Care and Epidemiology
Dr. David N. E. Whittaker	Associate Professor Emeritus of Educational Psychology and Special Education

*Dean McBride
Dr. Slonecker*

}

*That the recommendations of the Tributes
Committee concerning emeritus status, be
approved.*

Carried.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Next meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on Wednesday, April 16, 1997.

Appendix

AWARDS RECOMMENDED TO SENATE

Leonard R. **Andrews** Memorial Bursary-Entrance bursaries totalling \$39,000 have been endowed through the estate of Gordon Craig Allen in memory of Leonard R. Andrews. The awards are offered to students who have graduated from a British Columbia Secondary School. (Available 97 Winter Session)

Theodore E. **Arnold** Fellowship-Fellowships totalling \$20,000 have been endowed through the estate of Theodore E. Arnold and the University of British Columbia. The awards are offered to graduate students, and are made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (Partial funding available 97 Winter Session)

Arthritis Society Vancouver Branch Scholarship-A \$1,000 scholarship has been endowed by the Vancouver Branch of The Arthritis Society, B.C. & Yukon Division. The award is offered to a student in Rehabilitation Sciences interested in clinical research in Rheumatology, and is made on the recommendation of the School. (Available 97 Winter Session)

Hugh Robert Duncan **Chisholm** Scholarship in Forestry-Scholarships totalling \$6,000 have been endowed through the estate of Helen Margaret Clery for students in the Faculty of Forestry. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Faculty, and in the case of graduate students, in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (Available 97 Winter Session)

Patrick **Clery** Scholarship in Law-Entrance scholarships totalling \$6,000 have been endowed through the estate of Helen Margaret Clery. The awards are offered to undergraduate students entering first year law and are made on the recommendation of the Faculty. (Available 97 Winter Session)

Donald C. **Cromie** Memorial Fellowship in Journalism-A \$15,000 fellowship has been endowed through the estate of Geraldine Phyllis Cromie. The award is offered to a student in Journalism and is made on the recommendation of the School in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. ((Available 97 Winter Session)

Mildred **Johnson** Scholarship in Music-Scholarships totalling \$18,000 have been endowed through the estate of Marion Blanche Anderson. The awards are offered to students in the School of Music, with preference given to students studying piano or cello. The awards are made on the recommendation of the School and, in the case of graduate students, in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (\$13,500 available 96 Winter Session)

Malwa Brotherhood and Friends Society of Canada Prize-A \$300 prize has been endowed by the Malwa Brotherhood and Friends Society of Canada for the study of Sikh history, religion or culture, or Punjabi language or literature. The award is offered to an undergraduate student and is made on the recommendation of the Department of Asian Studies. (Available 96 Winter Session)

Ron **Riddell** and Roy Douglas Memorial Scholarship in Mathematics-Two scholarships of \$300 each have been endowed by friends, family and the Math Club in memory of Ron Riddell and Roy Douglas. One award of \$300 is offered to an honours student entering fourth year. The other award of \$300 is offered to a majors student entering fourth year. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Department of Mathematics. (Available 97 Winter Session)

Southview Farms Bursary in Agricultural Sciences-Bursaries totalling \$1,000 are offered by Southview Farms Ltd. to third or fourth year students in Agricultural Sciences. (Available 96 Winter Session)

Gregory Tso Memorial Scholarship in Asian Studies-Scholarships totalling \$10,000 are offered in memory of Gregory Tso, by his family, to students specializing in Chinese studies. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Department of Asian Studies and, in the case of graduate students, in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (Available 97 Winter Session)