



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 MAY 19, 1999

Attendance

Present: President M. C. Piper (Chair), Vice-President B. C. McBride, Dr. P. Adebar, Dr. I. Benbasat, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dean J. Blom, Dr. G. W. Bluman, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. P. C. Burns, Mr. P. T. Burns, Dean J. A. Cairns, Mr. A. Chui, Ms. J. DeLucry, Ms. J. Dennie, Mr. E. Fidler, Dean F. Granot, Mr. H. D. Gray, Acting Dean S. W. Hamilton, Rev. J. Hanrahan, Dr. P. G. Harrison, Dr. F. G. Herring, Ms. L. Hewalo, Dean M. Isaacson, Dr. M. R. Ito, Dean M. Klawe, Dr. S. B. Knight, Mr. J. Kondopulos, Mr. O. C. W. Lau, Mr. T. P. T. Lo, Dr. D. M. Lyster, Dr. D. J. MacDougall, Dr. M. MacEntee, Mr. S. MacLachlan, Dr. K. May, Acting Dean J. A. McLean, Dr. W. R. McMaster, Dean S. Neuman, Dr. J. M. Orr, Dr. T. F. Pedersen, Mr. R. L. de Pfyffer, Mr. G. Podersky-Cannon, Mr. H. Poon, Dean M. Quayle, Ms. C. Quinlan, Dr. H. J. Rosengarten, Dr. R. W. Schutz, Dean N. Sheehan, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Ms. K. Sonik, Mr. A. H. Soroka, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. M. Thompson, Dr. S. Thorne, Mr. D. Tompkins, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Mr. D. R. Verma, Dr. D. Ll. Williams, Dr. W. C. Wright, Jr., Dr. R. A. Yaworsky, Dean E. H. K. Yen.

Regrets: Chancellor W. L. Sauder, Dean F. S. Abbott, Dr. V. Froese, Dr. J. H. V. Gilbert, Dr. A. G. Hannam, Dr. V. J. Kirkness, Dr. D. K. Leung, Prof. P. T. K. Lin, Ms. P. Liu, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Dr. P. L. Marshall, Mr. W. McMichael, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Mr. A. Mitchell, Mr. V. Pacradouni, Dr. W. J. Phillips, Prof. J. A. Rice, Dr. D. P. Rolfsen, Mr. J. E. Sookero, Ms. L. M. Sparrow, Mr. J. Tsui, Dr. W. Uegama, Dr. P. A. Vertinsky.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

<i>Dean Cairns</i>	}	<i>That the minutes of the meeting of April 21, 1999 be adopted as circulated.</i>
<i>Dean Granot</i>		

Carried.

Business Arising from the Minutes

SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Vacancies had been declared at the meeting of April 21, 1999 for two elected student representatives to serve on the Nominating Committee (p. 12105). Nominations had been received for Ms. Joëlle Dennie and Ms. Pamela Liu.

<i>Dr. William</i>	}	<i>That nominations for student representatives to serve on the Nominating Committee close.</i>
<i>Mr. Verma</i>		

Carried.

Ms. Dennie and Ms. Liu were declared elected to the Nominating Committee by acclamation.

Chair's Remarks and Related Questions

TRIP TO ASIA

President Piper described her recent trip to China, Singapore and Hong Kong. UBC delegates included Mr. Larry Sproul, Director, International Liaison Office, Mr. Christopher Brown, Director, International Relations, Ms. Grace Wong, Assistant Dean, Commerce and Business Administration, Dr. Stan Hamilton, Acting Dean, Commerce and Business Administration, Dr. Pitman Potter, Director, Institute of Asian Research, and Dr. Grant Ingram, Principal, St. John's College. Highlights included the launch of the China Hong Kong Business Studies Network in Shanghai and Beijing. President Piper congratulated the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration for their very successful networking efforts both in China and in Hong Kong. A joint venture was signed between the UBC Centre for Molecular Medicine and Therapeutics and the Institute of Cell and Molecular Biology of the National University of Singapore. Members of

the delegation also attended a meeting of the Association of Chinese Universities. UBC was one of approximately 20 Commonwealth universities invited to the meeting, at which Chinese universities requested advice concerning the expansion of their research and education infrastructures.

Alumni events were held in four cities, and the President remarked that UBC is very well-represented in Asia. Support for UBC was evident, especially with regard to developing cooperative work placements for students. St. John's College was discussed at meetings in all 4 cities; the College is a reflection of the former St. John's University in Shanghai. The President was pleased to announce that the fourth world conference of Johanians will be held in Vancouver this summer, and attendees will have the opportunity to visit St. John's College.

The President stated that she felt privileged to represent UBC on this visit to Asia, where UBC is held in particularly high esteem.

MAY CONGREGATION

The President noted with pride that congregation would be held the following week. More than 5,000 students were to graduate in a total of 23 ceremonies. President Piper encouraged all members of Senate to consider attending at least one of the congregation ceremonies to celebrate with the graduands.

PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES OF MERIT

President Piper presented certificates of merit to those members of Senate attending their last meeting, in honour of their great contributions to the governance of UBC.

Reports from the Vice-President, Academic and Provost

RESEARCH ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice-President McBride announced that UBC had recently been very successful in the Major Collaborative Research Initiatives competition held by SSHRC. He stated that the funding of these projects points to UBC's strength in the social sciences and humanities. The following three projects had been approved:

1. **"International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems", Phase II of "The Longterm Preservation of Authentic Electronic Records"**, principal investigator Dr. Luciana Duranti, School of Library, Archival and Information Studies;
2. **"Entrepreneurship Research Alliance II"** (renewal), principal investigator Dr. Raphael Amit, Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration;
3. **"Reconciling Ecological Carrying Capacity and Human Well-being: Exploring Alternative Futures for the Georgia Basin,"** principal investigator Dr. John Robinson, Sustainable Development Research Institute.

Vice-President McBride also announced that Dr. James Kronstad of the Biotechnology Laboratory had recently received a Burroughs Wellcome Fund Scholar Award in Pathogenic Mycology, and that Dr. Dolph Schluter of the Department of Zoology had been named a Fellow of the Royal Society of London.

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLMENTS 1999/2000

See 'Appendix A: Undergraduate Enrolments 1999-2000'.

Vice-President McBride stated that the report on Undergraduate Enrolments for the 1999/2000 academic year was being presented to Senate somewhat later than usual, and explained that the Provincial Government had not released the enrolment targets until mid-April. They indicated that UBC would enrol an additional 486 students, and that the Government would provide \$7000 for each additional student. The tuition fees paid by these students would, of course, also be available to the University. The figures have been discussed by the Senate Admissions

Committee and the Committee of Deans. The proposed targets would see enrolment levels maintained at the same levels as last year.

<i>Vice-President McBride</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the Winter Session Enrolment Targets for 1999/2000.</i>
<i>Dean Granot</i>		

Dr. Knight asked how UBC would accommodate the 177 students that would not be funded by the Provincial Government under the 1999/2000 forecast. Vice-President McBride pointed out that the 177 unfunded students represented an increase of only 28 students over the previous year. Dr. Knight stated that the 177 extra students would generate an additional cost of \$4.5 million to be accommodated in the UBC budget. Vice-President McBride stated that, given UBC's and the Provincial Government's concern about access to university education, it was considered important that UBC admit the same numbers of students as in the previous year. He further noted that, although UBC would not receive the \$7000 per student in Government funding for 177 students, their tuition fees would assist in covering costs.

Mr. Podersky-Cannon pointed out that 635 students above the 1998/99 target had been enrolled for that year and asked what procedures were in place to ensure that the target is not considerably exceeded for 1999/2000. Vice-President McBride stated that the Enrolment Management Committee, chaired by Dr. Richard Spencer, meets weekly to discuss this issue. Minimum entry levels are set and adjusted as necessary to ensure that the figures are on target. Variables include return rates to various Faculties and students who transfer between Faculties. He stated that, although the process was complex, the Committee was using the available tools as effectively as possible. In 1998/99, it was necessary to ensure that enrolment targets were met in order to avoid the loss of the \$7,000 per student in funding. The policy has recently changed such that the Government considers now enrolments within a three year window, resulting in a somewhat less

aggressive approach toward meeting the targets. This new approach means that it is less likely that the targets will be significantly exceeded for the 1999/2000 year.

Dr. Harrison remarked, on behalf of the Admissions Committee, that the complicated process of meeting enrolment quotas had become easier in recent years. He noted that the main area of adjustment in attempting to meet quotas is in the numbers of high school students admitted. Since some decreases in first-year intakes have been proposed, Dr. Harrison stated that it was important to understand the direct impact of UBC's policies on high school students as a group.

The motion was
put and carried.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TEACHING QUALITY, EFFECTIVENESS, AND EVALUATION

See "Appendix B: Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Quality, Effectiveness, and Evaluation".

Vice-President McBride introduced the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee, which had been struck in 1997 at the request of Senate. He noted that the Report appeared on the agenda for approval, but that it had not been widely circulated or discussed outside the Ad Hoc Committee. He proposed that Senate receive the report and invite comment from deans and other members of the UBC community before bringing the recommendations back for approval in the fall of 1999.

<i>Vice-President McBride</i>	}	<i>That the report be received.</i>
<i>Dr. Slonecker</i>		

Vice-President McBride invited Dr. Neil Guppy, as chair of the Committee, to present the report. Dr. Guppy outlined the Committee's process, which included the review of two previous reports on teaching effectiveness and evaluation. The focus in *Trek 2000* and the *Academic Plan*

discussion paper on strengthening and valuing teaching was also the subject of discussion. The Committee sent a questionnaire to units responsible for evaluating teaching: Faculties, schools, departments and programs. The Committee found that recommendations from the two previous reports have not all been implemented. Dr. Guppy noted that it was therefore important that the latest set of recommendations be strongly supported by the campus community if they are to be implemented. He stated that the recommendations could be considered as "works in progress" and that additional feedback would be necessary before they could be finalized. Dr. Guppy outlined each of the 12 recommendations.

Dr. Pedersen commended the Committee for its thorough report. He urged the Committee to reconsider, however, Appendix C, Principle 2, items (i), (iii), and (iv), to improve the content and wording. He also proposed that the following sixth suggestion be added to Appendix D, under "Unsatisfactory Teaching": "Ensure that the appropriate professional resources are available so that improvements can be facilitated."

Mr. Podersky-Cannon asked whether students would be provided with the list of Effective Teaching Principles and Practices for use in evaluating teaching. Dr. Guppy stated that there is no way to guarantee that students will use this set of principles in completing their evaluations, but that it is more likely that peer evaluators would do so.

Dr. Ito noted that the Effective Teaching Principles and Practices suggest that an effective evaluation should go beyond the immediacy of a given course. He recalled research which had shown little correlation between an evaluation completed during the course and an evaluation completed two years later. He asked whether UBC had plans to follow up with graduates in order to obtain a better evaluation. Dr. Guppy stated that some attempts are made to measure teaching effectiveness after course completion: he gave the examples of exit surveys, and surveys

conducted of alumni at 2 and 5 years post-graduation. He agreed, however, that these attempts at measurement may not be as effective as they could be.

Dean Cairns, referring to Recommendation 9 of the Recommendations on Valuing Teaching from the Report of the University Committee on the Value and Evaluation of Teaching, described promotion as one the most powerful mechanisms currently available to influence behaviour. He asked what discussion had taken place with regard to the role of teaching in promotion and tenure. Dr. Guppy stated that the Committee had discussed the issue only briefly, and added that the Academic Plan Advisory Committee had explored the issue in greater depth.

Mr. Tompkins suggested that there should be a mechanism to separate evaluation of the instructor from the evaluation of the difficulty of the course, and asked whether this possibility had been discussed. Dr. Guppy replied that the Committee had not considered this issue, but had instead taken the approach of including questions that already exist on Faculties' current forms in the proposed list of common questions. Mr. Tompkins encouraged Faculties to consider implementing this separation. He also noted that Recommendation 4 could be stronger, and asked why the Committee did not recommend that student evaluations be made available to students by all Faculties. Dr. Guppy responded that there is currently a debate ongoing regarding Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy issues with respect to teaching evaluations. He further stated that many evaluations are already available, but that students do not appear to be aware that this is the case.

The motion to
receive was put
and carried.

In response to a question from President Piper, Vice-President McBride stated that the recommendations would return to Senate for approval at the October 1999 meeting.

List of Recipients of Scholarships and Awards

A list of Wesbrook Scholars and Sherwood Lett award winners had been circulated for information.

Candidates for Degrees

<i>Dr. Williams</i>	}	<i>That the candidates for degrees and diplomas, as approved by the Faculties and Schools, be granted the degree or diploma for which they were recommended, effective May 1999, and that the Registrar, in consultation with the Deans and the Chair of Senate, make any necessary adjustments.</i>
<i>Dean Granot</i>		

Carried.

Academic Policy Committee

PRE-SCHEDULED EXAMINATIONS

Dr. Schutz, as chair of the Committee, presented the following report:

At the April 1998 meeting of Senate the issue of "exam hardships" was discussed. It was suggested that the problem could be resolved if UBC were to publish an examination schedule at the same time as the registration guide. Although the exam hardship issue was subsequently resolved (see Senate Minutes of February 24, 1999), the Academic Policy Committee was charged with working with the Registrar to investigate the feasibility of scheduling exams prior to registration.

The Academic Policy Committee met to consider this issue and asked the Registrar to look into pre-scheduling exams in a way that would satisfy the needs of Faculties, instructors and students. In December 1998 the committee presented a report to Senate containing the following proposed recommendations (note: these were presented as preliminary drafts of recommendations, for information and discussion only, and were not voted upon):

Recommendations regarding the pre-scheduling of exams - Draft Only

The Academic Policy Committee recommends discontinuing the present practice of scheduling exams after students have registered, using software which can produce a conflict free schedule. Instead, exams should be scheduled prior to registration, with the scheduling of exams related to the course schedule so as to minimize potential exam conflicts. If possible, this should begin in 2000/01. Although this will reduce the possible choice of courses for

some students it will allow students and faculty to make travel and other end of term plans earlier. Students would be responsible for their exam schedule, as they are for their lecture schedule. The following policies are recommended.

Recommendation 1. The exam schedule should be published prior to registration, if possible beginning in the 2000/01 Winter Session.

Recommendation 2. Composite exams will normally only be scheduled when:

- There are six or more sections in the course
- One instructor is teaching three or more sections of the same course

In other cases each section will normally be scheduled according to its scheduling sequence (standard, associated, or non-standard).

Recommendation 3. It is the student's responsibility to register for courses that will result in an acceptable exam schedule.

Recommendation 4. The Registrar should be responsible for resolving all issues relating to the scheduling of exams.

The Registrar's Office developed a proposal for the pre-scheduling of exams (see "First proposal" of the attached Appendix), circulated it widely, and held a series of meetings with representatives from most Faculties and Schools. Louise Mol (Scheduling Coordinator, Registrar's Office) reported to the Academic Policy Committee in February 1999, and indicated that there was very strong opposition to aspects of the proposal, most notably with respect to recommendation #2 above. The Committee concluded that any approach that required separate exams for each section of a significant number of multi-section courses was very unlikely to be acceptable. This ruled out the common approach of basing the exam schedule on the lecture schedule, since most multi-section courses have lectures for different sections scheduled at different times. The Committee agreed that publishing the schedule before the start of classes, preferably before registration begins, would be a desirable alternative. Louise Mol agreed to look into whether it would be feasible to use the conflict free scheduling software to prepare a schedule based on student registration in the previous session. This draft would have to be adjusted to reflect known program changes, including courses that are no longer offered and new courses.

The Registrar's Office subsequently developed a pre-scheduled exam proposal which allowed for common exams for all multi-sectioned courses, and once again held a series of consultative meetings (see "Second Proposal" in the Appendix). The response to this proposal was again strongly negative, with less than 10% support for its adoption. Ninety percent (90%) of the 48 timetable/examination representatives who were polled voted in favour of continuing with the present exam scheduling process.

The Committee notes that since September 1998 the Registrar's Office has been able to produce a conflict-free exam schedule about five to six weeks earlier than was previously the case. This has alleviated many of the students' concerns with respect to being able to make flight arrangements early enough to secure reduced fares.

Recommendation:

Based upon the feedback from the Faculties and the Schools, and the recommendations from the Registrar's Office, it is recommended that:

The present practice of scheduling exams after students have registered, using software which can produce a conflict-free schedule, be continued.

APPENDIX

FIRST PROPOSAL

Definition:

Exams published in Registration Guide.

Exam times based on the meeting times of classes (for example, all MWF 10:30 am classes could be examined at the same time).

Action Taken:

The Scheduling Coordinator in the Registrar's Office spent three weeks working with the course scheduling data and developing a mock exam schedule. (An additional two weeks would have been required to make the mock exam schedule more accurate).

Meetings:

Two meetings held in January 1999 with approximately 75 people attending. These representatives ranged from Associate Deans to clerical staff.

Consultation:

164 individuals were consulted, either through meetings or mail:

- 116 Timetable Representatives (or Course Scheduling personnel)
- 82 Examination Representatives
- 34 common between the two groups

Feedback:

After the meetings a survey was sent to all departments asking for comments. In addition, several people sent e-mails to either Richard Spencer or Louise Mol.

Surveys returned: 65. E-mails: 9. The responses were strongly against the proposal.

Responses:

- Concern over workload increases
- Student queries spread out from the current 2 months to 9-13 months
- Composite exam issues (multi-sectioned courses requiring a common exam)
- Hardships not improved - may be worsened

SECOND PROPOSAL

Definition:

Exams published in Registration Guide.

Exam schedule created by using the current session exam and student data to create a conflict-free schedule and applying that information to the future course schedule.

Action Taken:

The Scheduling Coordinator in the Registrar's Office applied the Dec 1998 and Apr 1999 exam schedule to the 1999 Winter session course schedule and created mock exam schedules.

Meetings:

Two meetings were held in March 1999 with approximately 48 people attending. These representatives ranged from Associate Deans to clerical staff.

Consultation:

The same as above (First Proposal).

Feedback:

At the end of each session, a vote was taken. Results:

- 43 for current system
- 4 for second proposal
- 1 abstain

Responses:

- Concern over workload increases
- Student queries spread out from the current 2 months to 9-13 months
- Hardships not improved - may be worsened
- Clashes may be created

Dr. Schutz
Dr. Berger

}

That the present practice of scheduling exams after students have registered, using software which can produce a conflict-free schedule, be continued.

Dr. Schutz reminded members of Senate that the proposal to pre-schedule examinations arose from the discussion about examination hardships. The issue of examination hardships has now been satisfactorily resolved. He drew particular attention to the Appendix of the Report, remarking that the proposal to pre-schedule examinations had been rejected, and that strong support for the current system was evident. Using software that can produce a conflict-free schedule, the examination schedule can now be produced immediately following the deadline for adding or

dropping courses, which usually occurs during the third week of classes. Dr. Schutz noted that there would not be any significant advantage for students to know their examination schedules any earlier.

The Committee had also compared UBC practices with those of other Canadian institutions. The University of Alberta has a pre-scheduled examination system in place, while McGill University and the University of Toronto use systems similar to that of UBC. The Committee was supportive of the work done by the Registrar's Office in considering the proposal. Feedback from timetable representatives as well as students showed support for the present system.

Mr. Podersky-Cannon expressed doubt that the examination schedule could be conflict-free. He also suggested that the wording of Recommendation 3, which states that it is the student's responsibility to register for courses that will result in an acceptable examination schedule, be softened. Dr. Schutz replied that certain situations, such as where a student fails to register in a course or where his/her registration goes inadvertently unreported, could result in conflicts. The vast majority of conflicts that have occurred in the past, however, can now be avoided.

The motion was
put and carried.

Admissions Committee

NEW STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Dr. Harrison, as chair of the Committee, presented the following report:

The Committee recommends approval of the following exchange programs:

1. Reciprocal student exchange agreements*:

INSTITUTION	Country
Macquarie University	Australia
University of Wollongong	Australia
Sciences Po (Institut d'Etudes Politiques)	France
Kwansei Gakuin University	Japan
Osaka University	Japan
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies	Japan
Waseda University	Japan

*Because of an on-going imbalance in student flows, the Faculty of Applied Science exempts itself from all these agreements.

2. Faculty-specific Linkages:

INSTITUTION	Country	Agreement Limited to Faculty of:
Universiti Putra Malaysia	Malaysia	Agricultural Sciences
Edinburgh College of Art	Scotland	Agricultural Sciences
Heriot-Watt University	Scotland	Agricultural Sciences
Chulalongkorn University	Thailand	Law

3. UBC Faculty-specific Consortium Agreements arranged under the Canada-European Community Program for Higher Education and Training:

INSTITUTION	Agreement Limited to Faculties of:
Law Consortium with European Institutions (University of Turin, University of Paris II, Hamburg University, Maastricht University, University of Lund)	Law
Mathematics Consortium with European Institutions (University of Trieste, Université Catholique de Louvain, University of Coimbra, University of L'Aquila) and Dalhousie University and York University	Science
Sustainable Agriculture Consortium with European Institutions (Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, State University of Liège, University of Montpellier I) and the Universities of Saskatchewan, Guelph, Alberta, and Manitoba	Agricultural Sciences

<i>Dr. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve student exchange programs with Macquarie University, the University of Wollongong, l'Institut d'Etudes Politiques, Kwansei Gakuin University, Osaka University, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, and Waseda University, with the provision that the Faculty of Applied Science is exempt from these agreements.</i>
<i>Dr. Rosengarten</i>		

Dr. Harrison stated that the approval of these new agreements would greatly increase the opportunities for UBC students to study abroad.

The motion was put and carried.

<i>Dr. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve Faculty-specific student exchange linkages with Universiti Putra Malaysia, Edinburgh College of Art, Heriot-Watt University and Chulalongkorn University.</i>
<i>Prof. Burns</i>		

Carried.

<i>Dr. Harrison</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the Faculty-specific Consortium Agreements : Law Consortium with European Institutions, Mathematics Consortium with European Institutions, and Sustainable Agriculture Consortium with European Institutions.</i>
<i>Dr. Rosengarten</i>		

Carried.

REPORT ON EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM

Dr. Harrison presented the following report.

A Report on the Education Abroad Programs

History and Governance

In April 1990 Senate approved the guidelines for Education Abroad Programs (EAPs) that were brought forward by the Academic Policy Committee. EAPs are agreements for the exchange of students with foreign universities that allow students to maintain their status at their home university and to pay normal fees to that institution. Each EAP

is intended to provide reciprocity in student flows so that each partner benefits equally both financially and in the enrichment of its learning community.

Administration and oversight for the EAPs involves several campus units and committees. Students mainly interact with the UBC Student Exchange Program Office in Brock Hall (except for those in some faculties such as Commerce & Business Administration and Forestry which have their own coordinators) which collects applications, provides information to students and faculties, and handles most of the day-to-day operations. The International Liaison Office facilitates the negotiation of agreements at the institutional level in conjunction with the President's office and brings proposals to the Senate Admissions Committee. That committee was determined to be the "appropriate Senate Committee [that] should examine the calendar of the foreign institution and other relevant documentation and report to Senate so that Senate can make an informed decision on whether or not to approve an agreement with a foreign host institution for a specified period of time (i.e. 5 years)" (Minutes of Senate, April 18, 1990, p.9751). Finally, there is also a "small committee, consisting of one representative from each participating Faculty, an Education Abroad administrator, and (if possible) a student who has had EAP experience, [that meets] twice a year to review the students selected for the Education Abroad Programs, the materials for guides, and ongoing policy regarding such programs" (Minutes of Senate, April 18, 1990, p.9751). The Student Exchange Program Advisory Committee meets regularly.

Student interest in EAPs is growing rapidly. In 1995-96, 107 UBC students took part in an EAP. In 1997-98 the Faculty of Arts alone sent 113 students abroad out of a UBC total of 213 EAP students. Some Faculties, notably Commerce & Business Administration, Agricultural Sciences, and Law have much higher participation rates and have developed discipline-specific exchange programs. Recently, UBC has articulated a strategy of developing an undergraduate curriculum that will be "international in scope" ("Trek 2000: A Vision for the 21st Century", p.7) and EAPs provide one means of implementing that strategy. At the same time, potential partner institutions are having to consider the relative merits of reciprocal exchange agreements and the recruitment of full fee-paying international students.

Need for a Review

In May of 1996 the Senate Admissions Committee recommended to Senate "that there be a review of the Education Abroad Programs when the new Senate takes office" (Minutes of Senate, May 15, 1996, p.11458). Two concerns were raised at that time. First, there was unease about the way in which some EAP proposals were initiated and about the strength of the academic commitment among the faculty within UBC for some agreements. Second, there was concern "about the University's ability to provide the kind of counseling, support and infrastructure needed for these programs." In the fall of 1996 an ad-hoc Committee to Review the Education Abroad Program was formed but despite some very hard work and many meetings it has not finished its work.

The present Senate Admissions Committee has tried to fulfill its mandate with regard to the review of EAP proposals but has also had some reservations about the process:

- The choice of potential partners is predicated on the policy of sending only small numbers of UBC students to any one institution so that they will integrate into the host student body. This policy means that as interest in EAPs grows it is necessary to form more and more partnerships and the Committee sometimes feels pressed to approve proposals in order to increase the exchange options for students without a thorough evaluation of the overall direction of the program. For example, three stated

geographic areas of focus are the Asia Pacific, the Americas, and Europe, yet recently EAPs have been initiated in Africa. The popularity of some geographic regions is evident in the number of EAPs in certain countries and may soon exceed the availability of premier institutions in those areas.

- The strength of the commitment among faculty for some EAP proposals is often difficult to determine. Deans or faculty in individual departments or research units initiate some proposals so EAPs limited to one or two Faculties are usually strongly supported. When an agreement is proposed for a whole university, however, and especially one with which members of the Admissions Committee have little experience, the value of our perusal of the documents is limited.
- The provision of support to faculty advisers at UBC who are asked to counsel prospective EAP students was weak but is improving. A database that includes such basic information as the number of courses a student should take to obtain 30 UBC credits has not been available for many partner institutions until recently. The costs of developing and maintaining such a database are high. Even more work is needed before there is a library of course equivalents for our partners to which faculty and students can refer.
- There is no procedure for periodic review prior to renewal of agreements. Indeed, although the original guidelines passed in 1990 suggested a five-year limit on EAPs not one agreement has been brought back to Senate for review. The prevailing opinion is that the vast majority of student exchanges result in enriching experiences for the students. However, the University has an obligation to its students to be aware of any problems that may jeopardize their academic career or personal well-being and although the Student Exchange Office monitors all agreements and gets feedback from returning students, the process is more ad-hoc than systematic. Again, resource limitations are a concern.

EAPs are only one of several types of student exchanges which can contribute to the internationalization of the curriculum yet many faculty and students are unaware of the opportunities and options. Some exchange agreements are reciprocal and others are not, so that there are implications for student fees and the use of university facilities and resources. In addition, the International Student Initiative is a relatively new component of the internationalization of the campus with its own mandate and issues related to students and faculty. As a preliminary step in the implementation of the strategies outlined in Trek 2000, a thorough review of student exchange programs should be completed before the EAP expands further. Thus the Senate Admissions Committee recommends:

That Senate request the VP Academic to encourage the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Education Abroad Program to complete its work and that its report be presented to Senate, preferably in September 1999, and that until such a report is received no further EAPs be considered by the Senate Admissions Committee or Senate.

Vice-President McBride, responding to the report, thanked the Admissions Committee for reminding him that the review of Education Abroad Programs was in progress. The Committee had been struck in the fall of 1996, and is chaired by Dr. James Richards. Vice-President McBride had been advised that the Committee required approximately two more months to complete its work and would bring the report before Senate in the fall of 1999.

Budget Committee

Dr. Williams, as chair of the Committee, presented the following report for the information of Senate:

Senate Budget Committee Report to Senate

May 1999

A three-year budget strategy was developed for the first time last year to address the serious financial position facing the University at that time. The intent of this strategy was to provide a longer term perspective on the budget position, thereby avoiding unduly compromising future initiatives, which were anticipated to arise from the vision being developed in the TREK 2000 document and the consequent Academic Plan.

The first element of this plan proposed the carry forward of a significant deficit in the 1998-99 Budget Year, to be repaid in equal instalments over the succeeding two years. Of the other elements in the model, the major ones included an 80% freeze on new faculty appointments, a 10% freeze on new staff positions, an anticipated increase in the provincially funded undergraduate enrolment, and a projected increase in income from the International Student Initiative. The Development Office committed to raise endowment funding to reduce the dependence of scholarship funds on GPOF sources. The Senate Budget Committee is pleased to learn that, within minor variances, the strategy appears to be working and that no major surprises have surfaced. The Committee is currently considering a fresh three-year proposal relating to the budget years 1999-00, 2000-01, and 2001-02.

In the analysis of the proposed budget, it is important to distinguish between recurring reductions, which arise, in the main, from the relationship between ongoing commitments and the operating budget available from government and tuition sources; and 'one-time' cuts, which are often a consequence of earlier budget decisions. For example the 1997-98 Budget amortised several expenses, such as the government demand for two EI payments in one year, over three or more budget years. A new such expense will be incurred as a result of upgrades to the FMIS/IHRIS system amortised over five years. These, together with the major commitment from last year's budget to repay half the deficit, constitute the 'one-time' expenses. We are pleased to note the efforts of the Administration and the Office of Budget and Planning in identifying one-time sources of revenue to offset some of these 'one-time' expenses. The net sum required totals \$3M which is less than 1% of the GPOF Budget.

We have been consulted, at several stages, in the development of a collective submission by the B.C. Universities to the Provincial Government. The Government Grant to UBC, following these submissions, made provision for an increased undergraduate student quota of 486 FTEs at \$7000 each, together with a Tuition Freeze Offset of \$425K, and a similar contribution to address the University's commitments to Pay Equity. The Committee has been presented with a summary of the changes in the GPOF income anticipated from these and other sources, together with the offsetting changes in expenditures. These arise in large part from recent salary awards, and also from initiatives targeted in the Operational Timetable in the TREK 2000 document. These initiatives include a \$1M increase in the acquisitions budget of the Library, of which \$200,000 will be funded from re-allocations within the existing administrative charges on endowments. Notwithstanding this increase, which we support, we are aware that journal subscriptions will have to be pared further. On the positive side, a significant decrease in the need to fund Scholarships from the GPOF budget will be made possible through the more effective use of existing endowments. The reductions in recurring expenditures required to meet this year's budget total \$2.6M out of a total GPOF Budget of \$350M.

The reductions required will be distributed between the portfolios of the President and Vice-Presidents in proportion to their share of the operating budget. Since the dominant portion of the GPOF Budget lies within the portfolio of the Vice-President Academic, the distribution of the reductions required within this envelope has a significant impact on the academic direction of the University. Dr. McBride has established two committees, one on the Costs of Instruction, and one on the Costs of Research, to provide him with advice on how to equitably assess these costs. The Senate Budget Committee has a member on each committee.

In conclusion, the University is on track with regard to the budget projections made a year ago. While we are once again facing a need to reduce expenditures despite increased enrolment, we believe the GPOF Budget presented to us represents a responsible effort to position the University to move forward, while minimising the adverse effects on our academic enterprise. However, at this point, we cannot comment on specific cases of hardship, which may arise when the final distribution of the reductions is decided.

Dr. Williams spoke briefly to the report and highlighted its main points.

Dean Klawe expressed support for the move to a three-year budgeting process, but also registered a difference of opinion with the tone of the report. She stated that there exists within the Faculty of Science, as in other Faculties, a sense of desperation with regard to budget reductions. Faculty members feel demoralized, and recruitment and retention is becoming increasingly difficult. As Faculties strive to meet the goals of the *Trek 2000* and *Academic Plan* initiatives, budget cuts are damaging academic programs. Dean Klawe pointed out that the

Budget Committee was not at fault for this depressing situation, and that blame could potentially be assigned to the Provincial Government. Dr. Williams agreed that the University is facing a very difficult situation, but clarified that *Trek 2000* initiatives were not having a negative impact on the University's budgetary situation. Dean Klawe agreed. Dr. Berger described the effect of the recent series of budget cuts as "dismantling" the University. Dean Cairns spoke in agreement with Dean Klawe, confirming that other deans were experiencing the same difficult circumstances.

Vice-President McBride acknowledged the difficulties, adding that President Piper and the presidents of other BC universities have been working as hard and as effectively as possible to convey the reality of the situation to government officials. He stated that there is a discrepancy in the amount of \$58 million in the funding that UBC receives as compared to other Canadian institutions. The difference does not occur in the operating grant from the Provincial Government, but in the tuition fees paid by UBC students.

Mr. Gray encouraged Senate to consider what actions it can and should be taking to improve the situation, including refusing to accept the Provincial Government's decisions. Mr. Tompkins stated that the focus should rightly be on increasing transfer payments to the Provinces and thereby increasing the operating grant, rather than supporting dramatic increases in student tuition fees. Dr. MacEntee noted, as a member of the Budget Committee, that many of the sentiments expressed at the meeting of Senate had also been expressed at meetings of the Budget Committee. He stated that the tone of the report of the Budget Committee was an attempt to show that the University remains proactive in responding to serious budget shortfalls. Although it is necessary to continue to convey the seriousness of the situation to the Provincial Government, it remains crucial to examine internal budget and planning processes in order to respond to the

immediate problems. Mr. Gray expressed the opinion that the Provincial Government does not have additional money available, regardless of the compelling nature of UBC's argument for more funding. He spoke in support of increasing organized fundraising efforts, and against increasing corporate sponsorship on campus.

President Piper noted that Premier Glen Clark had been encouraged by the Presidents of BC Universities to raise the issue of increasing transfer payments at the recent Conference of Western Premiers. She reiterated that UBC has been playing a very strategic role in advancing these issues at both federal and provincial levels, and that suggestions as to how to improve this process are very welcome. President Piper further stated that \$40 million in endowments is currently being raised annually, and although UBC greatly values these contributions, they cannot diffuse the impact of funding shortages on the total budget of \$350 million. UBC continues to be successful in building donations on an annual basis. Dr. Williams agreed that the University has been very active in soliciting donations, and gave the example of a \$1 million reduction in general purpose operating funding for scholarships having been recently replaced by endowments.

Curriculum Committee

See "Appendix C: Curriculum Change Summary".

Dr. Berger presented the report as chair of the Committee.

GRADUATE STUDIES

<i>Dr. Berger</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the proposed curriculum changes from the Faculty of Graduate Studies.</i>
<i>Dean Cairns</i>		

In response to a query from Mr. Podersky-Cannon, Dr. Berger confirmed that the proposed new course *PHAR 590: Pharmaceutical Sciences Research* was appropriately classified as a graduate level course. Although undergraduate students should already have been exposed to research

principles and methods, this course will teach research skills as applied to the Pharmaceutical Sciences.

Dr. Schutz, referring to *NURS 623: Advanced Concepts in Quantitative Research Methods*, asked whether HCEP 400 would be appropriate as a co-requisite. Dr. Thorne responded that this course was probably not appropriate as a co-requisite, and agreed to look into this issue and report back to the Curriculum Committee.

N.B. After subsequent discussion, it was decided that all of the proposals from the School of Nursing would be withdrawn and resubmitted with revisions at a later date. Changes to NURS 623, NURS 624, and NURS 608 were withdrawn.

The motion was
put and carried.

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Dr. Berger introduced the proposal for Phase IV of the undergraduate program, noting that the revised Phase IV was 12 months in length, as opposed to 16 months for the transitional Phase IV. He stated that the revised Phase IV was four months shorter because students are provided with clinical exposure much earlier in the new M.D. curriculum, such that students acquire skills which enable them to move through Phase IV in a shorter period of time.

Dr. Berger
Dean Cairns

}

*That Senate approve the proposed Phase IV of
the M.D. program.*

Carried.

Nominating Committee

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS FOR STUDENT SENATORS

Dr. Williams presented the following report:

The Nominating Committee recommends that Senate approve the following appointments of student representatives to the Committees of Senate:

Academic Building Needs:

- Mr. Howard Poon
- Ms. Lis Hewalo

Academic Policy:

- Mr. Eduard Fidler
- Ms. Karen Sonik

Admissions:

- Mr. Scott MacLachlan
- Mr. Adrian Mitchell

Agenda:

- Mr. Eduard Fidler
- Mr. Vighen Pacradouni

Appeals on Academic Standing:

- Ms. Karen Sonik
- Ms. Lis Hewalo
- Mr. David Tompkins

Budget:

- Mr. Vighen Pacradouni
- Mr. David Tompkins

Continuing Studies:

- Mr. Adrian Mitchell
- Ms. Karen Sonik

Curriculum:

- Mr. Alex Chui
- Mr. Eduard Fidler
- Mr. Scott MacLachlan
- Ms. Jennifer DeLucry

Elections:

- Mr. Vighen Pacradouni

Liaison with Post-Secondary Institutions:

- Ms. Joëlle Dennie

Library:

- Mr. Jeffrey Tsui

Student Appeals on Academic Discipline

- Mr. Josh Sookero
- Mr. David Tompkins

Student Appeals on Academic Discipline:

- Mr. Howard Poon
- Mr. Jeffrey Tsui
- Mr. Josh Sookero

Student Awards:

- Mr. James Kondopulos
- Ms. Pamela Liu

Tributes:

- Mr. Alex Chui
- Ms. Joëlle Dennie

<i>Dr. Williams</i>	}	<i>That Senate approve the recommendations of the Nominating Committee.</i>
<i>Mr. Kondopulos</i>		

Carried.

Student Appeals on Academic Discipline

Mr. Soroka presented the following report as chair of the Committee:

Report to Senate from the Senate Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline, 1996-1999

The Senate Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline is a standing committee of Senate established under section 36(s) of the University Act. The committee is a standing committee of final appeal for students in matters of academic discipline and is called the Senate Committee on Student Appeals on Academic Discipline. Under section 58 of the University Act the President has power to suspend a student and to deal summarily with any matter of student discipline.

The University Calendar for 1999/2000 on pages 51-52 contains information about "Student Discipline". It describes certain offences, listing 13 of them, and cautions students that "misconduct ...includes, but is not limited to" these 13 offences.

The Policy Handbook of the University (<http://www.policy.ubc.ca/policy69.htm>) provides in pertinent part:

Academic Misconduct

When a member of faculty suspects that misconduct has occurred, he/she shall investigate it immediately. If satisfied that the misconduct did occur, he/she shall notify the student at once that s/he plans to report the incident,

and he/she shall then report it immediately to the department head, or to the appropriate person in the faculty, who in turn shall notify the dean of that faculty or designate without delay. If after thorough investigation, during which the student shall be given an opportunity to explain the incident, the misconduct has been established, the academic aspects of the matter may be dealt with, and appropriate academic action taken by the department or faculty concerned.

When the misconduct consists of cheating as described above, zero credit or some other mark may be assigned by the faculty for the examination or test in which the cheating occurred.

When the misconduct consists of plagiarism as described above, zero credit or some other mark may be assigned by the faculty for the plagiarized submission.

The action thus taken shall be reported immediately to the President's Advisory Committee on Student Discipline by the dean of the faculty in which the misconduct occurred, together with a complete description of the evidence upon which the faculty action was based.

During the past three years the Senate Committee has heard 6 appeals from students disciplined by the President on the recommendation of her Advisory Committee. The offences were as follows:

February 1999: purchase of an assignment and falsely submitting it as one's own. Punishment: zero in the course; entry in the student's record with the proviso that at the end of two years after graduation the student could apply to the President to have the disciplinary notation expunged; awarding degree delayed from May 1999 to November 1999.

Appeal dismissed

September 1998: collusion in cheating; communicating by signal in order to share examination answers.

Punishment: zero in the course; 1 year's suspension; entry in the student's record with the proviso that at the end of two years after graduation the student could apply to the President to have the disciplinary notation expunged.

Suspension varied to two consecutive summer session suspensions.

September 1998: student misconduct including assault.

Punishment: 4 month suspension; entry in the student's record with the proviso that at the end of two years after graduation the student could apply to the President to have the disciplinary notation expunged.

Appeal dismissed.

December 1997: tampering with submitted and marked quiz papers in an effort to gain an improved grade.

Punishment: zero in the course, 1 year's suspension; entry in the student's record with the proviso that at the end of two years after graduation the student could apply to the President to have the disciplinary notation expunged.

Appeal dismissed.

June 1997: cheating on an examination.

Punishment: zero in the course; 1 year's suspension; entry in the student's record with the proviso that at the end of two years after graduation the student could apply to the President to have the disciplinary notation expunged.

Appeal dismissed.

October 1996: plagiarism; submitting a paper written by another falsely representing it to be the work of the disciplined student. Punishment: zero in the course; 1 year's suspension; entry in the student's record with the proviso that at the end of two years after graduation the student could apply to the President to have the disciplinary notation expunged.

Appeal dismissed.

In all but one of the cases set forth above the Committee upheld the discipline imposed by the President on the advice of her Advisory Committee and dismissed the appeal. In the September 1998 cheating by collusion case the appellant had steadfastly refused to acknowledge guilt, while his accomplice quickly repented and confessed. On the eve of our hearing the appellant retracted his protestations of innocence and subsequently wrote the committee a letter apologising for his conduct and for misleading all concerned. The committee is essentially an appeals tribunal and has adhered to the convention of refusing to review de novo the evidence presented to the President or her Advisory Committee. In this case we received new evidence, that is, the appellant's confession and apology and varied the punishment awarded by the President so that the appellant's punishment was similar to, but somewhat more burdensome than, his accomplice's.

The Committee adhered to another convention: not to hear an appeal unless one or more student members were part of the quorum. We are concerned that there are no student members of the President's Advisory Committee. Mr. Dennis Pavlich, the President's legal advisor, has told us informally that the President intends to remedy this omission, and we wish to take this opportunity to recommend to the President that she promptly institute this wise reform of the disciplinary process.

Policy 69 indicates that a speedy investigation and resolution of alleged misconduct offences is important. In at least one case we have seen a student burdened by delay in the resolution of the charges brought because of holiday or other absence of the responsible department head. We would recommend that faculty responsible for reviewing misconduct allegations and imposing discipline in student misconduct cases make certain that there are no unwarranted delays in such matters, and perhaps appoint an agent to act in their stead when they are absent for more than a week.

Student Awards

HEADS OF GRADUATING CLASSES

Dr. Bluman, as chair of the Committee, made the following comments about the Heads of Graduating Classes, whose names had been circulated. 16 of the heads of graduating classes entered UBC directly from high schools, and 13 of those came from BC public schools. Of the remaining 13 winners, two came from BC colleges, four from other BC universities, three from other Canadian universities, and three from foreign universities. Four of the undergraduate winners held major entrance scholarships. 19 of the 29 winners are women, including the heads of the graduating classes in Agricultural Sciences, Arts, Dentistry, Commerce and Business Administration, Forestry, Medicine and Music.

NEW AWARDS

See "Appendix D: New Awards for Approval".

Dr. Bluman
Dean Blom

}

That the new awards be accepted and recommended for approval by the Board of Governors, and that letters of thanks be sent to the donors.

Carried.

AWARDS SUMMARY SEPTEMBER 1996 - MAY 1999

A summary of funds awarded by Faculty from September 1996 - May 1999 had been distributed for information. Dr. Bluman noted that over a million dollars was awarded annually, based on donations made in the last three years (report not included in the minutes).

STUDENT AWARDS COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Student Awards Committee proposed the following revised terms of reference for the Committee:

- To recommend scholarships, fellowships, bursaries and prizes to Senate for approval, to report to Senate on matters of policy under discussion by the Committee, and to make recommendations to Senate with respect to regulations and policies for awards.
- To advise the Director of Awards and Financial Aid on matters of policy relating to fellowships, scholarships, bursaries and prizes.
- Quorum: 4 voting members.

Dr. Bluman
Dean Isaacson

}

That Senate approve the revised terms of reference and quorum for the Student Awards Committee.

Dr. Williams, as chair of the Nominating Committee, pointed out that the Nominating Committee is charged with receiving requests to change terms of reference for Committees of Senate. He stated that, given that the Senate would not meet again until September and that many members of the Nominating Committee were present, the Nominating Committee had no objection to the proposed changes.

The motion was
put and carried.

Tributes Committee

MEMORIAL MINUTE

Dr. Thorne read the following memorial minute, which had been prepared in the custom of Senate:

Lawrence S. Weiler, 1942 - 1999

Larry Weiler was an undergraduate of the University of Toronto and received his Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1968. Upon graduation from Harvard he began his academic career at UBC as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Chemistry. Larry enjoyed a balanced academic career at UBC involving research, teaching, administration, and university service. He was promoted to Professor in 1980 and was well respected by his colleagues and students. He was the Principal Supervisor for 24 Ph.D. students, 10 M.Sc. students and also supervised 31 Post-doctoral students. The latter came from Canada, USA, India, Netherlands, United Kingdom, France, Israel, Brazil, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Kuwait, and Australia. He also taught first year students general chemistry, and organic chemistry to undergraduates and graduate students at every level of the curriculum.

His research was recognized internationally. He received recognition for his research as a Fellow of the Chemical Institute of Canada and he was the 1984 recipient of their Merck Sharpe & Dohme Award. He was also an invited speaker at numerous universities and international conferences. His outstanding teaching skills were also recognized by a Master Teaching Award from the students in the Department of Chemistry in 1971 and a UBC Faculty of Science Teaching Award in 1993.

Larry served on the Senate from 1984 - 1990 and was a member of the Senate Library Committee, the Senate Academic Building Needs Committee, the Senate Budget Committee and the Senate Awards Committee. He also served as Head of the Department of Chemistry from 1982 - 1990. He was active in the Faculty Association, Graduate Studies, and many Presidential Committees involving searches, reviews, awards and advisory matters. In addition to his UBC commitment, Larry also found time to actively participate in international committees for the Canadian Society of Chemistry and the American Chemical Society. He also served the communities of West Vancouver and Vancouver on school and hospital boards.

Larry Weiler was a superb university citizen and UBC was honored to have him as a member of the Faculty and its community for 31 years. He was dedicated to UBC and strove to improve its academic and social environment throughout his career. He was always thoughtful, friendly, supportive and constructive in his interactions with his colleagues.

He will be missed and remembered by his family, friends, colleagues and students.

Dr. Thorne
Dr. Slonecker

}

That the memorial minute for Dr. Lawrence S. Weiler be recorded in the minutes of Senate.

Carried.

Report of the University Librarian: 1996-1998

The report of the University Librarian for the years 1996 to 1998 had been circulated for information. Ms. Quinlan introduced the report and highlighted two main issues for the Library during its 82nd and 83rd years of operation: the construction of the new Koerner Library, and the migration to the DRA computer system.

Changes to Academic Regulations Section of the Calendar

The following editorial change to the Academic Regulations section of the Calendar had been circulated for information:

Editorial Change to Academic Regulations Section of Calendar

Information regarding the procedure for requesting academic concession in the case of sickness or injury during the December or April examination periods has been condensed and moved.

Previous Calendar Entry

The procedure was previously located under the entry for the Student Health Service in the Services and Facilities section and appeared as follows on page 63 of the 1998/99 Calendar:

Routine Regarding Absence due to Sickness and Injury

1. Students absent from December or April examinations must submit a "Request for Academic Concession" form to the dean of their faculty or director of their school as soon as possible. These forms are available from the dean's or director's office. The request should be accompanied by a Statement of Illness form completed by either the attending Student Health Service physician or the attending family physician. Academic concessions are granted only by the dean or director (or their delegate) and are a privilege, not a right. The student may be asked to provide additional information.
2. Students absent at other times because of illness should report their absence to their instructors. If they wish to request academic concession, they should follow the procedure outlined in point 1 above.

Present Calendar Entry

The procedure has been condensed and moved to the information under Academic Concession in the Academic Regulations section and appears as follows on page 49 of the 1999/2000 Calendar:

Students absent from December or April examinations must request academic concession. Students absent at other times because of illness should report their absence to their instructors. If they wish to request academic concession, they should follow the procedure outlined above.

Reports from Affiliated Colleges

REPORT FROM ST. MARK'S COLLEGE

Rev. Hanrahan presented a report from St. Mark's College, which had been circulated for information. The report included a proposal to amend the *St. Mark's College Act* such that the College would grant degrees in other disciplines as well as in Theology. The proposed amendment of the Act would give the institution the new title of the University of St. Mark's College. St. Mark's would continue to be an affiliated theological college of UBC while also offering programs toward its own degrees. As St. Mark's students would require some courses from UBC in order

to complete their programs, the College asked that Senate consider, through the appropriate committee(s), the establishment of cooperative arrangements with the proposed University of St. Mark's College. The report stated that the cooperative arrangement might resemble existing arrangements for visiting or exchange students.

The Agenda Committee recommended that the proposal to establish cooperative arrangements be referred to the Admissions Committee and to the Academic Policy Committee for consideration. President Piper accepted the recommendation of the Agenda Committee and indicated that the two committees in question would receive copies of the proposal.

Notice of Motion: Library Committee

Dr. Rosengarten gave the following notice of motion on behalf of the Library Committee:

The Senate Library Committee recommends that the Statement of Principles for the Management of Copyright in the Digital Environment, developed by the Canadian Association of Research Libraries, be supported by the University of British Columbia.

Information about this Statement will be provided to senators prior to the September 1999 meeting of Senate.

Other Business

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Brady stated that he had received a letter from Dr. Gordon Roback and asked whether the President was prepared to comment. Upon invitation of the President, Dean Neuman spoke to the matter, stating that the letter of complaint had been circulated to many people on campus. Dr. Roback had applied for a faculty position in the Faculty of Arts. The position was filled by someone who, unlike Dr. Roback, does not hold a Ph.D. degree. Dean Neuman further stated that the

Adjournment

incumbent possessed formidable credentials and a great deal of professional experience, and that she was entirely satisfied that the hiring had been appropriate. President Piper recommended to members of Senate that personnel matters not be raised in such a large forum, and invited Mr. Brady to speak with her at another time to discuss the issue.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Next meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on Wednesday, September 15, 1999 at 8:00 p.m.

Appendix A

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLMENTS 1999-2000

Report from the Vice-President, Academic and Provost

For the 1999-2000 academic year we plan to keep our total undergraduate enrolment at about the same level it was this past academic year. This year our forecast enrolment is 25,093 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) students, up very slightly from 25,065 last year. This will translate into approximately 29,500 students (the difference is from an adjustment for students taking fewer than 30 credits). As you will recall, our enrolments have been above our government-funded targets in previous years. The reasons for this are many, but include the desire to be over rather than under the funded targets, the desire to educate as many students as is feasible, and the high demand for access to UBC. However, as inflation adjusted funding levels have fallen, the university has found that maintaining the quality of our undergraduate programs is more and more difficult. Over the past three years our enrolments have grown, but this year we will work to maintain quality by keeping enrolment growth in check. Even while keeping the undergraduate level of enrolment stable we will still be teaching 177 more fulltime undergraduate students than government funds us for.

We are also planning that in the coming academic year the distribution of fulltime equivalent students (FTEs) among the Faculties will remain relatively constant. In the past some Faculties have changed in size at rates greater or smaller than the overall growth of UBC. For this coming year we plan on holding constant the number of FTEs in each Faculty. There are some minor exceptions to this in that we forecast that FTEs in Nursing, Human Kinetics, and Forestry will decline slightly, while there will be an offsetting increase in Commerce FTEs (through a new diploma program). One other important trend is that FTEs in both information technology and high technology courses and programs have been rising in recent years. This growth has anticipated government efforts to expand these places.

The university has in place two committees to oversee undergraduate enrolments. First, the Senate Admissions Committee is responsible for reviewing University and Faculty enrolments of new and continuing students. I met with this committee on April 28, reviewing the enrolment plan for the upcoming year and discussing the strategies we will use to maintain previous enrolment levels. Second, the Enrolment Management Committee (chaired by the Registrar, Richard Spencer) oversees the enrolment process, advising Faculties and the Undergraduate Admissions Office as necessary. This committee meets regularly through the enrolment cycle and writes a final report that goes to myself and the Senate Admissions Committee.

The Committee of Deans also reviews our enrolment plans and helps in the process of setting enrolment targets for the university and for specific Faculties. In particular the Deans of admitting Faculties are responsible for determining at which year levels and at what numbers we are to admit new students. The individual Faculty in-take numbers for 1999-2000 I am providing you with at this time have been recommended by the Deans. The attached tables are for information (tables not included in the Minutes).

Appendix B

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TEACHING QUALITY, EFFECTIVENESS, AND EVALUATION

N.B.: Appendices to this report are not included in the minutes.

History: In 1991 a Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Evaluation recommended improvements in the handling of teaching evaluations. In the fall of 1994 a subsequent committee was charged with reviewing the procedures and policies. That committee reported in the spring of 1996 (Gosline). More recently (1997) Senate struck another committee on teaching (the current committee), charged with reviewing progress in improving graduate and undergraduate teaching at UBC. In 1996 the Committee of Deans also constituted a committee to examine the issue of teaching valuation (Ungerleider).

Procedure: We began by reviewing recommendations on teaching evaluation made in two previous reports (see summary of these recommendations in Appendix F):

1. Gosline report to Senate: Review of Teaching Evaluation (Feb., 1996)
2. Ungerleider report to Committee of Deans (Oct. 1997)

Both reports contained numerous recommendations on teaching evaluation and the valuation of teaching.¹ We decided to proceed strategically by first considering the initial part of our mandate: "progress made by the University in the area of teaching evaluation procedures." We did this by undertaking a survey, as described below. To proceed with the second part of our mandate, enhancing teaching quality and effectiveness, we chose to examine several possible "best practice" initiatives. We report on these initiatives after considering responses to our survey questions about teaching evaluation procedures.

Progress in Teaching Evaluation: In considering this part of our mandate we surveyed teaching units on campus to learn more about how teaching is evaluated and how the results of evaluation are used. In particular we canvassed the campus community, at the level of both Faculties/Schools as well as Departments/Programs, to ascertain the influence of earlier recommendations. Guided by the recommendations in the Gosline and Ungerleider reports, survey questions were designed to address core issues raised in these previous initiatives. The results of this survey work, and our deliberations as a result of the responses, are reported on in detail in Appendix A.

¹ For our purposes we understood teaching to include, but not be limited to: teaching undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses; supervising student projects/theses, and developing course curriculum. We focused mainly on the first of these.

The survey results can be summarized as follows:

The use of student evaluations of teaching is now widespread at UBC. Although in some courses evaluations are not conducted (e.g., directed studies courses), our results suggest that for all courses in which such evaluation is appropriate, it is conducted. For academic units making recommendations on merit or career progress salary increments (not all do: e.g., Arts One), the vast majority of units report using teaching evaluations as part of the decision criteria. While quality of teaching is increasingly recognized in these decisions, other survey responses suggested to us that we all need to be more alert to the recognition of teaching, via local, national, and international prizes.

The public availability of student evaluations of teaching is not as widespread as would be appropriate. This is more a consequence of students not knowing that such information is available if they ask, than it is of units refusing to release this information. Some attention to publicity needs to be undertaken.

On the survey we asked about the criteria for effective teaching and the standards for judging quality teaching. The results suggested to us that there is room for improvement here and so as part of our subsequent work, we undertook to devise some principles and practices that reflect good teaching (see below).

The survey requested that all units supply us with the forms used for students to evaluate teaching. Prompted by one of our respondents, we undertook a close reading of the questions already used across campus and found that many questions appear on most forms. While we do not think that it would be wise for UBC to adopt a standard form for all teaching units, we do think that using a common *core set of questions* on all forms would be warranted. We say this for two main reasons: it allows for common assessment across teaching units when such comparison is warranted (as in promotion and tenure or in nominating colleagues for national or international teaching prizes) and it gives students from all faculties a common base on which to use teaching evaluation information. In Appendix B we have proposed a set of common core questions.

Peer evaluation of teaching is also something that is increasingly common although here we found that practices vary widely. Again one of the respondents prompted us to consider the quality of peer review and toward the goal of improving such evaluation, we propose guidelines that teaching units could adopt, or revise as necessary, to help colleagues engaging in the peer review of teaching (see Appendix E).

While we are stressing teaching more in our hiring procedures, we also have an obligation to ensure that our own graduate students are receiving the instruction in teaching that we would like to see in the new colleagues we hire. Our effectiveness here is mixed and we believe that more support for teaching preparation among our graduate student populations would be useful. We say this because such preparation would both benefit our undergraduates, many of whom take courses in which all or part of the teaching is done by graduate students, and our graduates,

the majority of whom seek teaching-related jobs (we note here the introduction by TAG of a Certificate Program for Graduate Students).

Finally, we also wish to note two other issues related to student evaluations of teaching that arose in the course of our deliberations. First, we heard of instances where one student completed more than one teaching evaluation form for a course. This is a form of fraud about which we need to be vigilant if the teaching evaluation process is to remain viable. (Ways to discourage this include having serial numbers on forms, counting forms distributed and returned, and generally being vigilant and professional in our procedures.) Second, we also want to encourage the use of evaluation mechanisms for diagnostic reasons, not just for reasons of performance review. Increasing numbers of colleagues are distributing a tailor made feedback form in their classes to encourage early comments from students that can be used to make improvements in the course. This is a very good idea that we would like to encourage.

Enhancing Teaching Quality and Effectiveness

As a consequence of what we learned from the survey we pursued four separate initiatives:

1. What constitutes effective teaching?

After reviewing the literature on teaching criteria we constructed a set of principles and practices which we believe represent core features of effective university teaching, and which when followed appropriately, lead to the best learning outcomes for our students. We have circulated these criteria for comment among selected colleagues² at UBC and we have incorporated their suggestions into the final version that appears in Appendix C. We feel these principles and practices could be used in a variety of circumstances, including the following:

- As exemplars for improving teaching
- As exemplars for new instructors
- As criteria to guide the evaluation of teaching

2. If we built on common questions that now exist on most Faculty student evaluations of teaching, what might a set of common core elements look like?

As we noted above, some very similar questions appear on almost every form used by students when evaluating teaching at UBC (see Appendix B). Systematizing these questions would be useful so that when we evaluate teaching, we have some communality in our measuring instrument. We suggest that minor modifications be made on all UBC forms for the student evaluation of teaching so that we use identical question wording and a common scale to collect evaluations, *for a set of core questions*. Student evaluation of teaching forms used by Faculties

² These colleagues (29 in total) were purposively chosen to reflect experience levels and academic diversity. We are grateful for their constructive commentary.

and Schools would retain other questions that measure important aspects of teaching that are outside this common core, and are often specific to different academic units (this strategy addresses important objections to the common core idea noted on our survey).

As with our teaching principles and practices we have asked selected colleagues for feedback, and their comments are reflected in the question wording and format we propose. The majority of colleagues supported the idea of common questions. Objections were limited to worries about any type of numerical summation of teaching quality.

3. What are basic principles and guidelines that ought to be considered in peer review teaching?

Some Departments and Faculties already have guidelines for the peer review of teaching, but the majority do not. We have drafted "Suggested Principles and Guidelines for the Peer Review of Teaching" (Appendix E) with the intent of providing some guidelines that might be used by Deans, Heads, and Directors to enhance the utility of peer reviews of teaching.

4. How should Heads/Directors respond to relatively poor or very good teaching reviews?

On our survey questionnaire, a few respondents noted that they did not have specific standards for satisfactory teaching. One Head noted that some ideas on how to respond to weak teaching scores would be helpful. We note, in Appendix D, some ideas about how Heads/Directors (or others) could respond to either strong or weak teaching assessments.

Recommendations

1. That the "Common elements on Student Evaluation of Teaching Forms" (Appendix B) should be included on all appropriate UBC evaluation forms (Action: VP Academic and Provost).
2. That "Effective Teaching Principles and Practices" (Appendix C) be adopted by Faculties as the basis for their criteria of effective teaching (Action: Deans).
3. That "Effective Teaching Principles and Practices" (Appendix C) be circulated to all members of faculty including tenured, tenure track, and sessionals (Action: Deans/Heads/Directors).
4. That all academic units review their procedures to ensure that students are made aware of the availability of student evaluations of teaching, as appropriate (Action: Deans).
5. That a short diagnostic evaluation of teaching (for the instructor's own purposes) be given to students after about 25% of a course is completed (Action: Deans/Heads/Directors).
6. That academic units, alone or in combination, have or use existing credit courses on effective teaching for graduate students, and especially for graduate student teaching assistants (Action: Deans).
7. That "Responding to Information from Evaluations of Teaching" (Appendix D) be circulated to all Heads and Directors (Action: Deans)

Appendix B

8. That "Suggested Principles and Guidelines for the Peer Review of Teaching" (Appendix E) be circulated to all Heads and Directors (Action: Deans).
9. That this report, including the Appendices, be made available on the Web site of the Centre for Teaching and Academic Growth (Action: Director TAG).
10. That the VP Academic report on the implementation of these recommendations at the March 2000 Senate meeting (Action: VP Academic).
11. That the VP Academic report annually to Senate on teaching quality, effectiveness, and evaluation, and on the extent to which the university is reaching its learning goals (Action: VP Academic).
12. That the Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Teaching Quality, Effectiveness, and Evaluation be dissolved (Action: Senate).

Appendix C

CURRICULUM CHANGE SUMMARY

Graduate Curriculum Changes

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

New course: ANSC 550.

FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE

Department of Chemical and Bio-Resource Engineering

New Course: BIOE 510.

Course changes: BIOE 540: change title, description, prerequisite.
CHML 560: re-enter (no change).

Department of Civil Engineering

New course: CIVL 527

School of Nursing

Changes to NURS 608, 623, and 624
WITHDRAWN by the School of Nursing.

FACULTY OF ARTS

Department of Anthropology and Sociology

Course changes: ANTH 506: change grading.

Department of Germanic Studies

Course changes: GERM 548, GERM 549: change credits.

School of Library, Archival and Information Studies

New courses: LIBR 513, LIBR 517, LIBR 557, LIBR 571, LIBR 597, ARST 514, ARST 554, ARST 556, ARST 591, ARST 575.

Course changes: LIBR 551: renumber to LIBR 554 and change title.
ARST 599, LIBR 599: change credits.
ARST 510, ARST 515, ARST 516: change title and description.

Change in program description (page 244-245 of 1998/99 Calendar).

Change in degree requirements for Joint M.A.S. and M.L.I.S. program.

Change in Calendar entry on Certificate Requirements.

Change in degree requirements for M.A.S.

Department of Economics

Course changes: ECON 555, ECON 556: change title.

School of Music

Change of program description for Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Musical Arts, Master of Arts and Master of Music.

Change in program requirements: credit requirements.

Course changes: MUSC 500: change title and description.
MUSC 501, MUSC 502: change title, description, prerequisite.
MUSC 503: change credits and description.
MUSC 504: change title, credits and description.

Delete course: MUSC 505.

New courses: MUSC 511, MUSC 600.

FACULTY OF COMMERCE AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

New course: COMM 589.

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Occupational Hygiene Program: rename to Occupational and Environmental Hygiene Program.

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

School of Audiology and Speech Sciences

Proposals to modify degree requirements for M.Sc., proposal to change clinical externships, course changes to AUDI 569, AUDI 592
all **WITHDRAWN** by Graduate Council on May 13, 1999, after material had already been circulated to Senate.

FACULTY OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

New course: PHAR 590.

Undergraduate Curriculum Changes

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Phase IV of the M.D. Program.

Appendix D

NEW AWARDS FOR APPROVAL

BLAKE Cassels Graydon Prize in Commercial Transactions--A \$750 prize is offered by Blake Cassels Graydon to a law student who shows outstanding achievement in Commercial Transactions. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1998/99 Winter Session)

BLAKE Cassels Graydon Prize in Corporate Transactions--A \$750 prize is offered by Blake Cassels Graydon to a law student who shows outstanding achievement in Corporate Transactions. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1998/99 Winter Session)

BLAKE Cassels Graydon Prize in Real Estate Transactions--A \$750 prize is offered by Blake Cassels Graydon to a law student who shows outstanding achievement in Real Estate Transactions. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1998/99 Winter Session)

BLAKE Cassels Graydon Prize in Securities Regulations--A \$750 prize is offered by Blake Cassels Graydon to a law student who shows outstanding achievement in Securities Regulations. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1998/99 Winter Session)

Approved by Senate Committee on Student Awards

May 4, 1999