



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](http://www.senate.ubc.ca)

## VANCOUVER SENATE

### MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 13, 1991

#### Attendance

**Present:** President D. W. Strangway (Chairman), Chancellor L. R. Peterson, Vice-President D. R. Birch, Mr. S. Alsgard, Mr. D. A. Anderson, Dr. A. P. Autor, Mr. J. A. Banfield, Miss K. Bentsen, Dr. L. L. Bongie, Dr. M. A. Boyd, Dr. D. M. Brunette, Professor P. L. Bryden, Mr. R. Bush, Dr. D. G. A. Carter, Dr. R. L. Chase, Dr. S. Cherry, Dr. T. S. Cook, Mr. N. A. Davidson, Dr. K. Dawson, Dr. J. D. Dennison, Dr. G. W. Eaton, Dr. A. J. Elder, Ms. C. J. Forsythe, Mr. C. Fung, Mr. E. B. Goehring, Dean J. R. Grace, Dr. S. E. Grace, Dr. R. D. Guy, Mr. M. L. Hanik, Rev. J. Id, Dr. J. A. McLean, Dean J. H. McNeill, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Dean A. Meisen, Dr. A. G. Mitchell, Ms. E. Onno, Dr. R. J. Patrick, Ms. B. M. Peterson, Mrs. S. K. Prpic, Professor R. S. Reid, Dr. P. Resnick, Mr. M. M. Ryan, Mr. A. J. Scow, Dean N. Sheehan, Dr. C. A. Thom, Dr. W. Uegama, Dr. A. Van Seters, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Dr. J. M. Varah, Mr. L. Waldman, Miss R. Walia, Dr. D. A. Wehrung, Dr. R. M. Will, Dr. D. L. Williams, Ms. N. E. Woo, Dr. W. C. Wright, Jr., Mr. A. J. Scow, Dean N. Sheehan, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Dean C. L. Smith, Dr. L. de Sobrino, Dr. L. J. Stan, Mr. G. A. Thom, Dr. W. Uegama, Dr. A. Van Seters, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Dr. J. M. Varah, Mr. L. Waldman, Miss R. Walia, Dr. D. A. Wehrung, Dr. R. M. Will, Dr. D. L. Williams, Ms. N. E. Woo, Dr. W. C. Wright, Jr.

**Regrets:** Dean C. S. Binkley, Dean M. A. Goldberg, Dr. S. W. Hamilton, Dean B. C. McBride, Dr. L. Paszner, Miss C. L. Rankel, Dean J. F. Richards, Dean P. B. Robertson, Dr. G. G. E. Scudder, Miss S. Sterling, Mr. M. Sugimoto, Dr. R. C. Tees.

#### Call to Order

#### Minutes of the previous meeting

Professor Reid	}	<i>That the minutes of the second regular meeting of Senate for the Session 1991-92, having been circulated, be taken as read and adopted.</i>
Mr. Scow		

Carried.

## **Business Arising from the Minutes**

### **BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CENTRE**

Dr. Autor referred to the problems concerning the Biomedical Research Centre, and informed Senate that Dr. W. C. Gibson, former UBC professor and department head, had told her that he had severed connections with UBC because of the way in which the situation had been handled.

### **Chairman's Remarks and Related Questions**

President Strangway stated that he had no remarks to make.

### **Correspondence**

The Chairman read to Senate a letter from Mrs. Marion Gunning expressing thanks and appreciation for the tribute paid to her late husband.

<i>Dr. Grace</i>	}	<i>That Senate express its thanks and appreciation for the sensitivity and creativity exercised by Dr. Dennison in preparing memorial minutes.</i>
<i>Dr. Cherry</i>		

Carried.

### **Candidates for Degrees**

Lists of candidates for degrees, as approved by the various Faculties and Schools, were made available for inspection by Senate members prior to the meeting.

<i>Dr. Sloneker</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, and that the Registrar, in consultation with the Deans and the Chairman of Senate, make any necessary adjustments.</i>
<i>Dr. Kelsey</i>		

Carried.

Dean Marchak informed Senate that the the Faculty of Arts had voted to grant the Bachelor of Arts degree to Joseph Kania. Mr. Kania obtained a B.Sc. degree in 1926 and felt that he had also qualified for the B.A. degree. However, due to some controversy over the fact that he had taken a German course instead of a French course, he was not granted the degree at that time. Dean Marchak stated that Dr. Harry Warren had been in the same position in 1926 but that having taken the French course he had been awarded the B.A.

<i>Dr. Sloneker</i>	}	<i>That Joseph Kania be awarded the Bachelor of Arts degree.</i>
<i>Dr. Kelsey</i>		

Carried.

## **Reports of Committees of Senate**

### **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

Dr. Sobrino, Chair of the Committee, presented the report.

#### **FACULTY OF ARTS**

The Committee recommended that the submission of the Faculty of Arts, which includes the following proposals, be approved in principle:

- a) the replacement of English 100 by a set of 3 credit first year courses;
- b) the introduction of an admission requirement for first year English courses based on the Language Proficiency Index examination;
- c) the introduction of a non-credit writing course under a new University Writing Skills Centre; and
- d) the discontinuance of the English Composition Test.

It was also noted in the report that the Committee expects to submit a final detailed recommendation to Senate at the December meeting.

<i>Dr. Sloneker</i>	}	<i>That the proposals of the Faculty of Arts, as outlined above, be approved in principle.</i>
<i>Dr. Kelsey</i>		

Dr. Sobrino explained that although the Committee supported the proposals in principle, it did have the following concerns:

1. that the universality of the Language Proficiency Index (LPI) examination may deter good students from coming to UBC;
2. there are a number of separate courses which may result in students from different Faculties segregating themselves in the different courses;
3. that this could lead to the dilution of the quality of the courses due to larger sections; and
4. that the LPI examination requirement may have implications for admission to the University if every faculty requires that students take first year English.

Dean Marchak stated that one of the advantages of the LPI examination is that students will take the test prior to entering the University rather than in the middle of a course, as is the case at present with English 100 and the English Composition Test. Another advantage is that students who have deficiencies will be able to get special tuition at the proposed University Writing Skills Centre.

Dr. Rosengarten, Head of the Department of English, was invited to speak. He gave Senate some background information on the proposed changes and also outlined some of the reasons for the proposal.

Dr. Grace stated that the matter was urgent because of the crisis which had developed in terms of being able to handle classes that have too many people who cannot function in English, particularly ESL students. Consequently, the

Department of English was unable to give these students the instruction they need to carry on with their university work.

As a member of the Senate Curriculum Committee Subcommittee examining the proposals, Father Hanrahan stated that while the subcommittee had reservations about the suitability of the LPI test for students wishing to transfer to UBC, it was even more concerned that the implementation of this test might diminish the attractiveness of UBC in the case of top students. He also noted that several Faculties had indicated that they would direct their students to take English 112 Strategies for University Writing, which in the subcommittee's opinion, would automatically lead to a process of segregation. Father Hanrahan stated that although the subcommittee approved of the proposed changes, concern had been expressed about the possible lack of control of the size of classes. The subcommittee felt that over- populated classes could lead to a dilution of teaching capabilities in first year English.

IN AMENDMENT:

<i>Dr. Birch</i>	}	<i>That the words "in principle" be deleted from the motion.</i>
<i>Dean Marchak</i>		

Dr. Birch stated that it was imperative that the proposals be approved as quickly as possible to alleviate the unreasonable and unnecessary burden placed upon the Department of English in administering the English Composition Test, and expressed his concern that the Curriculum Committee had felt it necessary to delay this matter further.

Dr. Sobrino stated that at the request of the administration, the Committee had made every effort to expedite this matter. However, in the time available the Committee had not been able to satisfy itself of the academic soundness of all the details or to propose specific amendments, and for this reason there was a complete consensus of the Committee in recommending approval in principle only at this time.

Dr. Sobrino suggested that one of the reasons for the present disagreement was that the Vice-President appeared to have a different view to his own about the role of the Senate Curriculum Committee.

He did not think that the detailed work of the Committee could be carried out on the floor of Senate. It was his understanding that the Senate Curriculum Committee had been established by Senate to study proposals of the Faculties, decide to the best of its ability on the academic soundness of the proposals and report accordingly to Senate, the body that, according to the Act, has sole jurisdiction over the academic affairs of the University. It was not enough, as the Vice- President appeared to imply, that ample consultation takes place prior to proposals being submitted to the Committee. While such consultations are helpful and welcomed by the Committee, ultimately the Committee has to make its own decisions and, in order to do so, may find it necessary to undertake further consultations.

The proposal under discussion was dated October 3, 1991, which gave the Committee only three weeks for its deliberations. The Committee required much

more time to complete the consultations that it deems necessary in view of the wide implications of the proposal both inside and outside the University.

In speaking against the amendment, Mr. Goehring stated that as the proposed changes would affect every Faculty on campus, and many outside institutions, he thought it was important that Senate have as much information as possible on the implications of these proposals.

Dr. Williams stated that he welcomed the proposals of the English Department and that there was no question that the proposed changes represented the most important and far-reaching change in curriculum for many years. Because of this he thought it important that the proposals receive proper study, and that it was, in fact, the duty of the Committee to thoroughly investigate all curriculum proposals presented to Senate for approval.

Dr. Wehrung asked for assurance that students taking a pre-Commerce year in Arts would be informed that English 112 would be a requirement for Commerce.

Dean Marchak stated that she was well aware that these changes would affect many people throughout the University and appreciated that people had to be informed. This was one of the reasons why the Faculty had hoped to get early approval of the changes as there was much to be done in setting up the infrastructure.

Dr. Birch stated that there was a sense of urgency for a variety of reasons. He noted that last spring a labour relations ruling affected the role of teaching

assistants which compounded the demands on faculty members in English in trying to deliver conscientiously the services that are required because of current degree requirements within the University.

In speaking to the amendment Dr. Klawe stated that it was clear that the Curriculum Committee supported the need for these changes, in principle, and it appeared that there was widespread support across the University for the reasons behind the changes and general agreement that it was a very sensible proposal for the replacement of the English Composition Test and English 100. This, therefore, was not the issue. The issue was whether or not the crisis involved in the current situation with English 100 meant that the Curriculum Committee should be denied an additional month to study the proposal in more detail. Unless there were reasons of which Senate was unaware, Dr. Klawe did not see why the Curriculum Committee could not be given another month to submit its final recommendation.

Dean Marchak responded that there was some urgency in that there was a need to put the budget together for the Writing Skills Centre which was a major undertaking, and there was also a need to begin the process of establishing the criteria for those who would be teaching at the Centre. There was also the question of finalizing the details for the administration of the LPI. However, the major reason for supporting the amendment was that the proposed changes would obviously affect high schools and colleges and it was therefore imperative that they be notified as quickly as possible.



Dr. Kelsey thought that most of the concerns of the Committee were of an administrative nature and asked what more could be accomplished by waiting another month.

Dr. Sobrino responded that the Committee was not entirely satisfied with the answers received in response to its concerns, but felt that through further discussions with the Department of English those concerns could be clarified and that a mutually satisfactory conclusion could be reached. He added that until this evening the Committee had not been informed of the reasons for the urgency in this matter.

Dr. Will stated referred to the question of universality of the LPI test. He stated that the English Composition Test was a universal test that was applied to almost all student pursuing a Bachelor's degree at UBC whether they took English 100 or not. He was not convinced, however, that the LPI was an appropriate test other than for those students going directly into English 100. He had no difficulty with the LPI as a placement test for those going into first year English but other than that he had no knowledge of its usefulness in comparison to the English Composition Test. He referred to other issues raised, such as the number of Commerce students that would have to take English 112 as well as the number of students from other Faculties that might be required to take this course, and suggested that the English Department would be teaching more language and less literature than it does at present. He stated that he would like to know what all the Faculties were going to require of their students in this respect. He felt that Senate

should know what will happen after the proposal has been adopted in terms of the deployment of faculty, the type of faculty needed, and whether you can teach language, as you can literature, in large classes. He stated that there were many questions that needed answering before the proposal was approved.

Dean Sheehan spoke in support of the amendment and stated that the fact that the proposal does affect all Faculties was a good reason to implement the proposal sooner rather than later. She stated that many Faculties have requirements for six credits of English 100 plus the ECT and that Faculties would have to decide how they were going to handle the English requirement plus the LPI. She said that each Faculty might wish to do this differently given the changes being proposed, and that they should be given as much time as possible to make the necessary changes to their programs.

Dr. Elder stated that approval in principle would not prevent the process of consultation within the University and would give the high schools and colleges an opportunity to let the University know what ramifications the proposed changes might have for them.

The amendment to delete from the motion the words "in principle" was put and lost.

The motion was put and carried.

*Dr. Sobrino*  
*Dr. Autor*

}

*That the proposals of the Faculty of Arts be implemented in September 1993.*

Chancellor Peterson stated that he did not see how Senate could be asked to vote on a recommendation to delay the implementation of the proposals before it had considered the final detailed recommendation of the Committee.

<i>Chancellor Peterson</i>	}	<i>That the motion be tabled.</i>
<i>Dr. Resnick</i>		

Carried.

#### FACULTY OF MEDICINE

The Committee recommended approval of a change in credits form (2) to (3) for Pathology 408.

<i>Dr. Sobrino</i>	}	<i>That the course change proposed by the Faculty of Medicine be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. McLean</i>		

Carried.

#### CONTINUING EDUCATION

Dr. Varah, Chair of the Committee, presented the Annual Report on Part- time Studies, Distance Education, Continuing Education and Cultural Activities 1989-90. He stated that the report had been prepared under the direction of the Associate Vice President Academic but that in future it would be prepared by the Associate Vice President for Continuing Studies, Dr. Walter Uegama.

<i>Dr. Varah</i>	}	<i>That the report be accepted.</i>
<i>Mr. Banfield</i>		

Carried.

In response to a query, Dr. Varah confirmed that in future Senate would receive reports closer to the date which they covered.

#### NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Dr. Elder, Chair of the Committee, presented the report on changes to student membership on Senate Committees. She explained that the students on the committees listed below were unable to attend the meetings at the times scheduled, so they were being replaced by students who would be able to attend the meetings of those committees.

##### ACADEMIC BUILDING NEEDS

Ms. J. Lahey — replacing Mr. J. Jacob

##### ACADEMIC POLICY

Mr. O. C. W. Lau — replacing Mr. C. Fung

##### AGENDA

Mrs. S. K. Prpic — replacing Ms. J. Lahey

##### CURRICULUM

Ms. C. J. Forsythe — replacing Mr. D. K. Leung

Mr. S. W. T. Mak — replacing Mrs. S. K. Prpic

##### UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Mr. S. W. T. Mak — replacing Ms. E. Onno

*Dr. Elder* } *That the proposed changes be accepted.*  
*Mr. Hanik* }

Carried.

## AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN QUESTIONS OF APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Dr. Resnick, Chair of the Committee, presented the following report which had been circulated:

"On November 14, 1990, Senate voted to establish an *Ad Hoc* Committee with the following mandate:

*To consult faculty and students with regard to the existing Senate guidelines barring student participation from department decision-making on appointments, promotion, and tenure, and report back to Senate on whether changes may be required to these guidelines.*

The committee, following its initial meeting in January 1991, decided to seek information from Deans, Department Heads, and Directors regarding current practices within their units. A questionnaire was sent out eliciting responses from most of those canvassed.

Most of those responding stated that student opinions and teaching were given a fair degree of weight in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, pursuant to the provisions in the *Faculty Handbook*. Where student participation was concerned, there was a significant difference in practice with respect to the following: decisions about new positions to be advertised, student membership of Search Committees, and student meetings with short-listed candidates. In all departments and units canvassed, students are, in fact, barred from participation in guidelines adopted in January 1973. There are, however, a number of departments and units in different faculties in which students have come to play a role both in the choice of fields in which new appointments are to be made and on Search Committees to short-list candidates for new appointments. It is also the case that many units provide opportunities for short-listed candidates coming to the university to meet with students, particularly graduate students, in the course of their visits.

In addition to sending out this questionnaire, members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee set up meetings with the Executives of the Faculty Association, the Alma Mater Society, and the Graduate Student Society. We can summarize this input as follows.

The Executive of the Faculty Association was strongly opposed to any formal student input into reappointment, promotion or tenure decisions in light of the *Faculty Handbook* provisions which bar even junior faculty from such participation. There did seem, however, to be some openness to a limited student role in the appointment process, especially if it were graduate students who would be involved. Major concerns were expressed about the importance of confidentiality being respected, were students to find themselves in such decision-making roles, as this would involve access to confidential documents.

The Executive members of the AMS with whom we met supported the principle of greater student participation in all three of appointments, promotion and tenure, though recognizing that this would be something of larger concern to graduate, rather than undergraduate, students. There was considerable willingness to support

the principle of student participation in decision re appointments, and a continuation of the more indirect consultative process, *ie.* through student evaluations, where promotion and tenure decisions were concerned.

The Executive of the Graduate Student Society were very strong supporters of student participation in all three of appointment, promotion, and tenure. Members of the Executive pointed to the experience of universities such as Western Ontario where students have been involved in decision-making in all three areas, and argued strongly that the quality of decision-making would be enhanced through student, especially graduate student, participation. Such participation would highlight the importance of teaching ability, and would ensure that new areas of interest within disciplines were given due recognition. Membership in appointment, promotion, and tenure committees would also provide invaluable experience to graduate students, many of whom hope to enter the academic profession in due course. Although supporting student participation in all three of appointment, promotion and tenure, the G.S.S. Executive was prepared to accept more limited student participation *e.g.* in new appointments, if it proved too difficult to win broad agreement for more extensive changes in the current guidelines. The G.S.S. Executive also stressed the need for Senate to ensure that the existing Senate guidelines regarding student participation were in fact respected by department heads. Too often students found themselves excluded from participation on Committees where Senate has said they have a right to participate.

Your committee also checked with faculty colleagues at other Canadian universities to get a sense of what the role of students in appointments, promotion and tenure might be. Most Canadian universities have practices similar to our own. Some universities, *e.g.* Western Ontario and Carleton, do have student representatives involved in decision-making in all three areas. The same is true for certain departments at McGill, *e.g.* Anthropology, but not for others. In a number of universities, students participate directly in appointment decisions and Search Committees, *e.g.* Ottawa, York, Simon Fraser. At Toronto, students do not participate in appointment, promotion and tenure decisions; however, a motion is about to come before U of T's governing body to provide for student participation in all administrative appointments from Chair to Dean.

Our committee, after carefully weighing the information we received and debating the issues at some length, has decided to separate the issue of new appointments from that of re-appointments, promotion and tenure.

Where new appointments are concerned, we would recommend that the Senate regulations of January 17, 1973 be modified, and that Senate now allow for student representation with full voting rights in Division, Schools, Departments and Faculties, and on relevant search committees, in matters of new appointments. Student representatives can bring a new perspective, particularly as regards teaching, to the appointment process. We would recommend that student representatives who would be so involved be either graduate or senior majors/honours students. In light of the language of the current faculty Handbook, we would recommend that the University Administration seek to negotiate with the Faculty Association any necessary change in wording to make it possible for

students to participate alongside faculty members on Search Committees, and wherever relevant, in appointment decisions as well.

Where re-appointments, promotion and tenure are concerned, some members of the committee are firmly in favour of retaining the existing procedures. Others would prefer a greater degree of student participation, if the current system of peer review could be altered. It would simply not be feasible, however, for students to become members of relevant re-appointment, promotion, or tenure committees, when a fair number of faculty members are barred from such a role. If the Faculty Agreement eventually were to be changed to provide for participation by faculty, regardless of rank, in re-appointment, promotion and tenure decisions, then members of our committee who support more extensive student participation would recommend to a future Senate that it look into these areas anew.

The committee also recommends that student representation be permitted in all faculties, as regards the appointment of heads of departments, division, or schools. These are administrative positions in the university, and appointments to them should be treated in the same way as the appointment of Deans and of the President. Students currently participate in search committees for those positions.

In sum, we propose no changes to the current Senate regulations barring student representation in matters of re-appointment, promotion and tenure. We would continue to support an indirect, consultative role for students in these matters, through teaching evaluations and the like. We do, however, recommend that student representatives be permitted to participate with vote in departmental or faculty committees in matters of new faculty appointments, and where administrative appointments within faculties are being made.

We, therefore move that Principle 3, adopted by Senate on January 17, 1973 (page 5753), be modified to read:

Although student opinions shall be sought and wherever practicable in a formal way, student representation shall not be permitted at Faculty meetings and/or Faculty committees dealing with the following matters: budget, salaries and other financial business; scholarships and other student awards; adjudication of marks and academic standing, and re-appointments, tenure and promotion.

We further move that students, in particular graduate or senior majors/honours students, be permitted to participate alongside faculty members on Search Committees, and wherever relevant, in appointment decisions as well.

Finally, we move that students be permitted to participate in faculty or departmental committees involved in the appointment of heads of departments, divisions, or schools.

We respectfully ask Senate to discharge the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Review Student Participation in Questions of Appointment, Promotion and Tenure."

<i>Dr. Resnick</i>	}	<i>That the report be accepted.</i>
<i>Professor Bryden</i>		

Carried.

Dr. Resnick spoke briefly to the report, highlighting the various points, and agreed to a suggestion that the motions be moved in reverse order.

<i>Dr. Resnick</i>	}	<i>That students be permitted to participate in faculty or departmental committees involved in the appointment of heads of departments, divisions or schools.</i>
<i>Dr. Klawe</i>		

Dr. Resnick pointed out that students already participate in committees involved in committees to select the President and Deans of Faculties, and also that this would not be in conflict with the *Faculty Handbook*.

The motion was  
put and carried.

<i>Dr. Resnick</i>	}	<i>That students, in particular graduate or senior majors/honours students, be permitted to participate alongside faculty members on search committees, and wherever relevant, in appointment decisions as well.</i>
<i>Mr. Lau</i>		

Dr. Resnick explained that the reason the words "wherever relevant" had been included in the motion was that there could be occasions where faculty were being recommended for the position of professor or associate professor, in which case certain members of the department would not be able to vote in that decision because of the rank, and in that case it would seem, because of the *Faculty Handbook*, that students would not be able to participate. The Committee thought it should be made clear that in an appointment decision where it is an assistant professor rank, where all faculty members do participate, students would be able to participate alongside faculty



members, but where it is a higher rank then the *Faculty Handbook* regulations would apply.

In response to a query, Dr. Resnick stated that in the case of the reappointment of an assistant professor, others at the rank of assistant professor do not participate in the vote as there is a different set of procedures when reappointments are considered than when first appointments are considered. If it were a new appointment all existing faculty members at that rank would participate.

Dr. Eaton pointed out that the question of reappointments had not been included in the mandate of the Committee. Dr. Resnick responded that the Committee felt that reappointments did fall within the broader sense of the word appointment, and that the Committee was in fact suggesting to Senate the guidelines established many years ago be revised to include reappointments where appropriate.

In response to further comments, Dr. Resnick stated that the words "... and wherever relevant, in appointment decisions as well" had been included because the Committee had recognized the fact that in certain cases there is a search committee alone, and in other cases it is a combination of a search committee and the department that makes the decision, and they felt that this caveat addressed both possibilities.

Professor Bryden pointed out that the motion states that students "be permitted ..." but that there was no University obligation that they participate. That was a matter for Faculties and departments to sort out. What was being removed was the present University rule against their participation.

The motion was  
put and carried.

Dr. Resnick	}	<i>Although student opinions shall be sought and wherever practicable in a formal way, student representation shall not be permitted at Faculty meetings and/or Faculty committees dealing with the following matters: budget, salaries and other financial business, scholarships and other student awards; adjudication of marks and academic standing, and reappointments, tenure and promotion.</i>
Dr. Bongie		

Dr. Resnick informed Senate that the only proposed change to the original motion passed in 1973 was that the word "appointments" be replaced by the word "reappointments".

Mr. Goehring, representative of the graduate students, stated that as a student senator he had served on the Senate Budget Committee and Student Appeals on Academic Standing which dealt in some respects with the matters prohibited in the motion. It also appeared that in some departments students do serve on similar committees. He felt that to say there should be no student participation on any of these committees was a bit harsh.

In response, Dr. Resnick pointed out that the mandate of the Committee had been to specifically look into the issue of student participation in matters of appointments, promotion and tenure, therefore the other issues referred to had not been addressed by the Committee.

Dean Meisen asked if there was a reason that only Faculty committees and not departmental committees were referred to in the motion. Dr. Resnick stated that this was simply a recapitulation of the 1973 motion which did not address departmental committees.

Ms. Forsythe expressed concern at the level of consultation and pointed out that the Executive of the AMS did not necessarily represent the views of the AMS itself. She stated that the Executive did not make policy for the AMS as that this was the responsibility of the AMS Council, and there had been no discussion of the proposal in Council. Ms. Forsythe also referred to a statement in the report that student representatives could bring a new perspective, particularly with regard to teaching and to the appointment process. She asked if the same perspective did not also apply to tenure and promotion issues.

Dean Grace stated that the Faculty of Graduate Studies had student representation on the Scholarship Committee and he felt that it was important to have student input into the policies regarding scholarships, university graduate fellowships, etc.

IN AMENDMENT:

*Dean Grace*  
*Mr. Waldman*

}

*That the motion be amended to read:*  
*"... shall not normally be permitted at Faculty*  
*meetings and/or Faculty committees ...".*

Lost.

Dr. Resnick pointed out that the real obstacle in the issue of promotion and tenure was the wording of the *Faculty Handbook*. If this were to change where rank is of no consideration in decisions on promotion and tenure, as is the case at some other universities, then it would be fair to ask a committee of Senate to address this issue.

The motion was  
put and carried.

**Proposal to establish the Entrepreneurship and Venture Capital Research Centre**

It was stated in the material circulated that the proposed centre would be based on the very substantial expertise available within the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration and will provide for the participation of scholars with related expertise from other faculties at UBC and elsewhere. The Deans of the faculties have been provided with the proposal and members of their Faculties invited to comment and to participate as appropriate.

<i>Dr. Birch</i>	}	<i>That the establishment of the Entrepreneurship and Venture Capital Research Centre within the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. Wehrung</i>		

Carried.

**Proposal to establish a Chair in Women and the Law**

<i>Dean Smith</i>	}	<i>That the Chair in Women and Law be approved.</i>
<i>Professor Bryden</i>		

It was stated in the material circulated that the establishment of a Chair in Women and Law will reinforce and strengthen the existing expertise in the Faculty in the area of feminist legal studies by expanding research and teaching in the area and by extending the interdisciplinary focus of such scholarly work. The Chair will enhance legal education by ensuring that graduates are equipped to assess the implications for women of legal processes and doctrines. The Chair will play a key role in coordinating feminist studies in the Faculty of Law's program of graduate studies, and work in conjunction with the University's new centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations.

Dr. Cook noted that the Chair will be funded through donations and matching funds from the Province of British Columbia, and asked if the funds had already been raised.

Dean Smith responded that the funds had not yet been raised.

---

*Report on the Status of UBC Degree Programs with the Colleges*

In response to a further query, President Strangway stated that there had been a number of similar proposals for which funds had be raised after approval by Senate.

The motion was  
put and carried.

### **Report on the Status of UBC Degree Programs with the Colleges**

Dr. Birch presented the following report which had been circulated for information:

"This is the third year of UBC's partnership with Okanagan and Cariboo University-Colleges in offering third and fourth year courses in Arts and Science and the UBC Elementary Teacher Education Program (Cariboo only).

All courses conform to UBC standards. Instructors have been interviewed by representatives of the UBC departments and their credentials evaluated. All instructional assignments have been approved by the relevant UBC departments and Office of the Dean.

Funding for UBC's participation in these joint ventures has been provided by the Province of British Columbia. Under the Access program, Arts received \$205,000; Science \$239,000, and Education \$116,000 to defray the cost of liaison. In addition, the University was provided \$55,000 to cover expenses relating to the colleges incurred by the Library and Registrar's Office. No UBC operating funds are being used to service our participation.

Liaison coordinators for the Faculties are dealing with continuing development of the programs at the university-colleges. Discussions were held about expectations for and reporting of scholarly activity in the past year. UBC contributed medals for the top graduates at last spring's convocation ceremonies, held at the university-colleges.

Recent visits suggest that things are going well, and morale among instructors and students is high. First and Second Year enrolments are again up at both locations, which may be a good indicator for next year's upper levels. Additions to the Library and Science Building at Cariboo University-College are complete, as is the new Arts and Education Building. Site clearance at the Okanagan University-College campus site is in progress and construction is expected to begin soon.

The Arts programs have experienced significant increases in enrolment. Majors have been approved in several fields at Okanagan and may soon be considered at Cariboo and in addition, a number of interdisciplinary options are being developed. Much effort has been dedicated to recruitment activities, monitoring courses and attempting to cultivate a suitable academic environment.

The Faculty of Science is also experiencing enrolment increases at the university-colleges. This year, major programs in Animal Biology, General Biology, Chemistry and Mathematics are being offered. A proposal for a major program in

---

*Report on the Status of UBC Degree Programs with the Colleges*

Freshwater Science is being considered and one in Resource Management is under development. The popular lecture series initiated last year, under which nine or ten UBC faculty members speak at each location on topics of general interest, is being continued to heighten awareness of UBC's commitment to the programs and to foster collegial relations. The Summer Science Fellowships, introduced in 1990 will be continued, bringing five faculty members from each university-college to UBC for ten to twelve weeks to engage in collaborative research.

The Faculty of Education continues to offer its Bachelor of Education (Elem.) at Cariboo College. A UBC Coordinator is on-site and many of the instructors for the program are seconded from local school districts.

Fraser Valley College has held preliminary discussions with UBC about entering a similar arrangement which would commence in 1992. Should that come to fruition, we will report on that partnership separately.

At this time, I would like to recognize the fine efforts of the Faculty Coordinators: Dr. Ronald Shearer and Dr. Graeme Wynn of the Faculty of Arts, Dr. John Sams of the Faculty of Science, and Dr. David Thomas of the Faculty of Education."

Dr. Birch noted that after the report had been prepared, he had been informed by Fraser Valley College that Simon Fraser University had withdrawn a proposal for the establishment of a third SFU campus in the Fraser Valley. Fraser Valley College had therefore decided to collaborate with SFU in the provision of degree completion programs in the valley.

In response to a query by Dr. Dennison, Dr. Birch stated that the agreements between the University and the colleges were initially signed for a period of five to ten years. He stated there was no basis on which to refine that estimate but the University was moving in the direction of greater control by the colleges over their offerings. At the moment, however, there was no mechanism in place at the colleges that would approximate the kind of academic scrutiny given by the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Senate, and this was an important issue if the colleges were to become autonomous degree granting institutions.

Dr. Will noted that 340 Arts students and 79 Science students were enrolled in the college programs and asked why the Faculty of Science had a larger liaison budget than the Faculty of Arts. Dr. Birch responded that the Faculty of Science had been very heavily involved in the development of laboratory courses which entail a whole series of laboratory exercises and set-ups.

### **Report on Enrolment 1991-92**

The report on enrolment for 1991-92 had been circulated for information.

Dr. Elder said she had been asked by a member of the Department of History why he had over a dozen unclassified students in his third year history course taking seats that history students might occupy. On checking through the enrolment figures Dr. Elder noted that there was a whole new category of persons under Graduate Studies listed as "no administering Faculty". She stated that there were eight in that category last year and that this year there were 49 students listed under the Master of Arts, and under Master of Science last year there was one person and this year there were 52. She found it puzzling that there were students who were not in any Faculty who were doing a Master of Arts program. Dr. Elder then drew attention to the statistics on unclassified students, and stated that large number of students in Third Year was probably accounted for by the Ritsumeikan students. However, on further inspection it appeared that under the Visiting category, which presumably meant students visiting as unclassified, the Ritsumeikan students had been included again. Dr. Elder requested that the Registrar's Office be asked for clarification as to what the figures mean.

Dr. Resnick stated that he also had concerns about the unclassified category, particularly the Fifth Year. He stated that in many cases this represent students who are thinking of applying to graduate programs, and that this puts a great deal of pressure in

certain departments on fourth year courses which are meant to be limited and seat a very small number of students. He asked if there were any guidelines regarding enrolment in Fifth Year. Dr. Elder responded that a department has the right to exclude any particular category of student from any particular course the department wishes. In response to a further query it was confirmed that any student with a degree would be given an eligibility to register in Fifth Year but would not have access to the system until much later than other students.

Dr. Will stated that it was the intention of the Senate Admissions Committee to try to get a handle on what was happening with unclassified students. He said that the number had increased greatly, and that as a result of Telereg unclassified students had easier access to many of the restricted courses. This had resulted in majors students not getting into the courses they preferred, and in some cases they had not been able to get into required courses. The Committee was very concerned that students who are not on a degree program are getting preference over students who are on a degree program.

### **Academic Year 1992-93**

The proposed dates for the 1992-93 Academic Year had been circulated. Dr. Williams expressed concern that the Christmas Examination period in 1992-93 was 13 days, particularly since the University was introducing more and more one term courses where examinations were final at Christmas. He stated that although it had been the intention of the University to try as far as possible to equalize the December and April examination periods, no progress had been made in this regard. He felt that the examination period for December 1992 was totally inadequate and suggested that it be changed from December 8 to December 1. In response to a query by Dean Meisen, Dean Grace confirmed that the date of June 1st as the last day for the Faculty of Graduate Studies to receive



---

*Report of the Tributes Committee (in camera)*

recommendations from departments for overseas international students to be admitted in September was one month earlier.

<i>Dr. Sobrino</i>	}	<i>That the proposed dates for the 1992-93 Academic Year be included in the Calendar.</i>
<i>Dean Sheehan</i>		

Carried.

Ms. Lahey stated that in discussions with the Registrar about complaints from students whose examinations were scheduled too close together, she had been informed that there were already problems with booking rooms and the number of examinations to schedule. Shortening the examination period would obviously create further problems.

Mr. Lau stated that because of the problems that had been raised, consideration of the motion should be postponed until the next meeting.

<i>Mr. Lau</i>	}	<i>That the motion be tabled.</i>
<i>Ms. Lahey</i>		

Carried.

**Report of the Tributes Committee (in camera)**

EMERITUS STATUS

<i>Dr. Dennison</i>	}	<i>That Dr. Fritz Bowers to offered the status of Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering.</i>
<i>Dr. Sobrino</i>		

Carried.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

**Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on Wednesday, December 11, 1991.