



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 NOVEMBER 16, 1994

Attendance

Present: President D. W. Strangway (Chair), Vice-President D. R. Birch, Dr. D. R. Atkins, Dr. A. P. Autor, Dr. S. Avramidis, Mr. J. A. Banfield, Dr. J. Barman, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dr. A. E. Boardman, Mr. J. Boritz, Mr. P. T. Brady, Dr. D. M. Brunette, Ms. S. Chan, Ms. L. Chui, Dr. D. H. Cohen, Dr. T. S. Cook, Dr. M. G. R. Coope, Mr. K. A. Douglas, Dr. J. H. V. Gilbert, Mr. E. B. Goehring, Dr. J. Gosline, Dean J. R. Grace, Mr. H. D. Gray, Mr. A. G. Heys, Dean M. J. Hollenberg, Dr. M. Isaacson, Dr. J. G. T. Kelsey, Mr. J. A. King, Professor V. J. Kirkness, Dr. S. B. Knight, Mr. H. H. F. Leung, Dr. M. Levine, Mr. C. Lim, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Dr. D. M. Lyster, Dr. D. J. MacDougall, Dr. M. MacEntee, Mr. K. R. MacLaren, Dean B. C. McBride, Dean J. H. McNeill, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Dean A. Meisen, Mr. R. L. de Pfyffer, Rev. W. J. Phillips, Mr. D. B. Preikshot, Professor M. Quayle, Mr. A. A. Raghavji, Dr. D. J. Randall, Professor R. S. Reid, Professor J. A. Rice, Dr. H. B. Richer, Dr. R. A. Shearer, Dean N. Sheehan, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Dean C. L. Smith, Ms. C. A. Soong, Ms. L. M. Sparrow, Dr. L. J. Stan, Mr. S. C. S. Tam, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. S. Thorne, Dr. J. Vanderstoep, Mr. D. R. Verma, Dr. E. W. Whittaker, Dr. R. M. Will, Mr. E. C. H. Woo, Dr. W. C. Wright Jr., Dean E. H. K. Yen.

Regrets: Chancellor R. H. Lee, Dean C. S. Binkley, Dr. D. G. A. Carter, Mr. P. G. Chan, Ms. S. Y. Dawood, Dean M. A. Goldberg, Dr. S. E. Grace, Rev. J. Hanrahan, Professor P. T. K. Lin, Dr. S. C. Lindstrom, Dr. R. T. A. MacGillivray, Dr. R. J. Patrick, Mrs. M. Price, Dean J. F. Richards, Dr. A. J. Sinclair, Mr. B. B. Telford, Dr. W. Uegama, Dr. D. Ll. Williams.

Senate membership

REPLACEMENT

Dr. James R. Thompson replaces Dr. George Eaton as a representative of the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences

Minutes of the previous meeting

Dean McBride
Mr. Woo

}

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

Carried.

Business arising from the minutes

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON TEACHING AND LEARNING (PP.10914-8)

The following letter from Mr. Orvin Lau, student representative on the Board of Governors, had been circulated for information:

I write concerning the Report of the Teaching and Learning Subcommittee, provided to Senate at its October 19, 1994 meeting. A copy of this report went to the Board of Governors, and was discussed at the last meeting of the Board's Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Since I was on the Senate Committee that requested this report, and given my continuing interest in the subject, I thought it important to convey my thoughts to you, and to others by copy of this memo.

Overall, I am very pleased to see this report and the recommendations that it makes. Certainly with respect to undergraduate teaching, the report takes the right view, considering that the University is a major research institution. I have provided my opinions on specific sections of the report below.

One general comment I have is that it is not completely clear to whom these recommendations are addressed. I am aware that Senate has endorsed these recommendations, and consequently they should be noted by all in a decision-making capacity at the University. Where appropriate, I have named or categorized the persons to whom the recommendations are probably directed.

1. Teaching and Research

Although this section is the last in the report, I comment on it first, as I believe it casts the report in an important perspective. When the phrase "major research university" is used, many will at once see an implied distinction between teaching and research, and think of the University as an institution concentrating its efforts on the latter. However, one of the most fundamental bases of a university is the uniting of teaching and research in its activities, and makes a university distinct from other institutions.

By contrast, this section, with its recommendations, offers a much more desirable context for the phrase "major research university", in that research pervades instruction at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and that teaching and research together are "a seamless web". I wholeheartedly agree that undergraduate students have not been exposed enough to UBC's research culture, and ought to be. All faculties and departments, and the Senate Curriculum Committee, should begin to move the curriculum of the University in the direction of implementing the recommendations of this section and to achieve this goal.

2. Curriculum and Instruction

If teaching is to be an important part of the University, good teaching must be encouraged and rewarded. Recommendations 1 and 2 are intended to do this, and will require changes in the culture and attitudes of faculty members. This change is especially important when promotion and tenure decisions are made, where faculty are involved at the initial (departmental) level. One member of Senate noted that most of the winners of the Teaching Excellence Awards had not attained the rank of full professor.

I fully understand that such changes are no easy task and will take time. In order to effect them, all department heads and deans must take a leadership role in promoting the rewarding of teaching, remembering always that this is a major research university. The Senior Appointments Committee must seek to ensure that teaching has been considered all decisions for preferment, and that it does not discourage its consideration, intentionally or unintentionally.

I have heard that this task is complicated by the fact that the university is not isolated, and cannot ignore what other universities and their faculty reward and consider prestigious. This may in some degree be so. However, like other difficult social problems (e.g. discrimination), the fact that the task is difficult should not dissuade people from dealing with it.

I also add that in addition to the opinion of academics outside UBC, public opinion should also be considered. The current public opinion of the University, as I gather, is in need of improvement. I maintain that should the funding cuts or the implied attack on tenure such as that in Alberta occur in British Columbia, there is likely to be little public sympathy for UBC's case. It is vitally important that both the actions from these two recommendations and the "major research university" role I've mentioned previously be conveyed to the public. Additionally, in light of the federal government's proposals to have students pay a greater proportion of their tuition, students will choose to attend whichever institution seems to offer the highest quality education. Should the proposals be implemented, and if UBC appears to be more dedicated to research than teaching and learning, students will go elsewhere, with disastrous consequences for the University.

Recommendation 3 proposes an interesting means of achieving the recognition of both teaching and research in a faculty member's activities. If such a system is implemented, it is important to ensure that it is flexible, since no faculty member can accurately predict the proportion of his/her activities. Additionally, in order for such a system to work, the aforementioned culture and attitude change need to take place, otherwise there is the potential for faculty members to choose research over teaching, given the greater perceived prestige of research.

Pedagogic training is raised in recommendations 4-7, and I believe the success of these recommendations mostly lies with the senior Administration. Funding for such activities, such as the Centre for Faculty Development, is currently little. Being a member of the Board, I fully acknowledge that resources are tight; however, I see little of these recommendations, which I fully support, having an impact unless there is greater funding.

It is also important to recognize that throwing money at any problem does not necessarily solve it. Faculty and graduate students must believe it to be important to make use of the opportunities provided from training, and those providing the training must ensure that faculty and graduate students feel that their time spent is worthwhile.

Recommendation 5 mentions making a seminar programme a Presidential or Provostial-sponsored event in order to signal the importance of teaching. I feel that this idea could be taken further. There is currently a Vice President Research at UBC, but no clear person within the President's Office who has the University's teaching mandate in his/her job description. Perhaps the job description of someone in the President's Office could be altered. Serious consideration should be given to this suggestion, especially in light of any turnovers in the President's Office.

3. Electronic Technology

Overall, I feel that the recommendations of this section, most of which are best addressed to the senior Administration, will help to enhance the use of technology in UBC's curriculum, especially given its potential and its increasing ubiquity. However, it must be ensured that any technology used does truly enhance learning. It should not be used for the sake of using it. Technology is certainly expensive, and where traditional teaching methods are equally (or more) effective, they should not be dispensed with.

With respect to recommendation 3, I express concern since it is vague in its intent. Is it intended that the funds would be targeted narrowly, to provide for, say, a few high-technology classrooms? Or is it intended to enhance the technology infrastructure throughout the University? I have a personal preference for the former, especially in light of the high cost of acquiring high technology.

As always, should the committee mentioned in recommendation 2 be established, there should be student representation, since they will be on the receiving end of technology-enhanced education.

Recommendations 5 and 6 are best addressed to the faculties and departments. Again, there will be a need to be a change in attitudes towards technology.

4. Quality of Teaching Space

All these recommendations should be addressed to the senior Administration, as the issue of space is really a campus-wide issue. For example, the University's stock of classrooms and teaching equipment convey a message to the students as to the importance of teaching and learning at the UBC, and it is important to ensure that they are adequately maintained throughout the campus.

In sum, recommendations 1 and 3 are definitely necessary. Renovations are needed to make teaching space more flexible and fitting for our faculty's and students' needs. There also needs to be a master plan in place for both maintenance and renovations, in order to ensure a uniform level of quality and a coordinated approach for these two recommendations. I believe that the President's Advisory Committee on Teaching Space is currently developing such a plan.

I am concerned with recommendation 3, given two reasons. First, as I have mentioned previously, technology is expensive, and consideration should be given to developing a few "high-technology classrooms" first. If electronic teaching capabilities are to be built into many classrooms, it should be minimal until the need for more sophisticated capabilities can be demonstrated. Second, the report of the Senate *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Environment for Teaching stated that there should be at least an overhead projector for every classroom on campus; this is not even the case. Perhaps that minimum requirement should be met first before providing electronic capabilities in all classrooms.

I would like to, as the Senate has, strongly encourage the deans to take the meaning and application of this report several steps further. And although I do not speak for the Board of Governors, my impression is that most of the members of the Board endorse this report, and would concur with the Senate and myself in taking it further.

I would like, by copy of this memo, to urge strongly that the Board of Governors and the Senate to continue to follow up on this report. Although I have full confidence in the administrators of the University, I cannot deny a skeptical part of me that says if I had not pressed for this report, that it may not ever have reached either the Senate or the Board.

Lastly, I would like to commend the deans who produced this report for their hard work and effort. The implied goal of the report that they have produced is very important. Achievement of that goal will make UBC, as its mission statement says, a world renowned institution of higher education and research.

Chair's remarks and related questions

There were no remarks from the Chair.

From the Board of Governors

NOTIFICATION OF APPROVAL IN PRINCIPLE OF SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- i. Awards (pp.10894-7)
- ii. Heart and Stroke Foundation Chair in Cardiology (p.10891-2)

Candidates for Degrees

Dr. Randall
Dean Hollenberg

}

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 Chair of Senate, make any necessary adjustments.

Carried.

Reports of Committees of Senate

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Curriculum Revision Process

Dr. Berger, chair of the committee, presented the report. He reminded Senate that at the May meeting the Curriculum Committee was requested to review the process for processing curriculum changes with a view to shortening the process and making it easier. Dr. Berger explained that in response to this request the committee had established a category of minor proposals whereby editorial curriculum changes that do not alter either the way a course is taught or alter its audience would be approved by the chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee and the Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee. If it is agreed that the changes are in fact editorial they will then be passed directly to the editor of the UBC Calendar for inclusion in the Calendar. A list of such changes will be provided to Senate annually.

Referring to Graduate curriculum change proposals, Dr. Berger explained that the sequence of decision making had not been changed but that the time previously taken to process the proposals had been shortened by having a joint meeting of the Curriculum Committee of Graduate Council and the Graduate Studies Subcommittee of the Senate Curriculum Committee, thereby giving the subcommittee an opportunity to deal with any queries ahead of time.

The recommendations of the committee are contained in the following report, which had been circulated:

Recommendations:

- A. That a category of editorial changes to existing courses and programs be established, that these changes be approved by the chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee and passed directly to the Editor of the UBC Calendar for implementation without review by either the Faculty Curriculum Committee or Senate Curriculum Committee. A list of these changes will be provided to the Committee and to Senate annually and this list will be attached to the minutes of Senate.
- B. That Graduate Curriculum Change Proposals, after approval by the budgetary faculty, be submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies which will distribute the material to the Curriculum Committee of Graduate Council and to the Graduate Studies Subcommittee of the Senate Curriculum Committee for review by the two committees meeting jointly. The Senate Curriculum Committee members will not vote at this stage. The proposals will then be submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for their action and subsequently will be presented to the Senate Curriculum Committee by the Graduate Studies Subcommittee.

Terms of Reference:

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on University Organization. Minutes of the Ninth Regular Meeting of the Senate of the University of British Columbia for Session 1993-94 of May 18, 1994, page 10816.

The Senate Curriculum Committee be instructed to study the process of curriculum revision and to bring recommendations to the Senate not later than November 1994 for the simplification of the process.

As guidelines, the Senate Curriculum Committee be invited to

- a) Establish a broad category of minor changes that can be made by departments, schools or non-departmentalized faculties without further consultations except notification of the appropriate curriculum review officer (who might be the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee), who will be responsible for ensuring that the change is indeed "minor" and that no other academic program is likely to be adversely affected. This category might include at a minimum, changes in course numbers, course names, prerequisite requirements and editorial changes in course descriptions.

- b) Establish a narrow category of major changes that require consultation and full review by faculties and the Senate. This category might include new programs, new courses, deletion of courses and changes that affect requirements for student programs in other departments.
- c) Consider the possibility that proposals for major changes in graduate courses and programs go directly to the Faculty of Graduate Studies from departments, schools and non-departmentalized faculties for full review before being sent to Senate for review and approval.

A. A two-stream system for editorial and substantive curriculum changes

Background and Rationale:

In 1972 a two-category system for processing curriculum changes was instituted (President's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Procedures for Course and Curriculum changes). The two categories of curriculum changes were defined as follows:

- Category A: Proposals for New Courses and substantive changes in existing courses, especially those involving more than one Department or Faculty.
- Category B: Proposals involving routine and minor changes: e.g., certain changes in credit, teaching hours, teaching methods (lecture, seminar, lab etc.), minor changes in wording of title or course description, minor changes involving more than one Department or Faculty.

The two-category system was established due to "The extraordinarily long time needed under the present procedures to introduce even quite minor changes." The hope being that the minor changes (Category B) could be dealt with expeditiously and thus speed up the overall process by allowing the Senate Curriculum Committee to focus on the substantive changes.

However, within a few years this two-category system was discontinued. (The last curriculum report to Senate using the two-category system was Spring 1977; the Fall 1977 report discontinues it.). In speaking to previous chairs of the Senate Curriculum Committee the main comment I received about the previous two stream system was that a great deal of time was spent in deciding whether a particular change was Category A or Category B.

We hope that the current sharper definition of minor changes (editorial changes) is less ambiguous than the previous Category B and that the decision of which changes are editorial and which are not should not require a lot of time. Indeed, we envision that chairs of Faculty Curriculum Committees will rarely need to refer proposals back to their committees for clarification of whether a proposed changes is editorial or not. If there is any real doubt, it is not.

Proposal:

We propose that changes to existing courses or programs be divided into two categories: Editorial changes that are changes to courses or programs that do not alter either the way that courses are taught or alter the audience of courses, and Substantive changes that alter the way that courses are taught or their audience.

1. Procedure for processing of editorial changes:

Changes originate at the departmental level and are sent to the chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee.

If the chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee agrees that the proposed changes are indeed editorial the forms are initialed and sent to the Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee.

If the Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee agrees that the changes are indeed editorial, the change form is initialed and passed on to the Editor of the UBC Calendar (Registrar's) office. A list of approved editorial changes are conveyed to the Senate Curriculum Committee for information.

If the Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee is uncertain about whether a proposed change is truly editorial, the Faculty Committee and/or the originating department may be consulted. Similarly if the Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee is uncertain about the editorial nature of a proposed change, the Senate Curriculum Committee and/or the originating faculty may be consulted.

2. Consultation

Appropriate consultation and review by the Faculty Curriculum Committee and by the Senate Curriculum Committee would be required for

- new programs,
- new courses,
- deletion of active courses (offered in last 3 years), as well as for
- substantive changes to existing courses and programs.

Consultation, review by the Faculty Curriculum Committee and review by the Senate Curriculum Committee would not be required for editorial changes including deletion of inactive courses (not offered in last three years).

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on University Organization suggested in their terms of reference (a. above) that changes to courses affecting only the programs of the originating department might be considered as editorial. This is very similar to the Category B designation of the 1972 proposals. We believe that blanket designation

of such changes as editorial is unwise. Clearly, if the proposed change affects only the program of the originating department, the extent of consultation would be minimal and review by the Faculty Curriculum Committee would probably not be time consuming. It must also be borne in mind that both the Faculty Curriculum Committees and the Senate Curriculum Committee are responsible for review and oversight of curriculum and curriculum development. They provide an important peer-review function for curriculum development.

B. Review of Graduate Curriculum Proposals

We agree with the *Ad Hoc* Committee on University Organization that the present scheme for review of Graduate Curriculum Change Proposals requires far too much time. We therefore recommend that:

Graduate Curriculum Proposals should be sent to the Faculty of Graduate Studies which will distribute the material to the Graduate Studies Subcommittee of the Senate Curriculum Committee and to the Curriculum Committee of Graduate Council.

The Graduate Studies Subcommittee of the Senate Curriculum Committee meet jointly with the Curriculum Committee of the Graduate Council to review the proposals; but only members of the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee will have voting privileges at this stage.

Recommendations from the Curriculum Committee of the Graduate Council will be presented to the Faculty of Graduate Studies by the chair of the committee.

After action by the Faculty of Graduate Studies the Graduate Subcommittee of the Senate Curriculum Committee will review, approve and recommend the proposals to the Senate Curriculum Committee for action.

This differs from the present procedure in which proposals go from the originating faculty to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and then to the Senate Curriculum Committee via the Graduate Studies Subcommittee. The sequence of decisions is the same as in the present procedure. Because the Graduate Subcommittee of the Senate Curriculum Committee will have seen and discussed the material in advance of official receipt of the course change proposals, the Subcommittee will need very little time for its review process. According to this new procedure, any clarifications, corrections or further information requested, during the joint review with the Graduate Council will be included in the material sent to the Graduate Studies Subcommittee. Thus, recommendations to the Curriculum Committee can now be made in a timely manner.

<i>Dr. Berger</i>	}	<i>That the proposed revisions to the curriculum process be approved.</i>
<i>Dr. Autor</i>		

Carried.

STUDENT AWARDS

New awards (see Appendix)

In presenting the report Dr. Cook drew Senate's attention to the Boyd Ferris Memorial Prize in Advocacy, the Hugh Ladner Memorial Prize in Labour Relations and the Bruce McColl Memorial Prize in Alternate Dispute Resolution, which had been established in honour of well-known British Columbia Q.C.s. Dr. Cook also noted that Mr. McColl had been a member of the bench of British Columbia.

Dr. Cook
Dr. Boardman

}

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

Carried.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION

Dr. Shearer stated that he had nothing to report at this meeting.

Faculty of Arts

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTS

The following proposal had been circulated:

1. That the Department of Russian and Slavic Languages and Literatures be dissolved as of June 30, 1995.
2. That the separate Departments of Classics and Religious Studies be dissolved as of June 30, 1995, and that a combined Department of Classical, Near Eastern and Religious Studies (CNRS) be established as of July 1, 1995, to include all members of the previous two departments of Classics and Religious Studies, as well as all courses and programs of both departments.

In the absence of Dean Marchak, it was agreed that discussion of this item be postponed to the December meeting of Senate.

Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences

MEMBERSHIP IN THE FACULTY OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

A proposal to add the President and the Registrar of the College of Pharmacists of B.C. to the membership of the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, as non-voting members, had been circulated.

Dean McNeill
Dr. Lyster

}

That the President and the Registrar of the College of Pharmacists of B.C. be added to the membership of the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, as non-voting members.

In response to queries, Dean McNeill explained that the Faculty has a very close working relationship with both the College of Pharmacists of B.C. and the Pharmaceutical Association of B.C. Since the college regulates the practice of pharmacy, it was felt that it would be worthwhile to have these individuals attend the Faculty meetings to see what is happening at the University. Dean McNeill also noted that as Dean of the Faculty he sits on the Council of the College of Pharmacists of B.C. and that another faculty member sits on the Board of the Pharmaceutical Association of B.C.

Following further
discussion the motion was
put and carried.

Report on Enrolment 1994-95

The enrolment statistics for 1994-95 had been circulated for information.

Student Elections to Governing Bodies

The following proposal concerning rules and regulations for student elections to governing bodies had been circulated:

The following elections are required annually:

- Board of Governors (*University Act*, Section 19 (e))
"Two full-time students elected from the Student Association"
- Senate (*University Act*, Section 34 (2) (h))
"a number of full-time students, equal to the number provided in paragraphs (a) to (f), (currently seventeen) elected from the Student Association in a manner that ensures that at least one student from each faculty is elected;"

In accordance with the *University Act*, Section 42, "The Senate shall make and publish all rules ... in respect of nominations, elections and voting ..."

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1994-95 ELECTIONS:

Following consultation with the AMS, the Registrar makes the following recommendations to Senate:

(Procedural changes are in bold face type.)

- that the call for nominations be placed by the AMS in a student campus publication on Wednesday, November 30, 1994, Wednesday, December 7, 1994, and Wednesday January 4, 1995. (The call for Nominations was previously mid-November and was placed by the Office of the Registrar.);
- the close of nominations be 4.00 p.m. on the first Friday in the second term. (The close of nominations was previously the last day of lectures in the first term.);
- that Senate abolish its current regulation that candidates limit their campaign spending to \$150.00 and require candidates to abide by the spending limit set by the AMS. (The rationale for this is that the AMS would like to make the spending limits for candidates for the Board and Senate the same as for the AMS Executive.);
- the voting to be completed by the end of January;
- those elected to the Board of Governors to take office at the first meeting of the Board on or after February 1;
- those elected to Senate to take office at the first meeting of Senate on or after April 1.

Schedule for 1994-95

- the call for nominations be placed by the A.M.S. in a student campus publication on Wednesday, November 30, 1994, Wednesday, December 7, 1994, and Wednesday January 4, 1995;
- close of nominations, 4:00 p.m., Friday, January 6, 1995;
- announcement of the list of candidates to be provided by the Registrar and placed in a student campus publications by the AMS Elections Administrator on Wednesday, January 11 and Wednesday, January 18, 1995;
- election date, Friday, January 20, 1995;
- voting to take place between Monday and Friday, January 16 - 20, 1995

Ballots

- **The AMS will prepare the Ballots for machine counting. The AMS will be responsible for having the ballots machine counted and shall provide the results to the Registrar, in confidence. The results are not official until released by the Registrar, in writing, no earlier than 48 hours after the close of polls. (This machine counting has previously been handled by the Office of the Registrar.)**

A copy of the Senate rules and regulations (previously approved by Senate, including the above amendments) **will be given to each candidate for election by the Registrar's Office when they hand in their nominations.** Copies are available to members of Senate from the Registrar, on request.

The Registrar drew Senate's attention to a change in the procedure in that the AMS will take more responsibility for the conduct of the election responsible and the counting of ballots.

Ms. Chui	}	<i>That the recommendations for the 1994-95 student elections to Governing Bodies be approved.</i>
Mr. Douglas		

Dr. Cook drew attention to the statement in the material circulated that Senate was being asked to abolish its current regulation that candidates limit their campaign spending to \$150 and require candidates to abide by the spending limit set by the AMS. It did not, however, state what this limit was. Ms. Chui responded that the current limit is \$200.

In response to a query by Dr. Kelsey, the Registrar stated that both the AMS and the Registrar's Office had an interest in changing the arrangements. In the past, elections for the AMS Council and the student elections to governing bodies were conducted at the same time but under different rules, and the students felt that this arrangement should be changed. As far as the Registrar's Office was concerned, it was interested in reducing the amount of work done in the Registrar's Office in conducting the elections.

The motion was
put and carried.

Other Business

READING BREAK

Dr. Birch informed Senate that at its meeting of October 6, the Board of Governors received the recommendation of Senate that the "reading break" be extended to a full week. The Board asked Dr. Birch to convey to Senate a request that the examination schedule not be allowed to extend into the month of May. Dr. Birch stated that there will be occasional years when the maintenance of a full week's reading break and the Senate regulation governing the period of time between the end of classes and the start of the spring examinations would result in the examination schedule extending into May. He recommended that the Senate Committee on Academic Policy be asked to examine this matter again and to recommend to Senate the policy changes necessary to ensure that the examination schedule is completed in April.

Dr. Birch
Dean Smith

}

*That this matter be referred to the Senate
Committee on Academic Policy for further
examination.*

Carried.

Report of the Tributes Committee (in camera)

HONORARY DEGREES

Dean McBride, Chair of the committee, presented the report recommending that the following be invited to accept honorary degrees at the 1995 congregation ceremonies.

THIS SECTION OF THE MINUTES IS NOT BEING CIRCULATED

THIS SECTION OF THE MINUTES IS NOT BEING CIRCULATED

<i>Dean McBride</i>	}	<i>That the recommendations of the Tributes Committee concerning honorary degrees be approved.</i>
<i>Dean Smith</i>		
<i>Dr. Cook</i>	}	<i>That the recommendations be considered seriatim</i>
<i>Mr. Woo</i>		

Lost

The motion to approve the
recommendations of the committee
was put and carried.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8.30 p.m.

Next meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on Wednesday, December 14, 1994.

Appendix

AWARDS RECOMMENDED TO SENATE

Peter ARMANIOUS Memorial Prize -A \$300 prize has been endowed by friends and colleagues in memory of Dr. Peter Armanious. The award is available to an outstanding resident in the Cardiology Training Program exhibiting excellence in clinical cardiology. The award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine in consultation with the Post-Graduate Education Committee in Cardiology. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)

BRITISH Columbia Bond Dealers Association Bursary -A \$300 bursary has been endowed by the British Columbia Bond Dealers Association. The award is offered to an undergraduate student in finance option in the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)

Boyd FERRIS Memorial Prize in Advocacy -A \$400 prize has been endowed by friends and colleagues in memory of Boyd Ferris, Q.C., a highly accomplished and prominent member of the legal profession of B.C. who passed away in the early 1990's in the same short period as Mr. High Ladner, Q.C. and Mr. Justice Bruce McColl, Q.C. The award is offered to a student demonstrating excellence in advocacy and is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)

C. Colin JACKSON Memorial Bursary in Medicine -A bursary of \$500 has been established by Dr. Gary Jackson in memory of his father, Dr. C. Colin Jackson. The award is offered to a student in the Faculty of Medicine. Preference may be given to mature students. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)

Hugh LADNER Memorial Prize in Labour Relations -A \$400 prize has been endowed by friends and colleagues in memory of Hugh Ladner, Q.C., a highly accomplished and prominent member of the legal profession of B.C. who passed away in the early 1990's in the same short period as Mr. Boyd Ferris, Q.C. and Mr. Justice Bruce McColl, Q.C. The award is offered to a student demonstrating excellence in labour relations and is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)

Peter Andrew MARRON Memorial Award -A \$1,000 award has been endowed in memory of Peter Andrew Marron by his father George A. Marron. The award is available to a student in the School of Human Kinetics who is in the Exercise Science Programme, or involved in research work who displays scholarship, leadership and perseverance. Preference will be given to a student working in the Buchanan Lab or comparable programme. The award is made on the recommendation of the School of Human Kinetics. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)

Bruce MCCOLL Memorial Prize in Alternate Dispute Resolution -A \$400 prize has been endowed by friends and colleagues in memory of Mr. Justice Bruce McColl, Q.C., a highly accomplished and prominent member of the legal profession of B.C. who passed away in the early 1990's in the same short period as Mr. Boyd Ferris, Q.C. and Mr. Hugh Ladner, Q.C. The award is offered to a student demonstrating excellence in alternate dispute resolution and is made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)

Appendix

Charles Victor RYDER Entrance Scholarship in Engineering -A \$2,000 scholarship has been endowed by the Estate of Charles Victor Ryder for an outstanding student entering first year engineering in the Faculty of Applied Science from secondary school. Recipients of this scholarship who also receive the Outstanding Student Initiative Scholarships are permitted to retain both awards. The award is made on the recommendation of the Entrance Scholarship Committee. (Available 1995/96 Winter Session.)

WRIGHT Parry Taylor & Fuller Engineering Ltd. Bursary -A bursary of \$500 is offered by Wright Parry Taylor & Fuller Engineering Ltd. to an undergraduate student in civil engineering in the Faculty of Applied Science. (Available 1994/95 Winter Session.)