



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 OCTOBER 13, 1999

Attendance

Present: President M. C. Piper (Chair), A/Vice-President D. R. Atkins, Dean F. S. Abbott, Dr. P. Adebar, Mr. R. Affleck, Dr. R. W. Blake, Dean J. Blom, Mr. P. T. Brady, Mr. P. T. Burns, Dean J. A. Cairns, Ms. E. J. Caskey, Mr. A. Chui, Ms. J. Dennie, Dr. D. Fisher, Dr. J. H. V. Gilbert, Dr. R. Goldman-Segall, Dr. D. Granot, Mr. H. D. Gray, Mr. E. Greathed, Dr. S. W. Hamilton, Dr. A. G. Hannam, Dr. P. E. Harding, Dr. J. Helliwell, Ms. L. Hewalo, Dean M. Isaacson, Dr. C. Jillings, Dr. D. D. Kitts, Dean M. Klawe, Mr. J. Kondopulos, Dr. B. S. Lalli, Dr. V. Lemay, Ms. P. Liu, Mr. T. P. T. Lo, Dr. M. MacEntee, Mr. S. MacLachlan, Dr. P. L. Marshall, A/Dean J. A. McLean, Dr. W. R. McMaster, Mr. W. B. McNulty, Ms. L. Morton, Dean D. Muzyka, Dr. P. N. Nemetz, Mr. V. Pacradouni, Dr. G. N. Patey, Dr. T. F. Pedersen, Dr. J. Perry, Mr. G. Podersky-Cannon, Mr. H. Poon, Dr. V. Raoul, Dr. H. J. Rosengarten, Dr. K. Schonert-Reichl, Dean N. Sheehan, Prof. A. F. Sheppard, Dr. D. Sjerpe, Dr. C. E. Slonecker, Ms. K. Sonik, Dr. R. Tees, Mr. D. Tompkins, Mr. J. Tsui, Dean *pro tem.* A. Tully, Dr. W. Uegama, Mr. D. R. Verma, Dr. D. L. Williams, Dr. R. A. Yaworsky, Dean E. H. K. Yen.

Regrets: Dr. W. L. Sauder (Chancellor), Dr. B. C. McBride, Dr. J. D. Berger, Dr. H. M. Burt, Ms. J. DeLucry, Mr. E. Fidler, Rev. T. J. Hanrahan, Dr. S. B. Knight, Mr. R. W. Lowe, Dr. D. M. Lyster, Dr. W. J. Phillips, Dean M. Quayle, Ms. C. Quinlan, Dr. C. Shields, Mr. J. E. Sookero, Ms. L. M. Sparrow, Dr. J. R. Thompson, Dr. W. C. Wright, Jr.

Senate Membership

DECLARATION OF VACANCIES (UNIVERSITY ACT, SECTION 36 (6))

1. Prof. Paul T. K. Lin, appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council;
2. Mr. Adrian Mitchell, student representative of the Faculty of Science.

REPLACEMENTS

1. Dr. Ricki Goldman-Segall replaces Dr. Victor Froese as faculty representative of the Faculty of Education;
2. Ms. Lillian Morton replaces Mr. Michael Edwards as student representative of the Faculty of Education.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Mr. Podersky-Cannon, referring to page 12182 of the Minutes of the Meeting of September 15, 1999 (Senate Committee Membership), noted that Dr. Williams had also stated that nominations for the four vacant positions for representatives to the affiliated colleges would be brought to the October meeting of Senate. Dr. Williams confirmed that he had indeed stated that this would be the case, and that the Committee was remiss. He explained that, although there was a shortage of volunteers for these positions, the Committee would endeavour to bring forward nominations as soon as possible.

Dr. Rosengarten
Dr. Tees

}

That the minutes of the Meeting of September 15, 1999 be adopted as circulated.

Carried.

Business Arising from the Minutes

POSITION OF STUDENTS IN CASE OF A STRIKE (PP. 12187-8)

Please see 'Appendix A: Policies on the Position of Students in Case of a Strike'

At the September 15, 1999 meeting of Senate, Mr. Tompkins had asked whether Senate had previously approved a policy regarding the impact on students of a possible strike. In response, the Registrar circulated two excerpts from the Minutes of Senate, which include relevant policies and discussion.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT IN THE DIGITAL ENVIRONMENT

Dr. Rosengarten presented the report on behalf of the Library Committee. He reminded members of Senate that the Library Committee had given the following notice of motion on May 19, 1999:

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.

The text of the Statement was circulated at the meeting.

[Note: Statement not included in the minutes. Printed copies may be obtained from the Manager, Secretariat Services.]

Dr. Rosengarten stated that the Statement had been prepared by the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) in support of a campaign to persuade the federal government to maintain an appropriate balance between the claims of copyright holders and the need for access for information by people involved in study, teaching and research. The Library Committee reviewed the Statement, and strongly supports its position.

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Dr. Rosengarten</i> | } | <i>That the Senate of the University of British Columbia endorse the Statement of Principles for the Management of Copyright in the Digital Environment, as developed by the Canadian Association of Research Libraries.</i> |
| <i>Dr. Gilbert</i> | | |

Speaking to the motion, Dr. Rosengarten stated that in recent years, copyright legislation had tipped the balance in favour of the rights of copyright holders, making it increasingly difficult and expensive to gain access to works protected by copyright, even with recent legislation that granted certain exceptions under the general rubric of 'fair dealing.' Difficulties have been compounded by the expansion of information in a digital environment. Librarians and scholars have become concerned that the owners of protected databases will restrict access to those who can

afford to pay. This Statement of Principles represents an attempt to persuade government to apply to digitized materials the same 'fair dealing' principles that apply to printed information.

Mr. Pacradouni, referring to Principle 6, 'Royalty-Free Access to Government Information', asked why the Statement's scope appears to be restricted to federal government materials. Mr. Burns pointed out that the abridged summary of the Statement dated May 1999 drew no distinction between federal and provincial materials.

In response to a query from Mr. Podersky-Cannon, Dr. Rosengarten confirmed that CARL recognizes that copyright holders have a right to receive royalties, but supports free access to information that might otherwise be restricted.

The motion was
put and carried.

Chair's Remarks and Related Questions

ACTING VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC AND PROVOST

The President announced with regret that Dr. Barry C. McBride, Vice-President Academic and Provost had taken a leave of absence due to health reasons, and wished Dr. McBride a speedy recovery on behalf of members of Senate. Dr. Derek R. Atkins had agreed to serve as Acting Vice-President during Dr. McBride's absence. The President thanked Dr. Atkins for agreeing to serve in this capacity.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETINGS

The President invited all members of Senate to attend either or both upcoming Annual General Meetings, scheduled on October 14 and October 19, 1999. The first meeting was to be held at the Waterfront Hotel, while the second was to take place at the Chan Centre for the Performing Arts.

President Piper also encouraged members of Senate to invite colleagues, students and others to attend.

THRONE SPEECH FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENT

The President stated that the federal government had announced its support for a program entitled '21st Century Research Chairs for Research Excellence.' President Piper described this announcement as very good news for research universities across Canada, and for UBC in particular. The federal government intends to introduce 1200 new chairs over the next three years. Funding for these chairs will be dispersed through the 3 major granting councils, and the total cost will be approximately \$180 million over three years. There is the potential to increase the number of chairs to 2000 over five years. This ongoing funding will support outstanding scholars in all disciplines, including those in the social sciences and humanities.

Although the implementation strategy was still to be worked out, the federal government's commitment to 1200 positions had been confirmed. The President urged the UBC community to think about how the University should position itself to take advantage of this very significant new development.

Reports from the Vice-President, Academic and Provost

DRAFT ACADEMIC PLAN

[Note: full text of the Draft Academic Plan not included in the Minutes. Please see <http://www.olderadm.ubc.ca/apac/>]

The President introduced the Draft Academic Plan by inviting members of Senate to participate in a thorough discussion of the document. President Piper suggested that motions for specific revisions to the document would not be accepted at that point in time. The intent was to seek the

advice of Senate in advance of presenting the document for adoption at a later date. President Piper then invited Acting Vice-President Atkins to comment further on the Draft.

Dr. Atkins stated that, although it was regrettable that Dr. McBride was unable to be present, he will still have a chance to listen to advice of Senate by reviewing the notes from the discussion.

The Academic Plan Advisory Committee (APAC), which consisted of 38 members, had circulated a preliminary draft document entitled 'Towards an Academic Plan.' This first document had been presented to Senate by APAC chair Dr. Michael Goldberg. 60 meetings on and off campus ensued and APAC received over 300 written submissions. Consultations continued when the Draft was presented at a Town Hall Meeting recently held at the Chan Centre for the Performing Arts. Dr. Atkins reminded members of Senate that the document remained in draft form, and APAC members were still open to receiving input.

Dr. Atkins described the Academic Plan as a 'child' of *Trek 2000*. The Plan will therefore inherit the properties, values and context of the *Trek 2000* document. The authors of the Plan had chosen a heavily decentralized planning process. In an effort to provide some flexibility, the document was vague about what constitutes an academic unit: be it a faculty, department or some other kind of structure. APAC had requested clarification from Senate on this issue.

Unit-based academic plans should document weaknesses as well as strengths. For example, conditions in teaching and research facilities are currently far below what they should be. Classrooms are overcrowded, and connectivity is obviously an issue. Support for faculty members in teaching and research is inadequate. Any effective plan must address these issues in order to identify what needs to be done to rectify the weaknesses before moving on.

One problem inherent to decentralized planning is that everyone may be heading in different directions. The Academic Plan will provide a sense that we are all heading in roughly the same compass direction. Dr. Atkins stated that it would not be helpful to have everyone heading to different points of the compass.

Given that the Draft Academic Plan contains 108 bullets, there will always be a place where someone will disagree. The Plan is not intended to be directive; instead, the bullets are intended as guidelines for what units might consider including in their own academic plans. The authors have chosen their language carefully: words like 'advocates,' 'supports,' or 'proposes' are used in place of 'we will,' 'we must,' or 'we should.'

A critical part of the planning process is to see the whole rather than just the parts. *Trek 2000* has generated an enormous amount of activity. For example, some of the ideas in *Trek 2000* have resulted in an avalanche of proposals for startling, wonderful new programs which build on the tremendous tradition of the University, as well as innovative programs. One problem with the Academic Plan involves incrementalism: if its ideas are examined one at a time, one may begin to focus on the hill immediately ahead rather than on the whole landscape. A second problem with incrementalism is that the first applicant may get the funding. It is hoped that we can find some way to assess what kinds of competing proposals may exist, so that decision-making bodies can determine how a particular proposal fits in with demands that UBC is facing on the whole.

There has been concern expressed about the Academic Opportunities Fund, particularly about the concept of taxing units. APAC would like to hear from Senate on this issue, and the Committee is open to considering alternate suggestions.

The development of an Academic Plan was listed as the first item under the 'People' section of *Trek 2000*. Dr. Atkins noted that implementing such a Plan will be expensive. Other parts of the *Trek 2000* vision will also incur large costs. Another example is the recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty, particularly considering the retirement bulge facing UBC in coming years. For many reasons, the next decade is going to be an expensive period. Difficulties in this area will be eased somewhat by the funding announcement in the Speech from the Throne, and Dr. Atkins added as a point of interest that President Piper had played an important role in initiating this new program. The Academic Plan, and the approximately \$3 to \$5 million required for its implementation would be considered among other priorities of the *Trek 2000* program as funds become available.

Dr. Atkins introduced three APAC members in attendance, including Dr. Richard Cavell.

Members of Senate were invited to speak to the Draft Academic Plan and made the following comments.

Dr. MacEntee asked why UBC needs a Plan at all. He stated that he would not quite agree that it would not be healthy for the University to be heading in all directions of the compass, because he believed that UBC is an effective university because it does so. In response to Dr. Atkins' comment that UBC needs an integrated approach to assist in prioritizing demands, he stated that there is already a structure in place that has worked for a very long time and has put UBC in a very good position.

Dr. MacEntee noted that the Plan states that it is not a detailed blueprint to be imposed on all units, but that the Plan also advocates rewarding existing programs which advance the goals of the Plan. The idea that funding would be administered through a committee proposed by the Fac-

ulties but selected by the Provost has made many people on campus very uneasy. He stated that the Plan fell far short of addressing the needs of a very diverse community, and would put UBC at risk for centralizing in a way that may not indeed suit us for the next century.

Dean Klawe, addressing the need for a Plan, reminded members of Senate that recurring budget cuts have had very serious consequences on campus, including in the Faculty of Science. Educational and research programs, as well as the morale of faculty, staff and students have all been negatively affected. Individual departments are attempting to cope with budget cuts in rational ways, while doing the least possible damage to things that they value, i.e. educational and research programs. Measures include asking faculty members to teach more and to accommodate more students in each class. Even while trying to coordinate cutbacks within the Faculty, the actions of a given department may have adverse effects on other departments or Faculties. This problem is difficult to manage without a coherent framework. Such a framework would be useful in times of fiscal restraint, but also in times of renewed resources. Having a Plan would not mean that everyone does the same things or has the same style, but would mean that UBC has identified some common goals.

Dr. Patey stated that the Plan is not transparent, even on the third or fourth reading. He pointed out its contrast with reality: although everyone is in favour of faculty retention and renewal, departing faculty members are not being replaced. He gave the example of the Department of Chemistry, where although 4 faculty members left the Department last year, only one replacement has been appointed. He expressed the opinion that a Plan which does not address funding cannot be credible. Faculty members are encouraged to support experiential learning, and indeed experiments are a major part of science, but laboratories are facing cuts. Teaching assistantships, a mainstay of a graduate education, are being reduced for financial reasons at the same time when UBC is working to attract more graduate students. He suggested that some recognition of

this reality appear in the Plan. The Plan contains a fundamental tension. It states that we want to offer programs which are more labour intensive, while also enhancing research efforts. This can only be accomplished in two ways: full time faculty will teach more or we will need to hire a large number of sessional instructors.

Dr. Patey, referring to the Plan's apparent overemphasis on interdisciplinarity and breadth, pointed out that depth, rather than breadth, is the most crucial factor in the physical sciences, where advances are made in areas that may be considered very narrow. He also stated that it was unclear what was meant by 'differential roles for faculty.' With regard to the Academic Opportunities Fund, Dr. Patey added that most units are not in a position to be taxed, as all funds are currently being used to simply maintain core programs. Dr. Patey added that the Academic Opportunities Fund would be more appealing if there were evident a commitment on behalf of the central administration to seek new funds, and to apply this principle to new funds.

Mr. Greathed noted that the Plan mentions alumni on Page 1 among the people to be kept in the foreground of all planning activities. He noted that there is no mention of alumni in other parts of the Plan, however, and suggested that this should be added, e.g. Section 5, Page 9. He also asked how the term 'broader communities to which we are responsible' should be interpreted. Are the authors of the Plan referring to Vancouver, the Lower Mainland, Southern British Columbia, or the Province of British Columbia? He stated that his recent experience has shown that the residents of Point Grey and the University Endowment Lands are angry about the actions and attitudes of UBC. He suggested that the Plan should focus more on these broader communities.

Dr. Fisher, referring to the focus on links with the broader community, stated the opinion that it would be a mistake to substitute service to our immediate communities in place of UBC's tradi-

tional purpose as a national research university that serves Canada, and to some extent other nations particularly those around Pacific Rim. The most important goal would be the sharing of knowledge through the world wide knowledge network, as this would contribute to the common good in the broadest sense.

Speaking to the section on governance, Dr. Fisher stated that transparency and collegiality should be emphasized as operating principles within the Plan. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the four main forms of organization of higher education institutions are: collegial, political, bureaucratic and market. All institutions incorporate elements of all of these forms in varying degrees. The document, as it stands, pushes UBC further toward the political, bureaucratic, and market end of the spectrum. He suggested that UBC look for ways to return to its collegial roots.

He noted that the draft could further centralize authority in the President's Office, creating quasi-markets where units would be forced to compete against each other for scarce resources.

Addressing the section on the learning environment, Dr. Fisher stated that traditional ways of organizing universities have not led to life-long learning. He suggested that perhaps a better balance should be struck between interdisciplinary and disciplinary learning.

Dr. Fisher agreed that the library is the central research resource for the entire university. He suggested that UBC focus on the goal of 'reviewing library funding concerning space, operations and acquisitions' rather than dissipating our efforts. He referred to a 1997/98 survey of 111 North American research universities conducted by the Association of Research Libraries. The survey showed that the University of Toronto had risen from 6th position to 4th position among the 111

institutions over the past five years; in comparison, UBC had fallen from 25th position to 35th position.

Dr. Fisher requested that sentences be used rather than point form, and that priorities be ordered rather than presented in long lists. The Plan should set priorities above all else. It should also contain clear and parsimonious writing.

Referring to the Academic Opportunities Fund, Dr. Fisher stated that it appeared that this proposed decision making process would bypass current decision making bodies, and expressed the opinion that decisions essential to UBC's academic future should be handled by the Senate.

Dr. Sjerve stated that, although he couldn't see the reason for a Plan at first, he has come to understand that a Plan may be a way to manage coming changes. He agreed with Dean Klawe, in that a Plan might assist Faculties in making decisions. He stated that the proposed Academic Opportunities fund would create a divisive environment, but added that this arrangement would be perfectly acceptable if it were applied to new funding only. Dr. Sjerve asked that the Academic Policy Committee be given the opportunity for a second reading of the Academic Plan at some point in the process.

Dr. Pedersen spoke in favour of the Academic Plan, but with some qualifications. He stated that he had been quite disturbed recently about the amount of invective about the Academic Plan among his colleagues in the Faculty of Science as well as elsewhere on campus. People appear to be frustrated in that they are speaking out in ways that debase the quality of discourse on this campus. He stated that it is incumbent on all of us to point out that UBC stands for a higher level of discourse.

Dr. Pedersen stated that the Academic Plan contains many good ideas, but fails two in areas. The first problem is the lack of an articulate preamble to establish what a university is and what it hopes to become. He stated that Dean Tully had written a marvellously constructed response to this issue, and urged members of Senate to seek a copy. The second problem concerns the Academic Opportunities Fund. He described the Fund as a good idea in principle, but flawed in process. Taxing each unit on an annual basis would create an enormous amount of work for heads of units and resulting committees, who would be forced to justify their needs. He spoke in support of the principle of reallocation, but expressed the need to find a different mechanism and suggested that new money would be required. As new funding becomes available, it should be awarded to centres of excellence and positions of strength rather than dissipated throughout all units.

Commenting on the pace of the approval process for the Academic Plan, Dr. Pedersen stated that there had been active discussion on campus in the past few weeks, and that it was only recently that the discussion had galvanized. He urged the senior administration to consider allowing extra time for the discussion to come to its full convergence. Because people are feeling under pressure to get their comments in prior to the deadline, they may not be responding as cautiously and thoughtfully as they might otherwise do.

Dr. Tees stated that he would support an Academic Plan, and agreed that UBC needs a Plan. He added that some revisions would improve the current draft. For example, the Plan would benefit from a preamble in which we lay out what is special about UBC. He also stated that the Plan should focus on how to generate more resources, and how to use resources we have. He agreed with previous speakers in that the source for funds through the Academic Opportunities Fund should not be a tax on poor departments, but should instead be derived from new money.

Mr. Burns stated that he agreed with previous speakers, particularly regarding the need for a preamble. He stated that he would support a plan fairly closely based on the Draft, subject to some modifications. He expressed an uneasy feeling, however, about certain features in the Draft. He agreed that the section on governance would inevitably mean greater centralization of authority in the central administration. To illustrate, he referred to the suggestion to reduce the number and size of committees. Faculty members may complain about the amount committee work to be done. When one considers the essentially democratic ideals of a university, however, what other way is there of ensuring that everyone has an opportunity to be heard? If the number and size of committees were reduced, representation by students and younger faculty members would be eliminated, leaving department heads and their allies to make decisions. He expressed the opinion that this would not be the proper way to manage a university where so many diverse interests exist.

Mr. Burns expressed a concern with respect to the following statement about governance: 'where possible, policies and regulations should focus on outcome rather than process.' He stated that this approach would ignore factors that are important to a university in a qualitative and moral sense. This statement would suggest that we consider consultation and equity to be problematic. When read in conjunction with the section on the Academic Opportunities Fund, the process could appear to be unfair.

Mr. Burns made several suggestions about the format of the Draft Academic Plan, including that the bullets be replaced by sentences, and that awkward terminology be reviewed by an academic rather than a professional editor. He stated that his annoyance with the language had deflected his interest in the subject.

Dean *pro tem*. Tully clarified that the above-mentioned statement by the Faculty of Arts was not intended to be critical in a negative way of the Academic Plan; the intention was to be positive. The statement does contain several criticisms of the Draft Academic Plan, which the Faculty of Arts hopes will be taken into consideration. Speaking to why he was in support of a plan, Dean *pro tem*. Tully stated that the Faculty has also been negatively affected by budget cuts over the last 15 years. Faculty positions have been reduced by approximately 100 since the early 1980's. Faculty turnover has been considerable, and a large number of people are due to retire over the next 7 or 8 years. Given these demographic and budgetary factors, the Faculty would like to find some way of rationally approaching what it chooses to do and how its members choose to see themselves. Arts is one of the Faculties that already has an Academic Plan, which was approved in May 1999. The Arts plan reflects some of the issues raised in the broader UBC Academic Plan.

Dean *pro tem*. Tully stated that he saw the discussion about the Academic Plan as an invitation to be constructive, as an invitation to liberate one's imagination, and as an invitation to redefine the University. The generation of academics that shaped UBC in the 1950's and 1960's see change as declension from the model they know best, and this notion has been reinforced by constant budgetary pressure since the early 1980's.

While still speaking in support of an Academic Plan, Dean *pro tem*. Tully expressed some ambivalence about the Academic Opportunities Fund and how it was conceived to operate. He could understand the apparent tension about centralization, but added that it would be naive to assume that budgetary decisions made in the past have somehow been transparent while decisions in the future would be centralized. He expressed the opinion that past decisions have been made in closets and according to irrational formulas.

Dean *pro tem*. Tully stated that he looked forward to the possibilities created by the Academic Plan. Although he could not speak for all members of the Faculty of Arts, he stated that there is a sense of support there, as well as the feeling that some intelligent changes should be made.

Dr. Blake referred to the suggestion of differentiated roles for faculty members, pointing out that to some people this implies an imposition of circumstance. There could be created a research stream of people, as well as a teaching concentration, and perhaps an opportunity for someone to declare their own focus.

Dr. Blake requested that the authors of the Draft Academic Plan include a more specific reference to graduate students, particularly with reference to their role in the interface between research and undergraduate teaching. He stated that he would also like to see some thought given to how resources or training could change the nature of the graduate student experience at UBC.

Dean Sheehan stated that the discussion about the Academic Plan had been the most interesting debate before Senate in her 13 years as a member. If nothing else, this discussion has caught everyone's imagination and allowed us to listen to one another about a Plan that has been in process for many months. Many parts of the University have become engaged, and all sorts of interesting ideas have emerged. Whether these new ideas fit with the Academic Plan or not, we have liberated ourselves to do things that we have not felt free to do before. If nothing else, this discussion has created a spirit of movement. Dean Sheehan added that, although the final Academic Plan may not be exactly like the Draft, we are well on our way.

Mr. Sheppard stated that he intended to consider the worst case scenario, and interpret this document in the worst possible light. The Draft Academic Plan could lead to the 'dumbing down' of academic standards on campus and a worsening of conditions for faculty. The document may

undermine the autonomy of the University, and reduce its role in the post-secondary educational sector in the Province of British Columbia. He expressed concern about the term 'partner employment policies.' Without knowing exactly what this term meant, he stated that he would assume that it would entail marching faculty off to work in industry and recouping the money for the University. Faculty members could possibly be pressed into this type of service against their wishes. The concept of differentiated roles of faculty was also of concern. Mr. Sheppard stated that the role of faculty has included teaching, research and service. The addition of community interaction could be problematic, because the necessary time would be time formerly devoted to teaching and research. Such a policy would therefore diminish the role of teaching and research.

Speaking to the section on experiential learning, Mr. Sheppard suggested that giving credit for prior life experience, rather than prior learning, was questionable. He also stated that reducing the total number of courses offered would cause him concern, as diversity and the expansion of knowledge would be necessarily discouraged. The idea that the level of student financial support become proportional to annual scholarly success could mean the abolition of bursaries for students in need. Offering greater rights of transfer for students from other institutions into UBC may lead to college instructors being able to set UBC's standards and UBC must therefore clearly indicate that it has the right to decide what credit will be granted to students entering UBC.

Mr. Sheppard stated the opinion that the discussion of information technology and its potential to influence learning was woefully inadequate, especially because it neglected to address the work load effect of technology. He stated that the opportunity to send e-mail to professors outside of class times has led to a deterioration in the quality of classroom discussions. Although he admitted that information technology has advantages, he stated that its problems should also be discussed in the Academic Plan.

With all due respect to its proposers, Mr. Sheppard spoke against the creation of a separate entity of a weekend college, because it could suggest a deterioration of the standards of the University. He added that he was also very concerned about the status of the humanities and social sciences on campus. He stated that most of the points under Section 3 have little relevance to the humanities and social sciences, and that the final document should contain greater emphasis on these areas. Mr. Sheppard stated that the creation of community associate teaching and research appointments would suggest the dumbing down of faculty standards.

Mr. Sheppard, referring to the statements in the Draft Academic Plan about maintaining a presence in the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD), reminded members of Senate that the institution is entitled 'The University of British Columbia' rather than 'The University of the GVRD.' He stated that he shares the concern about the community that we're supposed to be addressing. Given the value of the internationalization of knowledge as a valuable vision, it would not be appropriate to create a boundary around the GVRD and ignore the larger community.

Mr. Sheppard, referring to the proposed 'fast track' mechanism for approving curriculum changes, asked how a program in which students were enrolled could be stopped if it were to fail a rigorous review. He stated that the proposed reduction in the number and size of committees implies a reduced role for faculty and professional administrators in the governance of the University, and that this would be deplorable. He expressed his support instead for a more collegial and consultative model of university governance.

He stated that there was a contradiction in the proposal that cost recovery for UBC high-speed network connectivity and other 'common good' information technology services be re-consid-

ered. He stated that if something is for the common good, then the idea of cost reduction should not apply, and these services should be otherwise funded.

Dr. Gilbert stated that the development of an Academic Plan represented a unique opportunity for the University. The discussion has resulted in an incredibly democratic exchange of views, no matter how one may feel about the document. Speaking to the need for a Plan, he stated that this exercise was last completed in 1967, when 12 men were appointed to write a plan for the University: surely there are things that we would like to change since 1967. He added that the 1967 report was a good one and that it made some very interesting observations about the Computer Centre, and about decentralizing the library. Members of the community, however, were not asked for their opinions before the report was published. Instead of proceeding the same way this time, we have afforded ourselves this very intellectually enriching experience. He agreed with Dean *pro tem*. Tully's comments regarding a generation of academics who might believe that the perfect university existed at some time in the past, and that it should be recreated. This is not the case. We are reinventing something incredibly important through the Academic Plan. Dr. Gilbert stated that it would be impossible to agree with everything in the Academic Plan, but that he would vote for its next incarnation.

Mr. MacLachlan noted that the only place where undergraduate students are mentioned is in the section on the Learning Environment. As all sections of the Academic Plan will greatly impact the education of undergraduate students, he urged members of the Committee to consider an increased focus on the role of undergraduate students. He expressed the opinion that the section on Page 5 that begins with the statement that 'research and teaching are tightly linked in a research university' should be strengthened by the addition of the statement that undergraduate students are encouraged to participate in original research projects with faculty members. He fur-

ther suggested the addition of a statement under 'Learning Environment' to deal with academic outcomes.

Mr. Gray expressed the opinion that the most important part of the Academic Plan would be the planning process itself. Because plans generally do not turn out as one might expect, we should not be driven or led by the resulting document, nor should we allocate a great deal of resources to implementation. He stated that the Senate is supposed to be charged with the academic life of the community, and that this work is too important to be left to others. He stated that he would guard jealously the committee work done within the Senate, and that those not prepared to participate should not stand for election or appointment to the Senate.

Dr. Lalli commented that the quality of the students coming from the high schools has a direct effect on the quality of students that graduate from UBC, and asked whether there was a plan in place to improve the standards for students entering UBC. He also pointed out that the Draft Academic Plan contained no mention of equity in hiring, and asked whether there was already such a policy in place.

President Piper thanked members of Senate for sharing their views in what she described as a very informative, useful, and thought provoking discussion.

In response to a query from Dr. MacEntee, President Piper confirmed that it was not definite that the Academic Plan would be returned to Senate for approval at its November 1999 meeting. The Academic Plan Advisory Committee was to decide how much time they would need to integrate the input from Senate and will advise when they are ready to bring the revision back to Senate for approval. Dr. Atkins confirmed that the process may be extended.

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. Affiliation of Carey Theological College (pp. 12172 - 74);
- ii. Establishment of the Centre for International Study of Contemporary Records and Archives (pp. 12186).

Tributes Committee

MEMORIAL MINUTE FOR WILLIAM KAYE LAMB

Dr. Slonecker presented the following memorial minute on behalf of the Committee:

William Kaye Lamb, 1904-1999

W. Kaye Lamb, UBC's second University Librarian and Canada's first National Librarian, died at the University Hospital on August 24, 1999. He was born in New Westminster, BC on May 11, 1904, and attended schools there, in Surrey and in Vancouver. He entered the Faculty of Arts at UBC's Fairview Campus in 1923, where his principal mentors were Walter Sage, Frederick Soward, Garnett Sedgewick, Harry Ashton, and Frederick Wood. His academic life continued off-campus because during his undergraduate years he lived in Vancouver with the uncle after whom he was named, Joseph Kaye Henry, a Professor of English at McGill College, and at UBC in its first years. Upon graduating from the University of BC in 1927 with first class honours in history, he was awarded a Nichol Scholarship, which provided for three years of postgraduate study in France. During these years abroad he studied in Paris at the Sorbonne and the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques. Returning to UBC for a year in 1929/30, he completed requirements for an M.A. in history. He then attended the London School of Economics, where he completed a Ph.D. in 1933, under the tutelage of Harold Laski. Most of his research was conducted in two great national libraries, the British Museum and the Bibliothèque nationale, experiences on which he was to draw in future years. Upon returning to British Columbia he was appointed in 1934 as the Provincial Librarian and Archivist. In 1936 the government added to his responsibilities by appointing him Superintendent of the BC Public Libraries Commission; thus he presided over a period during which regional library services were being extended throughout the province.

In 1940 he succeeded John Ridington as UBC's University Librarian. Among his many accomplishments in this position were the construction of the first addition to the Library building, its North Wing, and the acquisition of the collections of his two great friends, Judge F.W. Howay and Robie L. Reid. Merged, these collections constitute one

of the greatest resources for the study of British Columbia and Pacific Northwest maritime history, and are the cornerstone of UBC Library's Special Collections.

As the Canadian Library Association's second President in 1947/48, he was deeply involved in the fledgling Association's campaign to convince the Government of Canada to found a national library, a campaign whose success was realized when on September 11, 1948, Prime Minister Mackenzie King announced the appointment of Dr. Lamb as the Dominion Archivist "with the special assignment of preparing the way for the establishment of a National Library in Ottawa." On November 24, 1948 the Cabinet established a National Library Advisory Committee with Dr. Lamb as its chairman, and as a result of its work on May 1, 1950 the precursor to the National Library was established, The Canadian Bibliographic Centre. The Centre commenced immediately on two major projects, the compilation of a current national bibliography and of a union catalogue of the holdings of major Canadian libraries. A National Library Act came into effect on January 1, 1953, and Dr. Lamb assumed the title of National Librarian, a position in which he was to serve with great distinction until his retirement in 1968, the year following the opening of a new building for the National Library and Public Archives. By that time the National Library had acquired a collection of 600,000 volumes through legal deposit, gift and purchase; had compiled a union catalogue of more than 10,000,000 titles; was responding to more than 80,000 location requests per year; had published seventeen annual cumulated volumes of *Canadiana*; had established a microfilming service for Canadian theses, and published an annual list of theses since 1962. His career as Dominion Archivist was equally distinguished. He established a systematic program for the collection, retention and organization of government records, and created a Record Centre to deal with the increasing flow of federal documents. He collected the papers of Canada's prime ministers, many of which had been dispersed, and was one of the literary executors of William Lyon Mackenzie King. Since many of the important documents dealing with early Canadian history are held in institutions in England and France, he instituted a program of microfilming as a means of repatriating Canada's historical record.

In addition to his twin careers as an archivist and a librarian, Dr. Lamb pursued a third: as a scholar and writer. His first historical article was published in the *Surrey Gazette*, before he entered university. His writing career commenced in earnest while he was in Victoria, where he also founded and edited the *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*. During his years at the National Library and Public Archives he authored forty-seven journal articles, ten encyclopedia articles and seventeen reviews and edited for publication the manuscripts of Daniel Harmon, Simon Fraser, Gabriel Franchère and Alexander Mackenzie. He was also the chief editorial consultant for the *Encyclopedia Canadiana*. His astonishing productivity increased after his retirement, during which he published four major books of Canadian history, over a dozen more articles, and edited the record of the voyages of George Vancouver. Until his last days he remained a serious and constant reader, with a lively interest in current events and in developments within his several professions.

Dr. Lamb was a member of many professional and academic associations, and was elected president of almost all of them: the Canadian Library Association, the BC Library Association, the Society of Archivists (England), the Society of American Archivists, and the Canadian Historical Association, to name a few. He was elected to

the Royal Society of Canada in 1949, served as its President in 1965, and was awarded in the same year its Tyrrell Medal "for the furtherance of the knowledge of the history of Canada". He was appointed an Officer of the Order of Canada in 1969. He was the recipient of many honours and awards, including honorary degrees from UBC (1948) and the University of Victoria (1966).

In 1939 he married Wessie Tipping, a French scholar, Vancouverite and another graduate of UBC. They are survived by their daughter, Elizabeth (Lamb) Hawkins (whose own professional career was spent in the National Library and National Archives) and two grandsons. In his will Kaye Lamb remembered UBC by providing funds for the continuing support of the Howay-Reid collection.

Prepared by Basil Stuart-Stubbs

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Dr. Slonecker</i> | } | <i>That the memorial minute for William Kaye Lamb be entered into the Minutes of Senate.</i> |
| <i>Dr. Rosengarten</i> | | |

Carried.

Other Business

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Dean Granot invited all members of Senate to participate in events to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Faculty of Graduate Studies that were to take place the following week.

Report of the Tributes Committee--in camera

Dr. Helliwell presented the report as chair of the Committee. He took the opportunity to first announce that Robert Mundell, a UBC graduate, had just been awarded the 1999 Nobel prize in Economics.

Dr. Helliwell presented the following candidates for emeritus status:

| Name | Rank |
|------------------|--|
| Carlo Giovanella | Senior Instructor Emeritus of Earth and Ocean Sciences |
| Kenneth Berry | Clinical Professor Emeritus of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine |
| Bruce Bohm | Professor Emeritus of Botany |
| Andrew Gruft | Associate Professor Emeritus of Architecture |

Adjournment

| Name | Rank |
|-----------------|--|
| Brenda Morrison | Professor Emerita of Health Care and Epidemiology |
| Donald Rix | Clinical Assistant Professor Emeritus of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine |

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Next meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate will be held on November 17, 1999.

Appendix A

POLICIES ON THE POSITION OF STUDENTS IN CASE OF A STRIKE

Excerpt from the Minutes of Senate: March 18, 1992, pp. 10299-303

POSITION OF STUDENTS IN CASE OF A STRIKE

The following guidelines on the position of students in case of a strike were circulated at the meeting:

I. Students who do not cross picket lines

- a) Students who choose not to cross a picket line as a matter of conscience must inform the Dean of the Faculty in which they are registered either in person, by telephone or by letter that they will not be attending classes or writing examinations; otherwise it will be assumed that they will be attending and writing. They will be responsible for fulfilling course requirements and, insofar as possible, they will be evaluated on the basis of the work they are judged to be able to do under the circumstances.
- b) A student who misses an essential component and/or a scheduled examination as a result of refusing to cross a picket line as a matter of conscience may be expected to attend a make-up session and/or write an examination scheduled in a supplementary examination period.

II. Classes or Examinations not held because of a Strike

1) Students unable to fulfill course requirements as a result of the strike:

A student who, as a consequence of the strike, is unable to fulfill course requirements, e.g. because the strike has made it impossible to obtain necessary and unique library materials, is responsible for informing the instructor or, if the instructor is absent, the Head of the Department or the Dean of the Faculty.

2) Evaluation of student performance:

- a. Faculty will attempt to examine or otherwise evaluate students according to the normal evaluation plan for the course.
- b. If classes are not held, students will be evaluated on the readings or other sources for which they could reasonably be expected to be responsible, but will not be evaluated on material which would have been available only in cancelled classes.

For examination purposes, therefore, students may be responsible for:

- i. the required readings for the entire course;
- ii. the material presented in classes (lectures, seminars, laboratories, etc.) prior to the strike;
- iii. the material presented in classes not affected by the strike (should there be periods in which some parts of the campus are struck and not others).

3) If examinations are cancelled:

If there were a minor disruption in the schedule, an attempt would be made to modify the examination schedule in order to hold all examinations close to their

scheduled time and, if that were impossible, an attempt would be made to provide an evaluation without a final examination.

III. Providing information and reassuring students

It is important that you anticipate the possibility of a strike and do your best to reassure students. Faculty should, therefore, ensure that:

- a) students have a clear and up-to-date course outline in which required readings are identified;
- b) students realize they are responsible for having access to the required textbook(s);
- c) students know where the department office is so that they can check for the posting of information on classes cancelled or otherwise interrupted;
- d) evaluation of student performance at the onset of a strike is complete, up-to-date and available to the Department Head.

Dr. Birch stated that the University was very cognizant of the tremendous pressures that a labour dispute places on students as well as on faculty and staff. In anticipation that the University might not be able to avert a labour dispute, the following statement had been included in the correspondence dated February 28, 1992 circulated to all faculty members: "...If a strike should occur, it should be remembered that strikes are legal and that members of the University community are free to follow their conscience in deciding whether or not they wish to cross picket lines. Staff members' and students' decisions must be respected. The intent of this letter is to encourage you to provide reassurance to your students and to ensure that you are able to evaluate their work fairly and assign them grades for their courses."

One of the attachments to that correspondence was the material circulated at the meeting outlining procedures for students who do not cross picket lines. Dr. Birch stated that the student senators had suggested to him that these administrative guidelines might have more academic status if they were endorsed by Senate. He had therefore brought the material to Senate for its consideration. But, since the guidelines were now in effect, he felt that it would be difficult to amend them. However, if Senate wished to endorse the guidelines, subject to review by a committee such as the Committee on Academic Policy, suggestions related to the application of the guidelines could be considered.

Dr. Birch said he wished to emphasize that the right of faculty members and students to follow their conscience must be respected.

In cases where the actions of a faculty member had been interpreted as coercive, intimidating, or directive, the University had sought to find out the basis for such actions and to ensure that it is not repeated. He stated that where there are large numbers of faculty and students, there is always the potential for misunderstanding, as well as the potential for individual initiative which might not be in line with a set of guidelines agreed to by the Deans. He stressed that it was tremendously important that added pressure not be placed on the students beyond that which they experience as a natural outcome of a labour dispute.

Miss Carole Forsythe, student senator, noted that in previous labour disputes, there had not been a policy on the position of students in case of a strike, and thanked the administration for producing one on this occasion. However, the student senators were worried about what was going to happen to students because the policy was a little too general and somewhat ambiguous. During a brief discussion of a proposed motion, Senate agreed to waive the requirement of notice of motion. Miss Forsythe subsequently moved the following motion:

Miss Forsythe
Mr. Lau

}

Be it resolved that Senate respect the right of students to follow their conscience in deciding whether or not to cross the picket lines in the current labour dispute with the University; furthermore, be it resolved that all students unable to fulfil course requirements as a result of the labour dispute with the University shall be referred to the policy statement entitled "Position of Students in Case of a Strike" submitted by Vice-President Birch; furthermore, be it resolved that the Academic Policy Committee be requested to recommend a detailed policy to Senate regarding the academic position of students in future labour disputes with the University.

Speaking to the motion, Miss Forsythe explained that some professors were telling students that if they did not cross picket lines and attend classes they would be assigned a failing grade for the course, which was contrary to the policy circulated.

Miss Lahey asked for clarification of the last sentence of item I.(a) which states: "...They (students) will be responsible for fulfilling course requirements and, insofar as possible, they will be evaluated on the basis of the work they are judged to be able to do under the circumstances." She stated that some professors were saying that students are responsible for the material if the lecture is held. Dr. Birch responded that students will not be responsible for material that is uniquely available in lectures that they have not attended either by virtue of the class being cancelled or by their respecting a picket line. He stated that it was very difficult to find wording to cover all eventualities.

After further discussion the motion was put and carried.

Excerpt from the Minutes of Senate: April 13, 1994, pp. 10778-80

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY

Dr. Tees, Chair of the committee, presented the following report, on the Academic Position of Students in Labour/Management Disputes:

In the event of a strike, it is the University's policy to take every reasonable measure to remain open. We are committed to maintaining instruction in all courses, access to core library services and examinations as scheduled. Faculty are responsible for teaching their courses and students are responsible for fulfilling course requirements. However,

the University respects the right of a faculty member or a student, as a matter of conscience, to refuse to cross a picket line in a labour dispute.

As a matter of University policy, department heads will ensure that every reasonable effort is made to make alternate arrangements for classes for which an instructor is absent as a result of refusing to cross a picket line. However, as a matter of University policy, classes may not be relocated to a non-picketed location. Unavoidable cancellations or room changes will be posted in or near the departmental office in a place visible to students.

The attached guidelines were circulated by the Vice President Academic and endorsed by Senate in March 1992. At that time Senate resolved "that the Academic Policy Committee be requested to recommend a detailed policy to Senate regarding the academic position of students in future labour disputes with the University." The Senate Academic Policy Committee has concluded that it is impossible and undesirable to attempt to anticipate all eventualities since many of the circumstances are unique to a specific labour/management dispute. It is essential that guidelines be provided for each particular occasion, that students be party to the articulation of such guidelines and that students who feel they have been treated unfairly have access to adjudication of their concerns.

Therefore, the committee recommends that in the event of a labour/management dispute involving picket lines:

1. A committee on academic guidelines be established with membership as follows:

- Vice President Academic and Provost, Chair
- Chair, Senate Academic Policy Committee
- Three Deans
- Two student senators
- Registrar

2. A senior faculty member be designated to serve as arbiter for students who have sought to resolve their concerns within their Faculties but feel they have been treated unfairly.

I. STUDENTS WHO DO NOT CROSS PICKET LINES

- (a) Students who choose not to cross a picket line as a matter of conscience must inform the Dean of the Faculty in which they are registered, in person, by telephone or by letter, that they will not be attending classes or writing examinations; otherwise it will be assumed that they will be attending and writing. They will be responsible for fulfilling course requirements and, insofar as possible, they will be evaluated on the basis of the work they are judged to be able to do under the circumstances.
- (b) A student who misses an essential component and/or a scheduled examination as a result of refusing to cross a picket line as a matter of conscience may be expected to attend a make-up session and/or to write an examination scheduled in a supplementary examination period.

II. CLASSES OR EXAMINATIONS NOT HELD BECAUSE OF A STRIKE

(1) Students unable to fulfil course requirements as a result of the strike:

A student who, as a consequence of the strike, is unable to fulfil course requirements, e.g. because the strike has made it impossible to obtain necessary and unique library materials, is responsible for informing the instructor or, if the instructor is absent, the Head of the Department or the Dean of the Faculty.

(2) Evaluation of student performance:

- (a) Faculty will attempt to examine or otherwise evaluate students according to the normal evaluation plan for the course.
- (b) If classes are not held, students will be evaluated on the readings or other sources for which they could reasonably be expected to be responsible, but will not be evaluated on material which would have been available only in cancelled classes.

For examination purposes, therefore, students may be responsible for:

- i) the required readings for the entire course,
- ii) the material presented in classes (lectures, seminars, laboratories, etc.) prior to the strike,
- iii) the material presented in classes not affected by the strike (should there be periods in which some parts of the campus are struck and not others).

(3) If examinations are cancelled:

If there were a minor disruption in the schedule, an attempt would be made to modify the examination schedule in order to hold all examinations close to their scheduled time and, if that were impossible, an attempt would be made to provide an evaluation without a final examination.

III. PROVIDING INFORMATION AND REASSURING STUDENTS

It is important that you anticipate the possibility of a strike and do your best to reassure students. Faculty should, therefore, ensure that:

Appendix A

- (a) students have a clear and up-to-date course outline in which required readings are identified,
- (b) students realize they are responsible for having access to the required textbook(s),
- (c) students know where the Department office is so they can check for the posting of information on classes cancelled or otherwise interrupted,
- (d) evaluation of student performance at the onset of a strike is complete, up-to-date and available to the Department Head.

Dr. Tees
Dean Sheehan

}

*That the recommendations of the committee
concerning the academic position of students in
labour/management disputes be approved.*

Carried.