



GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FACULTY

April 21, 1993

Senate adopted the following guidelines for the establishment of a Faculty at its meeting of April 21, 1993. See motion below. The Senate Academic Policy Committee prepared the report.

ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

Increasing the number of faculties has implications for academic governance, not just for the unit seeking faculty status, but for the university as a whole. There are implications for the size and effectiveness of Senate, the size and composition of the Committee of Deans as an advisory body to the president and academic vice-president, and the degree to which academic governance is centralized, as reflected in the number of academic units and administrators that report directly to the president's office.

For these reasons it is recognized that there cannot be indifference to the number of faculties at UBC. Any proposal to increase the number, either by raising the status of a school to that of a faculty, or by accommodating a new area of programming by creating a faculty, must be carefully considered, and declared benefits to the unit seeking faculty status must be examined in this context.

i. Senate Size and Effectiveness

Under the University Act (Section 34), creation of a new faculty adds four members to Senate--a dean, one faculty member, and two students. The present Senate has 87 members. If UBC were to have seventeen instead of twelve faculties, as is the case, for example, at the University of Western Ontario, Senate would have 107 members.

The effectiveness of Senate is not just a function of its size. For it to work well, all parts of the university community must have effective representation in the Senate. Academic units and programs are represented in Senate by their dean and their faculty and student representatives. In the case of a small or professional faculty, this tends to constitute a more direct representation than exists in the case of a large faculty encompassing several disciplines or professional programs (departments and schools), where both the dean and representatives of faculty and students may have to represent and speak for interests outside their discipline or program of study. This kind of indirect representation is inevitable in a large university, if Senate is to be of manageable size. The question is how well is it achieved? Do faculty and students so represented have an effective voice in Senate?

The answer to this question is unlikely to be found, in the particular instance, in the performance--adequate or inadequate--of the representational role of incumbent senators. It must be looked for, instead, in the academic and organizational integrity of a faculty, as constituted, as well as in its everyday functioning and "culture" (inter-relationships). There are two issues to be addressed in this respect. First, is the diversity of programming in a faculty of such a nature as to lead to the conclusion that interests of a particular unit or discipline within a faculty, say for example a school, cannot be represented indirectly in Senate? Or alternatively, are there compelling reasons from the viewpoint of the university or the wider community for a particular discipline within a faculty, say for example a school, or program to be represented directly in Senate, which can be assured only by faculty status? Secondly, is there basis for concluding that due to the diversity and size of units or disciplines that make up a faculty, and the absence of a

shared identity, faculty and students in a particular program are unable to elected to Senate?

Insight into the latter question can be obtained from the experience of recent elections to Senate. Have a school's faculty and students been nominated regularly for Senate and failed to get elected? Is there a history of apparent little interest in Senate, and a willingness to be represented by others? The question whether a dean can effectively speak for a discipline or profession unrelated to, or far removed from, his or her own may also be relevant. This is a question related to the cognateness of a faculty's programs and mission, which is discussed briefly below. That he or she may not always be able to do so is anticipated in the regulation of Senate¹, seldom used, that permits a director to present in person to Senate matters of special interest to his or her school.

Guideline 1--The effectiveness of a school's or other unit's representation in Senate is an important consideration in deciding whether to grant faculty status. This consideration must be tempered by a concern for the impact of change on the overall size and representativeness of Senate, and realization that many programs and units in the university must continue to be represented in Senate indirectly through a dean, faculty, and students who may be in another discipline.

ii. Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Faculty

The negotiated Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty (see Faculty Handbook) recognizes a three-tiered structure of collegial and administrative involvement in decisions affecting the appointment, reappointment, tenuring, and promotion of members of faculty holding appointments without review. This document establishes and defines the role of a faculty member's immediate colleagues and administrative head in such decisions, as well as that of colleagues at the faculty and university levels. It is based on the norm of departmentalized faculties where a department head, on the advice of an advisory committee initiates all recommendations relating to appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The role of faculty committees and the Senior Appointments Committee in this process is two-fold--to assure and maintain faculty- and university-wide standards of performance and achievement for faculty, and to provide a dynamic and responsibility for these standards that is conducive to their improvement. The Faculty Handbook, to ensure the viability of collegial input at the departmental level, as well as preserve the anonymity of the advice given, provides for the expansion of a head's advisory committee by the addition of faculty members from outside the department, when numbers are small. There is thus explicit recognition of a minimum size of a department for the provisions of the Handbook governing conditions of appointment, reappointment and promotion to apply as intended. Presumably the same holds for a faculty that is too small or has too few colleagues eligible to serve on mandated advisory committees.

It is at the level of the Senior Appointment's committee where the difference in the administrative scrutiny and collegial assessment received by recommendations for appointment, tenure and promotion in departmentalized and non-departmentalized faculties is most apparent. The Senior Appointments Committee, for the departmentalized faculty, represents a third level of assessment, after a recommendation has been initiated and approved by a candidate's department or school, and supported at the faculty level where it must be considered by a dean's advisory committee. Furthermore, the dean's advisory committee, like the Senior Appointments Committee, is composed for the most part, if not entirely, of persons outside the candidate's discipline or field of study, whose knowledge of the candidate is based primarily on the documentation presented.

This situation is different from that of a recommendation reaching the Senior Appointments Committee from a smaller, non-departmentalized faculty. Such a recommendation has had no second-level scrutiny, nor has it been considered by person's other than the candidate's immediate colleagues and his or her dean. It is also presented and argued before the Senior Appointments Committee by the candidate's dean, who in

¹ See **Appendix A** for motion of Senate of 1949 establishing schools and regulating their governance.

this case is also the administrator responsible for initiating the recommendation at the first level. (In this connection it is interesting to note that department heads and directors of schools do not serve on the Senior Appointments Committee on the grounds that they would be required, or would have the opportunity, to participate in the assessment of recommendations that they had initiated and supported at the department or school level.)

GUIDELINE 2--That any new faculty be of a size and complexity that permit departmentalization in conformity with the norms for administrative review of, and collegial participation in, decisions relating to appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion as laid out in the Agreement on Conditions of Appointment for Faculty. Particular attention should be given to the viability of advisory committees in relation to the number of eligible members of appropriate rank available to serve on them.

iii. The School within its Faculty

The 1949 motions of Senate establishing and governing schools (**Appendix A**) recognized them as "mainly professional or vocational in character", as offering a "specialized" curriculum, and as having policies that "do not generally affect policies in other departments to any great extent". Despite their distinctiveness and "special problems", schools were clearly envisaged by Senate as forming an integral part of an academic community defined by the boundaries of the faculty in which they were situated. Senate gave the school council jurisdiction over "matters pertaining only to the school", but saw fit to grant the dean discretion over whether these matters would also have to be referred to the faculty for approval before being forwarded to Senate. The 1949 motions explicitly stated that "all other academic matters" had to be referred to the faculty for approval. The relatedness of a school's mandate to that of its faculty and the faculty's departments is reflected in the provision that schools' councils consist of a school's faculty members and "representatives of closely related departments".

Practice in many cases has not conformed to Senate's intentions and instructions with respect to schools. Schools were established that did not share a sense of mission and community with departments and other schools in their faculty to the extent envisaged by Senate, if indeed at all. As a result, some schools have been accorded a degree of independence in the conduct of their affairs not intended by Senate. Academic matters have been deemed to be of interest to the school only, and for this reason, are not required to be approved by a faculty committee and the faculty as a whole before being forwarded to Senate. They act, in this respect, much like mini-faculties.

The relative independence from the academic governance of its faculty both reflects and contributes to a sense of apartness in a school, which is bound inevitably to raise the question whether it belongs, and whether it might not be better off, or no worse off, if it were to become a faculty. Only in the Faculty of Arts do schools seem to be integrated into the academic, as distinct to budget and personnel, committee structure of the faculty in a manner if not exactly contemplated, then encouraged, by Senate in 1949. The absence, with two recent exceptions, of school faculty serving as an assistant or associate dean of their faculty, not to mention dean, also presumably does little to enhance a feeling of belonging on the part of a school, and of being more than an anomaly within the faculty structure, or an appendage to it.

After all is said, there remains the question of how disparate can the programs administered within a faculty be, and there be, equally accessible to all programs, the academic leadership and environment, not to mention resources, needed to assure their wellbeing and future development. In other words, how cognate, if at all, must be the various programs and academic endeavours of a faculty? The answer to a large extent depends on how a faculty is viewed and defined. For example, is it foremost an academic body, or an administrative body, or both? The same enquiry can be raised with respect to the role of dean. Is the dean viewed as the academic leader of the entire faculty, of the schools as well as of departments, or does this role or aspect of the dean's job tend to be assumed, in the case of schools, by their directors? The reality is that it probably does, especially in the case of professional schools with wide outside involvement in professional organizations and the community.

It is reasonable to assume that Senate, in establishing schools, saw the director and not the dean as providing leadership in all matters particular to a school's professional or vocational existence, and with respect to the associations with outside organizations that this entails. Such a view or model of the complex faculty suggests that the dean's role as academic leader is restricted primarily to his or her discipline or general area of competence, which means, barring the possibility that the dean holds an appointment in a school, to the faculty's departments. For the school, the dean becomes essentially a provider, and an advocate and expediter before Senate and in the president's office.

But if we accept that a faculty, regardless of its complexity, is an academic unit, and comprises an academic community, it seems reasonable that a sense of belongingness and purpose be shared by all who hold appointments in the faculty.

In some cases this shared feeling has come easily, through an affinity of disciplines or professional concern, or a shared history, while in the case of other schools the basis for its existence is less evident, or non-existent. A majority of UBC's schools have evolved from within their faculty; others have been created and "attached". Schools are the product of the development and evolution of the university's mission, and for this reason it must be recognized that what was once considered their appropriate place in the organizational structure of the university, may no longer be so. This the university must be capable of doing and acting upon. The interests of the school and the university may be best served if a school becomes a faculty.

GUIDELINE 3 -- As an academic community, a faculty should be comprised of departments or departments and schools that share similar or common educational goals, and at least to some extent are inter-dependent and mutually reinforcing in the achievement of their respective goals. Measures of the latter may include the exchange of students in elective or required courses, joint research, and shared human and physical resources.

GUIDELINE 4 -- A school should be involved in a meaningful way in the academic governance of the faculty in which it is located, and similarly, members of departments and other schools in that faculty should have the opportunity to participate, where appropriate, in academic decision-making affecting a school.

ADMINISTRATION

i. Organizational Structure

The issue here is largely one of the degree of centralization in administrative structure and processes that is appropriate for a university of the size and complexity of UBC. Perspectives on this issue may not always be reconcilable with otherwise held views on optimum organization. In a very large organization that can invoke a sense of powerlessness, or even of neglect, it is natural that everyone would wish to be represented directly at, or report to, the "centre". Yet everyone also recognizes the importance of decentralized decision-making and responsibility. In the large university, the benefits of faculty status depend to a significant extent on there being relatively few faculties, although this may not always readily be seen as being the case.

The number of faculties defines the role of the president and vice president academic, to the extent that the nature of the decisions they must make, and the information level needed to make these decisions, depends on the number of administrators (deans of faculty) who report directly to them. It also, of course, defines the role and the scope of activities of deans. The organizational pyramid provides the balance between the need for control and accountability at the centre and the need for decentralization, which within the context of university governance and collegiality, has an appropriateness of its own. The present organizational structure at UBC of faculties, schools and departments is intended to provide such balance, and probably does in an acceptable, albeit less than perfect, way. Any argument to increase significantly or even incrementally the number of faculties has to be weighed carefully against any possible harm that might be done to this balance.

The number of faculties also has important implications for the manner in which resources are allocated within the university, or more specifically among academic programs. Faculty budgets are determined by the president's office, not without regard to the needs of departments and schools, but with the understanding that they are best attended to by allocations and reallocations within a global faculty budget. This approach to budgeting has proven to be sufficiently flexible to permit ear-marked funding from the centre, as well as additions to faculty budgets for the specific purpose of meeting the needs or program initiatives of a particular department or school. Its great advantage for the sub-faculty unit (department or school) is that the competition for funds and the important decisions affecting its budget occur at a level where its goals and objectives are likely to be best understood, and where support for them, and if necessary, articulation of them to a wider university community is likely to be greatest. The role of a dean, working together with a director in advancing the interests of a school, must not be underestimated, and should always be compared to the situation that would exist if the school were a faculty having to compete for resources in a larger arena, and on its own--especially if the number of faculties so competing were to increase much beyond the present number.

GUIDELINE 5 -- The implications that an increase in the number of faculties has for the organizational structure of the university, as this relates to the administration of academic units and programs, should be carefully considered. There are implications for both the unit seeking faculty status and other faculties, and for the university as a whole, of having decision-making and responsibility presently located at the faculty level moved to the president's office.

ii. The Committee of Deans

As an advisory and consultative committee to the president and academic vice-president, the Committee of Deans plays the important role of bringing together the different and often seemingly conflicting interests of the faculties for the purpose of articulating a university point of view or position. Consisting of the university's senior academic administrators, it also quite properly advises on all issues and matters affecting the wellbeing of the university. It is therefore important that the Committee of Deans be as representative as possible, i.e., be able and be seen as being able to speak effectively and equally for all parts of the academic community. This ability depends more on the composition of the committee, or on the basis on which faculties have been constituted, than it does on the actual number of faculties or of deans on the committee.

Some would claim that the Committee of Deans at present does not reflect as sensitively as it might the extent of interests represented by the existing faculties, and that any change in the committee's composition and size should be directed at improving its representativeness. For example, two of the twelve faculties--Arts and Science-- account for nearly half of total student enrolments in the university, and several of their departments have more members and students than several faculties directly represented on the committee. The same two faculties, representing the university's programs in the liberal arts and the sciences, have the same voice on the committee as Agricultural Sciences and Forestry, which together account for less than four percent of university enrolments. The Health Sciences, with a little over six percent of total university enrolments, have three representatives on the Committee of Deans, and in the past have had four when the office of Coordinator of Health Sciences was held by someone other than an incumbent dean. Nine of the twelve deans represent professional faculties.

GUIDELINE 6 -- The implications that the creation of an additional faculty has for the effective functioning of the Committee of Deans should be carefully considered. If they appear to increase present imbalance attributable to the different size of faculties or the strength of the representation some areas of the campus or academic community have on the committee, the benefits of a new faculty must be weighed against this disadvantage.

BUDGETARY IMPLICATIONS

The possibility of enhanced resources may well be one of the motivations for a school to seek faculty status. In today's financial climate, budgetary demands may also explain why a faculty would be willing to accede to a school's wish to seek needed funding elsewhere. There may be a desire by the school to insulate its budget from retrenchment. The experience at UBC the past ten

years or so clearly suggests that the smaller professional faculties have indeed fared better in this regard than have the large complex, multi-program faculties. Yet it is also true that the degree of retrenchment of the latter faculties has not always been reflected in cutbacks of schools' budgets.

It is difficult not to imagine that a new faculty would not represent a new spending centre for the university. The idea that granting faculty status does not have associated with it additional costs is not tenable. For example, cursory examination of faculty establishments indicate that the smallest faculties have one, or more frequently two, assistant or associate deans. There are also in most situations faculty or decanal funds, which with today's tight budgets, are unlikely to be apportioned, if at all, in a manner adequate to the needs of a fledgling faculty. The goodwill and aspirations attendant a new faculty are in themselves sufficient to give a boost to funding, and it would be foolish to assume that the university would not respond accordingly.

GUIDELINE 7 -- The budgetary implications of granting faculty status to a school must be carefully considered and estimated, with an undertaking to keep costs within these estimates for a specified period of time. The estimated cost of establishing a new faculty should be prioritized in relation to the other demands and needs of other faculties.

THE EXAMPLE OF OTHER UNIVERSITIES

Each university is organized into faculties, schools and other academic units in a way that reflects its unique history and the circumstances that have attended change and growth. A look at the organizational structure at major Canadian universities (Appendix B) suggests no norm or typical structure. UBC most closely resembles McGill and Dalhousie in the number of schools, although is probably unique in requiring that all schools be a constituent part of a faculty. Some schools, e.g., at Western, Toronto and Queen's, are schools in name only, with deans who report directly to the president or president's office. Half of the universities looked at are organized almost exclusively into faculties or schools that function as faculties. Not surprisingly, these are also the universities with the largest number of faculties.

The argument can and has been made that a school at UBC should be a faculty because most of its counterparts elsewhere in Canada are faculties with deans rather than schools with directors. This is essentially an argument for status and recognition, and for this reason should be examined carefully for substance. The notion that a school's wellbeing is tied to its name or perceived status within its university's structure is not held universally, as evidenced by the fact that some schools at Eastern universities have chosen to retain their name after being accorded what amounts to from an organizational point of view, faculty status. As indicated in table 1 (see below), no school at UBC is in an anomalous situation in terms of its designation or status as a school. Some schools' programs at UBC -- music is a good example--are taught in departments at other universities, a fact that is not evident from the table.

Table 1 : Not included in this excerpt. See the Minutes of Senate.

GUIDELINE 8 -- The example of other universities where the counterparts of a school at UBC have faculty status, and/or are headed by a dean, is not a compelling argument for a change in organizational structure and governance at UBC. Acceptance of such an argument would require evidence of disadvantage of maintaining a school's present status, or of real benefits to be derived from changing it.

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

Should it be concluded that, for whatever reason, the status of a school within its faculty is inappropriate, other remedies than granting it independent status as a faculty should be considered. UBC's organizational structure has grown by a process of accretion, without plan and regard to its ability to continue to accommodate growth and the changing needs and role of units within the structure.

The standard response should not be to create another faculty. This may not be the most appropriate solution for the school, or for the university as a whole, given the implications such a change has for the manner in which the university is governed. More fundamental change, such as the restructuring of the existing pattern of faculties and schools, including the amalgamation of

present faculties, may be required to meet the need for change and to provide for it in the future. The transfer of a school to another faculty may also be a solution.

GUIDELINE 9 -- Alternative solutions to granting a school faculty status should be carefully considered, in view of the appropriateness of faculty status in relation to the requisites of a conducive academic environment, and of the implications an increased number of faculties has for the governance of the university. The transfer of a school to another faculty, a restructuring of the existing pattern of faculties and schools, and the amalgamation or combination of existing faculties may be a more appropriate response to the need for change.

APPENDIX A OF THE REPORT

EXCERPT FROM SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING OF FEBRUARY 16, 1949 (pp 1476-1477)

Report of the Committee Appointed to Examine the Organization of the University

Dean Chant, Chairman, presented the report of the Committee on the Organization of the University as adopted at the meeting of January 7th, which reads in major part, as follows: "Within a Faculty departments appear to fall, at present, into one or other of two categories. Generally speaking, those of the first category, with which this Committee is concerned, are characterized as follows:

- a. their courses are mainly professional or vocational in character;
- b. they offer a specialized curriculum leading to a distinctive degree;
- c. because their courses are ordinarily restricted to students following the specialized curriculum, their policies do not generally affect policies in other departments to any great extent;
- d. they have a relationship with outside professional bodies, which is not only desirable, but is necessary because of professional requirements which must be considered when designing the curriculum;
- e. they have, therefore, special problems which in many other universities have given rise to a somewhat different position than that belonging to a department.

The committee, therefore, recommends:

1. that within a Faculty and under the Dean of the Faculty, departments falling in the first category described above may, on approval by Senate and the board of Governors, be designated as "schools" and their heads as "directors";
2. that faculty consist of members of "faculty" status in all the departments and schools of which the Faculty is composed;
3. that the Dean of the Faculty, in consultation with the Director appoint a council for each school consisting of all members of "faculty" status in the school and representatives of closely related departments;
4. that any matters pertaining only to the school be referred to the council of the school; any matters dealt with by the council of the school may, at the discretion of the Dean, be referred to the Faculty;
5. that all other academic matters be referred to the faculty;
6. that Senate, at its discretion and on request of the council, permit the Director of the school to present in person to Senate matters of special interest to the school.

The committee wishes to point out that adoption of the above recommendations would not prevent any department or school from becoming a Faculty, if Senate and the Board of Governors so decide. It would, however, without additional cost, or alteration to the University Act, provide a wider latitude in meeting problems of organization.

Members of the committee feel that the scheme meets all the requirements considered desirable by those departments with special problems. Furthermore, by such an arrangement, the Director of a school would be relieved from the necessity of dealing with many matters which have no direct bearing on his school, and would be given greater freedom of action in dealing with his special problems more expeditiously than if all matters had to be referred to faculty."

Dean Chant That this report be approved in principle. Dean Gage Carried.

APPENDIX B OF THE REPORT

ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS HEADED BY DEANS (Faculties unless otherwise indicated)

Source: Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, 1992; also reference to university Calendars

Note: The following information is not in every case an accurate reflection of the organizational structure of the university, although it is assumed that deans report directly to the president. Not all units headed by deans are faculties; and some schools are a constituent part of a faculty, as is the case at UBC, while others appear not to be. It is assumed that schools headed by a dean have a status equivalent to that of a faculty.

CALGARY (16)

- Continuing Education - Education - Engineering - Environmental Design - Fine Arts - General Studies - Graduate Studies - Humanities - Law - Management - Medicine - Nursing - Physical Education - Science - Social Sciences - Social Work

ALBERTA (16)

- Agriculture and Forestry - Arts - Business - Dentistry - Education - Engineering - Extension - Graduate Studies and Research - Home Economics (moved to Agriculture?) - Law - Medicine - Nursing - Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences - Physical Education and Recreation - Rehabilitation Medicine - Science

Schools: - Native Studies (program listed under Arts) - Library and Info Studies (in Faculty of Education)

DALHOUSIE (8)

- Arts and Social Sciences - Dentistry - Graduate Studies - Health Professions - Law - Management - Medicine - Science

Schools:

- Nursing (in Faculty of Health Professions) - Library and Information Studies - Physical and Health Education - Environmental Studies - Social Work - Human and Communicative Disorders - Occupational Therapy - Physiotherapy

MCGILL (15 incl. Admissions and Students)

- Admissions - Agricultural and Environmental Sciences - Arts - Continuing Education - Dentistry - Education - Engineering - Graduate Studies and Research - Law - Management - Medicine - Music - Religious Studies - Science - Students

Schools: - Nursing (in Faculty of Medicine; Director of Nursing is also Associate Dean (Nursing) in the Faculty of Medicine) - Computer Science (in Faculty of Engineering) - Human Communicative Disorders (graduate professional programs only) - Architecture (graduate programs only) - Graduate School of Library and Info St. - Urban Planning (graduate program) - Social Work - Occupational Health (graduate programs only) - Physical and Occupational Therapy (in Faculty of Medicine)

McMASTER (6)

- Business - Engineering - School of Graduate Studies - Health Sciences - Humanities - Social Sciences

Schools: - Nursing (in Faculty of Medicine) - Occupational Therapy and Physiotherapy (in Faculty of Medicine)

MANITOBA (16)

- Agriculture and Food Sciences - Architecture - Arts - Continuing Education Division - Dentistry - Education - Engineering - Graduate Studies - Human Ecology - Law - Management - Medicine - Pharmacy - Physical Education and Recreation Studies - Science - Social Work

Schools:

- Nursing - Music

QUEEN'S (9 incl. Women)

- Applied Science - Arts and Science - School of Business - Education - School of Graduate Studies and Research - Law - Medicine - School of Nursing - Women

Schools:

- Industrial Relations - Physical and Health Education - Rehabilitation Therapy

SASKATCHEWAN (12) (Faculties are called colleges at Saskatchewan)

- Agriculture - Arts and Science - Dentistry - Education - Engineering - Graduate Studies - Law - Medicine - Nursing - Pharmacy - Physical Education - Veterinary Medicine

[Has a School of Physical Therapy headed by a director]

TORONTO (15)

- Applied Science and Engineering - School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture - Arts and Science - Dentistry - Education - Forestry - School of Graduate Studies - Law - Library and Information Science - Management - Medicine - Music - Nursing - Pharmacy - Social Work

[Has a School of Physical and Health Education headed by a Director]

WESTERN ONTARIO (17)

- Applied Health Sciences (Departments of Communicative Disorders, Occupational Therapy, and Physical Therapy) - Arts - School of Business Administration - Dentistry - Education - Engineering - Graduate Studies - Graduate School of Journalism - Kinesiology - Law - Library and Information Science - Medicine - Music - Nursing - Part-Time and Continuing Education - Science - Social Science

SENATE DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT

In speaking to the report, Dr. Tees reminded Senate that at the November 18, 1992 meeting the Academic Policy Committee was charged to advise Senate on how the matter of Faculty status for a School in general would be decided. Dr. Tees explained that the Committee was recommending that a specially selected (ad hoc) committee of Senate be appointed at a time a proposal for a change in the organizational structure of the University involving the creation of a new Faculty comes before Senate. To this end, the Committee had constructed a set of guidelines, together

with explanatory text, background information and a copy of the 1949 report of the Committee Appointed to Examine the Organization of the University that focussed on the nature of a School. The guidelines would provide some guidance to the ad hoc committee and also to a School that would like to make a proposal to have its status changed.

MOTION

Dr. Tees, Dean Sheehan:

That the report be approved and that the guidelines for the establishment of a Faculty, outlined in the report, be utilized by a specially appointed (ad hoc) committee of Senate for consideration. This committee will report to Senate on the advisability of the proposed change, and if appropriate, may recommend alternatives.

DISCUSSION

Professor Carty drew attention to the second paragraph under the heading Organizational Structure, and in particular to the section which reads: "...The organizational pyramid provides the balance between the need for control and accountability at the centre and the need for decentralization which, within the context of university governance and collegiality, has an appropriateness of its own. The present organizational structure at UBC of faculties, schools and departments is intended to provide such balance, and probably does in an acceptable, albeit less than perfect, way. Any argument to increase significantly or even incrementally the number of faculties has to be weighed carefully against any possible harm that might be done to this balance." Professor Carty questioned the validity of the assumption that the University does operate in a balanced way under the present organizational structure. She felt that the implication that increasing the number of Faculties might harm the balance already in existence was discouraging to those units who might want to become Faculties.

Professor Carty also referred to Guideline 2 concerning the complexity of departmentalization, and questioned whether all of the existing Faculties conformed to this guideline.

In response to Professor Carty's comments, Dr. Tees recognized that not everyone would agree with every word or assumption in the report. However, he felt that the report reflected the sentiments and thoughts of the Committee to the extent that they are representative.

Dr. Will emphasized that the guidelines were a model, not an attempt to justify reality. Therefore if there was an anomaly, or something that is clearly not being served by the model, then there might be justification for a change. In response to a query by Mr. Woo concerning the time frame for dealing with the proposal for Faculty status from the School of Nursing, Dr. Tees explained that the first step was to deal with the general issue of how Senate should deal with proposals for Faculty status.

The motion was put and carried.