Vancouver Senate

MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2011

Attendance

Present: Mr. S. Haffey (Vice-Chair of Senate, Meeting Chair), Ms. L. M. Collins (Acting Secretary), Ms. K. Aminoltejari, Dr. F. Andrew, Dr. R. Anstee, Mr. K. Arciaga, Dean G. Averill, Dr. K. Baimbridge, Dr. J. Brander, Dr. B. Cairns, Ms. B. Craig, Mr. G. Dew, Dr. W. Dunford, Mr. A. C. Embree, Dean B. Evans, Dr. D. Farrar (Provost & Vice-President, Academic), Dr. D. Fielding, Ms. M. Friesen, Mr. R. Gardiner, Mr. C. Gorman, Mr. A. J. H. Hajian, Dr. W. Hall, Dr. P. G. Harrison, Dr. A. Ivanov, Mr. D. H. Kim, Ms. A. Koehn, Dr. B. S. Lalli, Dr. B. Larson, Dr. P. Leung, Dr. P. Loewen, Mr. B. MacDougall, Dr. P. L Marshall, Mr. W. McNulty, Mr. J. Mertens, Mr. C. Meyers, Ms. S. Morgan-Silvester (Chancellor), Mr. M. Murray, Principal L. Nasmith, Dr. D. O’Donoghue, Dr. G. Öberg, Ms. I. Parent, Dr. K. Patterson, Mr. S. Rasmussen, Mr. J. Rebane, Dr. A. Riseman, Dr. T. Ross, Dr. L. Rucker, Mr. J. Scafe, Dr. S. Singh, Dr. R. Sparks, Dr. B. Stelck, Dean G. Stuart, Dr. S. Thorne, Dr. M. Upadhyaya, Mr. D. Verma, Dr. M. Vessey, Ms. L. Watt, Mr. J. Yang, Dr. R. A. Yaworsky.

Guests: Mr. R. Bredin, Mr. T. Brennan, Mr. S. Cregten, Dr. J. Finkler, Mr. I. Habib, Mr. S. Heisler, Dr. A. Kindler, Dr. W. Pue, Mr. A. Sihota, Mr. B. Sullivan. Ms. J. Teasdale, Mr. A. Wazeer.

Regrets: Dean T. Aboulnasr, Dean M. A. Bobinski, Principal M. Burgess, Ms. C. Colombe, Ms. A. Duly, Rev. Dr. S. Farris, Mr. E. Grajales, Mr. E. Hilmer, Dean J. Innes, Dean M. Isman, Dr. S. B. Knight, Dr. D. Lehman, Dr. W. McKee, Dean D. Muzyka, Dr. C. Orvig, Dean S. Peacock, Mr. B. Perrin, Dr. N. Perry, Mr. J. Ridge (Secretary), Ms. E. Segal, Dean pro tem. J. Shapiro, Dean C. Shuler, Dean R. Sindelar, Ms. R. Sneath, Dr. J. Stapleton, Mr. D. Thakrar, Prof. S. J. Toope (President and Chair), Dr. R. Wilson, Dr. R. Windsor-Liscombe.

Call to Order

In the absence of the President, the Vice-Chair of Senate called to order the seventh regular meeting of the Senate for the 2010/2011 academic year.
Meeting Agenda

The Chair reported that “Item 8: Faculty of Graduate Studies Council Membership” had been withdrawn from the agenda by the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Mr. McNulty   Dr. Rucker
\{ That the minutes of the meeting of February
23, 2011 be adopted as circulated.\}  
Carried.

Business Arising from the Minutes

STATUS OF ASSOCIATE DEANS AS FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES TO SENATE

Dr. Anstee made a statement about the eligibility of Associate Deans as candidates to serve as faculty representatives to Senate. Main points were as follows:

- Under the University’s collective agreement with faculty, the parties had agreed to exclude certain academic administrators from membership in the bargaining unit. Associate Deans had been added to the list of excluded groups when the 2010-2012 agreement came into force on January 1, 2011.

- Dr. Anstee stated that this change clarified that Associate Deans were “management faculty,” as opposed to “non-management faculty.” Although the University Act appeared to be silent on this distinction, the change to the collective agreement had called into question whether management faculty ought to run for election as representatives of faculty on the Board of Governors and the Senates. Dr. Anstee expressed the opinion that Associate Deans should not stand for election to these seats, as had been the practice for Deans and other administrators for some time.

- An Associate Dean had recently been elected to serve as a faculty representative to the Board of Governors, but had subsequently chosen to resign. Dr. Anstee supported this decision. The Governor elected as a replacement was not an Associate Dean, thus resolving the issue for the following three-year term.

- Dr. Anstee stated that it seemed unclear how to proceed. He suggested three possible solutions: the University administration could take action to resolve the matter, the electorate could express its will by voting for non-management faculty, or (over the long term) the University Act could be changed.
DISCUSSION

Main points of the Senate discussion were as follows:

- Two Senators expressed their support for allowing each electorate to choose the most appropriate representatives, with one Senator emphasizing that preserving this choice was particularly important in smaller Faculties.

- There was discussion about what had motivated the exclusion of Associate Deans from the bargaining unit. Dr. Riseman suggested that concerns about potential conflict of interest in negotiations had been a factor. Mr. Dew asked whether these concerns could have been resolved instead through existing mechanisms to guard against conflicts of interest.

- Dr. Thorne stated that the management responsibilities assigned to Associate Deans varied widely by Faculty, and that it was therefore difficult to view Associate Deans as a “fixed entity” within the organization.

- Dr. Vessey noted the difficulty in drawing a line between management and non-management faculty, but also that Associate Deans most often performed managerial roles. He noted that the present-day role was more managerial than in previous decades. He expressed his preference that faculty seats not be held by management faculty. He also noted the lack of competition for Senate seats and the challenge of recruiting sufficient numbers of faculty.

Remarks from the Vice-Chair and Related Questions

EVACUATION OF UBC STUDENTS FROM JAPAN

As Vice-President, Students pro tem., Dr. Nasmith provided an update on the post-earthquake situation in Japan. She noted that she had been in Japan on March 11, the day of the earthquake. She thanked Ms. Janet Teasdale, Dr. Wesley Pue, and Ms. Katherine Beaumont for their quick action toward implementing provisions in Policy 69: Student Safety Abroad and for their tireless work in support of students. The University had made the decision to require UBC students in the most affected areas of Japan to return to Canada. Activities due to depart for those areas had also been canceled. Students in lower-risk areas had been permitted to choose whether to stay in Japan. In compliance with Policy 69, the University had relied upon travel advisories issued by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade to assess relative risk.
Dr. Nasmith stated that she understood that the decision to require students to leave was somewhat contentious, but emphasized that the safety of students would always take precedence. The University had arranged flights for returning students and had covered travel costs for 20 students to date. She requested the cooperation of academic units as issues related to academic credit were attended to on a case-by-case basis. Dr. Nasmith also requested assistance in identifying students in need of support. Counselling and other support services would be made available.

**DISCUSSION**

In response to a question from Dr. Rucker, Dr. Nasmith confirmed that the University relied upon travel advisories issued by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, and was also informed by actions taken by other universities.

On behalf of student constituents, Mr. Scafe expressed appreciation for the concern about student safety. He also expressed concern about students who had effectively lost their study-abroad term. To his knowledge, UBC was the only institution that had made the decision to evacuate its students. He described Policy 69 as heavy-handed and the order to evacuate as hastily made. He expressed the opinion that students on the ground in Japan were best placed to decide whether to return to Canada. Mr. Scafe indicated that students would be strongly opposed to the imposition of sanctions on students who refused to comply with the requirement to return. He also urged the Academic Policy Committee to review Policy 69.

Dr. Nasmith described the situation in Japan as chaotic, and stated that it was difficult confirm the accuracy of information and to make sound judgments in an emergency situation. She agreed that a post-hoc debrief of this first significant use of Policy 69 would be useful to determine how well the policy had worked.
Dr. Baimbridge spoke in support of Policy 69 and congratulated Go Global for establishing a traveler registration system than had enabled UBC to contact its students in Japan relatively quickly.

Mr. Mertens asked about students who had been enrolled in a final term abroad who would no longer have enough credits to graduate and who would perhaps lose out on employment opportunities. Dr. Nasmith indicated that each case would be considered individually, and that no student should be penalized.

Ms. Watt expressed her thanks for the support of students who wished to evacuate. She also indicated support for a review of the Policy, noting that interpretation of some of the language therein varied from reader to reader.

**CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION**

The Provost presented certificates of appreciation for Student Senators completing their terms on March 31, 2011. Senators applauded in appreciation of Student Senator service to the University.

**Admissions Committee**

Committee Chair Dr. Fielding presented the reports.

**BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PHARMACY – CHANGES IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

The Committee recommended for approval changes in admission requirements for applicants to the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy program. Applicants would be permitted to satisfy the first-year English pre-requisite through completion of SCIE 113.
MASTER OF PHYSICAL THERAPY -- CHANGES IN ADMISSION

The Committee recommended for approval changes in admission requirements for applicants to the Master of Physical Therapy program. The circulated document outlined editorial changes for clarity and a change in the admission interview format.

Dr. Fielding  
Dr. Anstee

That Senate approve changes in admission requirements for applicants to the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy program, effective for admission to the 2011 Winter Session and thereafter; and

That Senate approve changes in admission requirements for applicants to the Master of Physical Therapy program, effective for admission to the 2011 Winter Session and thereafter.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Harrison spoke in support of the proposed change to the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy. Bachelor of Science students opting to take SCIE 113, a new first-year communication course, in lieu of a first-year English course would no longer be missing a prerequisite for admission to the Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy program. He was hopeful that other programs would follow suit.

The motion was put and carried.

DOCTOR OF MEDICINE – CHANGES IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The Committee recommended for approval changes in admission requirements for applicants to the Doctor of Medicine program. The academic year with the lowest academic average (30 credits) could be excluded from the calculation of an admission average so
long as the applicant still presented a minimum of 90 graded credits by the application deadline.

That Senate approve changes in admission requirements for applicants to the Doctor of Medicine program, effective for admission to the 2012 Winter Session and thereafter.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Mertens stated that he had received questions from several students who objected to the proposed change. The previous policy had been to allow the exclusion of courses taken more than ten years earlier, whereas the proposed change would omit the academic year with the lowest academic standing. Students felt that the change would disadvantage applicants from lower socioeconomic backgrounds who had performed poorly during the first years of their undergraduate degree studies.

The assembly recognized Dr. Joseph Finkler, Associate Dean, Admissions, Faculty of Medicine. Dr. Finkler stated that it was not possible to address the question being posed because the University did not collect information about the socioeconomic status of its students. He provided an overview of the history of the “ten-year rule”, noting that the original purpose had been to avoid automatic exclusion of mature applicants who had performed poorly in a first degree but markedly better over the course of a second degree. Over the decade that the policy had been in place, the Faculty had observed that its policy had offered an unfair advantage to applicants who enrolled in a lighter course load and repeated courses for higher standing over a long period of time.

In response to a question from Dr. Cairns, Dr. Finkler acknowledged the existence of grade inflation within the applicant pool, but noted that this inflation was difficult to quantify.
In response to a question from Mr. Kim, Dr. Finkler clarified that Aboriginal applicants would be eligible for a full file review with an admission average of 70 or higher.

ENROLMENT TARGETS 2011/2012

The Committee recommended for approval proposed undergraduate enrolment targets for the 2011/2012 academic year, listed by Faculty, program and year level. The proposed enrolment targets had been reviewed by the Provost & Vice-President Academic and the Committee of Deans.

Dr. Fielding  Dr. Harrison

That Senate approve the 2011/2012 enrolment targets, as per section 27(2)(r) of the University Act.

Carried.

Student Awards Committee

Committee Chair Dr. Stelck presented the reports.

NEW AWARDS

See also ‘Appendix A: New Awards.’

Dr. Stelck  Dr. Rucker

That Senate accept the awards as listed and forward them to the Board of Governors for approval, and that letters of thanks be sent to the donors.

Carried.
Reports from the Provost & Vice-President, Academic

TRANSFER OF THE UBC BOTANICAL GARDEN AND CENTRE FOR PLANT RESEARCH

Dr. Farrar had circulated a proposal to transfer responsibility for the UBC Botanical Garden and Centre for Plant Research from the Faculty of Land & Food Systems to the Faculty of Science.

Dr. Farrar
Principal Nasmith

That Senate approve the transfer of the UBC Botanical Garden and Centre for Plant Research to the Faculty of Science from the Faculty of Land & Food Systems.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Loewen asked about the financial viability of the Botanical Garden and the potential effect on the Faculty of Science. Dr. Farrar noted some efficiencies related to combining like functions and leveraging existing infrastructure in the Faculty of Science, and added that the unit budget would be made whole prior to transfer. The transfer would not negatively impact the Faculty of Science budget, and would provide some future opportunities for Science.

The motion was put and carried.

Report from the University Librarian

2009/2010 REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN TO THE SENATE

Ms. Parent had circulated the following link to the annual report:

www.library.ubc.ca/home/UBC_RS_fa.pdf, and provided an overview. Main points were as follows:

• This represented the 95th annual report to Senate. Until 1953, the report had been presented by the Library Committee, with the Librarian delivering the report thereafter.
Report from the University Librarian, continued

- Ms. Parent thanked the members of the Library Committee, including Dr. Vessey as Chair, for their interest and sage advice.
- Library Mission: UBC Library advances research, learning, and teaching excellence by connecting communities, within and beyond the University, to the world’s knowledge.
- Library Vision: We are a globally influential research library, inspiring knowledge creation, exploration, and discovery.
- Library facilities such as the Chapman Learning Commons and the Canaccord Learning Commons enhanced student learning.
- The GIS/Research Data Lab was an example of the Library’s work toward accelerating research.
- The Library’s collection was managed in a digital context, with two-thirds of the acquisitions budget used to purchase access to digital material. A Director of Digital Initiatives position, a Digitization Centre, and an open access digital information repository (cIRcle) had been established.
- Community engagement initiatives included the Small Business Accelerator (SBA) program, a free comprehensive resource for business planning.
- A Library Think Tank and a Technology Training Program supported an exceptional work environment.
- Ms. Parent provided an overview of Library trends, including the evolving role of the librarian, demands for mobility and connectivity in learning technology, scholarly communications, use of library space for networking and study, and collaborative partnerships.

DISCUSSION

In response to a question from Mr. Hajian, Ms. Parent indicated that additional study space was being developed in the Walter C. Koerner Library. Open study space, as well as private rooms for group study were to be made available.

UBC Vancouver Campus and NCAA Division II Membership: A Review of the Issues

The assembly recognized guest presenter Mr. Brian Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan recalled that Senators had discussed the consultation process and timelines at the February 2011 meeting, and that the report had been re-circulated with the request for a fuller discussion at
the present meeting. Mr. Sullivan provided an update on discussions since the previous Senate meeting. Main points were as follows:

- UBC representatives had met with a delegation from Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS). CIS had expressed deep concern about the possibility of losing UBC to NCAA Division II.
- CIS intended to resume consideration of scholarship arrangements once a Presidential Oversight Committee had been established.
- The Canada West Future Competitive Structure Committee had recommended that once CIS had approved the formation of a second Regional Association in Western Canada, CWUAA was to split into Canada West Region One and Region Two. The intention would be to have the newest teams move into Canada West Region 2.
- Themes from consultation to date had been: caution about work involved in securing academic accreditation, differential impacts by sport of all of the options under consideration, the need for Athletics to raise additional scholarship funds under any of the options, and the need to ensure adequate consultation with student athletes as a key stakeholder group.

**DISCUSSION**

Dr. Anstee drew attention to the need to raise additional scholarship funds, and noted that it generally cost an additional 15 percent from the University’s discretionary funds to support fundraising efforts. He provided the example of raising $50 million in endowed funds, which would generate $1.5 million per year in scholarships, and would cost $7.5 million to raise. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged these overhead costs, and noted that salary costs for development officers and coordinators were covered from ancillary budgets, rather than discretionary funds. In response to a question from Mr. Rasmussen, Mr. Sullivan explained that additional scholarship funds would be necessary to be competitive in some NCAA sports, particularly football.

In response to a question from Mr. Brander, Mr. Sullivan recalled a baseline study four years earlier that had indicated that alumni who had previously participated as student athletes donated at three times the average rate and that a significant portion of those donations were targeted at areas other than athletics.
Mr. Mertens identified two areas of the report where he felt expansion would be helpful: the section addressing the impact on the University’s academic mission, and the statements about school spirit and the assumption that NCAA games would draw larger crowds. Speaking to the latter, he was not convinced that larger crowds would necessarily materialize and suggested that there were better and less expensive ways to draw in spectators. Mr. Sullivan indicated that other consultants had shared the opinion that the report overstated the potential impact on school spirit, with the possible exception of ice hockey. Responding to Mr. Mertens’ comments on links to the University’s strategic plan, Mr. Sullivan expressed the opinion that NCAA membership would offer significant opportunities in the areas of international, alumni, and community engagement, but that it would be a stretch to identify intersections with other parts of the strategic plan.

Mr. Yaworsky noted that Dr. Knight, who had sent regrets for the meeting, had prepared written comments. Copies of Dr. Knight’s comments had been circulated to Convocation Senators and Student Senators, and were available to others upon request. A former student athlete, Dr. Knight had played as quarterback for the Thunderbirds for the first national football championship in Toronto in 1959. Dr. Knight’s submission indicated strong support for expending the necessary time and effort to address shortcomings in CIS, rather than abandoning CIS altogether in favour of NCAA Division II.

Dr. Harrison addressed the requirement for academic accreditation, noting the ambitious plans for the University articulated in Place & Promise. While he felt that people were not afraid of the work involved in pursuing accreditation, he expressed concern that expending effort in this area would necessarily mean that less would be accomplished in other areas. As many programs in the Faculty of Science were already accredited by other bodies, the faculty was familiar with accreditation requirements. Dr. Harrison indicated that
his comfort with application for NCAA membership would increase if the accreditation requirement could be waived.

Mr. Mertens recalled that the Alma Mater Society had earlier taken a position against application for NCAA membership. Students with whom he had spoken remained supportive of retaining CIS membership. Mr. Mertens felt that there was value for athletes in traveling across Canada for CIS competitions that would be lost in the NCAA.

Dr. Ross asked whether schools who shared sports that had been “orphaned” under intercollegiate athletics associations might collaborate to establish a league of their own. Mr. Sullivan indicated that this issue had been raised from time to time, but was not under serious discussion. He added that tiering within CIS was not under active consideration.

**Other Business**

**TOPIC OF BROAD ACADEMIC INTEREST: CENTRAL EXAMINATION DATABASE**
On behalf of Student Senators, Mr. Mertens had circulated a paper advocating the creation of a central examination database. The authors indicated that students found reviewing past examinations effective as a learning tool, and that the Alma Mater Society had recently passed a motion establishing the creation of a central examination database as a student priority.

Mr. Mertens provided background for the proposal, noting the existence of several examination repositories within faculties and departments or maintained by student clubs. The potential benefits of a central database were cited as improving mental health and well-being, equalizing access to examinations, digitization of examination resources, and controlling access. Mr. Mertens identified McGill University, Queen’s University, and the University of Alberta as examples of institutions that had already created central databases hosted either by the University or by the students’ union. Mr. Mertens posed ques-
tions for discussion by Senate, including whether the Senate would be supportive of a central examination database and, if so, where and how such a database should be established.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Anstee recalled that many departments had previously submitted examinations to a repository in Brock Hall. This print repository had been succeeded by an electronic database administered by the Alma Mater Society, with records held by the Library. He stated that it would be a shame to lose the material already collected. While he was supportive of the creation of a central database, he hoped for a permanent solution. Dr. Anstee stated that he would be opposed to the inclusion of answer keys, noting that in Mathematics, a student club generated its own answer keys and sold them to students to generate revenue.

Ms. Friesen stated that examinations housed in the cIRcle database remained available. Mr. Mertens clarified that students were dissatisfied with the incompleteness of the collection. While the Library had indicated that cIRcle could continue to host the collection, there was a need for another unit to agree to communicate with departments and student users, and to ensure that the collection was complete. Ms. Parent agreed that cIRcle would be pleased to continue to host. Ms. Parent noted the existence of an historical 24-metre collection of past examinations in the Library, as well as some on microfilm. Records dated back to the 1920s.

Dr. Baimbridge suggested that the MD program would be opposed to releasing examinations, given the time and effort involved in creating new and effective multiple-choice examination questions. Approximately one third of the questions were replaced each year, meaning that it would not be feasible to release past examinations.
Dr. Harrison asked whether there were teaching and learning issues that should be addressed to decrease student anxiety around examinations. He emphasized the importance of tests administered over the course of the term as a way of preparing students for examinations. Like Dr. Baimbridge, he could foresee objections from faculty to any requirement that all examinations be released.

Dr. Ross spoke in support of sensitivity to the differences between examination types across disciplines. He noted that his practice was to provide students with the previous term’s examination, but not the answer key.

Dr. Thorne suggested that professional programs might take a particular perspective on this issue. She emphasized the role of examinations in evaluating student capacity to think critically about a new situation, rather than to promote the memorization of facts. She expressed the opinion that making past examinations available would not necessarily be helpful, and that it might constitute a distraction. She spoke in support of considering ways to reduce examination anxiety, but was not convinced that releasing past examinations was the answer.

Ms. Watt spoke to the issue of equality of access to past examinations. She recalled a recent course section where approximately half of the students had access to past examinations and thus performed much better on a midterm examination. She expressed the opinion that a central database would level the playing field for students.

Dr. Vessey indicated that each of his examinations were highly customized, and that past examinations were therefore not very helpful to students. He noted that the Department of English maintained a complete archive of past examinations. If a central database were to be created, he felt it would be important to respect local preferences. Dr. Baimbridge stated that faculty retained intellectual property rights to examinations they created, and
that a policy requiring faculty to deposit all examinations was therefore not feasible. He spoke in favour of an opt-in policy.

There was some discussion about whether an existing or new Committee of Senate ought to further study these issues.

Dr. Baimbridge
Mr. Rasmussen

That the proposal to establish a central examination database be referred to the Teaching & Learning Committee for further study.

Carried.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. The following regular meeting was scheduled for April 20, 2011.
APPENDIX A: NEW AWARDS

Kensaku ASANO Memorial Award: An Award of $1,050 is offered in memory of Kensaku Asano by his family, friends, and colleagues. Kensaku studied Theatre and English Literature at UBC and worked as a theatre and television actor in the years after he graduated from university. He died of cancer at the age of 25. The award is given to a theatre major or minor in third or fourth year, in any stream, who exhibits traits for which Kensaku was known: an unshakably positive attitude toward theatrical work, a gift for encouraging other students, and a healthy sense of humour at all times. The award is made on the recommendation of the Department of Theatre and Film with nominations by the department’s student body. (First Award Available in the 2011/12 Academic Session)

CONNOR, Clark & Lunn Portfolio Management Foundation Award: A $1,500 award is offered by Connor, Clark & Lunn for a student entering third or fourth year of the Bachelor of Commerce program at the Sauder School of Business in the Portfolio Management Foundation program who has demonstrated high academic achievement and leadership ability. The award is made on the recommendation of the Sauder School of Business in consultation with the UBC Portfolio Management Foundation. (First Award Available in the 2011/12 Academic Session)

Hilda JANZEN Memorial Award in Feminist Legal Studies: An Annual award of $18,000 is offered by Sonya Wall in memory of Hilda Janzen. The award is for a student in any year of the UBC Law JD Program, including first year, who has achieved good academic standing, has demonstrated leadership and community involvement in feminist and/or legal issues, and faces challenges, financial or systemic, in accessing or continuing legal education. The Award is made on the recommendation of the Faculty. (First Award Available in the 2011/12 Academic Session)

MACKAY LLP Scholarship in Accounting: Two $3,500 scholarships are offered by MacKay LLP, and the Chartered Accountants Education Foundation, to an undergraduate student enrolled in the Accounting option of the Bachelor of Commerce program at the Sauder School of Business. This award was established to mark the 40th anniversary of MacKay LLP and honour the legacy created by the founding partner, Iain MacKay and the other leading partners of MacKay LLP. This award is made on the recommendation of the Sauder School of Business to a student in good academic standing who has expressed an intention to enter the Chartered Accountants School of Business program immediately following graduation. (First Award Available in the 2011/12 Academic Session)

Beverly McLACHLIN Legal Access Award: Awards totalling $21,000 have been endowed by the Law Foundation of British Columbia, the Faculty of Law of UBC and members of the BC Bar to honour Chief Justice Beverly McLachlin, a former faculty member of the Faculty of Law. Beverly McLachlin was the first woman to be appointed Chief Justice of Canada. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Faculty of Law to students completing third year that have accepted articling positions in under-
served and/or rural communities in British Columbia, or in the area of public interest/social justice law in British Columbia. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Faculty. (First Award Available in the 2011/12 Academic Session)

Edward PIERS Memorial Award in Organic Chemistry: An annual award for a minimum of $1,000 is offered in memory of Dr. Edward Piers and in celebration of his distinguished career in the Department of Chemistry. The award is open to graduate students in any branch of Organic Chemistry (including synthetic, bioorganic, organometallic or materials) who demonstrate qualities of academic excellence, experimental skill and dedication to the field through service and leadership. During more than forty years on campus, Dr. Piers mentored more than 90 graduate students and postdoctoral fellows and inspired many to pursue careers in chemistry. His many accomplishments resulted in his election to Fellowship in the Royal Society of Canada in 1989. Dr. Piers also made significant leadership contributions to the profession of chemistry in Canada and was widely respected among his peers – “a true scholar and gentleman”. Recommendations are made by the Department of Chemistry, in consultation with the Faculty of Graduate Studies. (First Award Available in the 2011/12 Academic Session)

PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED AWARDS WITH CHANGES IN TERMS OR FUNDING SOURCE:

Bert HENRY Memorial Scholarship: A scholarship of $3,300 has been endowed by the late Gladys Henry. The award is made to a student proceeding from Senior Secondary School to the University of British Columbia. The award is based primarily on the student’s scholarly achievement. Holders of this scholarship who maintain a first class average in a full program of study, or who stand in the top 10% of their class are eligible to have the award renewed for a further three years of study. The exact value of the renewals may fluctuate depending on the total funds available. Candidates must be nominated by their secondary schools. Nomination packages must be received in the Awards Office by February 28.

How Amended: Due to a recent, realized bequest, this scholarship will move from an annual award to an endowed award ($247,431 given to the fund from an Estate Gift)

M.M. WEAVER Prize in the History of Medicine: A prize or prizes totalling $1,200 endowed by the late Dr. M.M. Weaver, first Dean of Medicine at this University, is awarded to the student or students in the Faculty of Medicine who submit the best essays on the topics in the history of medicine. Award recipients will be chosen by the Faculty based on the quality of paper and academic merit.

How Amended: The revision is Faculty driven as there isn’t a course aligned with this subject any longer which has made it impossible to assign the award. The revision will make it practical to administer while honouring the donor’s wishes.