

SM 10/10/68 Univ. Organ
Inter Univ. Rel.
Academic Planning

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE CONSTITUTION AND
FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING BODIES OF THE UNIVERSITY

1. Report and Recommendations
2. Report on some related issues
3. Pro's and Con's of possible systems
4. Press release describing Perry Commission
5. Working papers:
 - a) Present system in B.C. (a sketch; it is assumed that members of Senate know the Universities Act.)
 - b) University Government elsewhere in Canada
 - c) Grants Commissions
 - d) The Regents System in New York State and California (i.e., an integrated system)
 - e) Academic Planning
 - f) Budgetary Practice
 - g) Summary and Comment on K. Hare, On University Freedom in the Canadian Context
 - h) The problem of Provincial planning in the Universities
 - i) Selected bibliography

R. J. BAKER
CHAIRMAN

SM 10/10/68 *Univ Org*
Inter Univ Rel
Arch. Plan.
S - 157

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the time of the Macdonald Report, U.B.C. was used to being the only university in the province, and it was rather set in its ways. The possibility of doing anything different from what was done at U.B.C. - and thereby increasing the variety of higher education in the province - was small. Moreover, Victoria College was determined to become independent and autonomous. Consequently the Macdonald Report suggested that the three institutions of higher education be autonomous. In the interests of variety and local control and initiative, it also suggested that the regional and district colleges be autonomous. To provide some mechanisms of coordination, however, the Report suggested two new bodies: The Advisory Board and the Academic Board. These boards have worked valiantly since their inception, but it is clear that neither of them can solve current problems.

The present distribution of funds to the three universities almost guarantees conflict among them--as well as competition and overlapping of offerings. The Academic Board has not been consulted on major new offerings at any of the universities. The Advisory Board meets only to recommend the division of provincial funds. Whatever happens, the Boards, presidents, faculty and students at the three public universities are almost forced to compete with one another. Funds depend on enrolments, enrolments depend on the variety of courses (to some extent), and each president and Board is tempted to explain the failure to get more funds by blaming the others.

It is time to rework the overall structure of the government of B.C. universities. Recognising the impossibility of unlimited funds, we must devise a system which makes best use of those available. A tinkering with the present structure--by adding faculty or students to Boards or by giving more powers to Senates, for example-- cannot solve the problems. Only three possibilities exist:

- a) The present structure plus a powerful University Grants Commission,
- b) One governing body, something like the state Board of Regents' system in California or New York. (The "integrated system" of our recommendation:

c) Direct government control through a department of university affairs. (We have rejected as a possibility, the present system but its advantages and disadvantages are set out in appendix ...)

The last possibility would certainly be resisted by the universities. It can, moreover, be dismissed on the grounds that it has not been successful elsewhere. The French system is the infamous example of the control of universities by a civil service. Inevitably in our society, government control would lead to perpetual criticism of the government by academics, something that any government would no doubt consider politically undesirable, while at the same time it would remove the need for coordination and responsibility from the universities themselves.

The first two possibilities are both reasonable. University Grants Commissions are deeply rooted in the Commonwealth and some, especially that in Britain, have earned considerable respect. Recent developments in the United Kingdom, however, indicate that the system is in difficulty. As the costs of higher education rise, the need for planning, coordination, and economical operation grow. The probable line of planning and development would be something like this: department, faculty, Senate, Board, Grants Commission. As needs and complexity grow, each level needs a staff, consultation, and negotiation. Moreover, each Board continues -- rightly -- to defend its own institution and its needs. If the Grants Commission includes members from the individual institutions, whether they are faculty or laymen, it is likely to find that they are tempted to defend their own institutions. In Britain, with 44 institutions, individual loyalties are watered down by sheer numbers. In B.C. where institutions are few and loyalties strong, we are unlikely to find a Grants Commission so composed of saints that they are never suspect, particularly when they are almost certain to be criticised by individual Boards and presidents even when they are not suspect. Under the present system someone must bear responsibility for the failure of a Board to obtain the needed funds. The Grants Commission, acting as both the advocate for more money from the government and the dispenser of the money that is provided, is almost certain to be the scapegoat.

The concept of an integrated financial system for the whole province is attractive. Each institution can maintain its academic uniqueness and autonomy while one body can be responsible for arguing for and dividing funds. The one-board system has certain effects which are in line with much current university thinking:

- a) the role of Senates would be greatly increased. Now that universities contain many experts who are regularly used to advise government and business, the need for a lay Board to help with financial matters (traditionally thought not to be understood by faculties) has decreased. Moreover, the present division of responsibility between Board and Senate is increasingly difficult to operate. At its best, it is hard to separate academic matters from financial ones. At its worst, such a separation encourages irresponsibility in both Senate and Board. Senates make demands without facing the genuine choices involved. Boards make decisions about priorities without having to live from day to day with the effects.
- b) the demand for less unnecessary competition and overlapping among the public institutions could more easily be met if each Senate and president knew that he had to deal with one board, responsible for all the institutions.
- c) one Board could insist on standard and comparable accounting procedures in the various institutions and thereby make its judgments on a more rational basis.
- d) if the various universities had to make requests for funds and expansions to one Board, they would have to improve their planning techniques. Until recently, planning has been extremely haphazard.

WE RECOMMEND, THEREFORE, that the public universities in British Columbia be governed financially by one body, a British Columbia Commission on Universities. We emphasize, however, that each institution is to be given the greatest possible autonomy in academic affairs and that each institution have its own Senate.

The Commission on Higher Education should be responsible for:

- a) the receiving and evaluation of operating and capital estimates from all public universities.
- b) the negotiation of changes in those estimates with the individual universities.
- c) the presentation of the complete estimates and the arguments for them to the appropriate Minister.
- d) the allocation of funds to individual institutions once the total universities budget has been announced.
- e) the development of comparable accounting, estimating, and budgeting procedures in the various universities.
- f) the development of long-range planning and coordination among the universities.
- g) advising government on the establishing of additional universities or four year colleges in the Province.

We would also urge that the Commission work towards a system of budgeting that involves more than one year. A system under which universities budgeted for a three or four year period (with the possibility of annual adjustments) would allow for more sensible planning and cut down the amount of time now spent on annual budgeting.

(See Appendix Working paper on budgeting).

If the concept of one Commission is accepted, its composition and that of the Senates becomes crucial. A number of methods of making up a single Commission have been proposed or are in use: popular election, election by the Legislative Assembly, representation from the universities, representation from various civic groups, appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, election by the Senates, election by the graduates of the universities. Since we believe that the Board will play an all-important role in explaining the needs and problems of the universities and government to one another, we propose a mixture of government appointees and university members. We would argue for laymen appointed by government (after inviting universities to suggest candidacy) on the grounds that a democratically elected government represents the people of British Columbia and that it has a right to appoint people whose judgment it trusts to represent

the interests of the community as a whole. We believe that informed laymen can present the needs and problems of the university to Government and to the people of the Province. We would argue for academic members on the grounds that they know the needs and problems of the universities better than anyone else and that their presence on the Commission would ensure that lay members were fully informed of the implications of their decisions for the universities.

Provided that there are academics on the Commission, we would urge that Senates be made up only of members of the university community - faculty, students, graduates, and such other members of the university as can contribute to the deliberations and decisions of Senate. If there are academics on the Commission, the argument that laymen are needed on Senate to provide a communication link between the Commission and the academic community disappears.

We do not think that it is profitable at this time to try to decide on the exact make-up of the Commission. We would urge, however, that government make every possible effort to see that the Commission contains representatives of significant sections of the community, e.g. business, industry, labour, the professions, the rural and the urban areas of the province, and other sectors of the provincial educational system. The prime concern, however, should be to obtain people who can work in the best interests of the universities, deal with each of them fairly, and persuade government and the electorate of their needs. Representation from all possible groups is impossible, but men and women knowledgeable about and dedicated to higher education will always consider the needs and desires of all groups.

We believe that the Commission must be kept to a reasonable size, probably about fifteen, if it is to work, that it should have its own secretariat, and that the terms of office should be long enough to enable members to resist immediate political pressures but limited so that new ideas can be more easily received. With staggered terms, minima of three years and maxima of six years appear reasonable.

SM 10/10/68 Univ Org
See your Rel
Read Plan

- 6 -

We would expect the secretariat of the Commission to work closely with the universities on planning and coordination, etc., we do not think that we can specify the mechanisms of such consultation. Different universities may well use different techniques of planning themselves.

Since we envisage that our Commission would carry even greater responsibilities than the present Boards, and since we would like to enable any qualified member of the community to serve on it, we recommend that suitable compensation for time off from work, travel, and accommodation be provided.

R. J. Baker

L. Funt

K. Okuda (replacing S. Wasserman
in September)

G. Sperling

S. Wong.

SM 10/10/68

Univ Cong
Inter Univ Rel
Acad. Plan

Some additional notes and subjects for discussion

Since our terms of reference implied that we deal only with university government in the universities set up under the Universities Act, we did not consider that we should refer to private universities and other institutions of post-secondary education. We append, however, some suggestions and comments on those institutions and their relation to an overall system of higher education. Items from our own suggestions or others that arise in Senate could be incorporated in our presentation to the Perry Commission.

SM 10/10/68 *Univ. Org. Inter Univ. Rel Acad. Plan*

Regional and District Colleges and Institutes of Technology

The committee has confined its attention to the public universities, but it does think that most of the arguments it advances for better planning, coordination, budgeting, and the allocation of funds could equally well be made about the other institutions of post-secondary education. As far as we know, coordination is accidental or non-existent among Vancouver City College, Capilano College, the B. C. Institute of Technology, and the proposed Lower Mainland College -- even though they are all in the same area. With the development of Okanagan College, New Caledonia College, Nanaimo College, and the existing Selkirk College, in other parts of the province, we cannot believe that better planning will not be necessary.

The key question as far as the universities are concerned is whether or not all institutions of post-secondary education should come under our proposed Commission. Initially we think not. The Commission will have plenty to do bringing order into the university system, without facing the problems of colleges of a kind quite new to British Columbia. We have had no opportunity to talk as a committee with representatives of the colleges, and we think that it would be presumptuous for us to make recommendations on their future government. We would urge the Perry Commission, however, to consider the place of the colleges in the whole system of planning and coordination. If they do not come under our proposed Commission, we would urge very strongly that they be represented on it in some way.

The committee did not think that it should study the place of private universities and colleges-- e.g. Notre Dame University (Nelson) and Trinity Junior College (Fort Langley) --- in the public system of higher education in the province. We recognize, however, that many systems of higher education do incorporate both public and private institutions to some extent in the allocation of public funds. Under the integrated public system we have proposed, private institutions would be unlikely to want to give up their own Boards, individual plans, etc.. We see nothing to prevent our Commission advising government on the allocation of funds to private institutions, provided that both government and the individual institutions want to work in that way.

We would urge, however, that future private institutions be required to submit their plans to the Commission and that the government seriously consider the advice of the Commission before issuing any more charters to grant degrees, etc.. We do not think that the population or resources of British Columbia permit totally unplanned development of private institutions of higher education any more than they do of public institutions. If public funds are to be used in any way for private institutions, the public has a right to some say in the location, plans, and probable quality of education in those institutions. If no public funds are to be used -- operating, capital, scholarship, loan, bursary, etc. -- some system of academic accrediting may be necessary, but public financial control is obviously unjustified.

A NEW ACT?

SM 10 110 168

*Inter Univ Rel
Univ Org
Acad Plan*

If our proposals were adopted, in full a new Universities Act would be necessary. Many of our suggestions, however, could be implemented within the present Act. The Minister of Education could expand the present Advisory Board and give it many of the responsibilities we propose for the Commission. Present Boards of Governors could -- as in practice some now do -- turn over some responsibilities to Senates or to joint Senate-Board committees. Longer term budgeting can be instituted by the government at any time -- as it has indeed already done with capital funding.

PRO'S AND CON'S

SM 10/16/68

2
1. In the name of
Union Org
Adm. Sec.

In this section we set out the main advantages and disadvantages of the systems we see as possibilities. Needless to say, the committee does not make all of its suggestions with equal seriousness. Some items appear simultaneously as advantages and disadvantages (e.g. formula financing) because the committee recognized that their virtue is debatable.

SM 10 110/68

*Spur Univ Rel
Univ Org
Acad. Plan*

By integrated system, we mean something like the Board of Regents system. We envisage one provincial Board for all the public universities, the disappearance of individual Boards of Governors, and the re-allocation of some of the responsibilities of individual Boards to Senates. We suggest as titles: University Advisory Board, B.C. Commission on Universities, B.C. Commission on Higher Education, (The make-up and responsibilities of this Board are set out on pages 4, 5, and 6 of the Report and Recommendations.)

Advantages

- a) Simplicity of structure, especially for long-range planning and coordination.
- b) Ends the present division of responsibilities among Board and Senate.
- c) Leads to comparable accounting, estimating and budgeting procedures in different institutions.
- d) Probably leads to greater ease of transfer for both students and faculty.
- e) Probably greater uniformity on policies involving expenditure, e.g. "fringe benefits".
- f) One body is responsible for studying and presenting the estimates - and then for allocating the available funds.

Disadvantages

- a) The system could become monolithic and work against variety and experiment.
- b) Some loss of autonomy.
- c) Loss of laymen with strong loyalties to individual institutions.
- d) The system may not fit traditional Canadian systems of government. In the United States, the pattern of public budget hearings give individual institutions an opportunity to generate public pressures before budget allocations are made. The Canadian pattern of pre-budget confidentiality might be difficult to maintain if large Senates took over some responsibilities for preparing estimates.



GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

SM 10/10/68

*Inter Univ Rel
Univ Org
Acad Plan*

Advantages

- a) A powerful minister may be able to obtain more support for universities than independent Boards can.
- b) The Government is representative of the whole community and can be best decide on community needs in universities.
- c) University Senates and presidents could deal directly with government instead of working through Boards of Governors and the Advisory Board.

Disadvantages

- a) Experience of government control elsewhere is that the system tends to become beaurocratic and hide-bound.
- b) Academic Freedom has frequently been curtailed by government control.
- c) Government is less likely to understand the needs of individual universities than their own governing bodies.

GRANTS COMMISSIONS

*Inter Univ Fed
Univ Org
Acad Plan*

SM 10/10/68

Advantages

- a) Maximum workable independence for individual institutions.
- b) Leads to formula financing.
- c) Obviates detailed external control of university budgets.
- d) Retains present Board and Senate structures.
- e) Private donors can direct gifts to individual institutions and not have these considered a substitute for adequate public support.

Disadvantages

- a) Difficult to coordinate inter-university programs.
- b) Leads to formula financing.
- c) No easy formula for "emergent" capital costs.
- d) Retains present Board and Senate structures.
- e) Individual universities may have no direct representation on commission.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

3M 10/10/68

*John Lewis Kel
Lewis Org.
Acad. Soc.*

Advantages

- a) Maximum autonomy for individual institutions.
- b) Four and perhaps five different groupsb) can appeal to the government; i.e. the three Boards of Governors, the Advisory Board, the Academic Board.
- c) Individual Board members can identify c) with their institutions and work hard for both finance and the understanding of university needs and problems.
- d) Final allocation of funds within the institutions rests with their own Boards and Senates.

Disadvantages

- a) Such autonomy appears to preclude overall planning and the avoidance of unnecessary overlap and duplication.
- b) The multiplicity of appeals dilutes their effect and can lead to conflicting advice.
- c) Such identification is bound to lead to undesirable conflict and competition. Once the Advisory Board has allocated funds, the Boards, including presidents can be tempted to explain their own allocations by sniping at the other institutions. Post-budget depression in one institution can affect confidence in the whole system of university government.
- d) The fact that the Perry Commission has been set up indicates that the Advisory Board has found the system difficult to operate.
- e) The Advisory Board is responsible for allocating funds, but it has had no opportunity to study estimates well in advance and no opportunity to consider long-range plans. It cannot advise government before funds are allocated.
- f) As far as the universities are concerned the Academic Board has had very little opportunity "to advise on the orderly development of higher education" in the province.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM (cont.)

*Inter-Union Rec
Union Org
Acad Rec*

SM 10/10/68

Advantages

Disadvantages

- g) The Advisory Board has had no influence on the allocation of capital funds.
- h) The traditional distinction between the powers and responsibilities of Senate and those of the Board is increasingly difficult to justify or maintain. Academic and financial decisions cannot be separated easily. To place further Boards - Advisory and Academic - on top of the present structures adds complications and delays.
- i) The Advisory Board is too small to represent the academic and wider Community.
- j) The Advisory Board is not mandatory. (This could be considered an advantage by maintaining that the present Act is flexible enough for the Minister to change the present make-up of the Advisory Board and the functions of both the Advisory and the Academic Boards without new legislation.)

3M10/10/68

The original press release from the government is attached for information.

RELEASE

Sm 10/10/68

Inter Univ Rel
Univ Org.
Acad Plan

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER, HON. L. R. PETERSON

VICTORIA, B.C.

SUBJECT University grants and the appointment
of Advisory Committee on Inter-University
Relations

FOR RELEASE

IMMEDIATE

May 23, 1968.

The Honourable L. R. Peterson, Minister of Education, announced today that the Provincial Government had accepted the recommendations of the Advisory Board for the allocation of the \$53 million operating grants to the three public universities.

For the current fiscal year 1968/69, the Provincial grants for operating purposes will be:

University of British Columbia	\$31,186,572
Simon Fraser University	13,555,241
University of Victoria	8,258,187

Commenting on the recommendations of the Advisory Board, the Minister said that the operating grants provided by the Provincial Government this year would represent an increase of 18.02 percent for the University of British Columbia, 16.36 percent for Simon Fraser University, and 19.21 percent for the University of Victoria. This is in addition to the capital grants (announced earlier) which have been raised by 50 percent -- from \$8 million in 1967/68 to \$12 million this year.

SM 10/10/68

Inter Univ Rec
Univ Org
Adm Plan

- 2 -

Provincial Grants to the Public Universities

		For Operating Purposes	For Capital Purposes	Total Grants
University of British Columbia	1968/69 1967/68	\$ 31,186,572 26,424,541	\$ 5,000,000 4,000,000	\$ 36,186,572 30,424,541
Simon Fraser University	1968/69 1967/68	13,555,241 11,649,316	5,000,000 3,000,000	18,555,241 14,649,316
University of Victoria	1968/69 1967/68	8,258,187 6,926,143	2,000,000 1,000,000	10,258,187 7,926,143
TOTAL GRANTS	1968/69 1967/68	\$ 53,000,000 45,000,000	\$ 12,000,000 8,000,000	\$ 65,000,000 53,000,000

SM 10/10/68

Interuniv Rel
Univ. Org
Acad. Plan.

- 3 -

As foreshadowed in his address during the Budget Debate in the Legislative Assembly earlier this year, Mr. Peterson also announced the formation of the Advisory Committee on Inter-University Relations. The members of this Committee are: Mr. Richard M. Bibbs, Dean S.N.F. Chant, Mr. Alan M. Eyre, Mr. W. C. Mearns, and Dr. G. Neil Perry, who will be the chairman.

Each of the public Universities were invited to nominate a member of the Committee. Mr. Bibbs was appointed by the University of British Columbia, Mr. Eyre by Simon Fraser University, and Mr. Mearns by the University of Victoria. In addition Dean Chant was invited to serve on the Committee because of his experience as Chairman of the Academic and Advisory Boards.

Explaining the background for the appointment of the Advisory Committee, the Minister stated:

"In recent years, many governments in the Western World have been finding it necessary to review those sections of their educational policy which relate to institutions of higher learning.

A larger public appetite for higher educational services, together with a relative shortage of personnel and equipment, have combined with expansive forces within the institutions themselves to produce university budgets and requests for financial assistance of

SM 10 110/68

Inter Univ Rel
Univ Org
Acad Plan

- 4 -

a magnitude that is severely testing the ability of governments to supply the funds. In reaction, governments have sought to find ways of extending increased financial assistance but, at the same time, of demanding prudent management by the beneficiaries -- often by a more efficient use of plant and personnel and a more careful scrutiny of development expenditures. Confronted by other demands from faculty and students, university administrators have, not surprisingly, found these governmental prescriptions difficult to follow. It is against this general background that the Advisory Committee has been asked to look at the present state of inter-university and university-government relations in this Province.

In British Columbia, higher education has been moving away from a simple arrangement involving only one publicly-supported, Provincial university towards a more complex, multi-university system. With the emergence of regional and district colleges, technological institutes, and other post-secondary institutions -- as well as private institutions of higher learning -- a new layer of educational services has been interposed between the secondary schools and the universities. The articulation of this network of publicly-supported institutions has been left largely to the voluntary efforts of the organizations themselves, aided by the technical assistance and advice of the Academic and Advisory Boards. As the aggregate demand for financial support has gone up an important problem has arisen: shall this loose

Inter Univ Rel.
SM 10/10/68 *Univ. of*
Quebec

network relationship be continued or should a more formal system of relationships be created? Solutions adopted elsewhere on this Continent have attempted to preserve the independence of the component institutions while, concurrently, establishing ground rules for the system as a whole.

The task assigned to the Advisory Committee is to consider this relationship issue at the university level. It is recognized that some of the suggestions considered by the Advisory Committee could have implications for the other post-secondary institutions but, at this stage, the focus of the Committee's attention is expected to be on the universities. In the process of its work the Committee will be expected to review the adequacy of the arrangements established five years ago under the Universities Act of 1963 -- particularly the role of the Academic and Advisory Boards -- in the light of the experience thus far."

While hopeful that the Advisory Committee will be able to draw his attention to potentially-constructive changes, the Minister stated that he thought the task assigned to the Committee was a difficult one. He intended to facilitate their efforts by leaving the members free to ascertain the views of interested persons and groups in the Province, and to adopt such procedures as the Committee judged necessary. He also indicated that he would ask the

SM 10/10/68 Inter Xmas Res
Yours Q19
Glen Lee

- 6 -

Division of University and College Affairs of the Department of Education to provide services for the Committee.

Mr. Peterson stated he is hopeful that a final report from the Committee would be received before the next session of the Legislature.

- 30 -

Working Papers and Information

SM 10/10/68

*Inter-Union Rel.
Mr. Biggs
Acad. Board*

The present situation in B.C. is that the University of B.C., the University of Victoria and Simon Fraser University are governed by the same act and have essentially the same structure. Minor differences in the membership of the first convocations for Simon Fraser and Victoria will gradually disappear. Notre Dame University is governed by a separate act.

The BCIT is basically a provincial institution. It has a number of advisory committees for different technologies. Vancouver City College comes under the Vancouver Board of School Trustees and ultimately under the Public Schools Act. Selkirk College, Okanagan College, and Capilano College are governed by Councils set up under the Public Schools Act.

Three "overseeing bodies" - with rather ill-defined responsibilities derive their existence from the Universities Act: The Academic Board, The Advisory Board, and The Joint Board of Teacher Education. The Academic Board is mandatory and is to "advise the appropriate authorities on orderly academic development of Universities established under this Act and of colleges established under the Public Schools Act" I am a member of the Board and I think that it must be said that it has not the powers to make it effective as a coordinating body.

The Advisory Board is not mandatory, but it has in fact been operating for the last three years. The government tells the Advisory Board how much money it has allowed for the three public universities. The Board advises the Minister of Education on the division. To date, the advice has been accepted. The difficulty, however, is that the Board has no prior knowledge of plans, no standardised methods of comparing the three budgets, and no time.

The Joint Board of Teacher Education has the power to advise the Minister of Education and the Universities on curricula, staffing, and facilities in the various Faculties of Education. I have been a member of this Board in the past, and although I have doubts about its effectiveness, I have no reason to believe that it is a hindrance.

A new development is that the Minister of Education has set up a committee to advise on the coordination of institutions of higher education. Its terms of reference have not been defined. It is composed of one member nominated by each of the three Boards of Governors, - Mr. Biggs (U.B.C.), Mr. Eyre (S.F.U.), Mr. Mearns (Victoria), the Chairman of the Academic Board (Dr. S.N.F. Chant, former Dean of Arts and Science at U.B.C. He was elected by the Academic Board as chairman; he was appointed by the government chairman of the Advisory Board,) and the deputy minister of Education, Dr. N. Perry.

SM 10/10/68

Inu Yiu. Kel
Un Arg.
Dean. Stan

Elsewhere in Canada

Except where modifications have been introduced by the setting up of university grants commissions (Ontario, Manitoba) and to some extent in Saskatchewan, where one Board serves the two campuses- Saskatoon and Regina, the methods of governing universities are substantially the same as those set out in the present B.C. Universities Act. Lay Boards of Governors ~~boards~~ are responsible for financial matters and Senates (usually both lay and academic with academic majorities) are responsible for academic matters. Recently a number of universities have added students to their Senates and academics to their Boards, but the essential structures are like those in the B.C. universities.

G. Sperling

GRANTS COMMISSIONS

Canadian universities are now in a position where their major source of revenue stems from the provincial government. Student fees, which once covered the major part of the costs of the private institutions, are no longer adequate to cover the costs of even the most modest academic program. Private endowments, which were the mainstay of the universities of the past, are inadequate for even the most highly endowed institutions and sources of new funds are almost nonexistent. Direct Federal grants to universities have disappeared. Until 1965, they provided an independent guaranteed source of income to the universities as they were based on a formula tied to provincial population and university enrollment. The Canadian university, therefore, finds that its dominant source of revenue is the provincial government. The government, in turn, finds itself in the dilemma of retaining the responsibility for publicly accounting for the expenditure of its funds, and yet in appearance and practice, divorcing itself from the control of the expenditure of these funds within the university community. The problem is compounded by the necessity of subdividing educational grants amongst various universities in the province. This subdivision cannot be made on any simple grounds. The age of the institution, the complexity of its program, the distribution and size of student enrollment, all affect the costing of various programs which can be developed.

SM 10 110 168 *See 44. Re
exis Arg
See 1. Plan.*

2.

In order to exert some measure of responsible control over the distribution of funds, and yet not interfere with the internal operations of the universities, governments have appointed Grants Commissions. Their emergence has marked the development of educational finance in Canada during the last five years.

The first Grants Commission was established in Ontario, and it set itself the goal of devising some objective formula as the basis of allocating operating grants to the various provincially assisted universities within the Province of Ontario.

The purpose of providing a formula is to make available an objective mechanism for determining the share of the total provincial operating grant to be allocated to each university. Any private sources of endowment are not included in the formula. The use of the formula enables each institution to place its own priorities on its academic objectives, and to seek various methods of achieving excellence and to develop ingenious methods for inducing economy.

The establishment of a formula is in no way incompatible with the complete autonomy of the institution to operate and disburse the monies made available to it.

The existence of a formula provides a much more certain basis for university planning. The universities can make reasonable projections of enrollment for many years in advance and thus be assured of a minimum income and guaranteed floor for the budget.

. . . 3

SM 10/10/68

Inter Univ Rel
to Csg.
Acc & Plan

3.

The operation of a Grants Commission formula obviates much of the necessity for detailed scrutiny of university operating expenses. The Grants Commission can in turn devote its attention to long range planning, to the interrelationships of various institutions, and the way in which these interrelationships can be developed to best serve the needs of the province.

Finally, the employment of an operating formula gives assurance to private donors or to others that their gifts to the university for operating purposes will not merely prove to be a substitute for public support.

The initial Ontario formula did not make any provision for emergent costs of new institutions. These were based on an ad hoc approach but with the firm understanding that emergent costs were, by their very definition, temporary in nature.

In the period subsequent to the development of the first Ontario formula, attempts have been made to place emergent costs on a formula basis as well.

Similarly, capital costs were viewed on a comparable basis for all the institutions in the province. The adoption of a particular academic program entailed a commitment for the corresponding capital costs. Capital cost projections were made on a five-year on-going basis, and universities were informed in advance of their share of the capital costs.

Again, in the past year, there have been constructive attempts made to place capital costs on a similar formula basis.

. . . 4

SM 10/10/68

Inverness Rd.
Univ. Corg
Aberdeen

4.

The operating grant formula is based on the concept of basic income units. The number of basic income units for a particular university is determined by the student distribution in various programs in the university. Relative weights are assigned to each category of student, and these weights are assumed to be in reasonable correlation with the actual costs associated with the particular program.

From a tally of the total number of basic income units, each university can determine its proportion of the total provincial grant.

Once the provincial grant is known for the current budget year, the value of the basic income units for that year is stated and the university's budget is known accordingly.

There is no compulsion to distribute the monies amongst the various programs in direct proportion the basic income unit allocation. Once the university has obtained its budget, it is free to allocate it within its programs as it sees fit.

Provision has been made for the reassessment of the basic weight factors for each type of program, and these will be refined, as studies now in progress by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Association of University Business Officers reach fruition.

The table of categories for determining basic income units in Ontario, is as follows:

. . . 5

SM 10 110 168 Inter new Rel.
H. O. G.
G. A. L. H.

5.

Table of Categories for Determining Basic Income Units

UNDERGRADUATE AND FIRST DEGREE

Category 1

Weight 1

All General Arts
All General Science
All Pre-Medicine
All Journalism
All Secretarial Science
All Social Work
First-Year Honors Arts and Science

Category 2

Weight 1.5

Upper Years Honors Arts (including
"make-up" year)
All Commerce
All Physical Education
All Law
All Library Science
All Fine and Applied Arts
All Physical and Occupational Therapy

Category 3

Weight 2

Upper Years Honors Science (including
"make-up" year)
All Nursing
All Engineering
All Food and Household Sciences
All Pharmacy
All Architecture
All Forestry
All Agriculture
All Hygiene and Public Health
All Music

Category 4

Weight 3

All Medicine
All Dentistry
All Veterinary Medicine

... 6

SM 10 110/68

See you Res
on 10/9.
Good Plan

6.

GRADUATE

Category 5

Weight 2

Masters' Level (and First-Year Ph.D.
direct from Baccalaureate)

- Commerce and Business Administration
- Social Work

Category 6

Weight 3

Masters' Level (and First-Year Ph.D.
direct from Baccalaureate)

- Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Mathematics
- Law

M.Phil.

Other Graduates

Category 7

Weight 4

Masters' Level (and First-Year Ph.D.
direct from Baccalaureate)

- Psychology
- Geography
- Engineering
- Science
- Medicine

Category 8

Weight 6

All Ph.D. (except First-Year Ph.D.
direct from Baccalaureate)

Notes on the Table of Categories

In determining full-time equivalent enrollment, the
following definitions should be used:

- i. Full-time equivalent enrollment of students on "Co-operative"
and "Trimester" programs shall be one-half the sum of the
semester registrations.

SM 10 110/68

Inter Univ. Res.
Un. Arg.
Acad. Plan

7.

- ii. Full-time equivalent enrollment of Federated and Affiliated Colleges shall be that share of total enrollment as reflected by that portion of the teaching service performed by the university.
2. Students in the upper years of Honors undergraduate work in Psychology, Geography and Mathematics shall be included in Category 3. Costs of undergraduate Honors work in these subjects appear to be on the average similar to costs in Honors Science. At the Masters' level, however, Mathematics would seem to be more appropriately grouped with the humanities and social sciences, while Psychology and Geography, because of laboratory and field work requirements, remain with science and engineering.
3. "Other Graduates" as shown in Category 6 includes all graduate degree and diploma programs not specifically covered in the descriptions of other categories.
4. Part-time enrollment has not been included in the Table for the reason that it was not previously taken into consideration by the Government in calculating the operating grants to universities. The Committee feels strongly that such enrolment is deserving of support and should be taken into consideration in any formula designed to distribute money equitably. The following conclusions regarding categories and weights for part-time students were reached:

. . . 8.

SM 10 110/68 Inter Am Ref
Am Arg.
Acc. Plan

8.

- i. Part-time undergraduate students (including extramural students) working towards a Baccalaureate degree, - be taken on a full-course registration basis divided by six and the full-time equivalent counted in the appropriate undergraduate category.
- ii. Part-time graduate students (doing course work) - to be taken on a full-course registration basis divided by five and the full-time equivalent counted in the appropriate graduate category.
- iii. Part-time graduate students (actively doing dissertation under continuing supervision) - to be assigned a Weight of One.

In the event that the Government decides that the present policy regarding support for part-time courses be continued, the formula will not be rendered ineffective by their exclusion.

5. Preliminary Year students also have been excluded from the Table. This is a special type course which does not fit in with the general pattern of categories and weights established. However, for purposes of calculation, it is felt that a provisional weight of .7 (seven-tenths) should be assigned to this group.

Example of Operation: If university x estimates a total student enrollment of 3500, which translated (by using the scale of weights for the various categories) into 7,000 basic income units, and the assigned income per unit is \$1200, then the estimated basic

SM 10 110 168

Inter Un Rel.
Mr. Cng.
Acad. Plan.

9.

operating income for university x would be 7,000 x 1200 or 8.4 million dollars.

The Grants Commission formula, on a similar basis, has been adopted in the Province of Alberta, and in the Province of Manitoba.

At the present time, Saskatchewan has adopted an essentially integrated university system, and a grants formula would not be applicable.

There are indications that a grants commission system will be adopted in the Atlantic Provinces.

B. L. Funt

June 17, 1968.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Inter Univ Org

MEMORANDUM

PROF. R.J. BAKER

SM 10/10/68 Univ Org. Acad Plan

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE TO STUDY
THE CONSTITUTION AND FUNCTION OF THE
GOVERNING BODIES OF THE UNIVERSITIES

From.....Selma Wassermann.....

.....Professional Foundations.....

Subject.....Report on the Regents systems of
New York and California

Date.....July 3, 1968.....

The following report is a summary of some points of difference and similarity between the the "University Regents" system of New York and California.

Additional information may be obtained from the various journals, articles and other sources of reference kindly sent me by the Departments of Education of New York and California.

SUMMARY OF SOME POINTS OF
DIFFERENCE AND SIMILARITY
BETWEEN
THE "UNIVERSITY REGENTS" SYSTEM OF
NEW YORK AND CALIFORNIA

Under discussion are the Regents of the University of the State of New York and the Regents of the University of California. They will be referred to as the "N.Y. Regents" and the "California Regents" for short.

It should be noted immediately that the range of jurisdiction of the two bodies differs greatly. The N.Y. Regents are charged with the supervision of every aspect of education in the state, public and private, from kindergarten operation to the doctoral level. A major additional responsibility involves the setting of standards and licensing of practitioners in all the professions except that of law. The California Regents, on the other hand, have jurisdiction over the University of California only. That institution, however, with a full-time enrollment of more than 50,000 spread over 7 major campuses, is one of the world's largest and most diversified.

Each of the two bodies is designated by its respective state constitution as a corporate entity responsible, either exclusively or among other duties, for the overall planning for and operation of the state-supported institutions of higher education in its jurisdiction. Each body is given full power within these jurisdictions, subject only to the usual provisions with respect to the terms of special endowments, financial security, and to such constitutional admonishments as "shall be independent of all political and sectarian influence" and "no person shall be debarred admission (to the university) on account of sex." Thus, in respect to powers and responsibilities, the two bodies are roughly analogous to the Board of Governors of Simon Fraser University, though with the important distinction that certain

aspects of administrative and academic structure and function in British Columbia universities are set out in the Universities Act, thus in effect placing certain statutory limits on the functions and powers of the Governors.

Although both the N.Y. and California Regents were set up with the avowed intention that they be unresponsive to partisan politics, inevitably the composition, methods of selection, and terms-of-office of members of the bodies will bear some relation to the degree of their political independence. The N.Y. Regents number 15, including one from each of the state's 11 judicial districts and 4 chosen at large; none serve ex officio. They are elected by both houses of the bicameral legislature to 15-year terms, the terms so staggered that one expires each year. The California Regents number 24. Of these, 8 serve ex officio: the governor of the state, the lieutenant governor, speaker of the assembly, superintendent of public instruction, president of the state board of agriculture, president of the Mechanics Institute of San Francisco, president of the alumni association of the university, and acting president of the university. The other 16 members are appointed by the governor of the state for 16-year terms, staggered to provide for two expirations in each even-numbered calendar year. It should be mentioned that, in terms of publicity received during the past decade and more, the California Regents have on several occasions been under fire for alleged politically inspired "interference" in the affairs of their university, whereas the N.Y. Regents seem by and large to have escaped such accusations. Whether the charges in California are justified, and whether the difference in this respect between the two states arises from the structural difference between the two bodies, or from a difference in the temper of the political constituency, or from some other cause, cannot be determined here.

Each of the two bodies elects its own officers. The N.Y. Regents, in addition, appoint from outside their ranks a Commissioner of Education to head at their pleasure, the State Department of Education. While the Regents, like their California counterparts, are traditionally lay persons (though ex-teachers have served on occasion), the commissioner, who acts as the chief executive officer of the state's education system, is traditionally a professional educator. His California counterpart, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, is elected to office by the state's electorate at large.

The lines of authority and channels of communication that connect the California Regents with their university are direct; there is no intermediate governing body. However, the Regents, through their Standing Orders, have set up the Academic Senate with a membership of all Professors of whatever rank, and Instructors at the university (though instructors of less than 2-years' standing may not vote), and delegated to it broad powers with respect to the authorization and supervision of curriculum and similar broad powers, though subject to Regents approval, in connection with admissions and degree standards.

*See memo to
Univ. Org.
and Plan.*
SM 10 110 168

- 3. -

In New York, where the Regents preside over a vast educational empire that includes more than 4½ million students, a variety of intermediate governing bodies have been set up. Private universities, of course, have their own boards. Public-supported (and to some extent public-aided) institutions of higher learning in the state are governed, subject to the final legal control and responsibility of the Regents, by two governing bodies. A Board of Trustees, appointed by the governor of the state, runs the State University of New York. Created in 1948 and including all state-supported institutions of higher education this fast-growing system included at last count 68 colleges and university centers (with 12 granting doctorates), with a projected full-time enrollment by 1975 of 290,000 students. A Board of Higher Education runs the four city colleges of the City University of New York (these institutions grant degrees through the doctorate and should not be confused with 2-year or purely undergraduate schools) with a present full-time enrollment of approximately 80,000 students.

State law charges the N.Y. Regents with the formulation and maintenance, through quadrennial revision, of a master plan for higher education in the state, made up through the coordination of master plans formulated by the various components of the system. California has in recent years been analysing the structure and studying alternative plans for the future development of its universities and colleges through the agency of its statutory California Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

NOTE: Attention is directed to two Regents-type bodies that have recently begun to function in the U.S. These are Illinois' Board of Higher Education and the Ohio Board of Regents. Of major significance, to the purposes of the present committee, is the powers that both of these bodies have in connection with future development, including the power to approve all new educational programs, such as the establishment of any new department, division, or even an entire university.

SM 10 110 168

Inter Univ Rel
1
Univ Org
All Sec

To: Members of the Senate Committee on the Constitution and Functions of the
Governing Bodies of the University

From: Stan Wong

The purpose of this report is to outline some of the problems in Academic Planning both within the institution and in relation with other institutions of higher learning in the Province.

All institutions appear to work on two cardinal principles in Academic Planning. First, there exists an insatiable demand for financial resources. Second, there exists a conspicuous limit to the availability of financial resources.

Internal Academic Planning

The present methods employed at Simon Fraser for the introduction of new programs both instructional and research leave very much to be desired. Part of this 'ad hocery' can no doubt be attributed to the relative newness of the institution. However, the lack of foresight in academic planning can not totally be excused. Briefly, I will outline the procedure used in mounting a new program. A department can present a proposal for a new program through the various faculty committees to Senate and the Board for approval. Alternately, a department can present a proposal directly to Senate and the Board. In both instances, the Senate merely acts as a 'rubber stamp'. Consequently, the Senate spends relatively little time discussing and debating the various implications of a new programme. This arrangement obviously can not and must not prevail if the University desires to develop in an orderly fashion.

The University needs a Long Range Academic Planning Committee (perhaps responsible to Senate) to co-ordinate all new programmes and to examine them for university-wide implications. The Committee could be composed of academics from Senate, students, and Faculty. It would be responsible to examine each proposal as soon as discussion has been initiated within the department concerned. Hopefully, the result would be that Senate will be engaged in more meaningful deliberations and arrive at more informed decisions.

Internal Academic Planning

There appears to be a lack of institutional co-operation among the three public universities, Notre Dame University, BCIT, and the various community colleges.

SM 10/10/68

*Deputy Dir.
Univ. Org.
Acad. Plan.*

If B.C.'s institutions of higher learning desire to remain relatively autonomous from direct governmental control, they must exercise a great deal of restraint in academic planning.

The amount of co-operation in academic planning is limited to criticisms of each others programme and charges of a lack of co-operation and communication.

What appears to be needed is a provincial-wide Academic Planning Board on which all institutions are represented. While the Board would be concerned with channelling financial resources into programmes which are in the long-run interest of higher education, it must not be so rigid and 'dictatorial' to hamper the creativity and individuality of the each institution. Therefore the aim is to create a body which will ensure that funds are properly expended and at the same allow each individual institution to develop in such a manner which is consistent with its own academic goals.

The existence of an Academic Planning Board will no doubt depend on the existence of well-functioning academic planning bodies at the institutional level.

Attached are two recent papers presented to Senate on Academic Planning.

1. A Proposal to Change the Terms of Reference of the Longe Range Academic Planning Committee-----Stan Wong (presented to April 1, 1968 meeting of Senate)
2. Joint Senate-Board Working Relations Committee Report---presented but not discussed at May 1, 1968 meeting of Senate)

July 12, 1968

*Inter Univ. Rel.
Univ. Org.
SM 10/10/68 Academic Planning*

Budgeting

I. Present Budgetary Practice

1. Description

Under present practice, the Provincial Government incorporates a lump sum operating grant to the three provincial universities in its annual budget estimate. Additionally, capital grants are given to each of the universities.

Budget estimates are prepared by the several academic departments by the end of the summer semester, incorporated after careful review into the university estimate, and submitted to the Provincial Government by November. The actual allocation of operating grants, even if these were made shortly after the Provincial budget has been approved, would be no earlier than April, the beginning of the fiscal year for which the funds are appropriated.

Capital allocations have been made both on the basis of both multi-year commitment and annual decisions. In 1964, the Provincial Government agreed to give a fixed sum allocation for each of five years. In 1968-69, the government added to the amount previously committed and has recently authorized Simon Fraser University to borrow funds to expand its physical plant. This in effect commits government to further grants to repay the amount borrowed.

2. Critique

The present practise of annual operating grants of necessity dictates continuous budget activity. As soon as grants are allocated to the university and by the university to the various operating units, work must begin for the succeeding budget estimate. There is no real opportunity for departmental chairmen/heads and other academic

*Inter-univ. Fed.
Univ. Org
SM 10/10/68 Academic Planning*

-2-

officers concerned with budgets to take advantage of the research semesters.

If, as appears desirable, the body responsible for the allocation of the operating funds to the three universities is also empowered to review estimates before submission to the provincial government, the submission from the University would undoubtedly be pushed ahead generating even more time pressures within the University.

The implementation of new programs and the hiring of new staff and faculty is made a very uncertain matter. Estimates to finance these requirements would be submitted in the latter part of the year, but the final allocations are not known until the late spring. Hiring of faculty normally occurs during the winter for the following academic year -- at which time budget grants are still unknown. Getting the funds or the assurance of such funds in April is much too late for effective programming for the academic year which follows.

Capital grants are made on both a multi-year commitment and an annual "ad hoc" basis. This generates a great deal of uncertainty as exemplified this year. If enrollment projections upon which the multi-year grants are originally based prove incorrect, new multi-year commitments based upon revised projections would undoubtedly help reduce uncertainty and improve university physical planning.

II. Multi-year Budgeting

1. Description

One method of reducing the time pressures and the uncertainties generated by annual operating grants is to put provincial grants on a multi-year basis. A minimal step is to move to two or three year

rather than annual budgets. The Provincial Government would get requests for and commit itself to a university operating budget for more than one year at a time.

2. Critique

A multi-year budget will enable university departments to plan and implement its activities more effectively than does an annual budget.

To take one example:

A budget incorporating new programs and/or major expansion of staff would be submitted as at present. If approved for the second year of the two year budget, recruitment would take place over a longer period including the normal hiring season.

The future costs of present and new programs can be more clearly seen by both the university and the Provincial Government. The government could request three to five year plans and budget estimates and act upon the requests. Once a multi-year budget is instituted, governmental actions would affect only the grants for the second or third year in the future.

Universities will be forced to order their own priorities more efficiently. Knowing the operating grant available for one or two years ahead, the academic planning bodies will not be able to approve freely all programs which are presented for action. They will be forced to recognize the scarcity of resources and decide which of the programs will, in fact, be implemented given budget ceilings.

For a multi-year budget program to operate efficiently, government would have to prepare enrollment forecasts for higher education in the Province and for each of the three universities to be used as one input into the budget preparation process. If enrollments depart from forecasts, some revision of the multi-year budgets accepted by the government should still be possible.

*Shaw Univ Rel
SM 10 110/68
Academic Planning*

-4-

It is even more important that capital grants be put on a multi-year basis. This will enable the necessary pre-construction work to be ordered and proceed with a particular date set for the start of construction. Lead times for major construction projects easily extend over a year or two. The work itself usually extends over a period of time.

Multi-year Budgeting

Pros

1. More effective faculty recruitment.
2. University can order priorities within known limit.
2. Construction programs scheduled more efficiently.

Cons .

1. Government has less financial control.
2. Unforeseen contingencies can create difficulties.
3. Proposed expenditures, if known in advance, can inhibit development of new programs and projects.

K. OKUDA

SM 10/10/68
J. H. Hare
Univ. Org.
Academic Planning

UNIVERSITIES AND GOVERNMENT

SUNDAY 10:15 TALK - SUNDAY, 31st March, 1968.

Professor R. Baker

SUMMARY of K. HARE - "ON UNIVERSITY FREEDOM IN THE CANADIAN CONTEXT".

In 1966 the Minister for University Affairs in Ontario, the Honorable William Davis, gave the Gerstein Lecture in York University, Toronto. He asked a number of questions about university affairs, about the relationship of one university to another, and about the relationship of universities to society and the government.

University people tend to shudder at the very existence of someone called a Minister for University Affairs, and they shudder indeed when he turns up on campus and asks the kind of question put by Minister Davis. According to a new book by Dr. Kenneth Hare, the incoming president of the University of British Columbia, the fifth president of U.B.C., Davis asked whether the universities had really recognized the need for economy. It had been suggested to him that they hadn't. Ominous words, especially if you are a member of an Ontario university and know that the speaker is the man who will decide your next budget. Among other things, he cited the staff-student ratio in Ontario, 1:14, and asked why California and Michigan could cope with ratios like 1:16 and 1:17 without apparent loss of standards.

He questioned the way in which new programs and projects were launched. Boards of Governors, he asserted, were apt to announce new medical centres, new faculties, and new departments without prior discussion with government to see whether funds might be available. He wondered in this context whether universities could curtail what he called the "non-constructive aspects of competitiveness that could prevail among them. Competition was excellent, he contended, if it took the form of bold and really new ventures, of exciting new approaches

to higher education. It was undesirable if it led wasteful duplication of expensive faculties, or to competition between universities for publicly supported students".

He went on to question whether universities, with their traditions of autonomy could "subordinate their individual ambitions if society as a whole would be better served by such action. He was sure, for example, that the solution must lie in "co-operation and coordination: a willingness on the part of one university to share its facilities (libraries included) and its staff with students of another".

Finally he asked whether universities, supposing that they did learn to cooperate with one another, could learn to cooperate with non-university institutions like technical and teachers' colleges.

Well, those are pointed questions, frightening, perhaps, to some people in universities; long overdue, probably, to a politician - or a taxpayer - outside. Higher education demands more and more money. As Dr. Hare notes, the budget of the University of California is larger than the total provincial budget of Saskatchewan, even though that province spends nearly ten percent of its total revenue on higher education. Minister Davis had noted that the total public contribution to the fourteen Ontario universities in 1966-67 was \$121 million. No more than Harvard's annual budget, adds Dr. Hare.

With such questions put in public, Canadian universities obviously needed someone to suggest possible answers. In three lectures at Carleton University, Dr. Hare, gave his analysis of the problem and his suggested answers. He has now published the lectures in book form. At that time, before he had decided to return to Canada as president of U.B.C. Dr. Hare was probably the ideal choice to speak sensibly for the academic community.

*Inter-Union Rel.
Univ. Org.
SM 10/10/68 Academic Planning*

A distinguished scientist, an experienced university administrator, a man versed in the two cultures of Canada (he took one of his degrees at the University of Montreal, a man learned in Canadian, British, and American university affairs, he had at that moment the advantage of looking from outside, "through comparative spectacles" as he puts it. As the head of a college in Britain, he spoke, moreover, from a country where a much respected system of relationships - the University Grants Commission - was undergoing criticism and change.

The cause of the questions and the reason why they must be taken seriously is fundamentally the ever-increasing cost of higher education. The Bladen Report on university financing in Canada predicted that the universities of Canada would cost nearly two billion dollars a year in 1975...and Bladen was talking about 1965 dollars and almost certainly underestimating. He was also omitting the costs of two year colleges, technological institutes, schools of art and so on. Like Dr. Hare, I cannot believe that politicians anywhere will face expenditure on that scale without claiming detailed control over its use. And I am not using politician as a dirty word but as a word for a man who speaks for and is responsible to the electorate, the public.

The main purpose of Hare's book, therefore, is to consider the various ways in which universities and government can live together when government provides most of the money for the universities. He begins by making a simple division of methods. On the one hand there is highly centralized government control, at its worst in totalitarian countries, at its least undesirable, perhaps, in Germany and France. On the other hand, there is what he calls the buffer committee. The buffer committee is a respected body of intermediaries between the universities

*Inter-univ. Rel.
SM 10 11/10/68
Academic Planning*

and government, trusted (in principle) by both academics and politicians. The British, he points out, have favoured a committee mainly of academics, working by convention---and I would add working from homogeneous backgrounds from a relatively homogeneous society. The Americans have tended to favour a Board of Regents, made up of distinguished citizens, carrying great public prestige, and supported by legislation.

Some Canadian academics will be surprised to see the system they have advocated - an academic committee - grouped with the system they have attacked - that of a lay board. Hare can see the essential similarity, partly because he has looked further afield, but partly because he extrapolates from the relationships between academics and lay boards within modern universities. He believes that enlightened boards have realized that the most successful universities are those in which academic policy flows up from the faculty to the board and not downwards from the boardroom. He knows, he says, that there are some Canadian Universities (he is too tactful to name any) that will have to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into Confederation's second century, but he does think that the battle for academic control of the internal affairs of the university is nearly won. As he says, the dinosaurs will soon be seeking their last bed of pitch.

Hare chooses the buffer committee system without reservation and spends his second lecture considering the details of the particular buffer committee he thinks would work in Canada. He accepts that a working buffer committee implies that public universities will depend primarily on the state for funds, that the public universities in any one jurisdiction, in any one province essentially, have to be treated

SM 10/10/68
Inter-univ. Rel.
Chair Org.
Academic Planning

as a system, and that the buffer committee rather than the state should run the system.

The particular buffer committee he advocates would be made up of a combination of three elements: prominent lay members, with sympathy for university objectives; heads of universities (he thinks presidents make more trouble off than on such committees;) and senior professors. Among the laymen he thinks that there should be representatives of the school system, including at least one high school principal or senior teacher.

He thinks that the committee should have well-articulated terms of reference built into legislation, and he thinks that these should include the exclusive right to present requests for annual operating grants for the system to the government and the exclusive right to co-ordinate plans for new developments (including new professional schools,) the right to distribute monies to the universities as they think just and to arrange suitable systems of audit.

To judge the application of these recommendations in British Columbia, we must examine the present system. Under the Universities Act, there are two boards. One, called at the discretion of the Minister of Education, so far has been made up of one representative from each of the Boards of Governors (laymen by definition) three members appointed by the government, and a chairman appointed by the government. To the credit of the government the chairman to date has been Dr. S.N.F. Chant, the former Dean of Arts and Science U.B.C. Apart from Chant, no-one on the board is academic. There is no assurance that there will always be an academic on the Board. There is nothing in fact to ensure that the Minister need actually call on the committee for advice.

*Inter. Univ. Rel.
SM 10/10/68
J. H. Oger
Academic Rel.*

The second advisory committee in British Columbia is called the Academic Board. It is a statutory board and exists whether or not the Minister calls on it. It is made up of two members from each of the senates of U.B.C. Victoria, and Simon Fraser, and three members appointed by the government. It elects its own chairman, and it has elected Dr. Chant in the hope that the two Boards would therefore be linked.

Considering that until 1964 in B.C. there was no buffer mechanism between higher education and government, and considering that the change from one university to three public universities plus some two year colleges and an institute of technology and one private university involves painful rethinking -- and unpleasant suspicion -- for many people, the two Boards -- financial and academic -- have served us well. But their structure is based on the old division of powers -- financial to the board of lay governors and academic to a mainly academic Senate; a division of power that the universities are just abandoning -- in fact if not in law.

The Advisory Board on Finance has worked well in that its recommendations have been accepted by the government, and I am assured by people I trust that there has been no interference by the government in arriving at those recommendations.

The Academic Board has been I think more than helpful to the existing regional colleges and in their relationships with the universities. It has either fostered or blessed cooperation among the universities -- especially U.B.C. and Simon Fraser because of their proximity -- on such things as graduate studies and libraries -- cooperation of the kind that Minister Davis in Ontario was threatening to enforce.

SM 10 110168
Inter-univ. hel.
univ. Org.
Academic Planning

But, personally, and I have been a member of the Academic Board since it began and worked under the results of the Advisory Board on Finance, I am quite convinced that the present system will not continue to work.

I hope that when Dr. Hare arrives as President Hare of U.B.C. - he will be able to get the other presidents, the Board of Governors, the Senates, and the government to agree on a new system. President Macdonald's lasting achievement was to introduce variety into higher education in B.C. Perhaps President Hare's will be to introduce some order into that variety.

K. E. BAKER

SM 10 / 10 / 68

April 14, 1968

THE PROBLEMS OF PROVINCIAL PLANNING IN THE UNIVERSITIES

COUNTERPOINT

Text of C.B.C. Talk

*Inver Univ. Rel.
Univ. Org.
Acad. Plan.*

Individual universities may be the last stronghold in our kind of society of baronial techniques of development. And I don't mean that any particular chancellor, president, dean, or head of department acts like a medieval baron. I mean that the development of programs, departments, faculties, even new universities and colleges themselves, tends to come from the initiative of individuals or groups of individuals.

When there's only one university in the province, as there was in B.C. until recently, one can hope that all decisions about new programs are taken with all the relevant information under consideration. Someone had to decide that British Columbia needed to train its own lawyers for many years before it trained any of its doctors. Someone had to decide that it was important that professional social workers needed five years of university training and that professional elementary teachers could start with only one or two. Those decisions were made in large part by the Senate and the Board of Governors of UBC, and I'm sure that they were made carefully.

In the future, however, the situation is going to be quite different. We have three universities - public and one private. We have two-year colleges, an institute of technology, and vocational schools. It is time I think to consider how we co-ordinate our development in the future. Let me confine myself to the universities for now. At present, any group, department head, dean, president, faculty, Senate or Board of Governors can start thinking about some new program. At my own university, Simon Fraser, for example, I know that some faculty have had requests from people in the community for a Department of Clinical Psychology. Before Simon Fraser opened we had a request for some particular department or faculty just about once a week. What happens at present when someone gets an idea about a new program? Well he studies programs elsewhere,

SM 10/10/68

- 2 -

*Inter Univ. Rel.
Univ. Org.
Academic Pers.*

he surveys with more or less efficiency the needs in the province, and he draws up a proposal. The appropriate department discusses the proposal and perhaps modifies it. It's discussed in faculty and then in the Senate of the University. By the time it gets to the Senate, you can be fairly sure that the proposal is academically sound. It will be a respectable program that any university could put on in good faith. The approved proposal then goes to the Board of Governors of the university. The Board decides whether or not estimates for it should be included in the annual request for funds to the Provincial Government. Finally the total university request goes forward. After the government has announced its budget for all universities, the Provincial Advisory Board studies the budgets of the universities and advises the Minister of Education how to allocate the funds. So far the Minister has accepted the advice of his board. At no point however, has it been necessary for any committee or board-university or public-to study the proposal during its development, or to see whether or not one of the other universities was planning a similar development. Moreover, the Board of Governors of a university finds it difficult to turn down a request of its own Senate, and I'm sure that any government finds it difficult to suggest that any university delete a particular program from its plans.

To be specific, who is responsible for deciding whether or not Simon Fraser should train Clinical Psychologists; Victoria - social workers; UBC - dentists and Notre Dame - medical records-librarians. Who is to see that planning is co-ordinated in the future, as the demands for higher-education and the money it needs go up?

There are a number of possibilities. The new president of UBC has suggested some in a recent book. The Minister of Education has announced that he proposes to appoint a small Commission to examine the whole question. At Simon Fraser, a Senate Committee is at work. I'm sure that Victoria, Notre Dame

*Inter Univ. Rel.
SM 10/10/68 Univ. Org.
Acad. Plan.*

and the two-year colleges will also have suggestions. The present academic and advisory boards will certainly have some. The one thing I'm quite certain of is that someone must co-ordinate future plans, and that means internally the individual universities must develop better planning procedures than they've had in the past. And they must consider the plans of other universities, and perhaps other areas of higher education. Moreover, any planning body that is set up to co-ordinate university development and advise the government must have teeth, and the present academic board and advisory board have very bare gums indeed in matters of future planning.

R. J. Baker,
Department of English,
SFU.

CANADA

(a) Books, Pamphlets and Government Reports

- n.i.1. Armstrong, H.S. Academic administration in higher education: a report on personal policies and procedures current in some universities and colleges in Canada and the U.S. Ottawa, Canadian Universities Foundation, 1959. pp.98.
- n.i.1. Story, G.M. (Chairman). University government: a report of the Memorial University of Newfoundland Teachers' Association. St. John's, Memorial University Press, 1962. pp. 54.
- LA 415 U55 University government in Canada. Report of a commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. J. Duff and R.O. Berdahl. Toronto, Published for the Associations by the University of Toronto Press, 1966.
- LA 417 W45 Whalley, G. A place of liberty; essays on the government of Canadian universities. Toronto, Clark Irwin, 1964. pp.224.

(b) Periodical articles

- ..i.1. Beauregard, C. L'administration des universites: vers une ouverture nouvelle? Prospectives 3: 11-12, Feb. 1967.
- Bissell, C.T. A proposal for university government at U. of T. CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 15: 42-46, Dec. 1966.
- Cameron, P. Duff-Berdahl report: will the patient live? CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 15: 47-52, Dec. 1966.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers. The reform of university government; a statement by the Committee on University Government presented to the Executive Council of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 9: 10-35, 1960.
- n.i.1. Flynn, M. A survey of student involvement in the decision-making process at Canadian universities. Journal of the Canadian Association of University Student Personnel Services 2: 12-14, Spring 1967.
- Freedman, S. University government; an address to the Council of the CAUT given on Monday, June 15, 1964. CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 13: 14-26, Oct. 1964.
- n.i.1. Hugo-Brunt, M. Personal opinion (Administration of universities). School Administration 2: 50-51, Jan-Feb. 1965.
- Lower, A.R.M. Administrators and scholars. Queen's Quarterly 71: 203-213, Summer 1964.

SM 10/10 168

Inter Unio Rel.
Univ. Org. Res.
Academic Res.

MacKenzie, N.A.M. Faculty participation in university government.
CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 9, no.4, 8-14, 1961.

Mayo, H.B. University government--trends and a new model.
CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 13: 10-24, May 1965.

Morton, W.L. The evolution of university government in Canada.
Canadian Forum 43: 243-247, 1962.

Morton, W.L. University government: the alienation of the administration.
CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 9, 5-13, 1961.

Rowat, D.C. Duff-Berdahl report on university government; a summary and critique of its findings and main recommendations. CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 14: 23-30, April 1966.

Rowat, D.C. Faculty participation in Canadian university government.
American Association of University Professors Bulletin 43: 461-476, 1957.

n.i.l. Rowat, D.C. The government of Canadian universities. Culture 17: 268-283, 364-378, 1956.

Rowat, D.C. The uniqueness of the university administration. CAUT/ACUP Bulletin 9, no.4: 22-27, 1962.

Smith, J.P. University government. CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 8: 4-15, 1960.

n.i.l. Smith, P.J. Duff-Berdahl report on university government. University Affairs 7: 1-3, April 1966.

n.i.l. Stewart, C.H. The government of Canadian universities. CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 5, no.2: 8-10, 1957.

Thompson, W.P. University government. CAUT/ACPU Bulletin 9, no.2: 4-8, 1960.

n.i.l. University government in Canada as illustrated by the case of United College, Winnipeg. Universities Review(U.K.) 31: 43-48, 1959.

n.i.l. Williams, D.R. It's a good question! Is there a place on the academic senate for graduates? UBC Alumni Chronicle 21: 9, Summer 1967.

UNITED STATES

(a) Books, Pamphlets and Government Reports

n.i.l. Adams, A.S. Relations between governing boards and administrative officers, in Proceedings of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities, 1952. pp.51-57.

n.i.l. Beck, Hubert P. Men who control our universities: the economic and social composition of governing boards of thirty leading American universities. New York, King's Crown Press, 1947. 229pp.

This study is designed (1) to analyze objective evidence about the economic and social characteristics of members of governing boards of 30 leading American universities, and (2) to evaluate some of the implications of these characteristics. The author recommended greater diversity among board members, a wider representation of social groups.

Inter U. Rec.
U. Org.
SM 10/10/68 Acad. Plan

- LB
2341
55 Blackwell, Thomas E. College and university administration. New York, Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966. 116pp. (see Chapter 2, The corporate board and the office of the president, pp.6-17)
- LB
2523
B4 Blackwell, Thomas E. College law: a guide for administrators. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1961. 347pp. (see Chapter 2, The college corporation, pp.22-57.)
 The author reviews legislative and judicial decisions affecting: (1) state supervision and control of educational corporations, (2) public funds for support of educational institutions, (3) corporate powers and their exercise, (4) administration of the institutions, and, (5) duration of corporate life.
- LA
226
B75 Brubacher, John S., and Willis Rudy. Higher education in transition: an American history, 1636-1954. New York, Harper and Row, 1958. 494pp. (see Chapters 2, 17, and 18.)
 A history of higher education in the U.S. from 1636-1954, this volume includes the development of boards of trustees. The corporate structure of college government is seen by the authors as a distinguishing feature of U.S. higher education.
- n.i.l. Butts, R. Freeman. "Formulation of policy in American colleges and universities," in the Year Book of Education: 1959, Higher Education, George F. Bereday and Joseph A. Lauwerys, eds. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1959. 520pp.
 Traditional predominance of the administration and board in policy making should be equalized by a larger participation of the faculty at various levels of institutional government. The board serves best when its role is confined to consideration of policies proposed by the president and faculty.
- n.i.l. Capen, S.P. The management of universities. Buffalo, N.Y., Foster and Stewart, 1953.
- n.i.l. Carman, Harry J. "Boards of trustees and regents," in Administrators in higher education: their functions and coordination, Gerald P. Burns, ed. New York, Harper and Row, 1962. 236pp. (see pp. 79-98.)
 Boards of trustees have (1) increasingly delegated authority to the president and the faculty and (2) given the faculty autonomous authority over many educational matters.
- LB
2341
C77 Corson, John J. Governance of colleges and universities. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960. 209pp. (see pp. 49-58 and 126-127.)
 The author suggests the trustees ought to increase their participation in educational program decision making. Major problems facing boards: (1) dependancy on others for the formulation and making of many decisions for which the board is ultimately responsible; (2) inability to influence decisions that determine the basic character of the institutions - a great deal of authority having been delegated to the faculty; (3) inadequate information.
- LB
2341
D4 Demerath, N.J. Power, presidents and professors. New York, Basic Books, 1967. 275pp.

SM 10/10/68 *Univ. Or. Inter U. Rel. Ac. Plan.*

LB
2341
B6

Dodds, Harold W. The academic president - educator or caretaker? New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962. 294pp. (see pp. 211-286.)

The author sees modern academic government as a kind of bicameral system with an upper house, the trustees, making many unilateral decisions (primarily in "nonacademic" areas) and approving the actions (primarily in the "academic" area) of the lower house, the faculty. Too often these two houses live far apart from each other except as the president communicates between them.

n.i.l.

Hanson, Abel A. The trustees and the development program. Outline of the keynote remarks made before Panel IIIa, French Lick, Indiana, July 14, 1959. Mimeographed.

The author (1) sketches some differences between boards of trustees in public and private institutions, (2) reviews some of the literature defining trustee roles and functions, and (3) comments on the emerging role of the trustees in development programs, suggesting more trustee participation in fund-raising activities and policy making.

n.i.l.

Hardie, James C. Trustees - bless them all! Paper presented at a regional conference by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, New York, March 22-24, 1960. Mimeographed.

Trustees have two roles: custodians and builders. A top-flight institution is top flight because of an active board of quality and "building" trustees. Trustees become valuable to the extent that they are involved in the policy-making functions (and the development program) of the institutions.

n.i.l.

Hertzel, R. What are the central responsibilities of the trustees which apply both to publicly and privately supported institutions? in Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C., Association for Higher Education, 1960. pp.153-156.

n.i.l.

Houle, C.O. The effective board. New York, Association Press, 1960.

n.i.l.

Hughes, Raymond M. A manual for trustees of colleges and universities. Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State College Press, 1943. 166pp.

The purpose of this book is to acquaint trustees with some policies, practices, and problems of higher education administration. Areas covered include the relationship of the trustee to the president and the faculty; specific responsibilities of trustees; responsibilities of trustees in policy development; duties and services of a trustee.

LB
2342
H82

Hungate, Thad L. Management in higher education. New York, Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. 348pp.

In this analytical study of management (including trustees, executives and the faculty) in higher education, the author draws these conclusions about boards of trustees: (1) the board should emphasize participation in policy making at all levels of the organization: governance by consensus; (2) through the president, the board should delegate large portions of its authority and responsibility; (3) boards should be organized with an executive committee, advisory committee on objectives, plans, and evaluation, education, business and finance, public relations and fund procurement, ad hoc committees as needed, and a committee with power to act for the board--the committee on investments; (4) communication among all parties of governance is necessary for efficient management; (5) the board's view for the institution must be long range; (6) each institution should have its own governing board.

Inter U. Rel.
H. 019.
SM 10/10/68 Ae. Pen

LB
2341

Internal structure; organization and administration of institutions of higher education. United States. Office of education, Division of higher education, 1962. 123pp.

LB
2331
156
1963

Lunsford, T.F. The study of academic administration. Boulder, Colo., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963. 158pp.

LB
2332
M28
1967

MacIver, Robert M. Academic freedom in our time. New York, Columbia University Press, 1955. 329pp.

Devoted primarily to the topic of academic freedom, this volume spends some time on academic government (see especially Part II, pp. 67-110). A major conclusion: Those institutions of highest repute have boards that fully recognize the right of the faculty in the academic community. In addition: (1) boards should consult with faculties in the search for a president; (2) boards should make personnel changes only after consultation with the faculty; (3) boards should assure the faculty full authority over the curriculum.

n.i.1.

McVey, Frank L. and Raymond M. Hughes. Problems of college and university administration. Ames, Iowa, The Iowa State College Press, 1952. 326pp. (See Chapter 2, "The president and the trustees", pp.47-81).

The authors discuss president-board relationships, board size, and board responsibility for formulation of institution policy.

i.1.

Martorana, S.V. College boards of trustees. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.

LB
2341
M46

Millett, John D. The academic community: an essay on organization. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962. 265pp. (see pp. 182-186).

The role of the board is generally one of oversight of the administration of an institution. The board is keeper of the social conscience, guardian of the public interest in higher education. Boards should deal with broad issues, not details.

n.i.1.

Rauh, Morton A. College and university trusteeship. Yellow Springs, Ohio, Antioch Press, 1959. 112pp.

A report based on the author's interviews with over 50 trustees and a review of the literature, this volume sets forth the role of trustees (especially in private institutions offering the 4-year and higher degrees) and some techniques which are helpful in fulfilling this role. It also (1) describes the major functions of the board, (2) identifies some of the common problem areas, (3) provides some examples against which trustees can compare their own institution, and (4) suggests means of further study. Appendix includes recommended readings for trustees.

n.i.1.

The role of the trustees of Columbia University. The report of the Special Trustees Committee adopted by the trustees November 4, 1957. New York, Columbia University in the city of New York, 1957. 50pp.

This report is a careful analysis of the role of the board of trustees of this type of board. Specific recommendations are made for improving the work of the board; a brief history of the board and its functions is presented.

Inter u. Rel.
u. org.
SM 10/10/68
Ac. Plan

n.i.l.

Ruml, Beardsley, and Donald H. Morrison. Memo to a college trustee. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959. 94pp.

Essentially an assessment of financial and structural problems of the independent 4-year liberal arts college, this report (1) reviews the present method of curriculum building, suggests that the trustees should take from the faculty as a body the responsibility for curriculum design and administration; (2) emphasizes that the final responsibility for the institution and its programs rests with the trustees.

LB
2341
S4

Selected issues in college administration. Columbia University, Teachers College Press, 1967. 83pp. (see chapter 3, Organizing and energizing the board for effective action.)

n.i.l.

Tead, Ordway. Trustees, teachers, students: their role in higher education. Salt Lake City, Utah, University of Utah Press, 1951. (see pp. 171-180, 226).

The author recommends functional representation on boards of control, predicts greater faculty representation in the future, suggests limitation on length of service.

n.i.l.

Wicke, Myron F. Handbook for trustees of church related colleges and universities. Nashville, Tenn., Board of Education of the Methodist Church, 1957. 57pp.

Topics covered: the trustee system in the United States, areas of board responsibility, board-president relationships, meetings and reports of the board, the trustee and the faculty, the trustee and the church.

.i.l.

Woodburne, Lloyd S. Principles of college and university administration. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1958. 197pp. (see Chapter 1, "University organization," pp.1-34.)

LB
2331
W7

Wriston, Henry M. Academic procession: reflections of a college president. New York, Columbia University Press, 1959. 222pp. (see chapter 2, "The trustees," pp.44-85.)

Custom as well as charter provisions often determine the organization and work of a board. Time and custom have shifted much of the substance of power from the board to the faculty.

(b) Periodical articles

Axelrod, J. New organizational patterns in higher education. Education Digest 30: 22-25, Jan 1965.

n.i.l.

Ayers, A.R. and J.H. Russel. Organization for administration in higher education. Higher Education 20: 7-10, April 1964.

n.i.l.

Bell, Laird. From the trustees' corner. Association of American Colleges Bulletin 51-57, 1952.

Black, Max. Academic government. Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 42: 613-617, Winter 1956.

The quality of decisions of boards of control is determined largely by the quality of the counsel they receive. Communication between faculty trustees must and can be improved.

Brewster, K., jr. Pressures on university trustees; experts from address May 1967. School and Society 95: 404 Nov 11, 1967.

SM 10/10/68 - 4 Arg
 In a Rel
 Ac Pin

Brickman, W.W. Student power and academic anarchy. School and Society 96: 6, Jan 6, 1968.

n.i.l.

Brown, J.D. Mr. Ruml's memo: a wrong approach to the right problem. Journal of Higher Education 412-416, Nov 1959.

Brown, R.S., jr. and L. Joughin. Announcement of a program for faculty responsibility and authority. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 53: 400-402, Dec 1967.

Bryant, V.S. Role of the regent. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 50: 317-322, Dec 1964.

California state college trustees approve 1966 statement on government. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 53: 403-404, Dec 1967.

n.i.l.

Chambers, M.M. Who is the university? Journal of Higher Education 30: 320-324, June 1959.

Although a university may be many things, it is, legally, the board of trustees. Each student, faculty member, and administrator has made a contract with the board to perform certain services in exchange for certain payments and services. Powers of the board may be delegated but they can never be abrogated by those to whom the power is delegated. Various forms of student or faculty "self-government" are useful as long as their legal limitations are recognized.

Clark, B.R. Faculty authority. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 47: 293-302, Dec 1961.

n.i.l.

Coolidge, Charles A. Training for trustee. Association of American Colleges Bulletin 42: 510-513, Dec 1956.

The author compares directors of business corporations with trustees of institutions of higher education and concludes that differences between business and education organizations are significant, that some special training is desirable for trustees.

n.i.l.

Davis, Paul H. More to be desired are they than gold... Association of American Colleges Bulletin 44: 391-398, Oct 1956.

The author's judgement is that excellent institutions of higher education have three distinguishing features: (1) clearly defined objectives; (2) missionary zeal; and (3) "exceptional" trustees--exceptional in their enthusiasm for the institution, their rigorous code of ethics, their special contributions to the mission of the organization, their abilities and willingness to work.

n.i.l.

Davis, Paul H. An open letter to the chairman of the board of trustees. Liberal Education 47: 352-359, Oct 1961.

Boards of trustees, with few exceptions, are among the most serious problems facing colleges and universities to day. Sixteen recommendations are made by the author.

De Baun, V.C. Faculty as administrative seedbed. Educational Record 43: 158-162, April 1962.

n.i.l.

Eble, K.E. and A.J. Dibden. Faculty committee: aid or inhibitor in achieving educational goals? Journal of Higher Education 32: 280-283, May 1961.

Eells, Walter C. Boards of control of universities and colleges. Educational Record 42: 336-342, Oct 1961.

An analysis of data in American Universities and Colleges, 1960 ed.

Faculty participation in college and university government. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 48: 16-18, March 1962.

Faculty participation in college and university government; statement of principles approved by the council, October 26, 1962. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 48: 321-323, Dec 1962.

Farmerie, S.A. Characteristics and functions of trustees serving Pennsylvania liberal arts colleges. Journal of Educational Research 59: 374-376, April 1966.

n.i.1. Fram, E.H. Faculty ownership of higher education. Junior College Journal 32: 388-391, March 1962.

n.i.1. Harrington, F.H. Function of university administration; helping the university to change the world. Journal of Higher Education 34: 131-136, March 1963.

n.i.1. Havighurst, Robert J. The governing of the university. School and Society 79: 81-86, March 1954.

The author's thesis is that institutions of higher education are under the control of businessmen through their domination of the boards of trustees. The author concludes that businessmen can solve the economic problems of higher education; they may also solve the problems of guarding the freedom or research and teaching.

n.i.1. Horn, F.H. Dean and the president. Liberal Education 50: 463-475, Dec 1964

n.i.1. Keenan, B.R.; A Carisson; A.J. Dibden. Are specialized faculty members competent to help formulate broad educational policies? Journal of Higher Education 33: 446-451, Nov 1962.

n.i.1. Keenan, B.R. Need for closer conformity to the business model. Journal of Higher Education 32: 513-515, Dec 1961.

n.i.1. Lloyd, Glen A. A trustee looks at his job. Liberal Education 45: 459-500, Dec 1959.

The author suggests that trustees can be strong allies of the faculty, that trustees cannot perform their total responsibilities without concern for the educational program of the institution, that a prime requisite for board membership is interest, that boards should meet often and work through a few standing committees supplemented, as needed, by ad hoc committees.

n.i.1. McBride, K. The role of trustees. Journal of Higher Education 43: 432-434, Nov 1959.

McNeil, G.H. Faculty participation in college and university government: a utilitarian approach. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 48: 364-367, Dec 1962.

n.i.1. Marcham, F.G. Faculty representation on the board of trustees. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 42: 617-621, Winter 1956.

The author recommends a long-range planning committee consisting of trustees, administrators, and faculty members to meet regularly and plan the growth of the university.

SM 10/10/68
 Jan 11 Rel.
 Plan
 M. Q. 9.

n.i.l.

Merry, Robert W. How to orient and train trustees. Liberal Education 45: 373-381, Oct 1959.

The author discusses four purposes for the orientation and training of trustees: (1) to develop knowledge and understanding of the trustees' role; (2) to develop knowledge and understanding of the institution; (3) to enable trustees to participate more effectively earlier; (4) to make this public service fun from the start.

Mooney, R.L. Problem of leadership in the university. Harvard Educational Review 33: 42-57, Winter 1963.

n.i.l.

Morris, C. Senate and the university; increasing control of policy. Times Educational Supplement 2460: 54, July 13, 1962.

Newburn, H.K. Faculty and administration in the governance of the university. Educational Record 45: 255-264, Summer 1964.

Ohles, J.F. Berkeleyitis; a second look. School and Society 94: 66, Feb 5, 1966.

n.i.l.

Patton, R.D. Can we save democracy in higher educational administration? Journal of Higher Education 35: 217-219, April 1964.
 Reply. Lorish, R.E. 35: 342, June 1964.

n.i.l.

Patton, R.D. Changing scene in higher education: administration. Journal of Higher Education 34: 97-99, Feb 1963.

Pray, F.C. Report card for college trustees. Educational Record 45: 251-254, Summer 1964.

n.i.l.

Presthus, R. University bosses. New Republic 152: 20-24, Feb 20, 1965.
 Discussion 152: 28-29, March 13, 1965.

n.i.l.

Rainey, Homer P. How shall we control our universities. Journal of Higher Education 31: 376-383, Oct 1960.

Subtitled "Why College Presidents leave their jobs," this article explains that the authority of the board of trustees places the president in an unfavorable position: He is an employee of the board holding his position at the pleasure of the board. Despite attempts to develop mutual trust, boards hamper the creative effort of presidents.

n.i.l.

Reavis, C.A. Ten positive commandments for trustees. Liberal Education 53: 223-228, May 1967.

n.i.l.

The Ruml-Morrison proposals for the liberal college: a symposium. Journal of Higher Education 30: 411-452, November 1959.

This series of 8 articles reviews, often critically, the Ruml-Morrison analyses and recommendations. See especially "The function of the president as interpreted in the memo" by B.C. Keeney for a discussion related to boards of trustees.

n.i.l.

Steinzor, B. and A.J. Dibden. Professor as trustee. Journal of Higher Education 34: 345-348, June 1965.

Inter U. & U.
SM 10/10/68 u. arg.
ac. Plan.

Taylor, G.E. Leadership of the universities. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 356: 1-11, Nov 1964.

Tead, O. Role of the college trustee today. Educational Record 44: 258-265, July 1963.

Ten Hoo, M. Academic authority: the power and the glory. Educational Record 45: 265-271, Summer 1964.

Walker, E.A. President and his board. Educational Record 45: 246-250, Summer 1964.

Winters, George. Faculty-trustee communications. American Association of University Professors Bulletin 42: 621-628, Winter 1965.

Faculty and boards of control consist largely of reasonable, rational men of good will. Communication between these two groups is broken because of varying viewpoints--the faculty is concerned with teaching and research, the trustees with finances. Communication cannot be restored by the president alone or a few faculty representatives on the board; it can be partially restored by (1) joint trustee-faculty conference committees and (2) using the academic dean as an academic consultant to the board of trustees.

GREAT BRITAIN

(a) Books, Pamphlets and Government Reports

- n.i.l. Palmer, W.B. University government and organization. British Universities Annual, 1966. pp.128-142.
- n.i.l. "The place of the layman in university government." Proceedings of the Association of the Universities of the British Commonwealth. London, 1963.
- n.i.l. "Who should determine university policy?" Proceedings of the Association of the Universities of the British Commonwealth. London, 1958.

(b) Periodical articles

- n.i.l. Aylmer, G.E. University government--but by whom? Universities Quarterly 13: 45-54, 1958.
- Duncan-Jones, A. Thoughts on the government of modern universities. Universities Quarterly 9: 245-253, May 1955.
- n.i.l. Lloyd, M.F. Domestic administration in the universities. University Review 28: 23-24, Feb 1956.
- Mackintosh, John P. Who should control the universities? Times Educational Supplement 2683: 923, Oct 21, 1966.
- University administration; a symposium. Universities Quarterly 3: 796-813, 1949.

*Inver U. Fed.
H. Org.
SM 10/10/68 ac Pen.*

PRELIMINARY BRIEF ON UNIVERSITY STRUCTURES UNDER A PROPOSED NEW ACT

This brief will contain primarily recommendations. Supporting arguments can be discussed at our meeting and attached later.

I. Commission on Higher Education

Each institution of higher learning in the province will be given the greatest possible autonomy in developing its academic programs.

a) Functions:

1. Broadly to receive and evaluate budgets (henceforth to be openly arrived at) of all institutions of higher learning in the province.
2. To negotiate changes in proposed University budgets with the institutions concerned.
3. To argue the final budget document before the appropriate government office, be it Cabinet Minister or whatever.
4. To determine the final allocation of funds once the budget has become law.

b) Composition: It is clear from past experience that two basic elements should be represented on the commission.

1. The Community
2. Academic

For sake of argument, I suggest that we start with a figure of fifteen, eight of these to be academics and seven to be representatives of the community at large.

Representatives from the Community: Three Trade Unionists (two from the B.C. Federation of Labour, one representing unions not in the B.C. Federation of Labour), one representative from the B.C. Teacher's Federation, one representative from the B.C. business community, one representative of the rural community in B.C., one representative of the Bar.

Methods of Selection: These representatives from the community are to be chosen from a list of nominees presented by the several academic constituencies by the eight academic members of the commission.

Academic Members of the Commission: These should be chosen in such a manner as to ensure that each institution has at least one representative on the commission and that the remainder of membership be chosen in such a manner as to take into account the size of enrollment of students and the number of faculty in each institution. (Clearly, depending upon the number of institutions we consider within the parview of the act, it may be necessary to expand the number of academics on the commission). Although I believe that such institution should choose the way which it wants to select its members of the commission, would prefer to see a system of direct election by faculties.

- 2 -

Remuneration: I would expect that this commission would be in permanent session for at least six months of every year and that, consequently, the academic members of the commission would have to be seconded to the commission with full pay and that the lay members of the commission would have to be remunerated in a manner befitting the kind of work that they are doing for the commission.

Secretariat: The commission should have a small, permanent, highly-skilled secretariat. In addition to this secretariat, and in order to ensure that the secretariat does not acquire the real power of the commission by virtue of its (the secretariat's) being permanent, and to ensure the maximum of communication between the commission and the institutions of higher learning involved, I suggest that there be a Rotating Committee attached to the commission, composed of faculty members who are sitting on the Long-range Planning Committees of the several Universities. These faculty members would thus have access to relevant material and would also be able, in other deliberations on the University Long-range Planning Committees, to present a clearer picture of the province-wide situation.

II. Senate

- a) Functions: The Senate shall be the highest academic body of each institution of higher learning. In addition to the duties that it has under the present act, Section 54, it shall take over certain other functions now held by the present Board of Governors.
- b) Composition: Senate should be a body of thirty members, fifteen faculty and fifteen students. In each case, there should be a minimal guarantee that each faculty is represented; however, the majority of the membership should be drawn from the University at large, both students and faculty. For example, assuming that the three Deans would sit on the Senate ex officio, I believe that it would only be necessary to guarantee that each faculty has, in addition, one faculty representative from each faculty and one student representative from each faculty.

III. President and Academic Vice-President:

The President and Academic Vice-President should hold office for three years with the possibility of no more than one re-election. He should be chosen by a method of direct election, to be determined by joint faculty and the Student's Societies of each University.

G. Sperling