



Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., Canada V5A 1S6
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES; 291-4475

November 5, 1976.

Dr. P. Jewett
Chairman
Academic Planning Committee

Dear Dr. Jewett:

I enclose herewith a copy of the review of those recommendations of the Report on University Programs in Non-Metropolitan Areas that have implications for the present and continuing academic and administrative operation of this University, as requested by the Academic Planning Committee.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading 'Bryan P. Beirne', is written over a horizontal line.

Bryan P. Beirne
Reviewer



TO: The Senate Committee on Academic Planning
 of Simon Fraser University

A REVIEW OF ASPECTS OF THE WINEGARD REPORT

Or, more specifically:

A review of those suggestions in and recommendations of
the Report of the Commission on University Programs
in Non-Metropolitan Areas that have implications for the
present and continuing academic and administrative operation
of Simon Fraser University

BY: Bryan P. Beirne
 Professor of Pest Management

4 November, 1976

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
A. CONDITIONS	
1. That the status of the new Institution be defined clearly	3
2. That Simon Fraser University will not be required to make advance commitments on University College programmes	4
3. That Simon Fraser University can maintain its academic standards	6
4. That Simon Fraser University can treat its faculty uniformly	8
5. That continuing funding will be assured	10
B. CONSEQUENCES	
1. To the governing bodies and academic committees	12
2. To the academic departments and administrators	14
3. To the off-campus programmes	14
4. To the administrative services	15
5. To the Library	16
C. ADVANTAGES TO SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY	18
D. CONCLUSIONS	19
APPENDIX 1: Some problems of a multi-campus University	21
APPENDIX 2: List of individuals who provided information ...	22

INTRODUCTION

The charge is "to review those recommendations of the Winegard Commission Report which have implications for the present and continuing operation, academic and administrative, of Simon Fraser University." The reason is to provide information to assist Simon Fraser University in deciding whether or not to accept the proposal "that the new university begin as a separately-funded Division of S.F.U.."

A problem in preparing a review of this kind is that conditions and consequences that should be based on specified plans have to be based on assumptions because the plans do not yet exist.

The following, summarized from recommendations and suggestions in the Report, is taken as the basis for the review: [Note: numbers in parenthesis refer to page and paragraph numbers in the Report].

- That a new multi-campus university be established to serve non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia (12:4, 27:1, 13:3);
- That its academic status and standards will be high (7:4, 7:8) and it will be active in research and scholarship (14:2) as well as in teaching;
- That one of its primary functions will be to prepare and deliver courses and programmes for students who are out of reach of university campuses (7:6, 11:10, 14:1, 16:4, 24:4 to 25:4);
- That it will offer upper-level degree-completion programmes in Arts, Science, and Education (13:2, 3), and eventually additional, more specialized, programmes that may be in part professional (13:5, 26:3) and require courses at all levels including graduate (9:5); and
- That it would start as a University College of S.F.U. (12:5, 27:2, 27:8) if S.F.U. will accept the responsibility.

Suggested alternatives to these basic recommendations, such a new university from the start, the Open University system, or the system recently proposed for Alberta, and their relative merits are not discussed here because to do so would be outside the scope of this review as charged. For the same reason, no specific recommendations are made in this review.

A basic assumption is that S.F.U. will consider the proposal and its implications in the light of the moral responsibility of the university to do all that it reasonably can to make quality education available to all in British Columbia who want it. What S.F.U. would do in practice could be influenced by two sets of controlling factors: -

Conditions, which are stipulations that S.F.U. may wish to make to try to eliminate, reduce, or manage causes of potentially serious

harm to its standards, reputation, or operation that could operate if the proposal is accepted unconditionally and whose continuing existence thus could be reasons to reject the proposal; and

Consequences, which are unavoidable effects on the operations of S.F.U. if the proposal is accepted and implemented after the conditions have been met.

Finally, the courses of action open to S.F.U. are summarized briefly.

A. CONDITIONS

Simon Fraser University may wish to negotiate with the British Columbia Department of Education and the Universities Council of British Columbia agreement on some or all of the following as conditions for accepting the proposal. The purpose of the agreement would be to remove or reduce causes of potentially avoidable consequences that could be harmful to the interests of S.F.U.

A broad summary of the conditions is: to make the proposal viable and acceptable, S.F.U. must have reasonably full responsibility and authority for planning and setting up the University College and developing it into a new University as appropriate.

1. That the Status of the new Institution be defined clearly

The Report recommends that a new University to be established by 1990 (12:4, 27:1) should begin as a new Division or University College of Simon Fraser University (12:5, 27:2) and should be given a considerable degree of autonomy (14:3). That is, S.F.U., now a single-campus university, would become a multi-campus one that eventually would divide into two or more universities.

The new University College/University should have a distinctive name from the start, to serve as a constant reminder to all concerned that the ultimate objective is the development and establishment of a new University.

Simon Fraser University must guide and monitor the development of the University College and of its constituent parts and alter their status when it appears appropriate and feasible to do so; for example, to terminate a centre or programme that is clearly not viable, and to change the College into a University when it reaches the size - a head-count of about 5,000 students - when it can operate at a viable economic level. It therefore must have the authority to make the appropriate arrangements and recommendations.

The responsibility for expenditures of University College funds would rest with the S.F.U. Board of Governors (15:2), for approval of its academic programme with the Simon Fraser University Senate (14:3), and for general procedures, notably including those aimed at maintaining academic standards, with the administrators of the S.F.U. regulations (14:3). Such responsibilities could be accepted by S.F.U. only if accompanied by the relevant authority. As the University College would be part of S.F.U., it is difficult to see how it could have much more autonomy than has a Faculty or a Division of S.F.U.

The positions of the University College administrators in the Simon Fraser University hierarchy must be defined. Presumably the Principal would be a Vice-President, the Associate Principal at College Headquarters a Dean, and each Associate Principal in charge of a centre a (Departmental) Chairman.

The area of responsibility and authority of the proposed Advisory Council for the University College (15:3, 27:7) in relation to S.F.U. must be defined clearly, to remove in advance some sources of possible conflict. Indeed, the need for the Advisory Council at the beginning can be questioned. Perhaps what is really needed is two Advisory Councils, a shadow Board of Governors and a shadow Senate, to be established when the University College is close to becoming a new University. In this event those bodies should be constituted in accepted ways and include students and faculty.

2. That Simon Fraser University will not be required to make advance commitments on University College programmes

As the Report states, "it will be essential that some time be taken to plan the academic programmes ... before each centre begins operating" (24:1). Until this is done S.F.U. cannot and should not commit itself to any particular programme, and S.F.U. could not make plans before December 1976. The scope and size of the programmes will be determined by a combination of the minimum faculty size needed to offer a particular programme, the numbers and kinds of programmes needed, and the student numbers taking them. The sequence in which programmes can be established and developed will be influenced by the finances provided.

(a) The Faculty Size

The suggestion in the Report that each centre should have a F.T.E. faculty of only 10 is unrealistic. If the faculty carry normal teaching loads of which outreach courses would account for a substantial part, the number of formal courses that 10 F.T.E. faculty could give annually at a centre is more likely to be of the order of 25 or 30 than the 40 suggested in the Report. This would mean an average of 6 or 7 courses in each semester of each of the two upper years. As the normal full course-load of a full-time student is 5, the students' choice of courses would be quite limited.

[Note: In this review the term "outreach course" means any course given away from an established campus, or otherwise outside the traditional classroom situation, whether independent or directed study, or modular, correspondence, or remote group instruction.]

Probably 20 F.T.E. faculty would be necessary to provide the two upper years of a General Arts (B.A.) or of a General Science (B.Sc.) degree programme with honours and majors and with reasonable educational variety

in course selection. Four to 6 additional F.T.E. faculty could be needed for each subject that is emphasized in the programme. To make academic sense, therefore, a centre may soon have to have about 40 faculty instead of the 10 suggested in the Report.

Whether to establish at the outset four small centres or one or two large ones is an example of the kind of major decision that S.F.U. must have the authority to make if it is to be responsible for establishing the University College and developing it into a University. There are others. For instance: whether or not to concentrate first on developing the back-up facilities at Burnaby and the Headquarters and one centre - presumably the Nelson one because it is there already; when, and indeed if, to set up a Headquarters at Vernon; whether to concentrate first on developing the programmes at the centres and then the outreach programmes, or vice versa; and whether to set up a University College centre for the Upper Fraser Valley east of Abbotsford or to serve that area direct from S.F.U. Burnaby.

(b) The Academic Programmes

The academic programmes of the University College could be of three kinds: the basic B.A. and B.Sc. programmes given at all the centres; a broad theme that would be distinctive to each centre; and programmes in disciplines that relate to the theme of a centre and that it is feasible to emphasize there.

One reason why programmes other than the basic ones should not be defined in advance is that the surveys and analyses that are sufficiently adequate to define the numbers and the present and future educational demands of students and of their potential employers in different areas of the Province apparently have not yet been made.

A unique opportunity exists to break with tradition, by giving the centres constructive themes that relate to human needs and that are interdisciplinary in relation to the conventional classification of subjects. Examples of such themes are resource management, people management, business management, health management, environmental analysis, and communication studies. A question to be examined is which theme would be best for which centre.

The Report points out that the needs and the procedures for teaching the disciplines that might be emphasized should be reviewed before decisions to set up programmes on them are made: in Education (16:3, 27:9), Commerce (26:3, 29:1), Forestry (26:4, 28:11), and Nursing (26:5, 28:12). The same stipulation should apply to a variety of other possible subjects, especially semi-or para-professional ones, that relate to themes of centres.

Serious practical obstacles to giving some programmes at the University College may appear. For example, a typical programme in

Education could require at least 20 specialists in aspects of the subject, and may thus be beyond the resources of a given centre. It may in fact be necessary to separate the responsibilities for offering B.Ed. completion work from P.D.P. or certification work. An adequate programme in Commerce would require 9 or 10 faculty; and it may be impossible to set up a 5-or 6-faculty accounting programme because academically-qualified accountants are virtually impossible to find.

(c) The Student Numbers

The population of the areas that would be served indicates that a rapid expansion of student enrollments at the University College to high levels is a possibility. A faculty of 10 F.T.E. could handle 150 to 170 F.T.E. students effectively, as the normal faculty-to-student ratio in Canada is 1 to 15 and the current S.F.U. ratio is 1 to 17 (1 to 12 is regarded as the optimum). It seems probable that a centre would soon have an F.T.E. student enrollment of several times 170.

A plan to meet that contingency must be agreed upon in advance: either to expand the faculty numbers and the facilities to fit increased enrollments, which would require commitments for appropriate funding; or to limit student enrollments to fit the available faculty numbers and facilities, which would require an acceptable basis for doing so.

3. That Simon Fraser University can maintain its Academic Standards

A suspicion, or fear, exists at S.F.U. that a tie-in with the University College could result in an actual or perceived lowering in S.F.U.'s academic quality. Convincing safeguards are necessary to remove this suspicion as a major obstacle to accepting the proposal.

The suspicion arises in part from statements in the Report: -

(a) Alleged role of S.F.U.

That Simon Fraser University should have a more limited teaching role than it has and intends to have is suggested by these gratuitous and misleadingly incorrect statements in the Report: "S.F.U. has little interest in further development of professional schools and has or should have ambitions for a somewhat restricted role in graduate work especially at the doctoral level" (10:7).

A possibility that the tie-in with the University College would be interpreted in any way by anybody as reinforcing that suggested role may alone be sufficient grounds in the eyes of some for S.F.U. to reject the proposal. Conditions that S.F.U. may wish to make, before it decides on the proposal, are that bodies such as the British Columbia Department of Education and the Universities Council of British Columbia should

concur with the S.F.U. Senate's rejection of the general role suggested by those statements in the Report, and that if S.F.U. accepts the programme it can be responsible for setting up any professional or graduate programmes needed at the University College.

(b) Possible status of the University College

Though the Report repeatedly refers to a University, the descriptions of the suggested size, scope, faculty activities, and costs could be interpreted as indicating what is really intended initially is what might be termed a Provincial College: something at a rather lower level than a University and perhaps resembling a small State College of the former California system.

A question that is of fundamental importance to the decision that S.F.U. is called upon to make is this: is it the intent of the Government to establish a new University, with all that is implied of that status, or a lower order of institution? In this review the assumption is that a University is intended.

(c) Faculty recruitment standards

As University College faculty would be S.F.U. faculty they would have to meet S.F.U. recruitment standards. To lower S.F.U. standards, even temporarily and for its University College Division only - for example, to accommodate any faculty of Notre Dame University who may not be fully academically qualified (11:8, 19:5, 27:10) - could be to the long-term detriment of S.F.U.'s academic reputation. One condition, if S.F.U. accepts the general proposal, must be that it will not be expected to lower its faculty recruitment and evaluation standards.

It has been suggested that the quality of University College faculty might not be high because good candidates would be deterred from applying by the small size, the poor research facilities, and the possible heavy teaching duties, or that, if they were appointed, good faculty would stay there only until they could find jobs at big universities. The consequence would be a lowering of average faculty standards at S.F.U.

These viewpoints may be discounted. It seems far more likely that the combination of the current large reserves of available qualified candidates (except in a very few subjects such as Accountancy), the attraction of that rarity nowadays, a prospective new University, and the challenge and opportunity of helping to develop it will attract faculty of high quality that may well enhance S.F.U. standards.

(d) Student admission and evaluation standards

The Report suggests that, in relation to an expected backlog of students seeking admission, the University College must be extremely flexible in giving credit for courses taken elsewhere and that special concessions to such students may be necessary (11:3).

As University College students would be S.F.U. students they would have to meet S.F.U. admission standards. As with faculty recruitments, to lower those standards, even temporarily and for its University College Division only, could be unfair to S.F.U. Burnaby students and might in the long-term be detrimental of S.F.U.'s academic standards and reputation. Moreover, it would not be in accord with the statements in the Report on the need to maintain traditional university standards of academic excellence (7:4). One condition that S.F.U. must make is that if it accepts the proposal it will not be expected to lower its already flexible student admission standards. It may not be feasible, for example, for S.F.U. to assure prospective students that all community college courses will be acceptable (21:6, 22:1) until S.F.U. is satisfied that they are of the requisite standards.

The comment in the Report on the need to maintain traditional university standards of academic excellence at the University College (7:4) is reinforced by the statements on the need for programmes to be of a high standard and recognized by other universities, and that the graduate should have no feeling of being second-class in any respect (7:8). Nevertheless some fear exists that because of limited facilities at University College centres academic standards there would be lower than at S.F.U. Burnaby and that this could be to the detriment of S.F.U. standards. This may be discounted for most subjects: student and faculty motivation and energy can more than counteract any effects of poor facilities.

It seems that to attempt to ensure that uniform standards will exist throughout a multi-campus university can be a time-consuming task (see Appendix 1) that may well be a major obstacle to implementing the multi-campus idea. A system in which faculty from S.F.U. Burnaby would be involved in evaluating courses given at the University College could assist in maintaining satisfactory standards there. Quality control of Independent Study or Directed Study outreach courses would be especially important. Simon Fraser University must avoid becoming involved in a proliferation of second-rate colleges, programmes, or courses by doing what it can to ensure that none of them is second-rate.

4. That Simon Fraser University can treat its faculty uniformly

The faculty of the University College would be faculty of S.F.U. (14:1, 15:4). As such neither their working conditions nor the criteria used in evaluating them for contract renewal, salary levels and increases, promotion, tenure, or dismissal should differ from those of the faculty

of S.F.U. Burnaby to extents that are inequitable to either group. There are suggestions in the Report that if accepted could result in inequities.

One implication is that the teaching and related duties of University College faculty (16:1, 16:4, 17:1 and 2) would be heavier than the four courses or course equivalents normally required annually of faculty at the coast universities. Such duties of the University College faculty should be at or close to the norm, to reduce both direct inequities and inequalities in the time available for University College faculty to do the research that contributes to their academic advancement.

A reason suggested in the Report for their heavier teaching and related workloads is that University College faculty would have difficulties in doing research (17:2) and thus presumably would have time available for increased other duties. This argument for heavier non-research duties is not valid. While research that requires major or complex equipment may not be possible at a University College centre for some years, other kinds of research, especially kinds based in the field, are feasible there. Moreover, University College faculty must have adequate time for research to maintain their credibility and employability as scholars. Indeed it would add to the scholarly credibility if each centre had several senior, established scholars on its faculty from the start.

As the argument for less research time is not valid, another suggestion based on it is not valid: that University College faculty should have more frequent study leaves than is usual (14:2). This would give them an advantage over faculty at the coast universities that could be considered unfair.

The Report points out that the certification of the Notre Dame University Faculty Association could cause problems in integrating the Nelson Centre - that is, what is now N.D.U. - into the University College (20:5) and thus into S.F.U. Presumably S.F.U. would require this matter to be resolved by the Government before it could accept the proposal or, alternatively, may suggest a modification of the proposal that would exclude N.D.U.

University College faculty must be treated as S.F.U. faculty, even if to do so is not in accord with suggestions in the Report, unless S.F.U. decides on this alternative: to have two kinds of faculty in terms of duties, and therefore of criteria for evaluation. One would be the professors who would do both research and teaching and provide committee and similar administrative services to the university. The other, the lecturers, would not be expected to do much research and instead would carry heavier teaching and related work loads than the professors.

That suggestion has its advocates. But before S.F.U. accepts it, the implications must be weighed very carefully. For instance, the effects on the academic stature of an institution that has many "lecturers" and on the stature of institutions associated with it, the influence on prospective applicants for faculty posts, and the likelihood that "lecturers" will come to be regarded as a lower category than "professors" and one to which scholarly unproductive professors may be demoted.

5. That continuing funding will be assured

Adequate and continuing funding must be assured if the intent is to set up a university system that will meet the needs of the people of the non-metropolitan areas truly and not merely nominally.

If S.F.U. takes responsibility for the expenditures (15:2) it presumably will use as a guideline this statement in the Report: "No programme should be mounted without a sufficient commitment of financial support" (8:1).

The rough cost estimates in the Report (17:2 to 19:1) are widely regarded as unrealistically low. Some examples illustrate this:

- The library activities estimated at \$5 million would actually cost at least \$9 million;
- The estimated \$0.35 million annually for off-campus instruction may be contrasted with the \$2.5 million spent annually by the University of Waterloo for about 150 audio-taped courses for about 2,500 students;
- Costs of upper level undergraduate laboratory courses in Science can be high: a 4-faculty programme in chemistry would cost nearly \$0.6 million to start up and \$0.32 million annually to operate;
- The estimated salary costs of \$3.3 million for faculty of four 10-faculty centres in year five could be the costs for one 50-faculty centre in year two or three;
- The Report does not estimate possible costs of future expansion, though it is conceivable that these could resemble those of S.F.U. over the past ten years, though the cost per F.T.E. student could be higher because of the added costs of outreach programmes and of staggered course times. It may be noted that the S.F.U. Kelowna programmes in BioSciences and in Psychology have cost about \$16,000 per F.T.E. student in the first year, about \$8,000 in the second.

More realistic capital and operating costs cannot be estimated until, first, decisions have been made on priorities in setting up the Headquarters and the centres and on the sizes of each, on the kinds and

scope of academic programmes, and on the nature of the delivery systems for outreach programmes and courses, and, second, plans that can be costed have been devised for each. It may be noted that capital costs may be higher than imagined because of the possible need to construct facilities at some locations to house faculty, staff, and students.

While S.F.U. has the authority for expenditures it must be empowered, if funds are inadequate to do everything that is desirable, to determine priorities: to select what and what not to do and when and how, as described elsewhere in this review. Nevertheless certain basic conditions must be agreed upon in that S.F.U. must be satisfied, with whatever safeguards are feasible, that: funding for the University College will be in addition to and not directly at the expense of funding for existing universities; financial support must continue despite any changes in the Government of British Columbia; adequate funding will be provided during the establishment and developmental phases when the costs of faculty and facilities may be very high in relation to size of student enrollments; and expansion financing should be provided as needed.

It is important that S.F.U. must not suffer long-term diminished administrative services or depleted resources as consequences of its involvement with the University College. For example, the S.F.U. Library must not divide its services between the two but must be adequately financed to expand its services to cover both. Similarly, S.F.U. Continuing Studies should have an independent and reasonably protected budget to enable it to maintain its Lower Mainland operation in competition for resources with the University College.

The Report recommends that the University College be funded separately from S.F.U. Burnaby (12:5, 13:5, 27:2). Advantages of this would be that it would give the University College some sort of separate identity from the start that would be a precursor to its eventual separation; and that it would tend to protect S.F.U. Burnaby from being a scapegoat for failures actually caused by inadequate Government funding for the University College.

B. CONSEQUENCES

Simon Fraser University accepts a major responsibility if it accepts the proposal. It commits itself to doing all that it reasonably can to develop the University College and to foster its evolution into the new University, or Universities, despite the consequent extra time, trouble, and headaches, the possible spreading of services thinly, and the inevitable criticisms for what goes wrong or is not apparently done right.

The commitment means that officials in all segments of S.F.U. Burnaby that operate at the University level or that serve the University as a whole must become involved whether they like it or not. Their areas of responsibility will extend beyond Burnaby to encompass the University College.

There is a feeling at S.F.U. that individual faculty members however, should have a choice: they may become directly involved if they want to do so; but they should be free to have nothing to do with the arrangement if that is what they wish.

It does not follow that departments or faculty members who are willing to become involved directly can do so: the University College will have the final decision.

The committee, administrative, and other interactions between the two campuses may be so complex that, to resolve immediate problems, each campus may have to locate a senior "Ambassador" with powers of decision on the other campus.

1. To the governing bodies and academic committees

As the University College would be part of S.F.U. its financial and academic plans would be subject to approval by the same governing and other committees that deal with S.F.U. Burnaby. Because of this, University College personnel must have adequate opportunities to be represented on those committees. Changes in committee compositions would be a consequence.

(a) The Board of Governors

The Report recommends that three or four persons from the non-metropolitan areas be appointed to the S.F.U. Board of Governors (15:2, 27:6), though the proposed Advisory Council for the University College (15:3, 27:7) makes the need for this questionable. Presumably these Board members would replace existing appointees. If not, difficulties could arise: an imbalance would be created between the numbers of appointed members and the numbers of elected and ex-officio

members and to rectify it would require changes in the Universities Act.

University College personnel must have opportunities equal to S.F.U. Burnaby personnel to be elected as faculty, student, and staff members of the Board. However, logistics may dictate that they could attend only a few meetings, so that University College matters may have to be limited to those meetings.

(b) The Senate and its Committees

University College officials must be classified as S.F.U. officials before University College faculty can fit the procedures for election to Senate and for evaluation for renewal, promotion, salary increase, tenure or dismissal. Presumably the University College would be the equivalent of a Faculty of S.F.U. Burnaby, at least initially. Faculty members and students of the University College would be also eligible for election to Senate by, respectively, Joint Faculty and the Student Association. These changes in the composition of the Senate apparently can be accomplished without the necessity of changing the Universities Act.

University College faculty and students should have the opportunity to be represented appropriately on Senate committees or boards, especially those such as Academic Planning (S.C.A.P.), Undergraduate Studies (S.C.U.S.), Continuing Studies (S.C.C.S.), Undergraduate Admissions (S.U.A.B.), and Appeal Board (S.A.B.) that could become heavily occupied with University College affairs. Indeed, the extra work-loads may be so large that some of these committees may have to set up sub-committees to deal specifically with University College matters. However, University College faculty and students will inevitably be partially disenfranchised by logistics.

(c) Other Committees

If University College has the status of a Faculty of S.F.U. it must be appropriately represented on University committees that affect it, such as the Tenure Committee (U.T.C.), Appointments Committee (U.A.C.), and search committees for senior administrators.

Presumably S.F.U. Burnaby faculty would be represented on University College Faculty-level committees, such as search committees for Chairmen of centres; and it seems possible that S.F.U. Burnaby faculty and staff will participate in University College search and appointment committees for faculty and staff.

The chief consequences to S.F.U. Burnaby would be to involve, for at least the lifetime of the College, the members of the various committees in more work, trouble, and committee time than hitherto.

2. To the academic departments and administrators

The consequences to the academic departments would be chiefly to the teaching programmes. Some experienced faculty may move from Burnaby to the University College, especially if the need for some senior scholars there is recognized. More probably, willing faculty may be seconded temporarily to the University College, as they are now to Kelowna from the S.F.U. BioScience and Psychology departments, especially during the developmental phases.

A distinct possibility exists that faculty of S.F.U. Burnaby could be primarily responsible for setting up the outreach programmes and courses because University College faculty may not have the time and the experience and the facilities to do so at the beginning. This could reduce course availability at Burnaby.

A department may have to make special teaching programme arrangements or other concessions both to compensate seconded faculty for the interruptions in their scholarly careers and to integrate its course programme with theirs. And it could be involved in advising the University College on such matters as course and programme planning, faculty recruiting, student evaluations, laboratory building plans.

If S.F.U. accepts the proposal it becomes University policy to implement it, and departments are likely to be encouraged to participate at least as much as they are now encouraged to give Continuing Studies courses. The extent to which any one department may become directly involved will range from extensively to not at all. A department whose subject is not taught at the University College may not get involved, even if it wants to. But it is difficult to see how some departments could avoid becoming involved in the University College: in Faculties such as Arts, Interdisciplinary Studies, and Education, and especially departments whose subjects may be emphasized there. Not only could they not avoid participation, they would find it difficult not to accept direct responsibilities for ensuring that the University College programmes in their subjects are developed properly. A possibly contentious question that could face S.F.U. is what to do about academic departments that may refuse to become involved. The best answer: nothing.

3. To the off-campus programmes

Two segments of S.F.U. Burnaby currently give off-campus programmes in the Interior: -

(a) Continuing Studies Division

The Report stresses that a major responsibility of the University College will be to develop and give extension degree credit programmes

of Directed Studies to students out of reach of direct contact with University centres or formal classroom courses (7:1, 8:3 & 4, 11:8, 12:5, 13:4, 16:1 & 4, 17:1, 2 & 6, 18:1, 25:1 & 4).

As the Continuing Studies activities of S.F.U. are currently concentrated in the Lower Mainland, the immediate impact of the University College may not be great. The two activities in the Interior - the new and still small correspondence programme and the operation at Kelowna that now involves the equivalent of 4.5 faculty - presumably either would be replaced by University College activities or the University College would contract with S.F.U. to continue them.

However, a fear exists that the real possibility that the existence of the University College with its outreach programmes could direct a substantial part of Continuing Studies resources and faculty interest to the Interior from Lower Mainland programmes to the detriment of the latter.

(b) Faculty of Education

The Report recommends that the University College have special responsibilities for co-ordinating Continuing Education and outreach programmes.

The S.F.U. Professional Development Programme could be affected. Two of its three semesters are given by S.F.U. at Penticton, Kelowna, Vernon, Kamloops, Salmon Arm, Prince George, and Chilliwack; one specialization of the third semester otherwise given at S.F.U. is given at Kamloops. If those programmes were taken over by the University College the consequences would be severely damaging to the faculty without introducing significant advantages. One of the current strengths of the P.D.P. programme is the on-campus academic expertise that supports them and which, as indicated earlier in this review, would be virtually impossible to set up at the University College. The S.F.U. Faculty of Education feels strongly that it, not the University College, should continue to direct the P.D.P. programmes in the Interior. Degree completion work on the B.Ed. is a different matter, and theoretically might be supplied in the Interior if the University College could import the substantial resources necessary during the summers.

A recommendation in the Report could influence the nature of future off-campus activities of the S.F.U. Faculty of Education: that the universities and the Department of Education establish a Study Committee to review certification requirements and existing programmes (16:3, 27:9).

4. To the administrative services

The Registrar's Office and the Administrative Services divisions

of S.F.U. would all be involved. How they would be involved can be identified. How much each will be involved and for how long cannot until the magnitude of the operation has been identified and until a decision is made on when, or if, to set up a Headquarters at Vernon. In relation to needs of the University College, S.F.U. Burnaby administrators would (a) train, (b) advise, and (c) provide services.

(a) Training

Senior administrators of S.F.U. Burnaby would train newly-appointed University College administrators in procedures. Presumably this would be done chiefly at Burnaby, though partly the Interior Headquarters. It presumably would be concentrated in the first year or two. The offices of the Bursar and Registrar and of Physical Plant would be involved first, Personnel, and University Services soon thereafter. The consequent reduction in services to S.F.U. Burnaby would be temporary, and probably not noticable if additional staff are provided from University College funds as they should be.

(b) Advice

Simon Fraser University administrators, and specialists in computer, audio-visual, and other procedures, are likely to be required to advise the University College. The extent and scope of this cannot be suggested at this time, except that it certainly will not be merely nominal, it could be extensive, and it may be continuing.

(c) Continuing Service

As University College students, faculty, and staff would be S.F.U. students, faculty, and staff, all administrative departments of S.F.U. that are concerned with regulations and records related to people and standards would be responsible for the University College, at least during its existence as such. Additional staff probably would be needed at Burnaby. The extent to which this may continue after the new University is established can only be surmised. It seems possible, for example, that S.F.U. may be required to continue to supply computer, audio-visual, laboratory, special workshop, and science stores, as well as library, services but perhaps not to continue to handle functions of the Registrar or the Bursar.

5. To the Library

If the proposal is accepted, library facilities at and for the University College would be developed and sustained primarily by the S.F.U. Library. Consequences to S.F.U. Burnaby might be decreased effectiveness in some ways but certainly increased efficiency in others.

If the responsibilities of the various agencies involved are not defined clearly in advance or if continuing funding is not adequate, or both, the Library services could become so degraded and so overtaxed that they would deteriorate in relation to needs of all users; and the library resources of S.F.U. Burnaby might be depleted through cannibalization to meet University College needs.

However, these possible disadvantages could be offset by the introduction of efficient new procedures. Existing cataloguing and circulation systems, designed for needs of the Burnaby campus only and becoming increasingly inadequate with age and with increasing usage, could not also handle the requirements of the University College. New catalogue support and circulation control systems, such as UTLAS-CIRCS, based on latest communications and computer techniques, are necessary if S.F.U. is to provide adequate service to the Burnaby campus and essential if resource sharing is to become a reality. In addition the University budgetary and fiscal procedures must be upgraded and the Library research collections expanded. All these improvements would be of continuing benefit to S.F.U. Burnaby as they would raise the efficiency and effectiveness of the Library services permanently to higher levels than hitherto.

C. ADVANTAGES TO SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY

The University College would benefit from the arrangement much more than S.F.U. Burnaby. It could develop much better academic courses and programmes much sooner with S.F.U.'s assistance than alone.

The chief advantages to S.F.U. would be intangible ones:

- Simon Fraser University would demonstrate a positive and outward-looking attitude in meeting its duty and responsibility to do what it can to participate constructively in the development and improvement of higher education in British Columbia and would avoid becoming introspective and perhaps impoverished.

- It would avoid criticism and blame for not meeting the challenge.

- It would facilitate continuing cooperation of a kind not hitherto conspicuous in this Province between different universities for their mutual benefit.

- Faculty standards might go up because of the high quality of academics currently available for recruitment to University College posts.

- Simon Fraser University departments could expand the scope of expertise in disciplines that would be represented on the faculty of both the University College and S.F.U. Burnaby.

- Simon Fraser University could become a recognized centre of expertise in planning and organizing small innovative campuses and in techniques for delivering education to remote locations.

More tangible advantages would be in the higher levels of effectiveness of some existing services such as library, computing, and accounting. While improvements in them may not be possible with S.F.U. Burnaby resources alone, they could be possible with University College resources and would be to the long-term benefit of both.

D. CONCLUSIONS

The Report recommends that S.F.U. accept or reject the proposal before the end of December, 1976 (13:3, 27:8). Simon Fraser University has three alternatives: -

(a) To accept the proposal unconditionally. Indications received while this review was being prepared are that this would meet with widespread opposition from a majority of the faculty of S.F.U.

(b) To reject the proposal. A clearly valid reason would be essential, as merely to excuse or to rationalize selfishly could be academically indefensible and politically unwise.

(c) To accept the proposal conditionally. That is, to agree to accept it if reasonable and justifiable specified conditions are met, with the implication that S.F.U. could not accept the proposal if they are not met despite a moral responsibility to students and potential students.

If the third (c) is considered to be the best of the three alternatives, then the immediate task facing S.F.U. is to define what of the conditions, such as those described above in their original or modified form and/or different conditions, it regards as both reasonable and justifiable and then negotiate agreement on them.

If S.F.U. decides to accept this proposal in principle it may wish to state simply something that may be summarized like this:

Simon Fraser University will be prepared to take responsibility for attempting to meet needs for University education for non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia within the limits of the funds available and provided that conditions are met that give S.F.U. the authority to decide, in consultation with appropriate agencies, which needs to meet and in what sequence, and where, to what extent, and how.

Then, if this is agreed, S.F.U. may take one (or in sequence two or more) of the following routes after detailed evaluations of various possibilities including comparisons of advantages of the single-campus versus multi-campus systems: -

(i) S.F.U. remains a multi-campus University indefinitely.

(ii) S.F.U. remains a multi-campus University after budding off a new multi-campus University.

(iii) S.F.U. reverts to its single-campus form after budding off a new multi-campus University (which appears to be the intent of the Winegard recommendations).

(iv) S.F.U. reverts to its single-campus form after budding off several new single-campus Universities (which reduces to a minimum disadvantages of multi-campus systems).

A compromise that S.F.U. may wish to consider is a modification of (iv) that could shorten, reduce, or avoid many of the problems discussed in this review.

It is that the new Institution would start as a University College or Division of S.F.U. but would become a new single-campus University as soon as its officers have sufficient training and experience to run a University but irrespective of the numbers of faculty and students there at the time; and the new University would then negotiate with S.F.U. to obtain the academic and administrative assistance and the special and administrative services that it needs and that it would have had if it had remained as a University College until it remained University size in terms of faculty and student numbers.

Additional new single-campus Universities could be set up in the same fashion as needs dictate and finances permit.

This compromise would give autonomy early to regional Institutions without reducing the availability of expert assistance and cooperation from S.F.U. It would reduce problems of a multi-campus system. It would permit S.F.U. to avoid becoming involved where it is unable or unwilling to do so. It would facilitate the new Universities to involve Universities additional to S.F.U. in their activities and development. In general, it would increase flexibility in situations where the ability to react to changing circumstances is essential.

APPENDIX 1: Some Problems of a multi-campus University

The following are extracts from a letter of 20 October, 1976 from the Dean of Science of the multi-campus University of the West Indies:

"I hardly know how to answer your query except perhaps to say don't do it! I am not entirely sure what advantage is to be gained in the B.C. context by having a multi-campus organization rather than separate Universities, but presumably that has already been worked out. If there must be a multi-campus organization then the most important thing is to avoid having too tight central control from one campus and to keep cross campus administration to a minimum. It is in the very nature of academics that they want to go their own way and develop programmes which they believe are best for their situation; what is good for one campus is not necessarily good for another. This is well demonstrated in Biology in our own University. The type of course, and the emphasis placed in different parts of the course, that is suited to the Jamaican context is not suited to the Trinidadian context but our regulations say we must run common courses and have common examinations. After a few stormy meetings in the early days we now compromise and spend a lot of time finding ways of circumnavigating the Council's regulation.

"We are stuck with a situation in which many subjects are taught on all three campuses and the paper work and travel needed to co-ordinate teaching and examining is ludicrous. I suggest therefore that if you are developing a multi-campus University that each campus needs to have its own speciality and don't duplicate teaching on different campuses if it can be avoided. If individual Faculties (i.e. Science) are to be duplicated in different campuses then try to give the academics as much freedom to develop their own courses how they like. This may be easier in the Canadian system than it is in ours.

"Central control of administration also creates trouble. Mona is our centre and the other campuses always believe we are 'stealing' the largest slice of the cake and keeping the others in a state of subservience. Too tight centralisation also creates unnecessary paper work and travel. I travelled six times to Trinidad last academic year solely for the purposes of co-ordination and I could have spent my time in more profitable occupations."

APPENDIX 2: Sources of additional information (all
at S.F.U. unless otherwise indicated)

Dr. J. Blaney, Dean of Continuing Studies.

British Columbia Students' Federation, per Mr. Ross Powell,
Executive Member.

Dr. R. Brown, Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Dr. T. W. Calvert, Department of Kinesiology; member of
Advisory Committee.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Arts, collectively.

Chairmen equivalents of the Faculty of Education, collectively.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, collectively.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Science, collectively.

Dr. J. Chase, Director of Analytical Studies.

Dr. F. Cunningham, Department of Geography.

Department of Chemistry, per Dr. E. Wells, Chairman.

Department of Economics and Commerce, per Dr. B. Schoner, Chairman.

Department of Geography, per Dr. M. Roberts, Chairman.

Department of Psychology, per Dr. D. Krebs, Chairman.

Dr. L. M. Dill, Department of Biological Sciences.

Dr. M. E. Eliot-Hurst, Department of Geography.

Mr. H. Ellis, Registrar.

Dr. J. Ellis, Dean, Faculty of Education; member of
Advisory Committee.

Faculty Association, Notre Dame University, per Dr. V.J. Salvo.

Faculty Association, Simon Fraser University, per Dr. J. Farquhar.

Dr. L. Funt, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. R. Gehlback, Faculty of Education.

Dr. I. Goodbody, Dean of Science, University of the West Indies.

Dr. R. Harrop, Department of Mathematics.

Dr. G. C. Hoyt, Department of Economics and Commerce.

Dr. C. Jones, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. Jean E. Koepke, Department of Psychology, S.F.U.
Kelowna Programme.

Ms. Donna Laws, Administrative Assistant, President's Office.

Dr. S. K. Lower, Department of Chemistry.

Mr. M. McClaren, Faculty of Education.

Dr. J. M. Munro, Acting Dean, Faculty of Arts.

Dr. K. Okuda, Department of Economics and Commerce; member of
Advisory Committee.

Dr. S. Roberts, Vice-President, University Services.

Mr. D. Ross, Bursar.

Dr. R.M.S. Sadleir, Department of Biological Sciences.

Ms. Linda Severy, student; member of Advisory Committee.

Dr. M. Smith, Department of Biological Sciences.

Mr. G. Stuart, Vice-President, Administration.

Ms. Sharon Thomas, University Library; member of Advisory Committee.

The University Library, per Mr. T. Dobbs, Acting University Librarian,
and Ms. Sharon Thomas, Acquisitions Librarian.

Dr. N. Verbeek, Department of Biological Sciences, S.F.U.
Kelowna Programme.

Dr. J. Walkley, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. J. Webster, Dean of Science.

Dr. B. Wilson, Vice-President, Academic; member of
Advisory Committee.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To.....	All Members of Faculty	From.....	Pauline Jewett
			President
Subject.....	Review of the Winegard Report	Date.....	November 12, 1976

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of
Dr. Bryan P. Beirne's review of aspects of the Winegard Report.

Dr. Beirne's review is currently being considered by
the Senate Committee on Academic Planning.

Enclosure

PJ/pe DL.



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY, B.C. CANADA V5A 1S6
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE 291-4475

November 5, 1976.

Dr. P. Jewett
Chairman
Academic Planning Committee

Dear Dr. Jewett:

I enclose herewith a copy of the review of those recommendations of the Report on University Programs in Non-Metropolitan Areas that have implications for the present and continuing academic and administrative operation of this University, as requested by the Academic Planning Committee.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading 'Bryan P. Beirne', is written over a horizontal line.

Bryan P. Beirne
Reviewer



.

TO: The Senate Committee on Academic Planning
 of Simon Fraser University

A REVIEW OF ASPECTS OF THE WINEGARD REPORT

Or, more specifically:

A review of those suggestions in and recommendations of
the Report of the Commission on University Programs
in Non-Metropolitan Areas that have implications for the
present and continuing academic and administrative operation
of Simon Fraser University

BY: Bryan P. Beirne
 Professor of Pest Management

4 November, 1976

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
A. CONDITIONS	
1. That the status of the new Institution be defined clearly	3
2. That Simon Fraser University will not be required to make advance commitments on University College programmes	4
3. That Simon Fraser University can maintain its academic standards	6
4. That Simon Fraser University can treat its faculty uniformly	8
5. That continuing funding will be assured	10
B. CONSEQUENCES	
1. To the governing bodies and academic committees	12
2. To the academic departments and administrators	14
3. To the off-campus programmes	14
4. To the administrative services	15
5. To the Library	16
C. ADVANTAGES TO SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY	18
D. CONCLUSIONS	19
APPENDIX 1: Some problems of a multi-campus University	21
APPENDIX 2: List of individuals who provided information ...	22

INTRODUCTION

The charge is "to review those recommendations of the Winegard Commission Report which have implications for the present and continuing operation, academic and administrative, of Simon Fraser University." The reason is to provide information to assist Simon Fraser University in deciding whether or not to accept the proposal "that the new university begin as a separately-funded Division of S.F.U.."

A problem in preparing a review of this kind is that conditions and consequences that should be based on specified plans have to be based on assumptions because the plans do not yet exist.

The following, summarized from recommendations and suggestions in the Report, is taken as the basis for the review: [Note: numbers in parenthesis refer to page and paragraph numbers in the Report].

- That a new multi-campus university be established to serve non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia (12:4, 27:1, 13:3);
- That its academic status and standards will be high (7:4, 7:8) and it will be active in research and scholarship (14:2) as well as in teaching;
- That one of its primary functions will be to prepare and deliver courses and programmes for students who are out of reach of university campuses (7:6, 11:10, 14:1, 16:4, 24:4 to 25:4);
- That it will offer upper-level degree-completion programmes in Arts, Science, and Education (13:2, 3), and eventually additional, more specialized, programmes that may be in part professional (13:5, 26:3) and require courses at all levels including graduate (9:5); and
- That it would start as a University College of S.F.U. (12:5, 27:2, 27:8) if S.F.U. will accept the responsibility.

Suggested alternatives to these basic recommendations, such a new university from the start, the Open University system, or the system recently proposed for Alberta, and their relative merits are not discussed here because to do so would be outside the scope of this review as charged. For the same reason, no specific recommendations are made in this review.

A basic assumption is that S.F.U. will consider the proposal and its implications in the light of the moral responsibility of the university to do all that it reasonably can to make quality education available to all in British Columbia who want it. What S.F.U. would do in practice could be influenced by two sets of controlling factors: -

Conditions, which are stipulations that S.F.U. may wish to make to try to eliminate, reduce, or manage causes of potentially serious

harm to its standards, reputation, or operation that could operate if the proposal is accepted unconditionally and whose continuing existence thus could be reasons to reject the proposal; and

Consequences, which are unavoidable effects on the operations of S.F.U. if the proposal is accepted and implemented after the conditions have been met.

Finally, the courses of action open to S.F.U. are summarized briefly.

A. CONDITIONS

Simon Fraser University may wish to negotiate with the British Columbia Department of Education and the Universities Council of British Columbia agreement on some or all of the following as conditions for accepting the proposal. The purpose of the agreement would be to remove or reduce causes of potentially avoidable consequences that could be harmful to the interests of S.F.U.

A broad summary of the conditions is: to make the proposal viable and acceptable, S.F.U. must have reasonably full responsibility and authority for planning and setting up the University College and developing it into a new University as appropriate.

1. That the Status of the new Institution be defined clearly

The Report recommends that a new University to be established by 1990 (12:4, 27:1) should begin as a new Division or University College of Simon Fraser University (12:5, 27:2) and should be given a considerable degree of autonomy (14:3). That is, S.F.U., now a single-campus university, would become a multi-campus one that eventually would divide into two or more universities.

The new University College/University should have a distinctive name from the start, to serve as a constant reminder to all concerned that the ultimate objective is the development and establishment of a new University.

Simon Fraser University must guide and monitor the development of the University College and of its constituent parts and alter their status when it appears appropriate and feasible to do so; for example, to terminate a centre or programme that is clearly not viable, and to change the College into a University when it reaches the size - a head-count of about 5,000 students - when it can operate at a viable economic level. It therefore must have the authority to make the appropriate arrangements and recommendations.

The responsibility for expenditures of University College funds would rest with the S.F.U. Board of Governors (15:2), for approval of its academic programme with the Simon Fraser University Senate (14:3), and for general procedures, notably including those aimed at maintaining academic standards, with the administrators of the S.F.U. regulations (14:3). Such responsibilities could be accepted by S.F.U. only if accompanied by the relevant authority. As the University College would be part of S.F.U., it is difficult to see how it could have much more autonomy than as a Faculty or a Division of S.F.U.

The positions of the University College administrators in the Simon Fraser University hierarchy must be defined. Presumably the Principal would be a Vice-President, the Associate Principal at College Headquarters a Dean, and each Associate Principal in charge of a centre a (Departmental) Chairman.

The area of responsibility and authority of the proposed Advisory Council for the University College (15:3, 27:7) in relation to S.F.U. must be defined clearly, to remove in advance some sources of possible conflict. Indeed, the need for the Advisory Council at the beginning can be questioned. Perhaps what is really needed is two Advisory Councils, a shadow Board of Governors and a shadow Senate, to be established when the University College is close to becoming a new University. In this event those bodies should be constituted in accepted ways and include students and faculty.

2. That Simon Fraser University will not be required to make advance commitments on University College programmes

As the Report states, "it will be essential that some time be taken to plan the academic programmes ... before each centre begins operating" (24:1). Until this is done S.F.U. cannot and should not commit itself to any particular programme, and S.F.U. could not make plans before December 1976. The scope and size of the programmes will be determined by a combination of the minimum faculty size needed to offer a particular programme, the numbers and kinds of programmes needed, and the student numbers taking them. The sequence in which programmes can be established and developed will be influenced by the finances provided.

(a) The Faculty Size

The suggestion in the Report that each centre should have a F.T.E. faculty of only 10 is unrealistic. If the faculty carry normal teaching loads of which outreach courses would account for a substantial part, the number of formal courses that 10 F.T.E. faculty could give annually at a centre is more likely to be of the order of 25 or 30 than the 40 suggested in the Report. This would mean an average of 6 or 7 courses in each semester of each of the two upper years. As the normal full course-load of a full-time student is 5, the students' choice of courses would be quite limited.

[Note: In this review the term "outreach course" means any course given away from an established campus, or otherwise outside the traditional classroom situation, whether independent or directed study, or modular, correspondence, or remote group instruction.]

Probably 20 F.T.E. faculty would be necessary to provide the two upper years of a General Arts (B.A.) or of a General Science (B.Sc.) degree programme with honours and majors and with reasonable educational variety

in course selection. Four to 6 additional F.T.E. faculty could be needed for each subject that is emphasized in the programme. To make academic sense, therefore, a centre may soon have to have about 40 faculty instead of the 10 suggested in the Report.

Whether to establish at the outset four small centres or one or two large ones is an example of the kind of major decision that S.F.U. must have the authority to make if it is to be responsible for establishing the University College and developing it into a University. There are others. For instance: whether or not to concentrate first on developing the back-up facilities at Burnaby and the Headquarters and one centre - presumably the Nelson one because it is there already; when, and indeed if, to set up a Headquarters at Vernon; whether to concentrate first on developing the programmes at the centres and then the outreach programmes, or vice versa; and whether to set up a University College centre for the Upper Fraser Valley east of Abbotsford or to serve that area direct from S.F.U. Burnaby.

(b) The Academic Programmes

The academic programmes of the University College could be of three kinds: the basic B.A. and B.Sc. programmes given at all the centres; a broad theme that would be distinctive to each centre; and programmes in disciplines that relate to the theme of a centre and that it is feasible to emphasize there.

One reason why programmes other than the basic ones should not be defined in advance is that the surveys and analyses that are sufficiently adequate to define the numbers and the present and future educational demands of students and of their potential employers in different areas of the Province apparently have not yet been made.

A unique opportunity exists to break with tradition, by giving the centres constructive themes that relate to human needs and that are interdisciplinary in relation to the conventional classification of subjects. Examples of such themes are resource management, people management, business management, health management, environmental analysis, and communication studies. A question to be examined is which theme would be best for which centre.

The Report points out that the needs and the procedures for teaching the disciplines that might be emphasized should be reviewed before decisions to set up programmes on them are made: in Education (16:3, 27:9), Commerce (26:3, 29:1), Forestry (26:4, 28:11), and Nursing (26:5, 28:12). The same stipulation should apply to a variety of other possible subjects, especially semi-or para-professional ones, that relate to themes of centres.

Serious practical obstacles to giving some programmes at the University College may appear. For example, a typical programme in

Education could require at least 20 specialists in aspects of the subject, and may thus be beyond the resources of a given centre. It may in fact be necessary to separate the responsibilities for offering B.Ed. completion work from P.D.P. or certification work. An adequate programme in Commerce would require 9 or 10 faculty; and it may be impossible to set up a 5-or 6-faculty accounting programme because academically-qualified accountants are virtually impossible to find.

(c) The Student Numbers

The population of the areas that would be served indicates that a rapid expansion of student enrollments at the University College to high levels is a possibility. A faculty of 10 F.T.E. could handle 150 to 170 F.T.E. students effectively, as the normal faculty-to-student ratio in Canada is 1 to 15 and the current S.F.U. ratio is 1 to 17 (1 to 12 is regarded as the optimum). It seems probable that a centre would soon have an F.T.E. student enrollment of several times 170.

A plan to meet that contingency must be agreed upon in advance: either to expand the faculty numbers and the facilities to fit increased enrollments, which would require commitments for appropriate funding; or to limit student enrollments to fit the available faculty numbers and facilities, which would require an acceptable basis for doing so.

3. That Simon Fraser University can maintain its Academic Standards

A suspicion, or fear, exists at S.F.U. that a tie-in with the University College could result in an actual or perceived lowering in S.F.U.'s academic quality. Convincing safeguards are necessary to remove this suspicion as a major obstacle to accepting the proposal.

The suspicion arises in part from statements in the Report: -

(a) Alleged role of S.F.U.

That Simon Fraser University should have a more limited teaching role than it has and intends to have is suggested by these gratuitous and misleadingly incorrect statements in the Report: "S.F.U. has little interest in further development of professional schools and has or should have ambitions for a somewhat restricted role in graduate work especially at the doctoral level" (10:7).

A possibility that the tie-in with the University College would be interpreted in any way by anybody as reinforcing that suggested role may alone be sufficient grounds in the eyes of some for S.F.U. to reject the proposal. Conditions that S.F.U. may wish to make, before it decides on the proposal, are that bodies such as the British Columbia Department of Education and the Universities Council of British Columbia should

concur with the S.F.U. Senate's rejection of the general role suggested by those statements in the Report, and that if S.F.U. accepts the programme it can be responsible for setting up any professional or graduate programmes needed at the University College.

(b) Possible status of the University College

Though the Report repeatedly refers to a University, the descriptions of the suggested size, scope, faculty activities, and costs could be interpreted as indicating what is really intended initially is what might be termed a Provincial College: something at a rather lower level than a University and perhaps resembling a small State College of the former California system.

A question that is of fundamental importance to the decision that S.F.U. is called upon to make is this: is it the intent of the Government to establish a new University, with all that is implied of that status, or a lower order of institution? In this review the assumption is that a University is intended.

(c) Faculty recruitment standards

As University College faculty would be S.F.U. faculty they would have to meet S.F.U. recruitment standards. To lower S.F.U. standards, even temporarily and for its University College Division only - for example, to accommodate any faculty of Notre Dame University who may not be fully academically qualified (11:8, 19:5, 27:10) - could be to the long-term detriment of S.F.U.'s academic reputation. One condition, if S.F.U. accepts the general proposal, must be that it will not be expected to lower its faculty recruitment and evaluation standards.

It has been suggested that the quality of University College faculty might not be high because good candidates would be deterred from applying by the small size, the poor research facilities, and the possible heavy teaching duties, or that, if they were appointed, good faculty would stay there only until they could find jobs at big universities. The consequence would be a lowering of average faculty standards at S.F.U.

These viewpoints may be discounted. It seems far more likely that the combination of the current large reserves of available qualified candidates (except in a very few subjects such as Accountancy), the attraction of that rarity nowadays, a prospective new University, and the challenge and opportunity of helping to develop it will attract faculty of high quality that may well enhance S.F.U. standards.

(d) Student admission and evaluation standards

The Report suggests that, in relation to an expected backlog of students seeking admission, the University College must be extremely flexible in giving credit for courses taken elsewhere and that special concessions to such students may be necessary (11:3).

As University College students would be S.F.U. students they would have to meet S.F.U. admission standards. As with faculty recruitments, to lower those standards, even temporarily and for its University College Division only, could be unfair to S.F.U. Burnaby students and might in the long-term be detrimental of S.F.U.'s academic standards and reputation. Moreover, it would not be in accord with the statements in the Report on the need to maintain traditional university standards of academic excellence (7:4). One condition that S.F.U. must make is that if it accepts the proposal it will not be expected to lower its already flexible student admission standards. It may not be feasible, for example, for S.F.U. to assure prospective students that all community college courses will be acceptable (21:6, 22:1) until S.F.U. is satisfied that they are of the requisite standards.

The comment in the Report on the need to maintain traditional university standards of academic excellence at the University College (7:4) is reinforced by the statements on the need for programmes to be of a high standard and recognized by other universities, and that the graduate should have no feeling of being second-class in any respect (7:8). Nevertheless some fear exists that because of limited facilities at University College centres academic standards there would be lower than at S.F.U. Burnaby and that this could be to the detriment of S.F.U. standards. This may be discounted for most subjects: student and faculty motivation and energy can more than counteract any effects of poor facilities.

It seems that to attempt to ensure that uniform standards will exist throughout a multi-campus university can be a time-consuming task (see Appendix 1) that may well be a major obstacle to implementing the multi-campus idea. A system in which faculty from S.F.U. Burnaby would be involved in evaluating courses given at the University College could assist in maintaining satisfactory standards there. Quality control of Independent Study or Directed Study outreach courses would be especially important. Simon Fraser University must avoid becoming involved in a proliferation of second-rate colleges, programmes, or courses by doing what it can to ensure that none of them is second-rate.

4. That Simon Fraser University can treat its faculty uniformly

The faculty of the University College would be faculty of S.F.U. (14:1, 15:4) As such neither their working conditions nor the criteria used in evaluating them for contract renewal, salary levels and increases, promotion, tenure, or dismissal should differ from those of the faculty

of S.F.U. Burnaby to extents that are inequitable to either group. There are suggestions in the Report that if accepted could result in inequities.

One implication is that the teaching and related duties of University College faculty (16:1, 16:4, 17:1 and 2) would be heavier than the four courses or course equivalents normally required annually of faculty at the coast universities. Such duties of the University College faculty should be at or close to the norm, to reduce both direct inequities and inequalities in the time available for University College faculty to do the research that contributes to their academic advancement.

A reason suggested in the Report for their heavier teaching and related workloads is that University College faculty would have difficulties in doing research (17:2) and thus presumably would have time available for increased other duties. This argument for heavier non-research duties is not valid. While research that requires major or complex equipment may not be possible at a University College centre for some years, other kinds of research, especially kinds based in the field, are feasible there. Moreover, University College faculty must have adequate time for research to maintain their credibility and employability as scholars. Indeed it would add to the scholarly credibility if each centre had several senior, established scholars on its faculty from the start.

As the argument for less research time is not valid, another suggestion based on it is not valid: that University College faculty should have more frequent study leaves than is usual (14:2). This would give them an advantage over faculty at the coast universities that could be considered unfair.

The Report points out that the certification of the Notre Dame University Faculty Association could cause problems in integrating the Nelson Centre - that is, what is now N.D.U. - into the University College (20:5) and thus into S.F.U. Presumably S.F.U. would require this matter to be resolved by the Government before it could accept the proposal or, alternatively, may suggest a modification of the proposal that would exclude N.D.U.

University College faculty must be treated as S.F.U. faculty, even if to do so is not in accord with suggestions in the Report, unless S.F.U. decides on this alternative: to have two kinds of faculty in terms of duties, and therefore of criteria for evaluation. One would be the professors who would do both research and teaching and provide committee and similar administrative services to the university. The other, the lecturers, would not be expected to do much research and instead would carry heavier teaching and related work loads than the professors.

That suggestion has its advocates. But before S.F.U. accepts it, the implications must be weighed very carefully. For instance, the effects on the academic stature of an institution that has many "lecturers" and on the stature of institutions associated with it, the influence on prospective applicants for faculty posts, and the likelihood that "lecturers" will come to be regarded as a lower category than "professors" and one to which scholarly unproductive professors may be demoted.

5. That continuing funding will be assured

Adequate and continuing funding must be assured if the intent is to set up a university system that will meet the needs of the people of the non-metropolitan areas truly and not merely nominally.

If S.F.U. takes responsibility for the expenditures (15:2) it presumably will use as a guideline this statement in the Report: "No programme should be mounted without a sufficient commitment of financial support" (8:1).

The rough cost estimates in the Report (17:2 to 19:1) are widely regarded as unrealistically low. Some examples illustrate this:

- The library activities estimated at \$5 million would actually cost at least \$9 million;
- The estimated \$0.35 million annually for off-campus instruction may be contrasted with the \$2.5 million spent annually by the University of Waterloo for about 150 audio-taped courses for about 2,500 students;
- Costs of upper level undergraduate laboratory courses in Science can be high: a 4-faculty programme in chemistry would cost nearly \$0.6 million to start up and \$0.32 million annually to operate;
- The estimated salary costs of \$3.3 million for faculty of four 10-faculty centres in year five could be the costs for one 50-faculty centre in year two or three;
- The Report does not estimate possible costs of future expansion, though it is conceivable that these could resemble those of S.F.U. over the past ten years, though the cost per F.T.E. student could be higher because of the added costs of outreach programmes and of staggered course times. It may be noted that the S.F.U. Kelowna programmes in BioSciences and in Psychology have cost about \$16,000 per F.T.E. student in the first year, about \$8,000 in the second.

More realistic capital and operating costs cannot be estimated until, first, decisions have been made on priorities in setting up the Headquarters and the centres and on the sizes of each, on the kinds and

scope of academic programmes, and on the nature of the delivery systems for outreach programmes and courses, and, second, plans that can be costed have been devised for each. It may be noted that capital costs may be higher than imagined because of the possible need to construct facilities at some locations to house faculty, staff, and students.

While S.F.U. has the authority for expenditures it must be empowered, if funds are inadequate to do everything that is desirable, to determine priorities: to select what and what not to do and when and how, as described elsewhere in this review. Nevertheless certain basic conditions must be agreed upon in that S.F.U. must be satisfied, with whatever safeguards are feasible, that: funding for the University College will be in addition to and not directly at the expense of funding for existing universities; financial support must continue despite any changes in the Government of British Columbia; adequate funding will be provided during the establishment and developmental phases when the costs of faculty and facilities may be very high in relation to size of student enrollments; and expansion financing should be provided as needed.

It is important that S.F.U. must not suffer long-term diminished administrative services or depleted resources as consequences of its involvement with the University College. For example, the S.F.U. Library must not divide its services between the two but must be adequately financed to expand its services to cover both. Similarly, S.F.U. Continuing Studies should have an independent and reasonably protected budget to enable it to maintain its Lower Mainland operation in competition for resources with the University College.

The Report recommends that the University College be funded separately from S.F.U. Burnaby (12:5, 13:5, 27:2). Advantages of this would be that it would give the University College some sort of separate identity from the start that would be a precursor to its eventual separation; and that it would tend to protect S.F.U. Burnaby from being a scapegoat for failures actually caused by inadequate Government funding for the University College.

B. CONSEQUENCES

Simon Fraser University accepts a major responsibility if it accepts the proposal. It commits itself to doing all that it reasonably can to develop the University College and to foster its evolution into the new University, or Universities, despite the consequent extra time, trouble, and headaches, the possible spreading of services thinly, and the inevitable criticisms for what goes wrong or is not apparently done right.

The commitment means that officials in all segments of S.F.U. Burnaby that operate at the University level or that serve the University as a whole must become involved whether they like it or not. Their areas of responsibility will extend beyond Burnaby to encompass the University College.

There is a feeling at S.F.U. that individual faculty members however, should have a choice: they may become directly involved if they want to do so; but they should be free to have nothing to do with the arrangement if that is what they wish.

It does not follow that departments or faculty members who are willing to become involved directly can do so: the University College will have the final decision.

The committee, administrative, and other interactions between the two campuses may be so complex that, to resolve immediate problems, each campus may have to locate a senior "Ambassador" with powers of decision on the other campus.

1. To the governing bodies and academic committees

As the University College would be part of S.F.U. its financial and academic plans would be subject to approval by the same governing and other committees that deal with S.F.U. Burnaby. Because of this, University College personnel must have adequate opportunities to be represented on those committees. Changes in committee compositions would be a consequence.

(a) The Board of Governors

The Report recommends that three or four persons from the non-metropolitan areas be appointed to the S.F.U. Board of Governors (15:2, 27:6), though the proposed Advisory Council for the University College (15:3, 27:7) makes the need for this questionable. Presumably these Board members would replace existing appointees. If not, difficulties could arise: an imbalance would be created between the numbers of appointed members and the numbers of elected and ex-officio

members and to rectify it would require changes in the Universities Act.

University College personnel must have opportunities equal to S.F.U. Burnaby personnel to be elected as faculty, student, and staff members of the Board. However, logistics may dictate that they could attend only a few meetings, so that University College matters may have to be limited to those meetings.

(b) The Senate and its Committees

University College officials must be classified as S.F.U. officials before University College faculty can fit the procedures for election to Senate and for evaluation for renewal, promotion, salary increase, tenure or dismissal. Presumably the University College would be the equivalent of a Faculty of S.F.U. Burnaby, at least initially. Faculty members and students of the University College would be also eligible for election to Senate by, respectively, Joint Faculty and the Student Association. These changes in the composition of the Senate apparently can be accomplished without the necessity of changing the Universities Act.

University College faculty and students should have the opportunity to be represented appropriately on Senate committees or boards, especially those such as Academic Planning (S.C.A.P.), Undergraduate Studies (S.C.U.S.), Continuing Studies (S.C.C.S.), Undergraduate Admissions (S.U.A.B.), and Appeal Board (S.A.B.) that could become heavily occupied with University College affairs. Indeed, the extra work-loads may be so large that some of these committees may have to set up sub-committees to deal specifically with University College matters. However, University College faculty and students will inevitably be partially disenfranchised by logistics.

(c) Other Committees

If University College has the status of a Faculty of S.F.U. it must be appropriately represented on University committees that affect it, such as the Tenure Committee (U.T.C.), Appointments Committee (U.A.C.), and search committees for senior administrators.

Presumably S.F.U. Burnaby faculty would be represented on University College Faculty-level committees, such as search committees for Chairmen of centres; and it seems possible that S.F.U. Burnaby faculty and staff will participate in University College search and appointment committees for faculty and staff.

The chief consequences to S.F.U. Burnaby would be to involve, for at least the lifetime of the College, the members of the various committees in more work, trouble, and committee time than hitherto.

2. To the academic departments and administrators

The consequences to the academic departments would be chiefly to the teaching programmes. Some experienced faculty may move from Burnaby to the University College, especially if the need for some senior scholars there is recognized. More probably, willing faculty may be seconded temporarily to the University College, as they are now to Kelowna from the S.F.U. BioScience and Psychology departments, especially during the developmental phases.

A distinct possibility exists that faculty of S.F.U. Burnaby could be primarily responsible for setting up the outreach programmes and courses because University College faculty may not have the time and the experience and the facilities to do so at the beginning. This could reduce course availability at Burnaby.

A department may have to make special teaching programme arrangements or other concessions both to compensate seconded faculty for the interruptions in their scholarly careers and to integrate its course programme with theirs. And it could be involved in advising the University College on such matters as course and programme planning, faculty recruiting, student evaluations, laboratory building plans.

If S.F.U. accepts the proposal it becomes University policy to implement it, and departments are likely to be encouraged to participate at least as much as they are now encouraged to give Continuing Studies courses. The extent to which any one department may become directly involved will range from extensively to not at all. A department whose subject is not taught at the University College may not get involved, even if it wants to. But it is difficult to see how some departments could avoid becoming involved in the University College: in Faculties such as Arts, Interdisciplinary Studies, and Education, and especially departments whose subjects may be emphasized there. Not only could they not avoid participation, they would find it difficult not to accept direct responsibilities for ensuring that the University College programmes in their subjects are developed properly. A possibly contentious question that could face S.F.U. is what to do about academic departments that may refuse to become involved. The best answer: nothing.

3. To the off-campus programmes

Two segments of S.F.U. Burnaby currently give off-campus programmes in the Interior: -

(a) Continuing Studies Division

The Report stresses that a major responsibility of the University College will be to develop and give extension degree credit programmes

of Directed Studies to students out of reach of direct contact with University centres or formal classroom courses (7:1, 8:3 & 4, 11:8, 12:5, 13:4, 16:1 & 4, 17:1, 2 & 6, 18:1, 25:1 & 4).

As the Continuing Studies activities of S.F.U. are currently concentrated in the Lower Mainland, the immediate impact of the University College may not be great. The two activities in the Interior - the new and still small correspondence programme and the operation at Kelowna that now involves the equivalent of 4.5 faculty - presumably either would be replaced by University College activities or the University College would contract with S.F.U. to continue them.

However, a fear exists that the real possibility that the existence of the University College with its outreach programmes could direct a substantial part of Continuing Studies resources and faculty interest to the Interior from Lower Mainland programmes to the detriment of the latter.

(b) Faculty of Education

The Report recommends that the University College have special responsibilities for co-ordinating Continuing Education and outreach programmes.

The S.F.U. Professional Development Programme could be affected. Two of its three semesters are given by S.F.U. at Penticton, Kelowna, Vernon, Kamloops, Salmon Arm, Prince George, and Chilliwack; one specialization of the third semester otherwise given at S.F.U. is given at Kamloops. If those programmes were taken over by the University College the consequences would be severely damaging to the faculty without introducing significant advantages. One of the current strengths of the P.D.P. programme is the on-campus academic expertise that supports them and which, as indicated earlier in this review, would be virtually impossible to set up at the University College. The S.F.U. Faculty of Education feels strongly that it, not the University College, should continue to direct the P.D.P. programmes in the Interior. Degree completion work on the B.Ed. is a different matter, and theoretically might be supplied in the Interior if the University College could import the substantial resources necessary during the summers.

A recommendation in the Report could influence the nature of future off-campus activities of the S.F.U. Faculty of Education: that the universities and the Department of Education establish a Study Committee to review certification requirements and existing programmes (16:3, 27:9).

4. To the administrative services

The Registrar's Office and the Administrative Services divisions

of S.F.U. would all be involved. How they would be involved can be identified. How much each will be involved and for how long cannot until the magnitude of the operation has been identified and until a decision is made on when, or if, to set up a Headquarters at Vernon. In relation to needs of the University College, S.F.U. Burnaby administrators would (a) train, (b) advise, and (c) provide services.

(a) Training

Senior administrators of S.F.U. Burnaby would train newly-appointed University College administrators in procedures. Presumably this would be done chiefly at Burnaby, though partly the Interior Headquarters. It presumably would be concentrated in the first year or two. The offices of the Bursar and Registrar and of Physical Plant would be involved first, Personnel, and University Services soon thereafter. The consequent reduction in services to S.F.U. Burnaby would be temporary, and probably not noticable if additional staff are provided from University College funds as they should be.

(b) Advice

Simon Fraser University administrators, and specialists in computer, audio-visual, and other procedures, are likely to be required to advise the University College. The extent and scope of this cannot be suggested at this time, except that it certainly will not be merely nominal, it could be extensive, and it may be continuing.

(c) Continuing Service

As University College students, faculty, and staff would be S.F.U. students, faculty, and staff, all administrative departments of S.F.U. that are concerned with regulations and records related to people and standards would be responsible for the University College, at least during its existence as such. Additional staff probably would be needed at Burnaby. The extent to which this may continue after the new University is established can only be surmised. It seems possible, for example, that S.F.U. may be required to continue to supply computer, audio-visual, laboratory, special workshop, and science stores, as well as library, services but perhaps not to continue to handle functions of the Registrar or the Bursar.

5. To the Library

If the proposal is accepted, library facilities at and for the University College would be developed and sustained primarily by the S.F.U. Library. Consequences to S.F.U. Burnaby might be decreased effectiveness in some ways but certainly increased efficiency in others.

If the responsibilities of the various agencies involved are not defined clearly in advance or if continuing funding is not adequate, or both, the Library services could become so degraded and so overtaxed that they would deteriorate in relation to needs of all users; and the Library resources of S.F.U. Burnaby might be depleted through cannibalization to meet University College needs.

However, these possible disadvantages could be offset by the introduction of efficient new procedures. Existing cataloguing and circulation systems, designed for needs of the Burnaby campus only and becoming increasingly inadequate with age and with increasing usage, could not also handle the requirements of the University College. New catalogue support and circulation control systems, such as UTLAS-CIRCS, based on latest communications and computer techniques, are necessary if S.F.U. is to provide adequate service to the Burnaby campus and essential if resource sharing is to become a reality. In addition the University budgetary and fiscal procedures must be upgraded and the Library research collections expanded. All these improvements would be of continuing benefit to S.F.U. Burnaby as they would raise the efficiency and effectiveness of the Library services permanently to higher levels than hitherto.

C. ADVANTAGES TO SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY

The University College would benefit from the arrangement much more than S.F.U. Burnaby. It could develop much better academic courses and programmes much sooner with S.F.U.'s assistance than alone.

The chief advantages to S.F.U. would be intangible ones:

- Simon Fraser University would demonstrate a positive and outward-looking attitude in meeting its duty and responsibility to do what it can to participate constructively in the development and improvement of higher education in British Columbia and would avoid becoming introspective and perhaps impoverished.

- It would avoid criticism and blame for not meeting the challenge.

- It would facilitate continuing cooperation of a kind not hitherto conspicuous in this Province between different universities for their mutual benefit.

- Faculty standards might go up because of the high quality of academics currently available for recruitment to University College posts.

- Simon Fraser University departments could expand the scope of expertise in disciplines that would be represented on the faculty of both the University College and S.F.U. Burnaby.

- Simon Fraser University could become a recognized centre of expertise in planning and organizing small innovative campuses and in techniques for delivering education to remote locations.

More tangible advantages would be in the higher levels of effectiveness of some existing services such as library, computing, and accounting. While improvements in them may not be possible with S.F.U. Burnaby resources alone, they could be possible with University College resources and would be to the long-term benefit of both.

D. CONCLUSIONS

The Report recommends that S.F.U. accept or reject the proposal before the end of December, 1976 (13:3, 27:8). Simon Fraser University has three alternatives: -

(a) To accept the proposal unconditionally. Indications received while this review was being prepared are that this would meet with widespread opposition from a majority of the faculty of S.F.U.

(b) To reject the proposal. A clearly valid reason would be essential, as merely to excuse or to rationalize selfishly could be academically indefensible and politically unwise.

(c) To accept the proposal conditionally. That is, to agree to accept it if reasonable and justifiable specified conditions are met, with the implication that S.F.U. could not accept the proposal if they are not met despite a moral responsibility to students and potential students.

If the third (c) is considered to be the best of the three alternatives, then the immediate task facing S.F.U. is to define ~~what~~ *what* ~~which~~ of the conditions, such as those described above in their original or modified form and/or different conditions, it regards as both reasonable and justifiable and then negotiate agreement on them.

If S.F.U. decides to accept this proposal in principle it may wish to state simply something that may be summarized like this:

Simon Fraser University will be prepared to take responsibility for attempting to meet needs for University education for non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia within the limits of the funds available and provided that conditions are met that give S.F.U. the authority to decide, in consultation with appropriate agencies, which needs to meet and in what sequence, and where, to what extent, and how.

Then, if this is agreed, S.F.U. may take one (or in sequence two or more) of the following routes after detailed evaluations of various possibilities including comparisons of advantages of the single-campus versus multi-campus systems: -

(i) S.F.U. remains a multi-campus University indefinitely.

(ii) S.F.U. remains a multi-campus University after budding off a new multi-campus University.

(iii) S.F.U. reverts to its single-campus form after budding off a new multi-campus University (which appears to be the intent of the Winegard recommendations).

(iv) S.F.U. reverts to its single-campus form after budding off several new single-campus Universities (which reduces to a minimum disadvantages of multi-campus systems).

A compromise that S.F.U. may wish to consider is a modification of (iv) that could shorten, reduce, or avoid many of the problems discussed in this review.

It is that the new Institution would start as a University College or Division of S.F.U. but would become a new single-campus University as soon as its officers have sufficient training and experience to run a University but irrespective of the numbers of faculty and students there at the time; and the new University would then negotiate with S.F.U. to obtain the academic and administrative assistance and the special and administrative services that it needs and that it would have had if it had remained as a University College until it ~~remained~~^{became} University size in terms of faculty and student numbers.

Additional new single-campus Universities could be set up in the same fashion as needs dictate and finances permit.

This compromise would give autonomy early to regional Institutions without reducing the availability of expert assistance and cooperation from S.F.U. It would reduce problems of a multi-campus system. It would permit S.F.U. to avoid becoming involved where it is unable or unwilling to do so. It would facilitate the new Universities to involve Universities additional to S.F.U. in their activities and development. In general, it would increase flexibility in situations where the ability to react to changing circumstances is essential.

APPENDIX 1: Some Problems of a multi-campus University

The following are extracts from a letter of 20 October, 1976 from the Dean of Science of the multi-campus University of the West Indies:

"I hardly know how to answer your query except perhaps to say don't do it! I am not entirely sure what advantage is to be gained in the B.C. context by having a multi-campus organization rather than separate Universities, but presumably that has already been worked out. If there must be a multi-campus organization then the most important thing is to avoid having too tight central control from one campus and to keep cross campus administration to a minimum. It is in the very nature of academics that they want to go their own way and develop programmes which they believe are best for their situation; what is good for one campus is not necessarily good for another. This is well demonstrated in Biology in our own University. The type of course, and the emphasis placed in different parts of the course, that is suited to the Jamaican context is not suited to the Trinidadian context but our regulations say we must run common courses and have common examinations. After a few stormy meetings in the early days we now compromise and spend a lot of time finding ways of circumnavigating the Council's regulation.

"We are stuck with a situation in which many subjects are taught on all three campuses and the paper work and travel needed to co-ordinate teaching and examining is ludicrous. I suggest therefore that if you are developing a multi-campus University that each campus needs to have its own speciality and don't duplicate teaching on different campuses if it can be avoided. If individual Faculties (i.e. Science) are to be duplicated in different campuses then try to give the academics as much freedom to develop their own courses how they like. This may be easier in the Canadian system than it is in ours.

"Central control of administration also creates trouble. Mona is our centre and the other campuses always believe we are 'stealing' the largest slice of the cake and keeping the others in a state of subservience. Too tight centralisation also creates unnecessary paper work and travel. I travelled six times to Trinidad last academic year solely for the purposes of co-ordination and I could have spent my time in more profitable occupations."

APPENDIX 2: Sources of additional information (all
at S.F.U. unless otherwise indicated)

Dr. J. Blaney, Dean of Continuing Studies.

British Columbia Students' Federation, per Mr. Ross Powell,
Executive Member.

Dr. R. Brown, Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Dr. T. W. Calvert, Department of Kinesiology; member of
Advisory Committee.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Arts, collectively.

Chairmen equivalents of the Faculty of Education, collectively.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, collectively.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Science, collectively.

Dr. J. Chase, Director of Analytical Studies.

Dr. F. Cunningham, Department of Geography.

Department of Chemistry, per Dr. E. Wells, Chairman.

Department of Economics and Commerce, per Dr. B. Schoner, Chairman.

Department of Geography, per Dr. M. Roberts, Chairman.

Department of Psychology, per Dr. D. Krebs, Chairman.

Dr. L. M. Dill, Department of Biological Sciences.

Dr. M. E. Eliot-Hurst, Department of Geography.

Mr. H. Ellis, Registrar.

Dr. J. Ellis, Dean, Faculty of Education; member of
Advisory Committee.

Faculty Association, Notre Dame University, per Dr. V.J. Salvo.

Faculty Association, Simon Fraser University, per Dr. J. Farquhar.

Dr. L. Funt, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. R. Gehlback, Faculty of Education.

Dr. I. Goodbody, Dean of Science, University of the West Indies.

Dr. R. Harrop, Department of Mathematics.

Dr. G. C. Hoyt, Department of Economics and Commerce.

Dr. C. Jones, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. Jean E. Koepke, Department of Psychology, S.F.U.
Kelowna Programme.

Ms. Donna Laws, Administrative Assistant, President's Office.

Dr. S. K. Lower, Department of Chemistry.

Mr. M. McClaren, Faculty of Education.

Dr. J. M. Munro, Acting Dean, Faculty of Arts.

Dr. K. Okuda, Department of Economics and Commerce; member of
Advisory Committee.

Dr. S. Roberts, Vice-President, University Services.

Mr. D. Ross, Bursar.

Dr. R.M.S. Sadleir, Department of Biological Sciences.

Ms. Linda Severy, student; member of Advisory Committee.

Dr. M. Smith, Department of Biological Sciences.

Mr. G. Stuart, Vice-President, Administration.

Ms. Sharon Thomas, University Library; member of Advisory Committee.

The University Library, per Mr. T. Dobbs, Acting University Librarian,
and Ms. Sharon Thomas, Acquisitions Librarian.

Dr. N. Verbeek, Department of Biological Sciences, S.F.U.
Kelowna Programme.

Dr. J. Walkley, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. J. Webster, Dean of Science.

Dr. B. Wilson, Vice-President, Academic; member of
Advisory Committee.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To.....	All Members of Faculty	From.....	Pauline Jewett
			President
Subject.....	Review of the Winegard Report	Date.....	November 12, 1976

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of
Dr. Bryan P. Beirne's review of aspects of the Winegard Report.

Dr. Beirne's review is currently being considered by
the Senate Committee on Academic Planning.

Enclosure

PJ/
per DL.



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY, B.C. CANADA V5A 1S6
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES 291-4475

November 5, 1976.

Dr. P. Jewett
Chairman
Academic Planning Committee

Dear Dr. Jewett:

I enclose herewith a copy of the review of those recommendations of the Report on University Programs in Non-Metropolitan Areas that have implications for the present and continuing academic and administrative operation of this University, as requested by the Academic Planning Committee.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading 'Bryan P. Beirne', is written over a horizontal line.

Bryan P. Beirne
Reviewer



•

•

•

•

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
A. CONDITIONS	
1. That the status of the new Institution be defined clearly	3
2. That Simon Fraser University will not be required to make advance commitments on University College programmes	4
3. That Simon Fraser University can maintain its academic standards	6
4. That Simon Fraser University can treat its faculty uniformly	8
5. That continuing funding will be assured	10
B. CONSEQUENCES	
1. To the governing bodies and academic committees	12
2. To the academic departments and administrators	14
3. To the off-campus programmes	14
4. To the administrative services	15
5. To the Library	16
C. ADVANTAGES TO SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY	18
D. CONCLUSIONS	19
APPENDIX 1: Some problems of a multi-campus University	21
APPENDIX 2: List of individuals who provided information ...	22

INTRODUCTION

The charge is "to review those recommendations of the Winegard Commission Report which have implications for the present and continuing operation, academic and administrative, of Simon Fraser University." The reason is to provide information to assist Simon Fraser University in deciding whether or not to accept the proposal "that the new university begin as a separately-funded Division of S.F.U.."

A problem in preparing a review of this kind is that conditions and consequences that should be based on specified plans have to be based on assumptions because the plans do not yet exist.

The following, summarized from recommendations and suggestions in the Report, is taken as the basis for the review: [Note: numbers in parenthesis refer to page and paragraph numbers in the Report].

- That a new multi-campus university be established to serve non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia (12:4, 27:1, 13:3);
- That its academic status and standards will be high (7:4, 7:8) and it will be active in research and scholarship (14:2) as well as in teaching;
- That one of its primary functions will be to prepare and deliver courses and programmes for students who are out of reach of university campuses (7:6, 11:10, 14:1, 16:4, 24:4 to 25:4);
- That it will offer upper-level degree-completion programmes in Arts, Science, and Education (13:2, 3), and eventually additional, more specialized, programmes that may be in part professional (13:5, 26:3) and require courses at all levels including graduate (9:5); and
- That it would start as a University College of S.F.U. (12:5, 27:2, 27:8) if S.F.U. will accept the responsibility.

Suggested alternatives to these basic recommendations, such as a new university from the start, the Open University system, or the system recently proposed for Alberta, and their relative merits are not discussed here because to do so would be outside the scope of this review as charged. For the same reason, no specific recommendations are made in this review.

A basic assumption is that S.F.U. will consider the proposal and its implications in the light of the moral responsibility of the university to do all that it reasonably can to make quality education available to all in British Columbia who want it. What S.F.U. would do in practice could be influenced by two sets of controlling factors: -

Conditions, which are stipulations that S.F.U. may wish to make to try to eliminate, reduce, or manage causes of potentially serious

harm to its standards, reputation, or operation that could operate if the proposal is accepted unconditionally and whose continuing existence thus could be reasons to reject the proposal; and

Consequences, which are unavoidable effects on the operations of S.F.U. if the proposal is accepted and implemented after the conditions have been met.

Finally, the courses of action open to S.F.U. are summarized briefly.

A. CONDITIONS

Simon Fraser University may wish to negotiate with the British Columbia Department of Education and the Universities Council of British Columbia agreement on some or all of the following as conditions for accepting the proposal. The purpose of the agreement would be to remove or reduce causes of potentially avoidable consequences that could be harmful to the interests of S.F.U.

A broad summary of the conditions is: to make the proposal viable and acceptable, S.F.U. must have reasonably full responsibility and authority for planning and setting up the University College and developing it into a new University as appropriate.

1. That the Status of the new Institution be defined clearly

The Report recommends that a new University to be established by 1990 (12:4, 27:1) should begin as a new Division or University College of Simon Fraser University (12:5, 27:2) and should be given a considerable degree of autonomy (14:3). That is, S.F.U., now a single-campus university, would become a multi-campus one that eventually would divide into two or more universities.

The new University College/University should have a distinctive name from the start, to serve as a constant reminder to all concerned that the ultimate objective is the development and establishment of a new University.

Simon Fraser University must guide and monitor the development of the University College and of its constituent parts and alter their status when it appears appropriate and feasible to do so; for example, to terminate a centre or programme that is clearly not viable, and to change the College into a University when it reaches the size - a head-count of about 5,000 students - when it can operate at a viable economic level. It therefore must have the authority to make the appropriate arrangements and recommendations.

The responsibility for expenditures of University College funds would rest with the S.F.U. Board of Governors (15:2), for approval of its academic programme with the Simon Fraser University Senate (14:3), and for general procedures, notably including those aimed at maintaining academic standards, with the administrators of the S.F.U. regulations (14:3). Such responsibilities could be accepted by S.F.U. only if accompanied by the relevant authority. As the University College would be part of S.F.U., it is difficult to see how it could have much more autonomy than as a Faculty or a Division of S.F.U.

The positions of the University College administrators in the Simon Fraser University hierarchy must be defined. Presumably the Principal would be a Vice-President, the Associate Principal at College Headquarters a Dean, and each Associate Principal in charge of a centre a (Departmental) Chairman.

The area of responsibility and authority of the proposed Advisory Council for the University College (15:3, 27:7) in relation to S.F.U. must be defined clearly, to remove in advance some sources of possible conflict. Indeed, the need for the Advisory Council at the beginning can be questioned. Perhaps what is really needed is two Advisory Councils, a shadow Board of Governors and a shadow Senate, to be established when the University College is close to becoming a new University. In this event those bodies should be constituted in accepted ways and include students and faculty.

2. That Simon Fraser University will not be required to make advance commitments on University College programmes

As the Report states, "it will be essential that some time be taken to plan the academic programmes ... before each centre begins operating" (24:1). Until this is done S.F.U. cannot and should not commit itself to any particular programme, and S.F.U. could not make plans before December 1976. The scope and size of the programmes will be determined by a combination of the minimum faculty size needed to offer a particular programme, the numbers and kinds of programmes needed, and the student numbers taking them. The sequence in which programmes can be established and developed will be influenced by the finances provided.

(a) The Faculty Size

The suggestion in the Report that each centre should have a F.T.E. faculty of only 10 is unrealistic. If the faculty carry normal teaching loads of which outreach courses would account for a substantial part, the number of formal courses that 10 F.T.E. faculty could give annually at a centre is more likely to be of the order of 25 or 30 than the 40 suggested in the Report. This would mean an average of 6 or 7 courses in each semester of each of the two upper years. As the normal full course-load of a full-time student is 5, the students' choice of courses would be quite limited.

[Note: In this review the term "outreach course" means any course given away from an established campus, or otherwise outside the traditional classroom situation, whether independent or directed study, or modular, correspondence, or remote group instruction.]

Probably 20 F.T.E. faculty would be necessary to provide the two upper years of a General Arts (B.A.) or of a General Science (B.Sc.) degree programme with honours and majors and with reasonable educational variety

in course selection. Four to 6 additional F.T.E. faculty could be needed for each subject that is emphasized in the programme. To make academic sense, therefore, a centre may soon have to have about 40 faculty instead of the 10 suggested in the Report.

Whether to establish at the outset four small centres or one or two large ones is an example of the kind of major decision that S.F.U. must have the authority to make if it is to be responsible for establishing the University College and developing it into a University. There are others. For instance: whether or not to concentrate first on developing the back-up facilities at Burnaby and the Headquarters and one centre - presumably the Nelson one because it is there already; when, and indeed if, to set up a Headquarters at Vernon; whether to concentrate first on developing the programmes at the centres and then the outreach programmes, or vice versa; and whether to set up a University College centre for the Upper Fraser Valley east of Abbotsford or to serve that area direct from S.F.U. Burnaby.

(b) The Academic Programmes

The academic programmes of the University College could be of three kinds: the basic B.A. and B.Sc. programmes given at all the centres; a broad theme that would be distinctive to each centre; and programmes in disciplines that relate to the theme of a centre and that it is feasible to emphasize there.

One reason why programmes other than the basic ones should not be defined in advance is that the surveys and analyses that are sufficiently adequate to define the numbers and the present and future educational demands of students and of their potential employers in different areas of the Province apparently have not yet been made.

A unique opportunity exists to break with tradition, by giving the centres constructive themes that relate to human needs and that are interdisciplinary in relation to the conventional classification of subjects. Examples of such themes are resource management, people management, business management, health management, environmental analysis, and communication studies. A question to be examined is which theme would be best for which centre.

The Report points out that the needs and the procedures for teaching the disciplines that might be emphasized should be reviewed before decisions to set up programmes on them are made: in Education (16:3, 27:9), Commerce (26:3, 29:1), Forestry (26:4, 28:11), and Nursing (26:5, 28:12). The same stipulation should apply to a variety of other possible subjects, especially semi-or para-professional ones, that relate to themes of centres.

Serious practical obstacles to giving some programmes at the University College may appear. For example, a typical programme in

Education could require at least 20 specialists in aspects of the subject, and may thus be beyond the resources of a given centre. It may in fact be necessary to separate the responsibilities for offering B.Ed. completion work from P.D.P. or certification work. An adequate programme in Commerce would require 9 or 10 faculty; and it may be impossible to set up a 5-or 6-faculty accounting programme because academically-qualified accountants are virtually impossible to find.

(c) The Student Numbers

The population of the areas that would be served indicates that a rapid expansion of student enrollments at the University College to high levels is a possibility. A faculty of 10 F.T.E. could handle 150 to 170 F.T.E. students effectively, as the normal faculty-to-student ratio in Canada is 1 to 15 and the current S.F.U. ratio is 1 to 17 (1 to 12 is regarded as the optimum). It seems probable that a centre would soon have an F.T.E. student enrollment of several times 170.

A plan to meet that contingency must be agreed upon in advance: either to expand the faculty numbers and the facilities to fit increased enrollments, which would require commitments for appropriate funding; or to limit student enrollments to fit the available faculty numbers and facilities, which would require an acceptable basis for doing so.

3. That Simon Fraser University can maintain its Academic Standards

A suspicion, or fear, exists at S.F.U. that a tie-in with the University College could result in an actual or perceived lowering in S.F.U.'s academic quality. Convincing safeguards are necessary to remove this suspicion as a major obstacle to accepting the proposal.

The suspicion arises in part from statements in the Report: -

(a) Alleged role of S.F.U.

That Simon Fraser University should have a more limited teaching role than it has and intends to have is suggested by these gratuitous and misleadingly incorrect statements in the Report: "S.F.U. has little interest in further development of professional schools and has or should have ambitions for a somewhat restricted role in graduate work especially at the doctoral level" (10:7).

A possibility that the tie-in with the University College would be interpreted in any way by anybody as reinforcing that suggested role may alone be sufficient grounds in the eyes of some for S.F.U. to reject the proposal. Conditions that S.F.U. may wish to make, before it decides on the proposal, are that bodies such as the British Columbia Department of Education and the Universities Council of British Columbia should

concur with the S.F.U. Senate's rejection of the general role suggested by those statements in the Report, and that if S.F.U. accepts the programme it can be responsible for setting up any professional or graduate programmes needed at the University College.

(b) Possible status of the University College

Though the Report repeatedly refers to a University, the descriptions of the suggested size, scope, faculty activities, and costs could be interpreted as indicating what is really intended initially is what might be termed a Provincial College: something at a rather lower level than a University and perhaps resembling a small State College of the former California system.

A question that is of fundamental importance to the decision that S.F.U. is called upon to make is this: is it the intent of the Government to establish a new University, with all that is implied of that status, or a lower order of institution? In this review the assumption is that a University is intended.

(c) Faculty recruitment standards

As University College faculty would be S.F.U. faculty they would have to meet S.F.U. recruitment standards. To lower S.F.U. standards, even temporarily and for its University College Division only - for example, to accommodate any faculty of Notre Dame University who may not be fully academically qualified (11:8, 19:5, 27:10) - could be to the long-term detriment of S.F.U.'s academic reputation. One condition, if S.F.U. accepts the general proposal, must be that it will not be expected to lower its faculty recruitment and evaluation standards.

It has been suggested that the quality of University College faculty might not be high because good candidates would be deterred from applying by the small size, the poor research facilities, and the possible heavy teaching duties, or that, if they were appointed, good faculty would stay there only until they could find jobs at big universities. The consequence would be a lowering of average faculty standards at S.F.U.

These viewpoints may be discounted. It seems far more likely that the combination of the current large reserves of available qualified candidates (except in a very few subjects such as Accountancy), the attraction of that rarity nowadays, a prospective new University, and the challenge and opportunity of helping to develop it will attract faculty of high quality that may well enhance S.F.U. standards.

(d) Student admission and evaluation standards

The Report suggests that, in relation to an expected backlog of students seeking admission, the University College must be extremely flexible in giving credit for courses taken elsewhere and that special concessions to such students may be necessary (11:3).

As University College students would be S.F.U. students they would have to meet S.F.U. admission standards. As with faculty recruitments, to lower those standards, even temporarily and for its University College Division only, could be unfair to S.F.U. Burnaby students and might in the long-term be detrimental of S.F.U.'s academic standards and reputation. Moreover, it would not be in accord with the statements in the Report on the need to maintain traditional university standards of academic excellence (7:4). One condition that S.F.U. must make is that if it accepts the proposal it will not be expected to lower its already flexible student admission standards. It may not be feasible, for example, for S.F.U. to assure prospective students that all community college courses will be acceptable (21:6, 22:1) until S.F.U. is satisfied that they are of the requisite standards.

The comment in the Report on the need to maintain traditional university standards of academic excellence at the University College (7:4) is reinforced by the statements on the need for programmes to be of a high standard and recognized by other universities, and that the graduate should have no feeling of being second-class in any respect (7:8). Nevertheless some fear exists that because of limited facilities at University College centres academic standards there would be lower than at S.F.U. Burnaby and that this could be to the detriment of S.F.U. standards. This may be discounted for most subjects: student and faculty motivation and energy can more than counteract any effects of poor facilities.

It seems that to attempt to ensure that uniform standards will exist throughout a multi-campus university can be a time-consuming task (see Appendix 1) that may well be a major obstacle to implementing the multi-campus idea. A system in which faculty from S.F.U. Burnaby would be involved in evaluating courses given at the University College could assist in maintaining satisfactory standards there. Quality control of Independent Study or Directed Study outreach courses would be especially important. Simon Fraser University must avoid becoming involved in a proliferation of second-rate colleges, programmes, or courses by doing what it can to ensure that none of them is second-rate.

4. That Simon Fraser University can treat its faculty uniformly

The faculty of the University College would be faculty of S.F.U. (14:1, 15:4) As such neither their working conditions nor the criteria used in evaluating them for contract renewal, salary levels and increases, promotion, tenure, or dismissal should differ from those of the faculty

of S.F.U. Burnaby to extents that are inequitable to either group. There are suggestions in the Report that if accepted could result in inequities.

One implication is that the teaching and related duties of University College faculty (16:1, 16:4, 17:1 and 2) would be heavier than the four courses or course equivalents normally required annually of faculty at the coast universities. Such duties of the University College faculty should be at or close to the norm, to reduce both direct inequities and inequalities in the time available for University College faculty to do the research that contributes to their academic advancement.

A reason suggested in the Report for their heavier teaching and related workloads is that University College faculty would have difficulties in doing research (17:2) and thus presumably would have time available for increased other duties. This argument for heavier non-research duties is not valid. While research that requires major or complex equipment may not be possible at a University College centre for some years, other kinds of research, especially kinds based in the field, are feasible there. Moreover, University College faculty must have adequate time for research to maintain their credibility and employability as scholars. Indeed it would add to the scholarly credibility if each centre had several senior, established scholars on its faculty from the start.

As the argument for less research time is not valid, another suggestion based on it is not valid: that University College faculty should have more frequent study leaves than is usual (14:2). This would give them an advantage over faculty at the coast universities that could be considered unfair.

The Report points out that the certification of the Notre Dame University Faculty Association could cause problems in integrating the Nelson Centre - that is, what is now N.D.U. - into the University College (20:5) and thus into S.F.U. Presumably S.F.U. would require this matter to be resolved by the Government before it could accept the proposal or, alternatively, may suggest a modification of the proposal that would exclude N.D.U.

University College faculty must be treated as S.F.U. faculty, even if to do so is not in accord with suggestions in the Report, unless S.F.U. decides on this alternative: to have two kinds of faculty in terms of duties, and therefore of criteria for evaluation. One would be the professors who would do both research and teaching and provide committee and similar administrative services to the university. The other, the lecturers, would not be expected to do much research and instead would carry heavier teaching and related work loads than the professors.

That suggestion has its advocates. But before S.F.U. accepts it, the implications must be weighed very carefully. For instance, the effects on the academic stature of an institution that has many "lecturers" and on the stature of institutions associated with it, the influence on prospective applicants for faculty posts, and the likelihood that "lecturers" will come to be regarded as a lower category than "professors" and one to which scholarly unproductive professors may be demoted.

5. That continuing funding will be assured

Adequate and continuing funding must be assured if the intent is to set up a university system that will meet the needs of the people of the non-metropolitan areas truly and not merely nominally.

If S.F.U. takes responsibility for the expenditures (15:2) it presumably will use as a guideline this statement in the Report: "No programme should be mounted without a sufficient commitment of financial support" (8:1).

The rough cost estimates in the Report (17:2 to 19:1) are widely regarded as unrealistically low. Some examples illustrate this:

- The library activities estimated at \$5 million would actually cost at least \$9 million;
- The estimated \$0.35 million annually for off-campus instruction may be contrasted with the \$2.5 million spent annually by the University of Waterloo for about 150 audio-taped courses for about 2,500 students;
- Costs of upper level undergraduate laboratory courses in Science can be high: a 4-faculty programme in chemistry would cost nearly \$0.6 million to start up and \$0.32 million annually to operate;
- The estimated salary costs of \$3.3 million for faculty of four 10-faculty centres in year five could be the costs for one 50-faculty centre in year two or three;
- The Report does not estimate possible costs of future expansion, though it is conceivable that these could resemble those of S.F.U. over the past ten years, though the cost per F.T.E. student could be higher because of the added costs of outreach programmes and of staggered course times. It may be noted that the S.F.U. Kelowna programmes in BioSciences and in Psychology have cost about \$16,000 per F.T.E. student in the first year, about \$8,000 in the second.

More realistic capital and operating costs cannot be estimated until, first, decisions have been made on priorities in setting up the Headquarters and the centres and on the sizes of each, on the kinds and

scope of academic programmes, and on the nature of the delivery systems for outreach programmes and courses, and, second, plans that can be costed have been devised for each. It may be noted that capital costs may be higher than imagined because of the possible need to construct facilities at some locations to house faculty, staff, and students.

While S.F.U. has the authority for expenditures it must be empowered, if funds are inadequate to do everything that is desirable, to determine priorities: to select what and what not to do and when and how, as described elsewhere in this review. Nevertheless certain basic conditions must be agreed upon in that S.F.U. must be satisfied, with whatever safeguards are feasible, that: funding for the University College will be in addition to and not directly at the expense of funding for existing universities; financial support must continue despite any changes in the Government of British Columbia; adequate funding will be provided during the establishment and developmental phases when the costs of faculty and facilities may be very high in relation to size of student enrollments; and expansion financing should be provided as needed.

It is important that S.F.U. must not suffer long-term diminished administrative services or depleted resources as consequences of its involvement with the University College. For example, the S.F.U. Library must not divide its services between the two but must be adequately financed to expand its services to cover both. Similarly, S.F.U. Continuing Studies should have an independent and reasonably protected budget to enable it to maintain its Lower Mainland operation in competition for resources with the University College.

The Report recommends that the University College be funded separately from S.F.U. Burnaby (12:5, 13:5, 27:2). Advantages of this would be that it would give the University College some sort of separate identity from the start that would be a precursor to its eventual separation; and that it would tend to protect S.F.U. Burnaby from being a scapegoat for failures actually caused by inadequate Government funding for the University College.

B. CONSEQUENCES

Simon Fraser University accepts a major responsibility if it accepts the proposal. It commits itself to doing all that it reasonably can to develop the University College and to foster its evolution into the new University, or Universities, despite the consequent extra time, trouble, and headaches, the possible spreading of services thinly, and the inevitable criticisms for what goes wrong or is not apparently done right.

The commitment means that officials in all segments of S.F.U. Burnaby that operate at the University level or that serve the University as a whole must become involved whether they like it or not. Their areas of responsibility will extend beyond Burnaby to encompass the University College.

There is a feeling at S.F.U. that individual faculty members however, should have a choice: they may become directly involved if they want to do so; but they should be free to have nothing to do with the arrangement if that is what they wish.

It does not follow that departments or faculty members who are willing to become involved directly can do so: the University College will have the final decision.

The committee, administrative, and other interactions between the two campuses may be so complex that, to resolve immediate problems, each campus may have to locate a senior "Ambassador" with powers of decision on the other campus.

1. To the governing bodies and academic committees

As the University College would be part of S.F.U. its financial and academic plans would be subject to approval by the same governing and other committees that deal with S.F.U. Burnaby. Because of this, University College personnel must have adequate opportunities to be represented on those committees. Changes in committee compositions would be a consequence.

(a) The Board of Governors

The Report recommends that three or four persons from the non-metropolitan areas be appointed to the S.F.U. Board of Governors (15:2, 27:6), though the proposed Advisory Council for the University College (15:3, 27:7) makes the need for this questionable. Presumably these Board members would replace existing appointees. If not, difficulties could arise: an imbalance would be created between the numbers of appointed members and the numbers of elected and ex-officio

members and to rectify it would require changes in the Universities Act.

University College personnel must have opportunities equal to S.F.U. Burnaby personnel to be elected as faculty, student, and staff members of the Board. However, logistics may dictate that they could attend only a few meetings, so that University College matters may have to be limited to those meetings.

(b) The Senate and its Committees

University College officials must be classified as S.F.U. officials before University College faculty can fit the procedures for election to Senate and for evaluation for renewal, promotion, salary increase, tenure or dismissal. Presumably the University College would be the equivalent of a Faculty of S.F.U. Burnaby, at least initially. Faculty members and students of the University College would be also eligible for election to Senate by, respectively, Joint Faculty and the Student Association. These changes in the composition of the Senate apparently can be accomplished without the necessity of changing the Universities Act.

University College faculty and students should have the opportunity to be represented appropriately on Senate committees or boards, especially those such as Academic Planning (S.C.A.P.), Undergraduate Studies (S.C.U.S.), Continuing Studies (S.C.C.S.), Undergraduate Admissions (S.U.A.B.), and Appeal Board (S.A.B.) that could become heavily occupied with University College affairs. Indeed, the extra work-loads may be so large that some of these committees may have to set up sub-committees to deal specifically with University College matters. However, University College faculty and students will inevitably be partially disenfranchised by logistics.

(c) Other Committees

If University College has the status of a Faculty of S.F.U. it must be appropriately represented on University committees that affect it, such as the Tenure Committee (U.T.C.), Appointments Committee (U.A.C.), and search committees for senior administrators.

Presumably S.F.U. Burnaby faculty would be represented on University College Faculty-level committees, such as search committees for Chairmen of centres; and it seems possible that S.F.U. Burnaby faculty and staff will participate in University College search and appointment committees for faculty and staff.

The chief consequences to S.F.U. Burnaby would be to involve, for at least the lifetime of the College, the members of the various committees in more work, trouble, and committee time than hitherto.

2. To the academic departments and administrators

The consequences to the academic departments would be chiefly to the teaching programmes. Some experienced faculty may move from Burnaby to the University College, especially if the need for some senior scholars there is recognized. More probably, willing faculty may be seconded temporarily to the University College, as they are now to Kelowna from the S.F.U. BioScience and Psychology departments, especially during the developmental phases.

A distinct possibility exists that faculty of S.F.U. Burnaby could be primarily responsible for setting up the outreach programmes and courses because University College faculty may not have the time and the experience and the facilities to do so at the beginning. This could reduce course availability at Burnaby.

A department may have to make special teaching programme arrangements or other concessions both to compensate seconded faculty for the interruptions in their scholarly careers and to integrate its course programme with theirs. And it could be involved in advising the University College on such matters as course and programme planning, faculty recruiting, student evaluations, laboratory building plans.

If S.F.U. accepts the proposal it becomes University policy to implement it, and departments are likely to be encouraged to participate at least as much as they are now encouraged to give Continuing Studies courses. The extent to which any one department may become directly involved will range from extensively to not at all. A department whose subject is not taught at the University College may not get involved, even if it wants to. But it is difficult to see how some departments could avoid becoming involved in the University College: in Faculties such as Arts, Interdisciplinary Studies, and Education, and especially departments whose subjects may be emphasized there. Not only could they not avoid participation, they would find it difficult not to accept direct responsibilities for ensuring that the University College programmes in their subjects are developed properly. A possibly contentious question that could face S.F.U. is what to do about academic departments that may refuse to become involved. The best answer: nothing.

3. To the off-campus programmes

Two segments of S.F.U. Burnaby currently give off-campus programmes in the Interior: -

(a) Continuing Studies Division

The Report stresses that a major responsibility of the University College will be to develop and give extension degree credit programmes

of Directed Studies to students out of reach of direct contact with University centres or formal classroom courses (7:1, 8:3 & 4, 11:8, 12:5, 13:4, 16:1 & 4, 17:1, 2 & 6, 18:1, 25:1 & 4).

As the Continuing Studies activities of S.F.U. are currently concentrated in the Lower Mainland, the immediate impact of the University College may not be great. The two activities in the Interior - the new and still small correspondence programme and the operation at Kelowna that now involves the equivalent of 4.5 faculty - presumably either would be replaced by University College activities or the University College would contract with S.F.U. to continue them.

However, a fear exists that the real possibility that the existence of the University College with its outreach programmes could direct a substantial part of Continuing Studies resources and faculty interest to the Interior from Lower Mainland programmes to the detriment of the latter.

(b) Faculty of Education

The Report recommends that the University College have special responsibilities for co-ordinating Continuing Education and outreach programmes.

The S.F.U. Professional Development Programme could be affected. Two of its three semesters are given by S.F.U. at Penticton, Kelowna, Vernon, Kamloops, Salmon Arm, Prince George, and Chilliwack; one specialization of the third semester otherwise given at S.F.U. is given at Kamloops. If those programmes were taken over by the University College the consequences would be severely damaging to the faculty without introducing significant advantages. One of the current strengths of the P.D.P. programme is the on-campus academic expertise that supports them and which, as indicated earlier in this review, would be virtually impossible to set up at the University College. The S.F.U. Faculty of Education feels strongly that it, not the University College, should continue to direct the P.D.P. programmes in the Interior. Degree completion work on the B.Ed. is a different matter, and theoretically might be supplied in the Interior if the University College could import the substantial resources necessary during the summers.

A recommendation in the Report could influence the nature of future off-campus activities of the S.F.U. Faculty of Education: that the universities and the Department of Education establish a Study Committee to review certification requirements and existing programmes (16:3, 27:9).

4. To the administrative services

The Registrar's Office and the Administrative Services divisions

of S.F.U. would all be involved. How they would be involved can be identified. How much each will be involved and for how long cannot until the magnitude of the operation has been identified and until a decision is made on when, or if, to set up a Headquarters at Vernon. In relation to needs of the University College, S.F.U. Burnaby administrators would (a) train, (b) advise, and (c) provide services.

(a) Training

Senior administrators of S.F.U. Burnaby would train newly-appointed University College administrators in procedures. Presumably this would be done chiefly at Burnaby, though partly the Interior Headquarters. It presumably would be concentrated in the first year or two. The offices of the Bursar and Registrar and of Physical Plant would be involved first, Personnel, and University Services soon thereafter. The consequent reduction in services to S.F.U. Burnaby would be temporary, and probably not noticable if additional staff are provided from University College funds as they should be.

(b) Advice

Simon Fraser University administrators, and specialists in computer, audio-visual, and other procedures, are likely to be required to advise the University College. The extent and scope of this cannot be suggested at this time, except that it certainly will not be merely nominal, it could be extensive, and it may be continuing.

(c) Continuing Service

As University College students, faculty, and staff would be S.F.U. students, faculty, and staff, all administrative departments of S.F.U. that are concerned with regulations and records related to people and standards would be responsible for the University College, at least during its existence as such. Additional staff probably would be needed at Burnaby. The extent to which this may continue after the new University is established can only be surmised. It seems possible, for example, that S.F.U. may be required to continue to supply computer, audio-visual, laboratory, special workshop, and science stores, as well as library, services but perhaps not to continue to handle functions of the Registrar or the Bursar.

5. To the Library

If the proposal is accepted, library facilities at and for the University College would be developed and sustained primarily by the S.F.U. Library. Consequences to S.F.U. Burnaby might be decreased effectiveness in some ways but certainly increased efficiency in others.

If the responsibilities of the various agencies involved are not defined clearly in advance or if continuing funding is not adequate, or both, the Library services could become so degraded and so overtaxed that they would deteriorate in relation to needs of all users; and the Library resources of S.F.U. Burnaby might be depleted through cannibalization to meet University College needs.

However, these possible disadvantages could be offset by the introduction of efficient new procedures. Existing cataloguing and circulation systems, designed for needs of the Burnaby campus only and becoming increasingly inadequate with age and with increasing usage, could not also handle the requirements of the University College. New catalogue support and circulation control systems, such as UTLAS-CIRCS, based on latest communications and computer techniques, are necessary if S.F.U. is to provide adequate service to the Burnaby campus and essential if resource sharing is to become a reality. In addition the University budgetary and fiscal procedures must be upgraded and the Library research collections expanded. All these improvements would be of continuing benefit to S.F.U. Burnaby as they would raise the efficiency and effectiveness of the Library services permanently to higher levels than hitherto.

C. ADVANTAGES TO SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY BURNABY

The University College would benefit from the arrangement much more than S.F.U. Burnaby. It could develop much better academic courses and programmes much sooner with S.F.U.'s assistance than alone.

The chief advantages to S.F.U. would be intangible ones:

- Simon Fraser University would demonstrate a positive and outward-looking attitude in meeting its duty and responsibility to do what it can to participate constructively in the development and improvement of higher education in British Columbia and would avoid becoming introspective and perhaps impoverished.

- It would avoid criticism and blame for not meeting the challenge.

- It would facilitate continuing cooperation of a kind not hitherto conspicuous in this Province between different universities for their mutual benefit.

- Faculty standards might go up because of the high quality of academics currently available for recruitment to University College posts.

- Simon Fraser University departments could expand the scope of expertise in disciplines that would be represented on the faculty of both the University College and S.F.U. Burnaby.

- Simon Fraser University could become a recognized centre of expertise in planning and organizing small innovative campuses and in techniques for delivering education to remote locations.

More tangible advantages would be in the higher levels of effectiveness of some existing services such as library, computing, and accounting. While improvements in them may not be possible with S.F.U. Burnaby resources alone, they could be possible with University College resources and would be to the long-term benefit of both.

D. CONCLUSIONS

The Report recommends that S.F.U. accept or reject the proposal before the end of December, 1976 (13:3, 27:8). Simon Fraser University has three alternatives: -

(a) To accept the proposal unconditionally. Indications received while this review was being prepared are that this would meet with widespread opposition from a majority of the faculty of S.F.U.

(b) To reject the proposal. A clearly valid reason would be essential, as merely to excuse or to rationalize selfishly could be academically indefensible and politically unwise.

(c) To accept the proposal conditionally. That is, to agree to accept it if reasonable and justifiable specified conditions are met, with the implication that S.F.U. could not accept the proposal if they are not met despite a moral responsibility to students and potential students.

If the third (c) is considered to be the best of the three alternatives, then the immediate task facing S.F.U. is to define ~~what~~ *what* ~~which~~ of the conditions, such as those described above in their original or modified form and/or different conditions, it regards as both reasonable and justifiable and then negotiate agreement on them.

If S.F.U. decides to accept this proposal in principle it may wish to state simply something that may be summarized like this:

Simon Fraser University will be prepared to take responsibility for attempting to meet needs for University education for non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia within the limits of the funds available and provided that conditions are met that give S.F.U. the authority to decide, in consultation with appropriate agencies, which needs to meet and in what sequence, and where, to what extent, and how.

Then, if this is agreed, S.F.U. may take one (or in sequence two or more) of the following routes after detailed evaluations of various possibilities including comparisons of advantages of the single-campus versus multi-campus systems: -

(i) S.F.U. remains a multi-campus University indefinitely.

(ii) S.F.U. remains a multi-campus University after budding off a new multi-campus University.

(iii) S.F.U. reverts to its single-campus form after budding off a new multi-campus University (which appears to be the intent of the Winegard recommendations).

(iv) S.F.U. reverts to its single-campus form after budding off several new single-campus Universities (which reduces to a minimum disadvantages of multi-campus systems).

A compromise that S.F.U. may wish to consider is a modification of (iv) that could shorten, reduce, or avoid many of the problems discussed in this review.

It is that the new Institution would start as a University College or Division of S.F.U. but would become a new single-campus University as soon as its officers have sufficient training and experience to run a University but irrespective of the numbers of faculty and students there at the time; and the new University would then negotiate with S.F.U. to obtain the academic and administrative assistance and the special and administrative services that it needs and that it would have had if it had remained as a University College until it ~~remained~~^{developed} University size in terms of faculty and student numbers.

Additional new single-campus Universities could be set up in the same fashion as needs dictate and finances permit.

This compromise would give autonomy early to regional Institutions without reducing the availability of expert assistance and cooperation from S.F.U. It would reduce problems of a multi-campus system. It would permit S.F.U. to avoid becoming involved where it is unable or unwilling to do so. It would facilitate the new Universities to involve Universities additional to S.F.U. in their activities and development. In general, it would increase flexibility in situations where the ability to react to changing circumstances is essential.

APPENDIX 1: Some Problems of a multi-campus University

The following are extracts from a letter of 20 October, 1976 from the Dean of Science of the multi-campus University of the West Indies:

"I hardly know how to answer your query except perhaps to say don't do it! I am not entirely sure what advantage is to be gained in the B.C. context by having a multi-campus organization rather than separate Universities, but presumably that has already been worked out. If there must be a multi-campus organization then the most important thing is to avoid having too tight central control from one campus and to keep cross campus administration to a minimum. It is in the very nature of academics that they want to go their own way and develop programmes which they believe are best for their situation; what is good for one campus is not necessarily good for another. This is well demonstrated in Biology in our own University. The type of course, and the emphasis placed in different parts of the course, that is suited to the Jamaican context is not suited to the Trinidadian context but our regulations say we must run common courses and have common examinations. After a few stormy meetings in the early days we now compromise and spend a lot of time finding ways of circumnavigating the Council's regulation.

"We are stuck with a situation in which many subjects are taught on all three campuses and the paper work and travel needed to co-ordinate teaching and examining is ludicrous. I suggest therefore that if you are developing a multi-campus University that each campus needs to have its own speciality and don't duplicate teaching on different campuses if it can be avoided. If individual Faculties (i.e. Science) are to be duplicated in different campuses then try to give the academics as much freedom to develop their own courses how they like. This may be easier in the Canadian system than it is in ours.

"Central control of administration also creates trouble. Mona is our centre and the other campuses always believe we are 'stealing' the largest slice of the cake and keeping the others in a state of subservience. Too tight centralisation also creates unnecessary paper work and travel. I travelled six times to Trinidad last academic year solely for the purposes of co-ordination and I could have spent my time in more profitable occupations."

APPENDIX 2: Sources of additional information (all
at S.F.U. unless otherwise indicated)

Dr. J. Blaney, Dean of Continuing Studies.

British Columbia Students' Federation, per Mr. Ross Powell,
Executive Member.

Dr. R. Brown, Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Dr. T. W. Calvert, Department of Kinesiology; member of
Advisory Committee.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Arts, collectively.

Chairmen equivalents of the Faculty of Education, collectively.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, collectively.

Chairmen of the Faculty of Science, collectively.

Dr. J. Chase, Director of Analytical Studies.

Dr. F. Cunningham, Department of Geography.

Department of Chemistry, per Dr. E. Wells, Chairman.

Department of Economics and Commerce, per Dr. B. Schoner, Chairman.

Department of Geography, per Dr. M. Roberts, Chairman.

Department of Psychology, per Dr. D. Krebs, Chairman.

Dr. L. M. Dill, Department of Biological Sciences.

Dr. M. E. Eliot-Hurst, Department of Geography.

Mr. H. Ellis, Registrar.

Dr. J. Ellis, Dean, Faculty of Education; member of
Advisory Committee.

Faculty Association, Notre Dame University, per Dr. V.J. Salvo.

Faculty Association, Simon Fraser University, per Dr. J. Farquhar.

Dr. L. Funt, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. R. Gehlback, Faculty of Education.

Dr. I. Goodbody, Dean of Science, University of the West Indies.

Dr. R. Harrop, Department of Mathematics.

Dr. G. C. Hoyt, Department of Economics and Commerce.

Dr. C. Jones, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. Jean E. Koepke, Department of Psychology, S.F.U.
Kelowna Programme.

Ms. Donna Laws, Administrative Assistant, President's Office.

Dr. S. K. Lower, Department of Chemistry.

Mr. M. McClaren, Faculty of Education.

Dr. J. M. Munro, Acting Dean, Faculty of Arts.

Dr. K. Okuda, Department of Economics and Commerce; member of
Advisory Committee.

Dr. S. Roberts, Vice-President, University Services.

Mr. D. Ross, Bursar.

Dr. R.M.S. Sadleir, Department of Biological Sciences.

Ms. Linda Severy, student; member of Advisory Committee.

Dr. M. Smith, Department of Biological Sciences.

Mr. G. Stuart, Vice-President, Administration.

Ms. Sharon Thomas, University Library; member of Advisory Committee.

The University Library, per Mr. T. Dobbs, Acting University Librarian,
and Ms. Sharon Thomas, Acquisitions Librarian.

Dr. N. Verbeek, Department of Biological Sciences, S.F.U.
Kelowna Programme.

Dr. J. Walkley, Department of Chemistry.

Dr. J. Webster, Dean of Science.

Dr. B. Wilson, Vice-President, Academic; member of
Advisory Committee.

REPORT OF THE

COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS IN
NON-METROPOLITAN AREAS

COMMISSION ON
UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS IN NON-METROPOLITAN AREAS

COMMISSIONER:
DR. WILLIAM C. WINEGARD

500, 505 WEST BROADWAY
VANCOUVER, B.C. V6Z 1K1
(604) 672-0245

September 2, 1976

The Honourable Patrick L. McGeer
Minister of Education
Department of Education
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4

Dear Mr. Minister:

It is a pleasure to submit to you the report
of the "Commission on University Programs in Non-
Metropolitan Areas."

Yours sincerely,



W.C. Winegard
Commissioner

WCW/hkc

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	PERCEIVED NEEDS	2
3.	SUMMARY OF THE EXPRESSED PROBLEM	6
4.	CONCEPTS INVOLVED IN SEEKING A SOLUTION	7
5.	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS	8
6.	SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OPERATING AGENCY	11
7.	THE MAIN PROPOSAL	12
8.	ROUGH COSTS	17
9.	THE KOOTENAYS	19
10.	BRITISH COLUMBIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	20
11.	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	21
12.	ARTICULATION	22
13.	LIBRARY	23
14.	DIRECTED STUDY AND MEDIA SUPPORT	24
15.	PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION	26
16.	RECOMMENDATIONS	27
17.	MOMENTS TO REMEMBER	30
	APPENDIX A - A SERIES OF PROPOSALS	31
	APPENDIX B - COMPOSITION AND ROLE OF ADVISORY PANEL ..	41
	APPENDIX C - SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS	43
	APPENDIX D - LIST OF INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS WHO SUBMITTED BRIEFS WHICH WERE ACCEPTED BY THE COMMISSION	45

1. INTRODUCTION

The Commission was established by the Honourable Patrick L. McGeer, Minister of Education, on May 5, 1976 to "advise the Minister on all matters related to the delivery of academic and professional programs outside of the Vancouver and Victoria metropolitan areas, and academic transfer programs and their articulation". As quickly as possible the Commission prepared "A Series of Proposals" in order to focus the discussion with interested groups and individuals. Since the information contained in the document is important for a full understanding of the report of the Commission, it is included as Appendix A. The document was distributed widely on May 17th, after being viewed by the members of the Advisory Panel (see Appendix B for the role and composition of the Panel and the staff of the Commission).

During the early days of the Commission several interviews were held with groups from the universities, colleges, the British Columbia Institute of Technology, the Provincial Educational Media Centre, Professor McTaggart Cowan of the Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee, the Universities Council of British Columbia, the British Columbia Medical Centre, and the Joint Board of Teacher Education. These interviews were held to ensure that the Commission had a reasonable grasp of the post-secondary educational system in British Columbia and the role played by each part of the system.

For persons not familiar with post-secondary education in British Columbia, it is useful at this point to review in general terms the major elements of the system. The main components are the community colleges, the British Columbia Institute of Technology and the universities.

The 14 community colleges offer programs in vocational and technical fields plus two years of "academic transfer" work. The academic programs are the equivalent of the first two years of the general Arts and Science programs of the universities. Since the courses provided by the community colleges are designed and taught by the faculty of the colleges, there can be an articulation problem with any or all of the universities. Credit is given by the universities on a course-by-course basis and sometimes a course given by a college is not considered the exact equivalent of a university course. A special committee has been established to resolve these articulation disputes. The Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee also attempts to maintain good communication between the colleges and the universities in various subject areas.

The British Columbia Institute of Technology does not grant degrees but offers diploma programs in Business and Applied Arts

and Sciences. Many of these programs are of a highly specialized technical nature and are not available in the community colleges. The British Columbia Institute of Technology is involved in the articulation process because many of its programs contain courses which can be used for credit at the universities.

The universities offer degree programs in all of the major disciplines at the undergraduate and graduate levels. In addition, the universities conduct research and carry on large continuing education programs.

The geography and the extremes in population density of British Columbia present special problems for the educational system. In searching for a solution the Commission had to recognize that by 1979 some 839,000 people will be living on the Mainland to the north and east of Hope. A further 108,000 will be living on Vancouver Island to the north and west of Nanaimo. This will account for roughly 40% of the Provincial population. Yet, of the 35,000 students now enrolled in post-secondary academic programs, under 2,500 or 6-7%, are receiving instruction in the non-metropolitan areas. Many students from these areas make an annual migration to the coast to obtain an education but despite this there are striking variations in participation in academic post-secondary education with the metropolitan areas having a rate two to three times that of the rest of the Province. Two major population clusters exist in the Thompson-Okanagan and Prince George-North Cariboo areas which have projected 1979 populations of 335,000 and 160,000 respectively. The Thompson-Okanagan region will thus account for 12.5% of the Provincial population and the Prince George-North Cariboo region 6.0%.

Beginning June 14th, public meetings were held across the Province. The dates, places and names of staff and panel members in attendance are given in Appendix C. Also listed is the approximate number of people in attendance. At each hearing the Commission attempted to elicit information on the perceived need of the community for degree-completion work and types of educational service which would be acceptable, i.e. a few courses by correspondence or a complete science program by face-to-face instructional methods. In most places a high proportion of the people in attendance joined in the discussion to produce a lively and informed debate.

2. PERCEIVED NEEDS

Without attempting to place the items in order of priority or in order of presentation to the Commission, it is useful to

list the many things that were said during the public hearings or stated in the briefs.

"We want a new university in this city."

"We want a new multi-campus university for the non-metropolitan areas."

"Notre Dame University should be continued."

"Some programs should be continued on the Notre Dame site."

"Notre Dame should be the first of many sites for the new multi-campus university for the non-metropolitan areas."

"When you live a hundred miles from any major urban centre as we do, a new campus at one or more places will not help. Courses must be available by methods other than face-to-face contact."

"If the people in Vancouver can have face-to-face instruction so can we. It is time we got something for our taxes."

"The universities of the coast could provide all the courses that are necessary but we need a credit bank agency to straighten out the confusion."

"The universities at the coast have done a poor job up to now - why suppose that they will do any better in the future."

"Whatever you do, don't count on the three coastal universities cooperating in any effective way."

"An extension of one of the coastal universities would be acceptable. We don't need a new university."

"Don't change the community colleges, they are doing a good job and they respond to community needs."

"The community colleges could teach 3rd and 4th year courses and one or more could become a university if necessary."

"The college base and faculty could be used for the provision of upper year courses under the auspices of a new or existing university as long as the college remains as it is now."

"The colleges could do a better job than at present on 1st and 2nd year academic transfer courses if they had more money. They are poorly funded."

"Why would anyone want to provide 3rd and 4th year courses and programs when the real need is support for 1st and 2nd year and technical subjects?"

"We don't necessarily need more university work in this area, we need B.C.I.T. B.C.I.T. should be funded to develop and provide modular courses for use outside the Lower Mainland in conjunction with the colleges."

"We need small university centres in the major communities of the North and the Interior with some resident faculty and identifiable campus sites. Each of these centres could provide outreach programs to the surrounding community."

"We have been very pleased with the on-site services provided by Simon Fraser University here in Kelowna."

"Nothing will work without effective use of local need-identification committees to advise on programs."

"Since mediated courses will probably be necessary don't forget the resources of the Provincial Educational Media Centre."

"Whatever is done, the degree must be credible - even if that means an affiliation with a coastal university."

"Whatever is established it should be headquartered in the Interior."

"There is no equality of educational opportunity in British Columbia now and there will not be until the coast releases its stranglehold."

"We need to know how much is being spent to service the non-metropolitan areas - any program must be separately funded and managed."

"Along with 3rd and 4th year courses we need more effective counselling."

"The colleges are very traditional and unless they get out and provide 1st and 2nd year courses in an "outreach program" what is the point of having the 3rd and 4th years available?"

"Articulation between the universities and the colleges is a major problem."

"Articulation between the universities and the colleges is not a major problem."

"Articulation between the universities themselves is far more of a problem than articulation between the universities and colleges. We need appeal boards with authority to force universities to accept credits."

"Form one university for British Columbia and thus take care of the transfer of credits problem."

"Universities should allow or be forced to allow block transfer of 1st and 2nd year programs from the community colleges."

"We need more courses available but even more importantly we need the universities to accept the credits gained from other institutions."

"Students at Notre Dame University need some guarantees about transfer of credits."

"Many mature, part-time students register for courses whenever and wherever they can only to find that the credits earned aren't portable."

"Our group (teachers) has not been well served in the area. We have often requested courses that apparently cannot be given."

"The universities have done a reasonably good job of responding to requests over the years."

"The universities are helpful but there is no long-range planning; we don't know what will be offered next year or the year after."

"Is it necessary to stick to the usual time frame in the delivery of courses? Surely some could be concentrated into shorter periods while others could be given with shift workers in mind."

"The libraries of the colleges are not adequate for 1st and 2nd year programs let alone 3rd and 4th year."

"We don't need large libraries to begin a significant program in the non-metropolitan areas. Resources could come over a period of years."

"Is anybody in the Province coordinating the development of modular and/or media intensive courses in the colleges and universities?"

"We need degree-completion programs in Arts, Science and Education as a minimum starting point."

"Nurses working in the Interior should be able to complete the B.S.N. program without moving to Vancouver or Victoria."

"There is a need to offer post-basic training courses for nurses in the Interior."

"Couldn't the universities provide degree-completion opportunities in Commerce and Business in some major Northern and Interior centres?"

"There is only one university that can provide the courses needed by our profession (forestry) and that is the University of British Columbia. We want and need their help."

"It is all very well to talk of degree-completion programs but we also need continuing education courses for enrichment."

The Commission heard many other comments of a general nature and some specific to various fields of study. However, the paraphrased examples given above will suffice to show the major concerns and proposed solutions offered in the submitted briefs and informal discussions. A list of the briefs submitted to and accepted by the Commission is included in Appendix D.

3. SUMMARY OF THE EXPRESSED PROBLEM

There is no question that the residents of the non-metropolitan areas feel deprived in terms of post-secondary educational opportunity. As a minimum they want the opportunity to complete degrees in Arts, Science and Education without having to move to Greater Vancouver or Victoria. The expressed demand is appreciable but it is not clear how extensive it will be on a continuing basis after the back-log has been cleared. There is some evidence that students who now intend to attend a coastal university would not transfer to these institutions if programs were available in their home community. The number of students in this category has not been accurately assessed. There is also an expressed need for programs in several professional areas, most notably in Education, Nursing, Commerce and Forestry.

It would be unwise to underestimate the feeling of the non-metropolitan residents of the Province that most opportunities are only available at the coast despite the significance of the hinterland's contribution to the Province's wealth. Some people are tied to smaller communities and cannot move to the coast without considerable sacrifice. A survey of students in the Simon Fraser University Kelowna program supports this contention.

Much frustration centres around the real and perceived problems of credit transfer between the existing universities and between the colleges and the universities. Lack of credit portability and the unplanned, ad hoc nature of the upper-year courses available in smaller centres frustrate the desires of many students to complete a degree.

In the more densely populated areas of the Province the solution was generally seen as being the creation of a series of campuses in the major communities. The desire for an aca-

demographic physical presence to serve full and part-time students was widely expressed in these centres. In the less densely populated parts of the Province there was little faith that the creation of such facilities would solve the problem unless these campuses were to provide a vigorous media-based outreach program. In many of the remoter areas it was stated that if it was necessary to go to a campus to obtain instruction then the campus would be most conveniently located in Vancouver.

4. CONCEPTS INVOLVED IN SEEKING A SOLUTION

The Commission is in agreement with the brief from the University of British Columbia which states that any proposal to remedy the current situation must satisfy three basic tests:

- "1. It must substantially increase the opportunities for people resident in the interior to complete a degree program.
2. It must be consistent with the maintenance of traditional university standards of academic excellence.
3. It must achieve the first two goals with reasonable economic efficiency."

To satisfy test 1 it is necessary to have inter-mural instruction in more than one centre of the non-metropolitan areas in order to reach a large population. In addition, it becomes necessary to consider "outreach programs" and "directed study programs" to reach persons who cannot attend courses given on such a campus.

As stated in the brief from the Arts and Science Division and the Faculty Association of the College of New Caledonia, "the provision of programs must be systematic and committed. What is needed is a range of complete programs locally available in the Interior, not a few more courses in a few more locations. Students must be able to complete all aspects of their programs locally, and the facilities and personnel that such programs will require must be available. There must be a financial as well as a philosophical commitment to such programs ... "

Test 2 is satisfied by ensuring that the programs offered are of a high standard and recognized by other universities as such. The graduate of the program must be able to proceed to graduate and professional school and to the other career opportunities available to graduates of the existing universities. More importantly the graduate should have no feeling of being second-class in any respect.

Test 3 can be met most readily by using the resources of the existing universities. Reasonable economic efficiency is balanced, of course, by how well any agency, new or old, responds to the real problems. No program should be mounted without a sufficient commitment of financial support.

Although it is not essential to have resident faculty in the non-metropolitan areas to satisfy tests 1 and 2 above, it is the opinion of the Commission that the people in non-metropolitan British Columbia would be satisfied with nothing less. It follows then that some version of the campus model is necessary but one in which the costs are not excessive.

5. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

The concepts developed in the previous section lead to the conclusion that an outreach program with campus sites where population density makes them feasible would meet many of the needs of the people of the non-metropolitan areas. It follows that the campus sites, or University Centres should be placed first in the major population clusters of the Province. The Centres should operate in cooperation with, but administratively independent of, local community colleges and should have some fixed and some mobile units.

Assuming that three or four sites are possible and desirable the question arises as to how to organize and administer the upper year degree-completion programs offered as an outreach program and on the sites.

The Three Universities Cooperate (1)

This model has the advantage of making available the resources of all the existing universities. Two disadvantages are administrative complexity and the unanswered question of which institution would be awarding the degree. The University of British Columbia proposal assumes that Centre A is associated with University X and that the students of this Centre would take all or most of their courses from X. While this would reduce the portability of credit problems for new students it does little to solve the problems of a mobile student or a student resident in Centre A but with partial credits from University Y. More importantly, the proposal also does little to ensure the development of the modular or media-intensive courses which will be necessary to service the remoter areas of the Province, areas in which over fifty percent of the non-metropolitan population live.

Another important drawback is that such Centres fail to meet one of the essential criteria for acceptance demanded by the people of the non-metropolitan areas, that of budgetary autonomy.

It is essential to have all budgetary matters for programs offered in the new Centres (including the associated activities) separate from the submissions of the existing universities. Were this not the case, non-metropolitan residents would be suspicious that trade-offs between a university's main campus activity and off-campus activity were being made in periods of fiscal stringency. The budget for the "new operation" must be separate and clearly identified as such by the Universities Council of British Columbia. Only in this way will the amount of money available for non-metropolitan programming be readily identifiable.

New University (2)

The advantages of starting a new multi-campus university are clear. Many people in the North and the Interior would be delighted and it is an administratively simple solution. The disadvantages are equally clear. The degree would have to gain credibility at the same time as the institution was acting as a credit bank to clear up the back-log of credits held by various people from different institutions. Another problem would be the increased lead time necessary to establish a totally new institution.

Furthermore, the large cost of establishing a full-fledged university at this time could prove unfortunate for the post-secondary system of British Columbia. Public funds are limited and major expansion should be avoided until the predicted drop in enrolment during the 1980's is tested by time.

A new university is not going to be content to offer only upper year programs; it will want to offer all levels in several programs including graduate work.

An Existing University (3)

Although all three universities must be involved in any proposal which rejects a new university in the immediate future, it does not follow that all three should be equally involved. One university could carry the major administrative and teaching responsibility. Such an arrangement would be administratively simpler than model 1 and the degree credibility issue of model 2 is largely overcome. It is probably quicker to let one university get on with the main part of the job than to attempt the solutions of models 1 or 2. Additionally, it is relatively easy to form a new university at the appropriate time if the

University Centres are operated as part of one university.

The disadvantages of this model are that it may be seen as being an import from the coast and the possibility that the organizing university might have difficulty in persuading the other institutions to provide those offerings that it is not in a position to supply itself.

It is clear that the resources of all the universities will be required to offer the range of academic programs needed outside Vancouver and Victoria. It does not follow, however, that all universities must be equally involved.

If one university is to be chosen to carry out the task it is necessary to look at the role and function of the three coastal universities in order to make the decision.

The University of British Columbia is the major professional, graduate and research institution of the Province; in these areas it is a national and international resource. It must carry a heavy responsibility for extension work in all parts of the Province in the professional disciplines. As well, it must assume a major responsibility for continuing education and evening credit programs in the Vancouver area. The Commission feels very strongly that the role of the University of British Columbia as outlined above is the correct one and that the people of British Columbia and indeed of Canada would be ill-served by any proposal that diluted this role. It is difficult to believe that the University of British Columbia can expand its existing degree programming for the non-metropolitan areas without detracting from its major responsibilities as outlined above.

The University of Victoria wishes to be, and should be, a highly residential undergraduate Arts and Science university with a few professional programs and limited graduate work. It has the opportunity to stay relatively small and promote quality in its restricted programs. It has been carrying much of the load for continuing education on Vancouver Island and on some parts of the Mainland coast and could continue to do so without being detracted from its main role. The Province needs a university of the type envisaged for the University of Victoria.

Simon Fraser University originated as an Arts and Science institution with an emphasis on tutorial teaching and in recent years it has developed interdisciplinary programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The University has little interest in further development of professional schools and has or should have ambitions for a somewhat restricted role in graduate work especially at the doctoral level.

In the past few years the University has been moving out to various parts of the Province with its programs, for example

in Kelowna, and has been aggressive in terms of service to the communities outside the Lower Mainland. Another point about Simon Fraser University should be borne in mind. It is on the semester system and faculty are used to the concentration and division of material required for such an operation.

6. SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE OPERATING AGENCY

Regardless of which model is chosen, the new agency will inherit certain special tasks, problems and responsibilities. Some of these are listed below.

1. It must be extremely flexible in granting credit for courses taken elsewhere to help clear up the back-log of credit problems. This applies mostly in the Arts and Education areas. Special concessions to these "back-log" students will be necessary if the agency is to serve its function well.
2. There must be a headquarters site outside Victoria or the Lower Mainland.
3. There must be a special advisory committee to the agency consisting of people who live and work outside of Vancouver and Victoria.
4. There must be a recognition that the new agency is an interim step towards the establishment of a university for the non-metropolitan areas.
5. It is essential that the new agency cooperates with existing post-secondary educational institutions to provide as wide a range of programs as possible with the funds available.
6. The new agency should agree to employ as many of the faculty and staff of Notre Dame University as it reasonably can.
7. It must ensure that the students enrolled at Notre Dame during the 1975-76 academic year are given full credit for their work and are allowed to finish their programs on the Nelson site.
8. The agency must agree to actively pursue the development of upper level directed study courses and act as a coordinator for the Province in this matter. In this task it will be necessary for the agency to work cooperatively with the Provincial Educational Media Centre.

*selected
or
appointed*

9. It must also agree to cooperate with the community colleges in every region of the Province to establish need-identification committees in each locality.
10. It is hoped that any agency involved in providing educational services to the non-metropolitan areas will take the opportunity to plan sound programs that respond to the needs of the people. The Commission feels strongly that the usual pattern of courses and timings may not be appropriate for the new operation. Serious consideration should be given to providing more general interdisciplinary programs with courses or sections of courses given at various times of the day or night or in three or four week concentrated periods.
11. The agency will have a responsibility to promote the idea that degree programs are available outside Vancouver and Victoria by taking the first two years through a community college and the upper years through the agency.

7. THE MAIN PROPOSAL

The long-term recommendation is that a multi-campus university be established to serve the non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia. The university will be needed by 1990 to accommodate the likely increase in student numbers during the last decade of this century.

The new university should begin as a separately funded Division of Simon Fraser University charged with the responsibility of providing a comprehensive outreach degree credit program. To help accomplish the outreach objective, the Division, headquartered in Vernon, should establish four small University Centres in Prince George, Kamloops, Kelowna and Nelson.

Centres at Prince George, Kamloops and Kelowna are recommended because these communities have populations large enough to warrant such facilities. The Nelson Centre is recommended for reasons which are discussed at some length in the section of the report dealing with the Kootenays.

Vernon was chosen as the headquarters site for a variety of reasons. It is desirable to locate the headquarters outside the metropolitan areas of Vancouver and Victoria but in a community that does not have one of the four University Centres. This avoids the implication that one of the Centres is a more important entity than the other three. Vernon satisfies these two criteria and has the additional advantage of being located at the centre of the Thompson-Okanagan region,

the largest population cluster outside the metropolitan areas. Furthermore, a substantial site is available in Vernon should it become the main campus of the University established in 1990.

The Division should offer upper level degree-completion programs in Arts, Science and Education (see section on programs).

The responsibilities outlined in this proposal and in the section entitled "Special Responsibilities" may not be acceptable to Simon Fraser University. The University has every right to refuse the assignment. It is recommended that Simon Fraser University be given to December 1976 to accept or reject the proposal. Should the proposal be rejected, it is recommended that a new university be established immediately despite the disadvantages. The people of the non-metropolitan areas want degree-completion programs and would not be adverse to the establishment of a new multi-campus university with the same functions and responsibilities as detailed for the proposed Division of Simon Fraser University.

The University College of Simon Fraser University

Programs

The University College of Simon Fraser University should provide very restricted programs in Science, a more extensive program in Arts to allow for some specialization, and the appropriate program in Education. The programs should be available by directed study methods as well as intermurally.

It is hoped that each Centre would be prepared to develop a special emphasis in its academic programs if it appears appropriate.

Funding

The University College of Simon Fraser University should be funded by the Universities Council of British Columbia separately from the main campus of Simon Fraser University. The separate funding is necessary for several reasons. First, the people of the non-metropolitan areas will insist on knowing how much is allocated by the Universities Council of British Columbia. Second, the Universities Council of British Columbia will want a guarantee that the funds allocated for this special purpose are in fact spent for the purpose. Third, Simon Fraser University must be protected from any possible charge that the University has diverted funds from this program to programs on the main campus and vice versa.

Faculty

Since the University College is a Division of Simon Fraser University, the faculty will be hired as regular Simon Fraser University faculty but their primary responsibility will be to promote the outreach program and to teach and research at the Centres. If the faculty appointments are made to the Division in this way, it will facilitate the formation of the new university. All faculty will know that they are part of a new significant venture.

The academic viability of the Centres depends upon the faculty being active in research and scholarship. Such a situation is hard to achieve unless professors are able to interact with colleagues in their own and other disciplines. Arrangements must be made and a budget provided for professors to spend time on a large campus or research institution more often than the normal research sabbatical program would allow. It will be essential for the research capabilities of the new Division that the faculty members have access to the resources of the main campus on a regular basis. The faculty strength proposed at each Centre is 10 full-time equivalents although all 10 need not be resident at the Centre. As outlined in the section on costs, 10 faculty members can provide the recommended level of programing for each Centre.

Administration

Although the new unit will be part of Simon Fraser University it should be given a considerable degree of autonomy. In many ways it should be treated as an affiliated college but subject to the regulations of the Senate and the University.

changed representative

At the headquarters site in Vernon there should be a Principal, a Registrar, an Associate Principal for outreach programing, the directed study team plus the necessary support staff. At each Centre, in addition to the faculty, it is expected that there will be a senior faculty member who would act as an Associate Principal; a Registrar-Coordinator; two or three professional librarians; several library assistants; an audio-visual technician and the necessary clerical and maintenance staff.

Governance and Funding

As stated earlier in the report, it is anticipated that the budget for the new Division of Simon Fraser University will come to the Universities Council of British Columbia as a separate item. It would be presented by the Principal after consultation with the Advisory Council (see below). Naturally, the Principal will have to consult with the senior administration of Simon Fraser University because the main campus will

be providing library and other supporting services which must be accounted for in the budget.

After the budget is approved by the Universities Council of British Columbia the normal administrative procedures for public accountability by Simon Fraser University should apply. In the final analysis it is the Board of Governors of Simon Fraser University that must accept the financial responsibility for the expenditures on operations and capital projects. Because of the above fact it is recommended that three or four persons from the non-metropolitan parts of British Columbia be appointed to the Board of Simon Fraser University. Such a move would give the people who live outside of Vancouver and Victoria some assurance that their interests were being considered at all times.

impact on the university

In addition to a change in the composition of the Board of Governors of Simon Fraser University, it is recommended that the Minister of Education establish an Advisory Council for the University College of Simon Fraser University. The Council should consist of 8 to 10 people who live and work in the non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia. The Council would advise the Principal both on program needs and financial requirements.

Fac & students

Relationship With The University of British Columbia and The University of Victoria

If this proposal is accepted it is anticipated that most of the teaching in the Arts, Science and Education fields will be done by Simon Fraser University because the faculty at the Centres will be Simon Fraser University professors. However, it would be unfortunate if the resources of the other universities were not used in the program. For example, it is hoped that the University of Victoria would continue its outreach work on Vancouver Island and on the Mainland coast with payment for the services being provided by the new Division of Simon Fraser University on a contract arrangement. Although Simon Fraser University is the coordinating and administering university in the proposal, it does not and indeed cannot be the only university that provides teaching.

Many of the professional programs can only be given by the University of British Columbia. In addition, the resources of the "Independent Study Program of the Centre for Continuing Education" of the University of British Columbia can, on a contract basis, provide many courses for the outreach part of the proposal. There is no need to duplicate work that has already been done. Simon Fraser University should always bear in mind that it coordinates as well as develops programs. It is hoped that the new college would actively seek and use the

courses already prepared at the University of British Columbia as well as those prepared in other jurisdictions. In this way a much greater variety of courses could be made immediately available to the people who cannot attend the courses offered at the Centres. There are some sections of the Province which can only be served by directed study courses and courses given by "parachuting professors".

Special arrangements will be necessary in the Education field. At the present time there are several thousand teachers in the Province who do not yet possess a degree but who would like to "complete" their training if this was possible. The majority of these teachers hold their credits at either the University of British Columbia or the University of Victoria as these two institutions predate Simon Fraser University in the teacher training field. The Simon Fraser University program is of a very different nature than the programs of the other two and as such would not be of any aid to some teachers. In order to ensure that the needs of these teachers are met, Simon Fraser University will have to contract with both the University of Victoria and the University of British Columbia for the orderly provision of the necessary courses.

A final word concerning Education is in order. The Commission and others who made their views known on this subject are of the opinion that it is time for the Department of Education and the universities to have another look at the certification process as well as the existing programs in Education. It is therefore recommended that the universities and the Department of Education establish a study committee to review certification requirements and existing programs. If necessary, the committee should develop new programs specifically designed to train teachers for and in the non-metropolitan areas.

Directed Study (Outreach)

Although it has been stressed several times in the report that directed study is a major responsibility of the new Division, the present section has been added to emphasize the point. Outreach programs from the Centres will have to be delivered to surrounding communities. In addition, an extensive outreach program will have to be mounted by the headquarters staff of the Division using the resources of the main campus of Simon Fraser University and the other universities. If courses are not available in directed study format, they will have to be developed. A core of upper level courses should be available and the resident faculty of the Centres, or those members assigned to the Division on a temporary basis, should be prepared to work on such projects. The technical production of the material is a specialized task and the production team of the Provincial Educational Media Centre should be used once the faculty and administration of the new Division

have decided on the format, i.e. simple correspondence, correspondence plus audio tapes, audio plus slides on video tape, or a full-fledged television production. All of the techniques should be supplemented by face-to-face contact whenever possible. Such contact could be provided by the faculty of the four Centres or by qualified community college faculty in those areas of the Province in which there is no University Centre.

8. ROUGH COSTS

Operating Costs of Centres

For purposes of calculation, it is assumed that in year five the four Centres will be operating at the recommended level of service, i.e. 40 semester courses per year. (It is not necessary to assume that the offerings will be equal in each location but only that the total be 160 semester courses per year.) Under this assumption each Centre would require the full-time equivalent of 10 faculty members assuming that on average each faculty member would give no more than four semester courses per year. This is a reasonable load because of the difficulty of conducting research away from the main campus, and the heavy responsibilities carried in terms of counselling, community involvement and the development of directed study courses.

Faculty salaries are usually about 40% of the total university budget but at the Centres it is probably more realistic to assume a lower percentage such as 30. The total operating costs in year five would be $40 \times \$25,000 = \$1,000,000 \times 100/30 = \$3,330,000$ (approximately). Naturally the cost would be lower in the build-up years.

Added to the operating costs but placed in a special category is library material. It is estimated that approximately 150,000 volumes will be necessary in addition to the resources that already exist at the Nelson Centre. A reasonable estimate for this material is \$1,000,000 per year for five years. (See the section on Library.)

Operating Costs of Headquarters

The costs of administering the Division and the costs of the directed study development team are estimated at \$350,000 per year.

As outlined in the section on Directed Study, a team of people is necessary for need identification, design, script writing and production coordination of the media assisted

programs (including correspondence). The team may not do the actual production but it will have to evaluate programs, establish contracts, etc.

The cost of program development, delivery, evaluation, acquisition and production could run anywhere from \$300,000 to several million dollars per year. An additional \$750,000 per year is included in the headquarters budget for these purposes. Some of the funds could of course be transferred to the Centres to cover their costs for delivery and evaluation. The Commission believes that the total headquarters budget of \$1.1 million should provide a good level of outreach program development and delivery.

Capital Costs

The capital costs for the Nelson Centre would be about \$2.5 million which includes taking over the existing mortgages and relocating the library.

Each of the three Centres would have 1 classroom for 100 students, 3 small seminar rooms, 1 laboratory for science, 1 humanities/social sciences laboratory, a lounge area, a reception area to include the main office and registration function, a small library and 20 offices for faculty and staff. The space required is approximately 22,000 net assignable square feet at an estimated cost of \$85 per net assignable square foot including furniture and equipment. In addition, a few mobile units will be required. The estimated cost for each Centre is \$2.0 million. The total cost of \$6.0 million for the three Centres plus \$2.5 million for Nelson could be spread over five years.

Although in this section on capital costs it is implied that the University Centre facilities will be separate from the facilities of the community colleges, it may be advantageous in some localities to consider combining certain facilities (such as library) into a joint operation.

No capital allowance has been estimated for the headquarters facility. It is assumed that initially less than 3,000 square feet will be required and that this could be rented until such times as decisions are made concerning how much program planning and development is done at the headquarters or the Centres. The cost of rental is included in the operating cost for headquarters.

Combined Costs

To give some idea of the total costs involved in the proposal it is useful to take year five as a typical year.

Centre Costs	\$3.3 Million
Headquarters	\$1.1 Million
Special Library	\$1.0 Million
Capital	<u>\$1.7 Million</u>
Total Yearly Cost	<u>\$7.1 Million</u> (1976 Dollars)

9. THE KOOTENAYS

The Commission is aware that there is a strong feeling in Nelson that Notre Dame University should have been allowed to continue as a four year degree granting institution. Such a feeling is to be expected, especially in a spirited, civic-minded city such as Nelson. Despite all the points made by the people of Nelson, the Commission is convinced that the chances of a full-fledged university remaining viable both academically and financially without a large population base is very small. The small city university is a story from the early part of this century and will not be repeated in the 70's. Although the Commission cannot accept the argument for the continuation of Notre Dame University, it does accept the point of view that upper level degree-completion programs should be available in the Kootenays.

The site of a University Centre for the Kootenays would be Castlegar or Cranbrook if it were not for the history of Nelson. A Centre in Castlegar, for example, would be consistent with the rest of the Commission's recommendations because the Centre would operate in association with the local community college in the same way that the Centres in Prince George, Kamloops and Kelowna are expected to operate. However, facilities do exist in Nelson and they can be used effectively as one of the University Centres of the new Division of Simon Fraser University. The Centre at Nelson is expected to be about the same size as the other Centres, i.e. about 10 F.T.E. faculty. Should a decision be taken to specialize in Education programs on the Nelson site two or three more faculty would be required.

Assuming that the Nelson site is used for upper year courses in Arts, Science and Education by the new Division of Simon Fraser University and that first and second year programs are given by Selkirk College at Nelson, it will be possible to complete degree programs in Nelson.

It is recommended that as many as possible of the faculty and staff of Notre Dame University be given appointments by

Selkirk College and/or by the new agency created. This does not mean that faculty employment in Nelson should be guaranteed; it may be advantageous for faculty to move to other sites operated by the agency or to the main campus of Simon Fraser University.

It is recommended that faculty and staff nearing retirement age be given the option to retire without loss of pension income. It is further recommended that should there be members of faculty and staff who are not re-deployed or retired they should be given generous settlements. Students enrolled at Notre Dame University in 1975-76 should be guaranteed the completion of their programs on the Nelson site.

A Centre at Nelson which is part of a major outreach program by the new Division of Simon Fraser University can, acting in concert with the community colleges of the Kootenays, bring many educational opportunities to the area.

The Commission is very much aware of the briefs presented by C.A.U.T. and the Confederation of Faculty Associations of British Columbia. Indeed the latter brief was of considerable help in formulating the main proposal. However, their suggestion that the Nelson campus be independent is difficult for the Commission to accept and is not recommended. It is a second-best solution and is not in keeping with the post-secondary educational system envisaged for British Columbia.

It has been brought to the attention of the Commission that the integration of the Nelson Centre into the main proposal may cause problems because of the certification of the faculty association at Notre Dame University. The problem is recognized and the last thing the Commission would recommend is the forced hiring of any faculty member by a university whether the faculty member came from Notre Dame University or the University of British Columbia. Despite the problems, the Commission is convinced that Nelson should have a centre like the rest and that a way can be found to achieve this end.

10. BRITISH COLUMBIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

It is clear that the British Columbia Institute of Technology knows its role and is pursuing it vigorously. The Commission urges B.C.I.T. to continue along its present path with one extension; an extension that B.C.I.T. is prepared to accept if proper funding is provided. In many parts of the Province the Commission heard comments that the priority need was for more B.C.I.T. type programs. It was suggested that most colleges haven't the facilities or the funds to provide the

sophisticated technical courses offered by B.C.I.T. and that B.C.I.T. should become more involved in taking courses to outlying regions using the community colleges as the base for operations.

It is therefore recommended that B.C.I.T. provide such courses by face-to-face contact and in modular forms at the request of the various community colleges. B.C.I.T. should receive designated funding from the Department of Education for the development and delivery of such courses. It is further recommended that B.C.I.T. take on the coordinating role for the development of modular or directed study courses in the technical areas in conjunction with the colleges. In the development of media courses, B.C.I.T. should use the production facilities of the Provincial Educational Media Centre in the same way that Simon Fraser University will use them for upper level academic courses.

B.C.I.T. is the flagship of the technical education system and a very important part of the post-secondary education system of British Columbia.

11. COMMUNITY COLLEGES

During the public hearings the Commission was informed that although the colleges offered first and second year university programs on their campus sites, such programs were not readily available in the more remote areas of the Province. This situation should be corrected by the colleges.

For the upper level courses, a recommendation has been made that a new Division of Simon Fraser University coordinate and develop outreach programs for the Province using the resources of all three provincial universities. In a similar vein it is recommended that a separately funded unit of the colleges be established to provide a core of first and second year courses. Such a unit will be necessary and its exact form should be developed by consultation between the Department of Education and the principals of the colleges. The media-assisted courses should be purchased, developed, and used by all the non-metropolitan colleges in their directed study programs. As with the new Division of Simon Fraser University, the production of the courses, when necessary, should be done at the Provincial Educational Media Centre.

Still dealing with the colleges, but on a different matter, it is imperative that the courses provided by the colleges on site or by media should be the base for the upper level courses provided by the universities. Students in every part of the Province must be assured that the community college

courses plus the upper level courses offered by the new Division of Simon Fraser University provide a complete degree program. There is a system for post-secondary education in British Columbia and the Commission urges all parts of the system to make it work.

12. ARTICULATION

The articulation process is seen as functioning well or poorly depending upon the person to whom one speaks. There seems little doubt that it functions smoothly when the discipline committees meet and report regularly to the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee. The fact remains, however, that some committees meet infrequently and some college members have difficulty in attending. The Commission proposes no real change in method of operation of the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee but does have several recommendations.

It is recommended that the subject committees (1 person from each college department and 1 from each university department) meet three times a year with the expenses being paid from the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee budget. The university members of the discipline committees should work closely together to ensure that students are treated generously with regard to credit portability between the three universities as well as between the colleges and the universities. In addition, it is recommended that the Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee be reduced in size to 11 members to include the Chairman (presently Professor McTaggart Cowan), the Associate Deputy Minister (Post-Secondary), 1 faculty member from each university appointed by the president of each university, 5 college faculty members appointed by the college principals, and 1 faculty member from B.C.I.T. appointed by the principal of B.C.I.T. Also recommended is the appointment of a full-time administrative officer to support the Chairman.

It is anticipated that the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee will make recommendations to the universities and the colleges only on disputes that have not been settled by the discipline committees. The Commission rejects the advice that legislation embodying compulsion be introduced to resolve articulation disputes. In the Commission's opinion it would be both unwise and improper to undermine the autonomy of the institutions in this way. The Commission concurs with the Chairman of the Coordinating Committee that in the long run, discussion and good-will will resolve the issues in dispute. Only in the case of long standing intransigence by an

institution should compulsion be considered.

Finally, the Commission recommends that the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee report to and be funded by the Universities Council of British Columbia. The Universities Council of British Columbia needs to be informed about these matters on a continuing basis in order to fulfill its mandate. The Department of Education will be informed through the participation of the Associate Deputy Minister, Post-Secondary.

13. LIBRARY

Much of the success of this new venture will depend upon the availability of library materials. Each University Centre should hold about 50,000 volumes and take no longer than five years to build up to that strength. Since Nelson already has sufficient resources, it will only be necessary to consider the other three Centres.

If we assume that all of the Centres begin together (something that is not necessary but is useful for costing purposes) then 150,000 volumes will be needed at a processing and volume cost of \$30 each. The total of \$4.5 million spread over five years gives an annual library materials cost of \$900,000.

In addition to the acquisition of materials, the libraries of the Centres will face the additional problems of developing a rapid delivery system and a communication network. The communication problem is solved relatively easily by the installation of Telex connecting the Centre libraries with the libraries of Simon Fraser University, the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria. The rapid delivery of materials including inter-library loans will probably have to be handled on an ad hoc basis using various forms of transportation. A delivery system similar to that used by the Provincial Educational Media Centre is envisaged. There are costs involved and although they are difficult to estimate with any accuracy, an estimate of \$100,000 per year for the cost for Telex, delivery and inter-library loans seems appropriate.

The establishment of the Centres will bring to the fore once again the lack of any Provincial Union Catalogue in British Columbia. Although it is not specifically within the terms of reference of the Commission, it is recommended that the development of a Provincial Union Catalogue in machine readable form be given a high priority in the library development of British Columbia.

10
CARDS

what is a
"Provincial
Union Catalogue"

A final caution about library development is necessary to ensure the success of the venture. Acknowledging that all of the Centres should not be started at once, there will still be a problem in library development. It will be essential that some time be taken to plan the academic programs and thus the library resources before each Centre begins operating. The main library of Simon Fraser University will fulfill the acquisition and cataloguing role under this proposal; it will have to move quickly to supply the service required but cannot do so until it knows what is needed and where. In this regard, Simon Fraser University's main library may have to consider procedures which will guarantee a rapid and flexible response to the needs generated by the Centres and the outreach program of the new Division. The Division, on its part, may need a special librarian to coordinate its operation with the library of Simon Fraser University and other libraries in the Province.

14. DIRECTED STUDY AND MEDIA SUPPORT

The Centres

The Centres should be equipped with the traditional media support services. The responsibility for the operation and maintenance of these classroom services should lie with the library administration and the acquisition of media materials should be part of the acquisition program of the library. There should be no attempt to become involved in media production at the Centres except for the usual slide preparation, etc. More extensive requirements can be met by whatever contracting arrangements the headquarters makes with the main campus of Simon Fraser University or the Provincial Educational Media Centre.

The capital costs at each Centre should not exceed \$50,000 and the operating costs, exclusive of personnel should be in the order of \$6,000 annually. The staffing would be minimal and can probably be met by one audio-visual technician attached to the library staff. The costs of acquisition are included in the library budget and the other costs are included in the appropriate estimates given in the section on Rough Costs.

Outreach

The goal is to create and deliver a wide range of learning materials and opportunities to a diverse audience through many access points. The learning materials may include books, pamphlets, study guides, audio tapes, video tapes, kits and television programs. The access points may be homes, public

and institutional libraries, radio, cable television, resource centres and television networks. The range of possibilities is great, as can be the cost. To place the subject in perspective, it is useful to look at outreach under two separate headings - Delivery and Communications, and Creation and Production.

Delivery and Communications

Assuming that one has something to deliver, the cost of delivery can be relatively small. Books and printed material can be sent by mail or by commercial carriers using all forms of transportation. The same is true for audio tapes and video tapes. Once the tapes are prepared the requirement at the student end is for a playback system located in an accessible place. The place may even be in the home if one keeps in mind the fact that television can be used as a "distributor" of even non-television originated materials. Cable television and/or an educational channel can broadcast tapes relatively inexpensively.

As far as communication is concerned, it can be achieved by telephone, telex, mail and by face-to-face contact with local tutors. The delivery and communications system can range in cost from mail charges to several thousand dollars per hour for live television distributed throughout the Province. Preparation and evaluation costs are not included in this section.

Creation and Production

As stated earlier in the report, the creation and production of a directed study course requires a special team. The faculty member must decide what to include but a support team is important for instructional design, script writing (even for a correspondence course) and production coordination. The team must be capable of working in a range of media formats including print, graphics and television. It is not intended that production facilities be established where existing facilities can be used, for example those of the Provincial Educational Media Centre. However, the team may have to encourage the development of some facilities at an appropriate place if such services are not readily available. The Provincial Educational Media Centre may have to increase its production capabilities in some areas if it is to meet the demands made of it. The creation of courses cannot be farmed out; the team is necessary. The production part of the operation is another matter and contracting is an appropriate mechanism.

The costs for the creation and production of learning materials range from the rather minimal for rewriting to the

moderate for audio cassette preparation and video taping of classroom lectures to over \$50,000 for full scale television productions.

An estimate of creation, production and delivery costs is included in the headquarters costs for the new Division of Simon Fraser University.

15. PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

Throughout the hearings and in the briefs presented to the Commission many references were made to the need for professional programs. In particular, concern was expressed about Nursing, Commerce (especially in accounting), and Forestry.

Forestry programs can be supplied only by the University of British Columbia and it is recommended that the University of British Columbia and the Association of Professional Foresters jointly assess the need for Forestry courses in various parts of the Province. Unless otherwise requested there appears to be no need for Simon Fraser University to be involved.

There is no question about the demand outside of Vancouver and Victoria for degree-completion courses and post-basic courses in Nursing. Since Nursing is offered by the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria it is recommended that the two universities cooperate in the delivery of the necessary programs to the non-metropolitan areas. Simon Fraser University can provide some of the Arts and Science courses needed for the training of nurses but the major load must be borne by the other two universities.

Commerce is offered by Simon Fraser University and it is recommended that part of the mandate of the new Division should be to identify the needs and provide the required services.

On the continuing education front, the Commission has no recommendations to make since this matter is before the committee chaired by Dr. R.L. Faris of the Department of Education. Doubtless the large programs now offered by the universities will be necessary in one form or another. The University of British Columbia carries a very heavy load in this area and in many subjects it is the only resource available.

Dr. Faris was with this Commission at all of the public hearings and he knows of the concerns expressed by various groups for special services.

16. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that a multi-campus university be established by 1990 to serve the non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia. (page 12)
2. It is recommended that the new university begin as a separately funded Division of Simon Fraser University charged with the responsibility to provide a comprehensive outreach degree-credit program. (page 12)
3. It is recommended that the Division be headquartered in Vernon and have four small University Centres in Prince George, Kamloops, Kelowna and Nelson. (page 12)
4. It is recommended that the Division offer upper level degree-completion programs in Arts, Science and Education. (page 13)
5. It is recommended that the new University College of Simon Fraser University be funded by the Universities Council of British Columbia separately from the main campus of Simon Fraser University. (page 13)
6. It is recommended that three or four persons from the non-metropolitan areas of British Columbia be appointed to the Board of Governors of Simon Fraser University. (page 15)
7. It is recommended that the Minister of Education establish an Advisory Council for the University College of Simon Fraser University. (page 15)
8. It is recommended that Simon Fraser University be given to the end of December 1976 to accept or reject the proposal. Should the proposal be rejected it is recommended that a new university be started in 1977. (page 13)
9. It is recommended that the Department of Education and the universities establish a study committee to review certification requirements and existing programs and if necessary develop new programs specifically designed to train teachers for the non-metropolitan areas of the Province. (page 16)
10. It is recommended that as many as possible of the faculty and staff of Notre Dame University be given appointments by Selkirk College and/or by the new agency created. (page 19)
11. It is recommended that the faculty and staff of Notre Dame University who are nearing retirement age be given the option to retire without loss of pension income. (page 20)

12. It is recommended that members of faculty and staff who are not re-deployed or retired be given generous settlements. (page 20)
13. It is recommended that the students enrolled at Notre Dame University during the 1975-76 academic year be guaranteed the completion of their programs on the Nelson site. (page 20)
14. It is recommended that the British Columbia Institute of Technology provide their specialized technical courses in outreach modular forms and/or intermurally at the request of the community colleges. (page 21)
15. It is recommended that the British Columbia Institute of Technology assume the coordinating role for the development of directed study courses in the technical areas in conjunction with the colleges. (page 21)
16. It is recommended that a separately funded unit of the community colleges be established to provide a core of media-assisted first and second year academic courses. (page 21)
17. It is recommended that the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee be reduced in size to 11 members. (page 22)
18. It is recommended that a full-time administrative appointment be made to assist the Chairman of the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee. (page 22)
19. It is recommended that the subject committees of the Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee meet three times each year with the expenses being paid by the Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee. (page 22)
20. It is recommended that the Provincial Post-Secondary Coordinating Committee report to and be funded by the Universities Council of British Columbia. (page 23)
21. It is recommended that a Provincial Union Catalogue in machine readable form be given a high priority in the library development of British Columbia. (page 23)
22. It is recommended that the University of British Columbia and the Association of Professional Foresters jointly assess the need for Forestry courses in various parts of the Province. (page 26)
23. It is recommended that the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria cooperate in the delivery of degree-completion programs in Nursing to the non-metropolitan areas. (page 26)

24. It is recommended that the new agency identify the needs and provide service for degree work in Business and Commerce for the non-metropolitan areas. (page 26)

17. MOMENTS TO REMEMBER

The look of determination on the face of the young woman who told us that she had driven 15,000 miles last winter for a degree credit course.

The standing ovation given by over 1,000 people to the United Church minister in Nelson who asked the Commission to inform the Honourable P. McGeer that the people of Nelson believed in resurrection and that Notre Dame was not dead.

The smile on the face of the man who read to the Commission several quotes about the educational needs of the people of the non-metropolitan areas from a book by Professor Patrick McGeer.

The barely suppressed look of frustration on the face of the woman from Alert Bay as she talked of the need to bring education to the people and not vice versa.

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.
- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

November 15, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.
- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

November 15, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.

- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

November 15, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINECARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINECARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.

- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

November 15, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.
- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.
- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

November 15, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.
- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

November 15, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.
- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan

November 15, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA JOINT SENATE/BOARD OF GOVERNORS COMMITTEE ON
THE WINEGARD COMMISSION REPORT

I. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

From page 10 of the Winegard Report, one may draw some false impressions of the University of Victoria. These must be clarified and corrected.

- A. The University of Victoria is not a "highly residential" university, whatever that may mean. Fully 55% of its students come from outside the Victoria metropolitan area; yet, because of Government funding policies, it can offer residence accommodation to a mere 11% of its full-time student body (a ratio that places it 23rd among 30 representative Canadian universities).
- B. Though long respected for the quality of its undergraduate teaching, it has a broad range of excellent graduate programs, an outstanding library, a deep commitment to academic research, and a number of professional faculties and schools.
- C. It views itself as serving the entire Province of British Columbia. In many of its programs (Education, in particular), it has been attracting students for decades from every region of the province; it has never seen its role as a university for Vancouver Island. Moreover, it has been very active in extra-mural credit teaching: in 1974/75 and 1975/76 it offered an average of 26 classes of selected, advanced undergraduate course work outside the Victoria region -- almost a third of the total effort envisioned in the Winegard proposal.

II. THE WINEGARD PROPOSAL

Though motivated by admirable concern for the needs of students in the British Columbia interior, the Winegard proposal has a number of serious inadequacies and dangerous pitfalls. It is, in short, an expensive way of providing a mediocre education for a mere handful of students.

A. Academic faults:

1. By diffusing resources among four mini-campuses and a separate administrative centre, the proposal would result in token library and laboratory facilities, hopelessly inadequate for advanced undergraduate study.
2. By providing only ten faculty members for each campus, the scheme could offer no variety or specialized study within any one academic discipline. One assumes that the great majority of advanced undergraduate students in the interior will need access to complex university degree programs: what is offered is a meagre academic smorgasbord.
3. By pursuing the mini-campus concept, the proposal would fail to create the academic and cultural ambience that is vital to

any true university community. Faculty and students alike would be deprived of scholarly discourse with colleagues in their own disciplines. The additional problems of geographical isolation would enforce a spirit of academic stagnation. This would be a grave disservice to the university students of the B.C. interior.

B. Financial faults:

1. The report identifies an annual operating cost of \$7.1 million -- no trivial figure. Yet even this substantial amount seems to be a naive and irresponsible underestimate of the cost needed to set up four separate campuses, each with its own library, laboratories, local administration and faculty, plus a discrete administrative centre in Vernon. Much of the \$7.1 million would soon be swallowed up with the cost of coordinating this vast and scattered operation.
2. Even if the \$7.1 million estimate should be accurate, there is grave concern that the proposal would divert urgently needed funds from the present system of provincial universities and colleges. One of the most wasteful aspects of the proposal is its failure to use the existing resources of the regional college system.
3. In attempting to meet the needs of the minority of students who will be satisfied with a diluted and general degree-completion scheme, the proposal ignores the financial problems of the majority who will continue to seek serious degree programs in the major public universities. It must be realized that a large number of students in B.C. will always be required to attend a university beyond commuting range of their homes.

C. Administrative and political faults:

1. The proposal is a bureaucratic wonderland. One could hardly imagine a more cumbersome and tortuous model than that of four tiny faculty units, each reporting separately through a remote administrative centre to the sub-unit of a distant university, itself subject to the nebulous control of a Universities Council. This will lead to creative academic innovation?
2. The need perceived by Dr. Winegard is not so much academic as it is demographic and political: there is a pressure to create an institution for advanced higher education in the interior that is not tied to an existing and remote metropolitan university. Yet the interim solution advocated is a link with Simon Fraser University -- an apron-string proposal that contradicts this political imperative. Moreover, the interim solution would create a brand new political problem by granting one of the established public universities a province-wide territorial influence to which it has no historic claim. This prospective realignment is unwarranted and unjustified.

III. POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

- A. On purely academic and fiscal arguments, the wisest action would be to provide differential bursaries to enable qualified students in the interior to have fair and equal access to the specialized advanced programs at the established universities of their choice. (The magnitude of Winegard financing could provide 2,000 bursaries of \$3,500 each! Of course, any equitable scheme of financial aid would need to be scaled to meet geographical differences.) At the same time, the public universities would have to be encouraged to develop and extend their "outreach" activities for academic enrichment and degree completion, in cooperation with the regional colleges, either by individual initiative or by consortium. However, if the political premise of the Winegard Report is valid, this logical alternative may well be unacceptable.

- B. If the Minister of Education, through the Universities Council, is truly determined to make available substantial new funding for higher education, these funds could be consolidated to create, in one Interior community, a new, small, degree-granting college with some academic validity and coherence. Its on-campus offerings should be strictly limited to a narrow range of basic disciplines, mainly at the third- and fourth-year level. It must be autonomous, so as to be able to identify and respond to regional concerns; its degrees would soon win whatever acceptance they deserve. It might well attract a number of students from metropolitan areas at the coast. The new college would surely emphasize outreach and extension activities, using the existing resources of the regional college system. It might assume the role of a "degreebank," if that concept is desirable; it might even become a course coordinating agency like the British Council for National Academic Awards. Undoubtedly, it would wish to explore new technological methods of extending its services to outlying communities. Its entire personality and academic style would be free to develop without the stultifying control of a paternal authority.

This second alternative would reduce substantially the academic weaknesses of the Winegard system. Financially, it would eliminate many of the wasteful and redundant costs of running four campuses and a discrete administrative centre. Unlike the Winegard model, it would develop and exploit the strengths of the regional colleges, without creating a new and divisive layer of higher education in British Columbia. However, the citizens of British Columbia must not be deceived into thinking that the costs would be trivial; and any new expenditures must not be allowed to preempt the urgent priority needs of the major public universities and existing regional colleges. If there is indeed a political imperative, it must be met with a realistic and honest academic response.

For the Senate

J.L. Climenhaga
C. Rippon
P.L. Smith

For the Board of Governors

A.M. Hall
M.D. Phillips
L. Ryan