

UBC REPORTS

Vol. 14, No. 11/Dec. 19, 1968/Vancouver, B.C.

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

Master Teacher

Dean Walter Gage, recipient of the first UBC Master Teacher Award, plans to give away the \$5,000 cash award that goes with the honor for the purchase of books for three undergraduate libraries. Five other UBC teachers were awarded certificates of merit as outstanding teachers. For details, see page two.



The Public Purse

Who should control the public purse?, asks Dr. Denys K. Ford, a UBC medical researcher. Not those who have a direct vested interest in the spending of such funds, he argues. This would rule out the 'right' of faculty and students to control University funds. His article appears on page three.



UBC Space Race

Gary Hansen, a graduate student in architecture, suggests some unique ways for UBC to solve its space problem and at the same time break down barriers between the University community and the general public. His article appears on pages four and five.



The President's Job

Addressing UBC's Faculty Association, President F. Kenneth Hare said that if the University is to raise teaching standards and general performance, it will have to be by self-discipline. Excerpts from his December 5 speech to the Association appear on pages six and seven.



UBC Reports has "gone weekly."
After a Fall term of irregular but increasingly frequent production this publication has settled down to a regular weekly schedule. After the Christmas break, the paper will appear on campus every Thursday. The last edition of each month will also be mailed to all our known alumni, the parents of our students, and to other friends of the University.
The increased frequency of publication stems from a policy decision of the editors to try to reflect more accurately the mood of the campus, and to provide more frequent opportunities for discussion of University issues in our columns. We invite students, faculty and staff members, alumni and other interested persons to submit contributions to these discussions.
In the meantime the editors of UBC Reports and the staff of the Information Service wish all their readers a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

DIVISION
LIBRARY
CAMPUS

50-008
0016900

UBC's FIRST MASTER TEACHER

THE MAN WHO HAS SUPERVISED THE GIVING AWAY
OF MILLIONS TO UBC STUDENTS PLANS
TO BOLSTER THREE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARIES
WITH THE \$5,000 CASH PRIZE THAT GOES WITH
THE MASTER TEACHER AWARD



Dean Walter Gage, the 63-year-old deputy president, professor of mathematics and dean of inter-faculty and student affairs at the University of B.C., has been named the first recipient of the Master Teacher Award.

And characteristically, the man who has supervised the awarding of millions of dollars to students in the form of prizes, scholarships, bursaries and loans, will himself give away the \$5,000 cash award that goes with the honor for the purchase of books for three campus libraries.

He said he would divide the award for the purchase of books in the main undergraduate library, the mathematics library and the engineering undergraduate library.

"My decision to do this," he said, "which I hope won't be regarded as a precedent by future winners, reflects my philosophy that teaching is not a one-sided affair—that students enter into the teaching process.

"In a sense it is the students who have helped me to win the award. Part of the funds I would like to see used for the purchase of books in the engineering library, since two-thirds of my teaching load is in that faculty; part for books for the mathematics library, because math is my discipline, and a third part for books in the main undergraduate library."

He said he hoped that the books purchased for the engineering and main libraries would be of a general nature—"books of general interest that will arouse the interest of undergraduates."

Dean Gage, who teaches ten hours a week in addition to supervising University awards, chairing a multitude of University committees and serving as one of UBC's top administrators, has always regarded his teaching duties as his first interest.

"I've always made it clear that I have three main interests at UBC—teaching first, student aid second and administration third. And if I were ever forced to make a choice among these interests, teaching would be my first choice," Dean Gage said.

• • •

The Master Teacher Award was established this year by Dr. Walter Koerner, chairman of UBC's Board of Governors, in honor of his brother, Dr. Leon Koerner, one of the University's leading benefactors.

Nominees for the award were screened by a six-man committee appointed by President F. Kenneth Hare and chaired by Dr. William C. Gibson, head of the department of the history of medicine and science.

The committee's membership included Chancellor John M. Buchanan, Mr. David Zirnhelt, president of the Alma Mater Society, and Mr. Stanley Evans, president of the UBC Alumni Association.

Dr. Gibson said the committee had received 39 nominations for the award, many of them from students, and had decided to award certificates of merit to five other UBC teachers who were considered outstanding.

The merit certificates have been awarded to Dr. J.F. Hulcoop, associate professor of English; Prof. Sam Black, professor of art education in the faculty of education; Dr. David Suzuki, associate professor of zoology; Dr. Kenji Ogawa, assistant professor of Asian studies; and Dr. Gerald F. McGuigan, associate professor of economics and head of the Arts II program. All five will be eligible for the Master Teacher Award in future years, Dr. Gibson said.

"The task of choosing one outstanding teacher was an extremely difficult one for the committee," Dr. Gibson said. "However, after long study of supporting documents and other material, and visits to the classrooms of some of those nominated, the committee reached the unanimous conclusion that the more than 40 years of productive teaching by Dean Gage merited the first award."

He said a great many of the nominations for the award had come from students, who had particularly impressed the committee with the supporting material which they prepared.

"Students are above all able to recognize outstanding teaching when they come in contact with it," he said, "and the number of nominations submitted by students is ample testimony to the fact that UBC has a solid core of excellent teachers."

Dean William Armstrong, deputy president and head of the faculty of applied science, in which Dean Gage chiefly teaches, said he was delighted that the committee had honored Dean Gage by naming him the first recipient of the Master Teacher Award.

• • •

"There is no question in my mind that he is one of the outstanding teachers in the history of this institution," Dean Armstrong said, "and I know that Dean Gage's colleagues and, most of all, the thousands of students who have been lucky enough to encounter him in the classroom, will endorse the committee's choice and hope that he will continue to be among us as a teacher for many years to come."

Dean Gage was born in Vancouver and educated at UBC, where he received his bachelor and master of arts degrees in mathematics and physics.

His teaching career began in 1927 at Victoria College, then an affiliate of UBC. He was also registrar there from 1929 to 1933, when he joined the UBC faculty.

Dean Gage became a full professor at UBC in 1948, and the same year was named dean of administrative and inter-faculty affairs. He was UBC's acting president in 1967-68 prior to the arrival of President F. Kenneth Hare, and during the fall of this year while President Hare was absent because of illness.

To be eligible for the Master Teacher Award a candidate had to have served at least three years at UBC at the rank of assistant professor or above and during that time taught undergraduate courses in the winter session.

Dr. Denys K. Ford, a UBC medical researcher, maintains that students and faculty have no 'right' to be on policy-making committees spending taxpayers' money, and the viewpoint that they should control such committees is contrary to the working of democracy as we know it in the western world

It seems to me that at least one viewpoint has not been given enough emphasis in considering student and faculty unrest at universities. This can be expressed in the statement that control of the public purse should not be under the direct control of those persons who have a direct vested interest in the spending of the funds.

Both faculty and students do indeed have a direct vested interest. The economic livelihood of the faculty and their professional success depends directly on the university's fiscal policies and decisions. The comfort of students and their benefit from university services are also an obvious vested interest. Both students and faculty speak through their own associations which are direct, and very proper, lobbies.

The university budget, like most governmental budgets these days, is a multi-million dollar proposition. The taxpayer, who pays, has the right to demand that those who are delegated to handle this money will be answerable to the taxpayer at election time. This is the only control the taxpayer has over his money and this has become the accepted method in western democracies and recognized as the safest, if not always the most efficient, method.

The politician attempts to spend the taxpayer's money according to the taxpayer's wishes, or estimated wishes, as determined by the vote. In doing so the politician is very unwise if he delegates responsibilities for policy involving fiscal decisions to any parties who have a direct vested interest in the spending of the funds.

The public would be wisely upset if multi-million dollar hospital budgets were under the control of hospital architects, hospital administrators and doctors who undoubtedly know far more than others about the technical details of running hospitals. We would rightly be uneasy if the military budget was under the direct influence of the military or arms manufacturers, or if the Liquor Control Board was represented by the executives of distilling companies. The Department of Highways was recently under widespread criticism; how much greater would the criticism have been if asphalt and concrete manufacturers and civil engineers were controlling or even significantly influencing policy decisions.

I submit, therefore, that neither students nor faculty have any "right" to influence policies that involve fiscal decisions at a university by being represented on the boards of governors.

It is clear that the faculty and probably also the students have a "right" and "duty" to be represented and heard at the advisory board level. It is equally clear that a board of governors would be unwise to ignore the views of either faculty or students. In fact one could argue that there should be a clear line of communication from the faculty and students directly to the board of governors without going through administration. In the hospital world, "joint conference committees" are designated to improve communications between medical staff organizations and the hospital management boards.

All citizens have a right to lobby and those with strong convictions about improving life will, very properly, lobby whenever the opportunity arises and at all levels of government. Those with special interests and knowledge in one aspect of life will naturally and rightly press for action in that sphere of interest. They should concede however that they are looking at life from their particular vantage point.

The improvement of educational facilities, the extension of both welfare

and health services, urban renewal, the expansion of transportation services in our sparsely populated province and the widening of the tax base by the promotion of new or expanded industry are all competing for our limited tax dollars. Our elected representatives, who can see the overall picture, may well choose courses with which we disagree; nevertheless we elected them to make these decisions and we have recourse to the polls.

To summarize, regardless of who happens to be on the board of governors of the university, the vested interests of the students and faculty have no "right" to be on the policy making committees which involve the spending of taxpayers' money. The viewpoint that they should control such committees is absurd and contrary to the working of democracy as we know it in the western world in 1968.

On the other hand, the application of constructive, intelligent, unified pressure to both electors and elected is a requirement for progress, and its success already demonstrated on previous occasions.

?
WHO SHOULD
?
CONTROL THE
?
PUBLIC PURSE
?



Dr. Denys K. Ford is associate professor in the department of medicine in UBC's medical school. He is also director of the Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society research unit in the faculty of medicine.

Graduate architecture student Gary Hansen is shown at right standing in front of a vacant building in Maple Tree Square, one of Vancouver's oldest commercial areas adjacent to the Waterfront. He suggests in the article on these pages that the University might arrange to rehabilitate buildings such as this in various areas of Vancouver to relieve the demand for additional space on the Point Grey campus. In doing so, he suggests, the University would also break down traditional barriers which have stood between the academic community and society-at-large. Photo by Mike Woods.

A GRADUATE STUDENT
IN ARCHITECTURE
AT UBC MAKES
SOME SUGGESTIONS
FOR SOLVING . . .

THE RACE FOR SPACE

By GARY HANSEN

At this time, when the University is perplexed by the insistent demands for more places for students in the University, more academic breathing space, a more favourable student/faculty ratio and demands by the student body for a higher quality of instruction the administration is confronted with an embarrassing depletion of finances.

This has led to a general, as yet unofficial, acceptance that some form of restricted enrollment is the only realistic way, if only on a temporary basis, of maintaining the standards of the academic community in the absence of adequate funding.

UBC's president, Dr. F. Kenneth Hare, in an address to the student body on Nov. 27, 1968, referred in detail to the capital and accommodation deficiencies of the University and to the mess of vested interests within the society that contribute to the complication of the issues. He stated that "The main problem in getting issues of this kind 'fixed' lies outside the University."

If this is in fact the case; if, as we are told on good authority, there is a direct positive relationship between the gross national product and the number of persons in a community with a University degree, and, if the University is to remain a truly public institution, then the concept of limiting the extent of interaction between the University and the community has a direct detrimental effect upon both the University and the community that it serves, however immediately beneficial the results appear to be on the University's balance sheet.

Gary Hansen is a graduate student in UBC's school of architecture. The theme of the article on these pages parallels his thesis topic which is concerned with understanding social change and the development of a medium for facilitating greater popular participation in decision-making which affects the human environment. Born in England, he studied architecture at Canterbury School of Architecture and planning at University College, London, before coming to Canada.



I submit that the crisis demands a totally contrary solution to that proposed and that it is capable of implementation entirely within the control of the University administrative structure.

It is evident that there is a wide area of non-understanding that separates the aspirations of the academic community from the concept held by elected legislators and the citizenry of the role of the University in our society.

The solution that I venture to advocate is one involving a dramatic, explosive extension of the field of influence of the University.

There appear to be three inseparable concerns: Firstly, accommodation. The supply of additional physical facilities to house an increasing student enrollment is indisputably not keeping up with the demand if the "open door" policy of admitting any prospective student who has achieved the required standards, a policy that the University is currently pursuing, is to be maintained.

BENEFITS TWO-FOLD

Secondly, funding. A preponderant dependence has been placed on the provincial government to meet the ever-increasing demands for finances that higher education has put upon it in recent years.

Thirdly, human resources. Like the community's economic resources, the human resource has not been capitalized to approach its potential.

There are two social units at variance, the University and the outside community. There are three commodities that we are dealing with, money, accommodation and human resource.

Let us play roulette.

But before we do, perhaps we should ask one very pertinent question: What are the purposes of developing intelligence in the community?

The very structure of this question precludes the

separation of intelligence from community. I submit, that reference to such a question might often be most helpful when determining University policy.

If the University wishes to attract more funds from the community it must make a special effort to communicate that need. The most effective means of communication is the one that directly affects the greatest number of people in that community.

Suppose that we indulge in a dramatic program to integrate the University with the community in every sense of the word. What are the benefits and what is the cost for the University?

The benefit would appear to be two-fold: more people and organizations establish a direct identification with the needs of the University through participation, and therefore release funds through conventional governmental channels and through "incentive-prompted" investment from private sources; and secondly, more people expose themselves to a higher level of educational experience. I shall explain the concept of incentive-prompted investment later.

The price to the University is a loss of the "institutional" identity traditionally enjoyed by academics, and an administrative nightmare. Not too high a price, I suggest.

So how do we start? Let us take a look at the problem of University buildings.

There is confusion as to the purpose of capital investment with respect to the University's needs. Investment commercially is primarily for the purpose of appreciating capital. That is, output must exceed input in dollars. However, the output in educational investment isn't measurable in dollars. The input is dollars and the output is educational opportunity. It is therefore inappropriate to justify investment in education in purely economic terms.

Let us understand clearly then that the prime purpose



more directly with the community for specific programs or concentrated community-oriented courses.

The identity of individual and group interests is de-emphasized to enable common goals to become more easily understood.

Such an opportunity could readily be recognized and appreciated by the departments of planning, geography, architecture, social work and other social sciences. The interdisciplinary structure of Intermedia might well be studied carefully in considering such a program.

Further, off-campus housing could be developed privately with the help of subsidies from the University in an amount equal to the difference in rent that a student can reasonably be expected to pay at the current commercial rental rates. These might take the form of direct grants to the students.

An alternative way to use part of the capital budget would be to subsidize private enterprise to lease land on a 99-year basis and to build academic structures on the Endowment Lands. Guarantee ten-year leases to cover the period normally taken by a private developer to pay off his indebtedness, and require perhaps that the building be designed to be as easy to disassemble as it is to construct, Tinker-Toy like. Technically this is very simple.

The University may choose to extend the lease arrangement or not, but it is not encumbered with an obsolete building that does not meet the educational demands of the time, and more immediately attractive, has been able to apply the capital elsewhere. The owner, at worst, has a fully-paid-up building that he must relocate and re-lease.

NO SPACE SHORTAGE

These proposals represent the incentive-prompted investment referred to earlier.

Concerning space, structure is the crystallization of a process. If a structure is static and a process dynamic, the likelihood of a structure designed to accommodate a process or activity satisfactorily for any significant length of time, in a period when the pace of change is accelerating rapidly, is slight. This in itself reinforces any serious questioning as to the advisability of investment in permanent physical construction designed to accommodate specific activities.

I submit that there is no shortage of space on this campus. There is merely a gross inefficiency of space use.

We are still locked in on an agrarian calendar designed to free labor to help bring in the harvest, and to academic curricula confined to those hours when the dew is off the grass.

I know of no evidence to support a claim that we are more receptive in our learning at certain times during the 24-hour day than others.

Circulation patterns on campus at critical hours during the day create excessive congestion dictated by our gastronomic habits and the academic scheduling that demands that we be faithful to them.

Two prime questions seem to remain unasked; what are the most feasible ways of opening up existing space? And more fundamentally, what space forms do we need?

Perhaps we can distinguish between those spaces that we conceive of as primarily developed to facilitate exchange and social intercourse and those that satisfy the demands for personal isolation. There is very little space on the campus for meditation and private thought.

It has been suggested that the installation of a pub and of a sanctuary on campus would contribute considerably to personal problem-solving without the need for a single word to be spoken.

There is a considerable reservoir of untapped knowledge and skill in the community that could be drawn into participation through invitational lecturing programs or part-time teaching assistantships. Extension department courses could be significantly expanded and designed to utilize the physical facilities much more efficiently.

The accommodation dilemma remains with us. The university administrator, like the city traffic engineer, is restricted by the limitations of his professional role and operates most effectively in that role if he accepts the constraints imposed by his discipline. It is these constraints, however, that impair the perspective of the social utility that each organic sub-system strives to serve within the community.

I submit that these proposals indicate a possible direction for the University to develop that would realize both educational and economic returns. I am hopeful that refreshing ideas will evolve from other sources to help share the burden of responsibility of decision-making and that they will have an opportunity to be articulated through this paper.

of capital investment in educational facilities is not to establish equity in fast-depreciating physical structures, but to provide accommodation for the functions of teaching and learning.

Assume that the University has a capital improvements budget of \$10 million per year, and that it commits the total sum to new physical plant. No unexpended balance remains.

OFF-CAMPUS COLLEGES

Now suppose that \$9 million of this \$10 million is applied instead to leasing existing or new private structures, either rehabilitated or designed for the specific use of the University, and only \$1 million is used for University construction. (There is precedent, incidentally, for government agencies leasing rather than purchasing space).

What are the benefits and the penalties? Let us develop the purchase vs. rent model to clarify the discussion.

Using the \$10 million per annum capital improvement budget assumed and comparing two plans of investment, "A", a direct purchase plan, and "B", a plan to combine purchase and lease of accommodation, we will see very clearly that Plan "B", incorporating provision for leasing accommodation, provides for the

University an increase of 4,500 per cent of the accommodation in square feet provided by a direct purchase plan represented by Plan "A" at the end of the first year.

Using conservative figures of \$25 per square foot for the cost of purchasing new buildings on the campus and the figure of \$5 per square foot for the lease of private property, \$10 million under Plan "A" would purchase 400,000 square feet, with no space being provided by lease arrangements. In Plan "B", if \$1 million is applied to the purchase of new buildings that would provide 40,000 square feet; while \$9 million would be applied to leasing space which would realize 1,800,000 square feet, providing a total of 1,840,000 square feet of academic space being made available.

This purchase/leasing device is designed to give the University the flexibility required to adjust its total space holdings each year to match its current needs, within a limited capital improvements appropriation.

What are the implications of this proposal?

Firstly, the University would commit itself to a decentralizing policy, for suitable existing buildings and/or private building sites are off the University campus. The net result automatically initiates a closer relationship trend between members of the University and members of the community as a whole.

The suggestion then is one of developing University annexes, sub-campii or University college concepts within the city. At least one department of this University has expressed an interest in partially relocating downtown.

This proposal is not designed to create any situation under which faculties or departments would need to make a decision as to whether or not they would relocate off the campus, but rather to provide an additional facility and expanded opportunity to interact

UBC
REPORTS

Volume 14, No. 11—December 19, 1968. Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Vancouver B.C. Published by the University of British Columbia and distributed free. J.A. Banham, Editor; Barbara Claghorn, Production Supervisor. Letters to the Editor should be addressed to the Information Office, UBC, Vancouver 8, B.C.

THE



PRESIDENT'S

Dr. F. Kenneth Hare, UBC's president, addressed the Faculty Association on December 5. What follows are excerpts from his speech.

I'm glad to have this chance of meeting the Association. You were parties to my appointment, and I wouldn't have accepted the President's job on any other terms. I am a professional university teacher, and have always held that the future of the universities lies in the hands of the professionals. Lay trustees and senators can do their bit, and students a lot. But the main burden lies on us of the profession, the *cadres* that in France are called *le corps universitaire*. If we fail, the universities go to the wall. For each of us, *tuum est* is a personal spur.

As at present conceived the Presidency is a burden because the university does not really know its own mind. The President is the chief executive officer of the university, and not simply of the Board of Governors, as is sometimes wrongly stated: even the Universities Act gets this clear, whatever else it leaves obscure. Now an executive officer must know what, rather than whom, to execute. He must work from a body of agreed policy. Clearly he must also be allowed certain prerogatives, and certain powers of initiative. But these, too, must be within agreed limits, and must spring from the needs of the academic community.

It is my suggestion that neither policy nor prerogatives have in fact been agreed on by the academic profession. The President hence works in an exasperating vacuum. The point, in my view, is that we have failed to adjust our sights to the new scale on which we must work, to the new relation between society and the world of scholarship. As a profession we have drifted into a revolutionary situation all unexpectedly.

I must say that we tend to exaggerate the importance of our little revolution. One of the lessons of events in France last May, in Columbia last spring, in London last month is that events that seem to threaten our very existence leave the public unimpressed—who become vengeful, perhaps, rather than sympathetic. On the short, tactical scale that influences political decision—for democracies only have strategic policies by hindsight, when historians discover long-term consistencies that never occurred to the perpetrators—the effects of campus rumpus are wholly prejudicial to the universities.

So when I say we have failed to adjust our sights, I don't mean to our new social importance (which is real, but goes unobserved in crises), but simply that we now serve a populist, not an aristocratic, constituency. And this means that we have a unique, untried problem on our hands, where our traditional weapons of more talk, more explanation, more polemic, more public anguish tend to work against us.

I have, however, reflected on some aspects of the role of the President of UBC. Often I have stressed the role of diplomat, and in this I was right. There is a huge job to do to persuade a perplexed society that the wells of goodwill have not run dry, and that well-intentioned men need not fight one another over problems whose cause really lies outside the

university. And as teacher (including self-teacher!) the President shares with the rest of the Faculty the task of bridging the chasm of misunderstanding now separating the politically-motivated students from our intellectually-driven selves.

A few of us try to be motivated both ways, and a President cannot avoid being perhaps dangerously alert to political issues if he is to be credible at all to the student body. I have the same feeling that I had when I was a student in the 1930's; of impending disaster unless all of us abandon the habit of shrugging our shoulders at the sight of our own impotence.

I believe that we can solve the university problem within the context of existing Canadian society, though I am sure that we shall have to assault some of the values of that society if we are to succeed.

Which brings me to the first of my personal *angsts* or *angoisses* or *cauchemars* or what have you: no English word quite hits the spot. It is that I also have to play the role of non-diplomat, of brutally frank commentator, of one who doesn't fear the consequences for himself of saying what he thinks. I found the prospect of having to go over to the attack repellent—but necessary. The President's office is a good place to find out about the failures, the inadequacies, the prejudices and the stupidities that have landed us where we are. Traditionally the President bottles these up, because to reveal them would be inexpedient, or personally and institutionally hazardous. Reluctantly I reached the conclusion a little while ago that if I was to do this job I had to speak with very uncharacteristic bluntness.

'I believe we can solve the university problem within the context of existing Canadian society, though I am sure we shall have to assault some of the values of that society if we are to succeed.'

Among the things that we must all attack are some of the attitudes of our own profession, because I think we have ourselves caused some of the trouble in the universities, with good intentions but bad effect. We have to criticize the society around us, which has simply not thought out the consequences of its own social and economic policies, the effect of which is to underemploy, to disfranchise, to disgust morally, and hence to alienate a substantial fraction of the world of youth. And a third is the attitude of the people of this province who, by their neglect of higher education, have made a world-wide problem even harder of solution within British Columbia.

Clearly in the present company it must be our own professional attitudes that I tackle. Let me start with the Faculty Association and its role. I was one of the early presidents of the McGill Association of University Teachers, and a prime mover at McGill of the effort to persuade the governing body to leave control of academic affairs to the professoriate. That effort has been largely successful, and has been

paralleled on thousands of other campuses. The 1950's and early 1960's saw the rise of Faculty power in North America, as chronicled with blinding hindsight by McGeorge Bundy in the September *Atlantic*. This power has been established by the progressive acceptance of conventions rather than by legislative change, and it is still incomplete.

Its growth has sapped the power of Presidents, I think wisely and inevitably, but the most striking result is that the total power in the system has been reduced. The junior faculty of a modern university still feels disfranchised and unconsulted. And the universities lack speedy and effective powers of decision-making, of academic foresight, and of rising to sudden crises.

Where power is diffused, it cannot quickly be condensed again. I am cheered by the death of the old campus despotisms, but chastened by the inescapable need for big institutions like ours to react decisively and quickly to change of circumstances. Somehow we must find professional answers to this need.

Faculty associations have also battled, again with good reason, to raise salaries, improve fringe benefits, and win the right to tenure. They have succeeded beyond the expectations of those of us who in the 1940's and 1950's really began this movement in Canada. There is still much to do, and I've no doubt you will do it. I feel, however, that the moment is upon us when the profession must also bear heavily down upon itself as regards its obligations and practices. As clinicians I believe we need to stiffen our self-discipline in ways to which I'll return. To be blunt, if we are to raise our standard of teaching, of intellectual rigour and of general performance as professionals, it will have to be by self-discipline.

There is no external administration to make rules for us about the way we deal with students, and governors were long ago frightened off this thorny ground. I believe the faculty associations, like medical and legal and engineering professional bodies, will have to take on this embarrassing job. No one else will do it, or can do it, though senates may try.

Of course it is unreasonable to expect such an acceptance of professional responsibility unless the profession also feels that it has a proper share in the university's government. I must say right away that I believe we have attached too much importance to the structures and forms of university life, and too little to the personal obligations it involves. I have worked in universities almost wholly professor-governed, wholly lay-governed, and with mixed boards. The facts of academic life were much the same in all.

Nevertheless I don't feel one can expect the academic community to discipline its own members if it feels it is ruled from on high. In my own view neither Duff-Berdaal nor the manifestos of this Association go far enough. I can offer full support for the Association's ambition to see some of its members on the Board, but I feel that you should really look beyond this to the more fundamental question: does the bicameral Senate-Board system serve us adequately?

In my view it does not. I can also support efforts towards the involvement of junior faculty and students in the decision-making processes, not because of sentimental ideas about the community, but because they, too, will have to share in the internal disciplinary processes without which, to quote Eric Ashby in Melbourne this summer, the

JOB

disintegration of our profession will be accelerated.

"Disintegration" is a harsh word, and perhaps it is too strong. I remember being shocked in 1956 when I asked a senior professor of physics to join McGill Association of University Teachers. He said curtly: "I'm not a university teacher, I'm a physicist." I had supposed he was both. Many of us make this distinction, and the temptation is always there to be loyal to our discipline rather than to our role as teacher. I believe this attitude to be quite wrong, and at the root of some of our troubles with students. It is one thing to say "I cannot be loyal to my students unless I am first loyal to my discipline"; this implies what I think is true, that our professional obligation contains a dual loyalty, the two halves of which are inseparable. It is another thing to say "My ambition is to advance my discipline, and my teaching must not interfere with this ambition." In private this gets said all the time.

How can we blame, in fact, the young scholar who says just this? Our appointment and promotions policies have for long stressed achievement in research, and soft-pedalled teaching. These policies are not overt; but are dependent on professional attitude. Page 27 of the *Faculty Handbook* actually puts teaching at the top of the list of "criteria of excellence"; research is second, professional competence third, and contributions to the university community and the external society fourth and fifth. I'm sure this is often not the order observed. Certainly there is a widespread belief at UBC that premature devotion to teaching is a good way of remaining a lifelong instructor, just as those who practice the rhythm method of birth control are called parents.

The point I want to stress is that professional attitudes, not rules, underlie the present low prestige and neglect (in some quarters) of teaching. Here, as in a dozen other ways, we can achieve change only by an altered outlook—in which this Association should, in my view, have a major hand.

I see the President as the man who has the duty to try to detect these professional attitudes, to attempt to alter them if they seem wrong to him (by direct methods and not by tactful subterfuges) and to try to be in himself a sort of encapsulation of the profession's ambitions for itself, for its students and for society. To do these things he needs all the help he can get. Most notably he needs the following things:

(i) a critical, friendly but independent professional association like this, to keep him up to scratch, and to give him a body outside the hierarchy of the university that can speak for professional interests and obligations;

(ii) an effective system of internal government that can speedily arrive at sound decisions, give all

'I see the President as the man who has the duty to try to detect professional attitudes . . . and to be in himself a sort of encapsulation of the profession's ambitions for itself.'

members of the university a feeling of participation in formal affairs, and permit a reasonable measure of *accepted* central authority;

(iii) within this system a sort of cabinet that can formulate policy for ratification by the larger bodies, and provide the President with authoritative advice when emergencies occur.

'Structural reform will fail if not accompanied by strong professional action to update practices, shake accepted prejudices and meet the wave of student unrest and public hostility constructively.'

I have recently set up an Advisory Committee, chaired first by Acting Dean John Young and now by Prof. Noel Hall, to examine points (ii) and (iii), as well as the external relations of UBC. The committee has members nominated by Senate, this Association, the Alumni, the Alma Mater Society, and myself. I hope and expect that it will bring in proposals for a restructuring of the University. These will have to be ratified by the various bodies concerned and then, we hope, made the subject of revised provincial legislation. Let me stress that I hope great things from this committee. But in itself structural reform will fail, as will the President, if it is not accompanied by strong professional action to update practices, shake our accepted prejudices and meet the present wave of student unrest and public hostility constructively.

At the beginning of my talk I said that I thought that we did not know our own mind, that we hadn't come to terms with our phenomenal growth and new social position. In effect, we have imported into the age of the multiversity much of the outlook of a smaller, more leisurely, less populist world. We take for granted the worthwhileness of knowledge, and of the inevitability of its advance. Most of us, myself included, have defended the proposition that our first duty to society is the advancement of knowledge, not only because this helps economic advance, but because man feels a sort of duty to know. None of these things weighs much with the public, who pay our bills. Seven per cent of the G.N.P. now goes into education, largely because it is assumed to be useful, not desirable. In my view, we bang our heads against a wall if we forget this fact. I don't say we should accept the public view—but that we should never forget it.

Nor, frankly, do these ideas weigh much with our students. The majority, perhaps, still accept their years at UBC as training for a job within an economic framework they have no special urge to change. The articulate minority that has brought us to noisy unrest feels otherwise. They reject society in its present guise, and condemn the university because it serves society's ends. Neither group contains any great number who are scholars for scholarship's sake. So our traditional view of the liberal university is close to meaningless to all three groups—to taxpayer, to orthodox student, to activist alike. What we need is a new prophet, who can reconcile these seeming polarities and put the times a little less out of joint.

Letters to the Editor

MORE STUDENTS NEEDED

I was interested in the November issue of "UBC Reports", particularly in the discussion about "The Looming Numbers Crisis."

I would remind you that although the facilities at UBC are strained up to and perhaps beyond capacity, our facilities at Selkirk were designed to accommodate 300 more students than are enrolled at present. We have 500 students and could accommodate 800.

You can understand, perhaps, that from our point of view, the term "crisis" seems a little strong. It has often seemed rather strange to me that UBC continues to accept students from this area when the pressures upon it are so very great and space for these freshmen is available at Selkirk.

Ross P. Fraser
Administrative Assistant
to the Principal,
Selkirk College,
Castlegar, B.C.

INACCURATE ARTICLE

I have read with interest the November issue of UBC Reports and was rather amazed that Dr. David Bond's article was accepted for publication, as it is completely inaccurate. It appears to me that Dr. Bond, while perhaps understanding economics, has no knowledge of mathematics. I would think that a man of his standing would research his subject before going into print.

Firstly, if we consider his first means of raising additional money, we find that the student would be borrowing up to \$2,500 per year, for a probable total loan of \$12,500. This is based on a present average fee of about \$500, plus the \$1,000 raise in fees suggested, plus the \$1,000 for living expenses. Now, we find that the average annual income tax for a married man, without children, having an annual income of \$25,000 is about \$8,000. Therefore if a surcharge of 1 per cent on the borrower's payable tax was collected, for an estimated average of 40 years, the total amount repaid would come to \$3,200.

This could hardly be considered to meet Dr. Bond's statement that "his lifetime payments would not only pay back his loan but several others as well". Secondly, if we assume that Dr. Bond made a mistake and meant to say that a surcharge of 1 per cent would be made on the borrower's *income*, even gross income, the total amount repaid even if we extend the lifetime earnings to 50 years would only amount to \$12,500 which would repay the borrower's loan only. Needless to say, no interest would have been collected, and in addition the value of the repayments would be greatly reduced by inflation.

On a quick reading, the article appears to offer a possible solution, but when one returns to earth and applies a little simple arithmetic to the proposition, as above, we find that it is practically worthless. Perhaps Dr. Bond was thinking that most students would borrow only a fraction of the amount made available, but I doubt very much if that is the case, because if students only borrowed a small amount they would not sign up to a lifetime repayment basis.

G.R. Loutet

ISSUE APPRECIATED

Although journalism has always ranked very *low* in my scale of responsible pastimes, I have never been moved enough to write about it.

Your recent issues of "Reports", however, have been so good that I must let you know they are appreciated. Possibly it is because your contributors in the Nov. issue (No. 8) are not journalists—but whatever the reason, every one of them seems to have got to the basics of the problems. The entire issue, every article, was worthwhile and excellently done.

My congratulations.

W.D. Parkinson.
B.A.Sc. '56.

CONTACT

A UBC Alumni Association Report



Perry Commission found alumni brief to be unique in approach. Presenting the brief were (left to right) Stan Evans, Nick Omelusik, Jack Stathers, Ken Martin, George Morfitt, and chairman Sholto Heberton. Absent were committee members John Gercsak, Robert Mair and Graham Nixon.

Higher Education Agency Proposed

The University of B.C. Alumni Association has recommended the establishment of a single agency to co-ordinate post-secondary education in British Columbia.

The agency, in essence, would co-ordinate the academic and financial affairs of the three public universities, the community colleges, and technical and vocational schools.

The proposal was made in a brief presented November 28 to deputy education minister Dr. G. Neil Perry, who is heading an advisory committee reviewing planning and operations of B.C.'s public universities. The brief is the result of five months study by the association's Government Relations Committee.

BRIEF RECEIVED

The chairman of the committee, Sholto Heberton, BA '57, BA, BCL (Oxon), LLM (Harvard), said Dr. Perry received the brief "with interest" but was non-committal. Association director Jack Stathers, BA '55, MA '58 noted that Dr. Perry had said the alumni brief was quite different from others.

"The distinguishing feature of our brief is that, while others might tend to be more protective of the interest of faculty and the institutions, our view was more general," Stathers said. "I think we felt there was a need for more co-ordination and control than that expressed by others."

The alumni brief said there are three proven systems for centralized planning of higher education:

-A governing board that co-ordinates and governs all public institutions of higher learning within a province or state;

-A co-ordinating agency empowered to co-ordinate and control certain selected activities of the institutions but restrained from exercising general governing or administrative powers;

-Voluntary representation or a meeting of representatives of each institution to co-ordinate activities of common concern.

The alumni committee said it found the co-ordinating agency to be the

most suitable organization for the job. "The establishment of goals by the co-ordinating agency and the independent execution of these goals by the institutions encourages a thorough and rigorous review of results and reduces the opportunity for institutions to cover their mistakes," said the brief. **MORE AUTONOMY**

"There is more autonomy with a co-ordinating agency than with a governing board. Such autonomy increases the likelihood of academic initiative by individual institutions."

The committee clearly opposes the idea of one governing board as proposed by the Simon Fraser University Senate. The fear is that that system would have too great a centralizing effect.

"The difference between Simon Fraser's proposal and ours is the difference between having one university and having three universities," said Sholto Heberton.

"The difference between the two ideas is that with a governing board, that top board gets involved in executing decisions as well as making them, but this would not happen with our proposal because the universities would retain their individual boards."

The brief said the co-ordinating agency should have nine to 15 members and a full-time director paid about the same as a Dean—\$22,000 to \$25,000. The members of the co-ordinating agency would be of high calibre and would not be paid.

Some academics would be included in the body, but each individual institution would not be represented, though all types of institutions would be.

SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS

The specific functions of the agency would include: determination of academic and financial priorities within the system; initiation, approval or rejection of new faculties, schools and departments; co-ordination of admission standards and transfer procedures; recommendation to the government of the total appropriation to the system; and division of the funds among the institutions.

Viewpoint

By Dr. W.C. Gibson

I sometimes think that what this university needs more than anything else is a little imagination. Because of rapid growth the university faces complex problems—shortage of funds, overcrowding, traffic congestion, student unrest—which cry out for bold solutions. The safe, conventional approach does not seem adequate for the job. Nor does the mere infusion of more money. We must instead begin searching for more imaginative solutions. And I would like to help begin that process by raising a few questions.

I wonder what would happen if South West Marine Drive, from 41st Avenue to Totem Park, were made a one-way, two-lane entry to UBC from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and a one-way, two-lane exit from the campus from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. daily? Except for these stated periods it would of course continue as it now is, a two-way road.

The money which might otherwise go into paving the present wide slash in the university forest could be used to take the tourist traffic down the sloping side of the cliff at the point where the divided four-lane highway now runs out, along a dyke enclosing an Olympic rowing course (6,000 feet long by 600 feet wide by 10 feet deep), and then along an anti-erosion road at the foot of the cliffs below Cecil Green Park and the School of Social Work, and so into the city by joining North West Marine Drive at Spanish Banks. A 2,000-boat marina could even be built at the north-west tip of Point Grey to amortize all road costs.

I wonder what would happen if students who now leave their cars on Blanca Street in such profusion were able to leave them in an extensive, specially-created, band-like parking area stretching along the west side of Blanca from 11th Avenue to 16th Avenue? Campus traffic jams would be reduced, and an improved bus service from Blanca to the campus would become more feasible economically.

I wonder what would happen if the Alumni Association were finally allowed to take over the lease on the so-called "University Golf Course" from the construction company that built it? The income could go into university coffers for a change, along with the \$200,000 a year now contributed by UBC graduates for a variety of purposes.

I wonder what would happen if "the quiet campus" on Saturdays and Sundays were to be developed as "A Weekend University" for those who have to earn their bread and that of their families from Monday to Friday? After a mammoth conversion of the UBC timetable to a five-day week, our vast plant remains idle on the weekends except for graduate students and library users.

I wonder what would happen if a "Free University" for those clamoring for it, were set up at, say, the old Air Force Base at Jericho, where residences and lecture halls—even large hangers for indoor sports—are available? The tuition fees of UBC students desiring to transfer to such an institution of self-instruction could be refunded in full at any time during the college year. The rest of UBC's students could be left to pursue their education in peace.

Weekend students might take, during one winter session, the equivalent of the two courses taken in the presently concentrated summer session. The teaching might be done by younger faculty members who would expect, in return, to be allowed to pursue their research without interruption from Monday to Friday.

What do you think would happen if these things were done?

Dr. Gibson, BA '33, MSC (McGill), PhD (Oxon), MD, CM (McGill) is a professor of the history of medicine and science. The Viewpoint column is open to any alumni for the free expression of opinion. Contributions should be sent to: Communications Director, UBC Alumni Association, 6251 Northwest Marine Dr., Vancouver 8, B.C.