

**Transcripts – KPU Oral – Judith McGillivray – Dean – Health and Community Services;
VP Finance Academic and Provost**

Interviewer – Roger Elmes, Dean Emeritus

Second Interviewer and Camera – Alice Macpherson

File name: 181115_JMcGillivray_Interview

Transcribed by: Transcription Ninjas (AN)

Length of file (time): 1:29:40

[Beginning of transcript]

ROGER: So, I'll just give a little intro. Why'd you join in 1994, etcetera.

JUDITH: Okay.

ROGER: And maybe you might want to talk a little bit about why you came to Kwantlen, why you chose Kwantlen. You don't have to.

JUDITH: Well from 1994, for five years I was the Dean of Health and Community Services. That's what they called it. And then I took on the role of Vice President, Academic and Provost, and that was for 11 years and then I retired.

ROGER: Wow, that's quite incredible. That's very exciting, and also in the midst of all of that, in 2012, you completed your thesis.

JUDITH: Yes, I did.

ROGER: Very interesting read.

JUDITH: It was. It took a lot of literature review to go through, let me tell you. Four or five different literature reviews, but it sort of fits in with what you're talking about, which is the history of Kwantlen as an institution. First as a community college, coming out of the Macdonald Report. And it's interesting, Macdonald said he didn't base it on California, in his interview he did with Rob Fleming, but most of the literature refers to California. But, the colleges when they started in the 1960s, started under the impetus of the communities and were under the aegis of the school boards, which were quite authoritarian in terms of how they conduct their business. And it wasn't until they [the colleges] were made independent, that you got a little more sort of movement into sort of more academic influence, I would say. But the colleges overall, and one of the things that I looked at in the dissertation – colleges and university-colleges compared to universities, remain hierarchical, bureaucratic, authoritarian. As much as being an administrator in that time, you don't quite understand it until you make a move to a university model. And the establishment of Senates and Faculty and the evolving of power and decision making into those

bodies. And then you begin to understand sort of some of that history and why, when universities were established, there was conflict. We had a number of constituent bodies and sort of entrenched social forces that grew from those early college days, went to university college days and then were trying to change a culture which in the midst of carrying forward all of this history that we

[03:40]

had, right? So I mean that early history - amalgamated colleges with vocational schools, which is how we became a mixed bag of what we were in post-secondary. And also, we talk a lot about – well not a lot, but the Faculty Association slash Union is very important in all of this mix, because when the University started, I don't think we, and I take personal responsibility for this, did as much as we could in terms of the discussion that needed to occur. Whether or not we agreed, I think the discussion didn't take place and should have taken place. Because when you go back into that history, when colleges were first formed, they [faculty associations] went for the Society's Act, and it wasn't until the BC Labour Code was established sort of in the 60's and early 70's that they came out of that Society's Act.

ROGER: Out of the Public Schools Act.

JUDITH: Yeah, out of the Public Schools Act. So, before that, in terms of working conditions and all that, were all done individually, so they were very different practices throughout the province. However, when the BC Labour Code was introduced, faculty were allowed to organize and become certified as trade unions and bargain collectively. And over time, especially during the time just before that Solidarity Movement came in, we had a huge period of growth in the college system, right? And all of a sudden we were having this claw-back of 3%, we were having this claw-back of access. So, the Faculty Associations took on the initiative and organized themselves provincially, which then forced administrators to organize themselves provincially in order to deal with the provincial body, right?

ROGER: Yeah.

JUDITH: And we ended up at a common table after that, right? And so, it's sort of interesting to understand that dynamic. But the other dynamic was with the introduction of the College and Institute Act, and the establishment of Education Councils, which really had some powers but a lot of recommendation powers, right? Which I don't think they fully appreciated. And I can talk a little bit about that.

ROGER: First they've been under the KEAC model in Kwantlen, Educational Advisory [Committee], as opposed to some more specifically legislated power, or some power anyway.

JUDITH: Yes exactly, and before even another institution didn't have that KEAC model, so the faculty associations or unions in many ways were the voice of faculty around academic matters, right? And so, that's why as we switched to the Senate and they started to get into fights about what is an academic matter and what is a working condition. And you go back to three-hour versus four-hour classes, four hours at night, three in the day, but why can't we be three all the time. Which is when the Curriculum Committee said, that's our jurisdiction, that's a curriculum matter. And the Faculty Association said, no that isn't, that's a working conditions matter.

[07:30]

So you get into these loggerheads between these two parties, but it goes back in history because they were the voice and all of a sudden that voice was being switched substantially to another body. And therefore, you saw all of these – not all, but a number of – not even – grievances I would say, put forward during that early stage of the Senate development, you know? You don't have faculty rank, begs a huge, contentious issue. And so you start to – and some examples will probably come up later. But that whole switch and the fact that they were such an important player. And how do you make a transition and take away and somebody's - what they thought or had been their jurisdiction, switch it over to another body, and leave them feeling like, what in God's name is happening here, right?

ROGER: Yeah.

JUDITH: So I think we had a lot of turmoil during those first years just because of that whole history. So that's at the union end of it. But it was interesting also, because when there was KEAC [Kwantlen Education Advisory Committee] and then Education Council came in to existence and it always had a problem, at least when I was sitting at that table, understanding the academic decision versus the union decision, right? And the prime examples came up when we would cancel a program. I think there were two cancellations during my time. But in both of those, the Education Council, the whole argument would be on, is this academically, yes we see this information, but does it mean loss of jobs? And so, I remember the one situation, the Board asked them for advice which they have to in the College and Institute Act, and they wouldn't give advice because they were conflicted.

ROGER: Conflicted.

JUDITH: And I remember sitting next to George Melville, who was on the board at the time [Board member 2003 to 2009; Chancellor 2014-2020] and he looked at me and he said, "So what are we supposed to do? Our academic body won't give us any advice. So you know what I'm going to do with a business man? I'm going to give advice based on a business decision." And that's where the board members who were businesspeople, primarily were saying. "Why can't you give us some advice? Because we would like to understand this besides just hearing it from the administration."

ROGER: Right.

JUDITH: So I think – so that was a really difficult period for them also. I think what I've learned is, when I did contract at Vancouver Community College as their VP *pro tem* I did a lot of work with the Education Council, and I said, “You’re not coming to a meeting without the College and Institute Act in front of you. You have to understand your legislated mandate.” And these are the areas that you’re not doing it in, and so you have to tell me why you’re not, because you’re supposed to under legislation. And so, I think part of it is not having become more aware of that background. At the same time, I think we grew over time.

[11:27]

Because when I think through the various chairs of Education Council [at Kwantlen], we did a lot, we did a lot in terms of curriculum. We did a lot in terms of program review. I think we did a lot in terms of policy. But any time there was a real conflictual issue, as a body of academics, that professional hat and that union hat always came into contestation with each other.

ROGER: You now it does go right back to, in the Kwantlen setting, it goes right back to the Douglas days when the union was formed. For some of us, the reason we formed a union because it was sort of financial issue. A couple of other people, Sandra Carpenter, a few others who aren’t here anymore – that... two different reasons for it. One was, we were sort of getting pushed away from being this kind of collective democracy, everybody coming together to make decisions.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: And that was disappearing as the institution grew. So, we were getting pushed away from that as faculty. And then there was another group who were really more on the working conditions, salary, and those kinds of issues. So, those two things were there from the very beginning. And as you say, it remained in this sort of weird partnership for a long, long time.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. And there’s no doubt the literature says that as institutions grow, they become more bureaucratic.

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

JUDITH: And therefore, that democratic public space that you would have experienced as a small institution has gradually eroded, right? So, I think when the Senate was established, it gave – at least when I was observing – it gave the opportunity for some faculty who had never participated in any of the committees, just sitting at the table and saying, this is now a space where I can put forward what I think, and my beliefs, and of course we have many, many articulate doctoral prepared faculty who had positions and could state them well.

ROGER: Yeah. It's quite interesting. We just interviewed a faculty member yesterday, and he was talk about the fear of speaking out, even within the union. So, there's - and fear of speaking out beyond the union. So, I think those are two important points. So, Kwantlen as a college and then as a university-college, and then the new legislation governing university colleges, which gives some more role for faculty – a different role, under legislation. And as you say there was a lot of conflict around what that role was, and where they could be accepted and adopted by faculty and used effectively.

JUDITH: I think about the Senate and Board of Governors is interesting also, because the Act says that the Senate can give advice. I think the Board thought they had to ask for advice before the Senate gave it. But the Senate took it on their responsibility that they were going to give advice

[15:05]

regardless of being asked of what they thought were important matters, right? Which I know points in time kept the Board back, like how do you deal with this? We're not used to working in this situation where people are telling us what they think, and where we might be wrong. So, that was a really interesting dynamic to see them struggle with also.

ROGER: Yeah. So, in the university-college setting, you kind of get a shift as presidents who - and then there's a modified Carver Model of governance that kind of comes into play, which sort of differentiates between the board and the senior administration, and says, broad policy, directions, etcetera - that's the board, overseeing budget, approving budget. But then, the day to day operations are in the CEO, which started to be a term that was used as well. And that's kind of the model that the institution moved into for what... six years at least, maybe longer?

JUDITH: At least, yes. And maybe we could use the example of budgets. Budgets were highly centralized. What we would each do as Vice Presidents is work with the Deans, bring up our budget, we'd be within parameters of what the Vice President of Finance told us we were capable of doing, and then we would negotiate back and forth and cut sections or whatever. But, in the university model, the senate must give advice. That opened up a whole different budget process. Because they could see the budget. You had to set the priorities before-hand. They could comment on it from, you know. And people had to learn about budget, which was a huge thing for committees. I remember Gordon Lee giving his Accounting 101 type of lecture in terms of how to read a spreadsheet, what goes into it, what you should be able to question, you know? And so, that was a whole different process, and I found it enormously enlightening. I think the Deans could speak better for themselves than I could as their Provost, right? Because I could collectively do some things. But, when they came, they could make a really strong case for some initiatives.

ROGER: Mm-hmm. Yeah. So, I mean all of this post-dates me of course, because I've been retired two years before it became a university and the senate was established. So, a lot of this a learning curve for me. So, it's quite interesting to read through your thesis and look at how you set it up with public, social, and private space and assets. And how it then fit into how is the senate organized? How is it set up? How does it organize itself so it can work through these issues? So, it's quite fascinating.

JUDITH: I think during... I mean the time when you were Dean too, I mean, we did a lot of things. And I was thinking back on how did we do them if they weren't done before, right? I mean, I remember when I first started here, you were meeting with the President during that time trying to get some support for research and scholarship and it was going nowhere.

ROGER: Yeah.

[18:44]

JUDITH: And so, I went back and thought, how did we manage to set up...

ROGER: Well it didn't go anywhere for quite a while and then we got an agreement, that the Board ultimately approved, which said, yes, research and scholarship are things that faculty can – and possibly should do, but no college funds, no university-college funds will be spent on it.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: So that was kind of the first step, if you like, putting that into place. And then you were able to sort of say, well there's other university-colleges out there that are doing this. So, how can we link up with them? And then we started to do some joint annual conferences, presentations of student-faculty research with them, and then we hosted one. And it kind of grew like that, off the side of the desk before there was...

JUDITH: Because you were the Dean and you were in charge of it too, and we had one employee.

ROGER: Mm-hmm, that's right. Who's still there.

JUDITH: Yeah, and so that's how we started out. And part of it was just convincing the other Vice Presidents and the President that we needed some money.

ROGER: Yeah.

JUDITH: Not a lot of money, but we needed somebody to house this.

ROGER: Yeah, but see that didn't even happen until you became a VP. Before that, I mean you were supportive and Deans generally were supportive, and so on. But we hadn't got beyond that,

and no college, no university-college money will be used to support it. So, it took somebody in the position, you specifically, to make that extra step and start that moving ahead.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. Because, when we set up the Research Ethics Board, and we set it up without any release time, right? So we set it up in this really odd way that different people would be brought together and form a committee of four or five, you know? And, it didn't work at all for a lot of reasons. And part of it... then the next step was that, if you want AUCC accreditation, my fellow Vice Presidents and President, we're going to have to have a research ethics board that is funded, has release time, and has expertise. And, that's what sold that, right? But, you know, across the system, when you look at the other universities, I know we had a lot of issues in terms of some of the research being challenged and that type of thing. I remember phoning up the University of Alberta Vice President, Research at the time. Can you imagine? She was Indira who then became president of the University of Alberta? And she took my call, and she spent about an hour on the phone, I mean just as an academic saying, this is what you need to do, this is who you should think about contacting, they may be your external person.

[21:58]

And so, I remember phoning up who was then the Vice President of UNBC, I can't remember her name, Vice President, Academic and said, "Would you consider sitting as the external on our... and the research will come forward and we can Skype you in?" And she said, "Of course we will. Of course I'll do that for you." And the same with SFU, phone up John Waterhouse and saying, "I have a real issue here, I don't know how to deal with it." And he said, "I'll put you in contact with..." Who was it? Their internal VP Lawyer, who said, "I don't even have that expertise, I'm going to put you in contact with a boutique lawyer who's going to guide you through this." And everybody else that we contacted said, "Of course we'll do that for you. I'm retired, I have that background, I'll do it for you." "All you have to do is pay my ferry way, and get my hotel, and I don't demand anything else." And that I think, doesn't astound me, but you appreciate that academics support each other in very significant ways without having to be on contract to do it, right?

ROGER: Yeah. And we... as we move forward from research, and got into developing degrees, of course, that created some other interesting situations. Even as a university-college, yours was one of the first degrees – the Bachelor of Science, Nursing – that came forward as a university-college, I think it was within 6 months of something like that. It had already been put together. And they designed the degree that had sort of been grand-parented in from... so theirs was a little different, but BSc Nursing was put together quite quickly and effectively.

JUDITH: But I think when the other university-colleges were established in terms of being degree-granting, they were mentored.

ROGER: Yes.

JUDITH: Kwantlen was never mentored, it was just established. So mentorship can be looked at in a number of ways. How they were mentored, based on my understanding, is that if you're Fraser Valley, you will take on everything SFU does, and accept all their policies, and accept everything thing they do about rank and tenure, accept everything they say about curriculum, everything they say about liberal education. Period. That's it. The mentorship. We struggled with that. And I think that struggle really helped us. Because people were saying, "What is liberal education?" So, I think that conversation was really valuable and we didn't just accept what somebody else told us to accept. The other thing... it skipped my mind... besides mentorship...

ROGER: I would say it kind of gave the degree's automatic approval.

JUDITH: Oh, the applied. The applied. Kwantlen will be applied. Well, so we knew we could sort of do Design, we know we could do Health, we knew we could do Business. Figure out we're going to do humanities and arts, right? When the Psych degree first went through it was refused by the ministry.

[25:47]

And I remember going over to Victoria one day and sitting down with Arlene Paton and her crew, and she was the ADM I believe. And we had a really good guide [*0:25:58], and then the oddest thing occurred about a month later, I was on the phone with her about something else. We got onto the degrees again, and why won't you allow Kwantlen to be like the other university-colleges. She said to me, "I don't see anything in the legislation or in any correspondence that I have that says you can only do applied." Those were her words. And I said, "Oh, it's really been nice talking to you." And then immediately I thought well, you won't put it in writing, but door's open, we engage Bob Brown. He came in, well recognized, and one of the things he said to that working group when we set up the umbrella degrees for the Bachelor of Arts. He said, "This would have taken me four years at SFU. Four to six years." He said, "You guys have done it in about 6 months." People were so engaged, and I know Bob and I went over to the ministry a couple of times to smooth feathers. In terms of, these are coming through. I remember going over to SFU, I forget who was the chair of DQAB at the time, but talking with him, he said the degree was coming through.

ROGER: So, it's the Degree Quality Assessment?

JUDITH: Yeah, I forget who the chair was. "Do you see any issues that we have not addressed?" Trying to cover our bases at all points before those degrees went public. And that I think just opened the gates.

ROGER: Yeah. It was sort of a 7 year... coming from a university-college there was kind of a 7 year where this applied only seemed to be the rule. And then, as you say, there was no rule.

JUDITH: There was no rule.

ROGER: And then all of a sudden, this pent-up demand, desire, to create degrees and what is now a Faculty of Arts. All of that was pushing along and using Bob Brown was a stroke of genius I think, because it automatically creates a sort of premature quality on it all.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. And I think part of it is just sitting around the table on some real contested issues around how much math can you include or not. Or should you do this in which you have to include a lab science, and just him giving his perspective. If you do this, you're going to slow down your degree, because one, you don't have enough space. You don't have enough science space. So, if you're going to put this in all of your degrees, you're going to just delay them. So, can you look at it through another frame to get what you want, but not perhaps get everything you want. So, it was just having that wisdom, somebody being able to talk in a straight-forward manner.

[29:10]

ROGER: Yeah, and he was certainly that. And it provided - I mean his experience at SFU, and the length of his experience at SFU, gave him credibility with I think faculty and deans as well, and they listened; they listened to his comments and learned from it. It was very, very helpful. And it did, as he said... 6 months, that was pretty amazing because it created this wonderful framework and other departments could fit in and say, "Okay now we'd like to...", and there was a framework that everyone could follow.

JUDITH: I think the other thing we learned was that the outcome - so initially people were going forward and they were spending a lot of time and effort and investing their soul in creating potential degrees. And then not being supported. So that's when we went back and developed the program concept versus the whole program proposal. Saying this is really not fair to anyone. Let them put in a concept, market analysis, do all of that up front and before they proceed, the Board has to say, "Yes we support this and we'll find the funding for it in the next budget," right? That to me was just... we learned we had to do something, right? And I think that model is still the most workable model.

ROGER: Yeah, because you can spend a lot of faculty time, effort, energy and spirit.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: And then if it just gets beat down because it's not going to happen, or it won't be happening for five years, or whatever it might be, then yeah, it's way better to do a short proposal concept and then move on from there. And then there was the establishment of Faculties.

JUDITH: Right and that sort of further pushed down decision making. I mean we had curriculum committees in some of the faculties, not all of the faculties, but you know, curriculum committees and coordinator committees and that type of thing. But it wasn't a faculty of the whole. The faculty of the whole only came together in the fall when they had the welcome back and that type of thing. Usually it was the talking heads up there telling everything that's going on. But that's where faculty would actually be part of their own education, part of their own budget planning and then it would be fed up to the senate standing committee that would be fed up to the senate. I think pushes that decision making down to where it should occur.

ROGER: Yeah, that was, as you laid out in your dissertation, it's very clear that it didn't exist before.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: And it did create some real challenges for faculty who wanted to be involved. And so, their avenue for real involvement was through the union.

JUDITH: Yes.

[32:32]

ROGER: And the role of the Chair was quite minimal, and it was just kind of a discussion about how much release time for a chair, versus what is the chair able to really do. So, chairs were sort of pulled one way by the union and another way by what a dean might say, "Well you should really be doing these things because that's more like what a chair would do in a university.", and yet they're stuck with not being defined very well. And university-college didn't really address that.

JUDITH: I think we were lucky enough during the time I was Vice President to gradually get support for the dean. We instituted Associate Deans which was a big step. And then we managed to convince those that needed to be convinced that we should institute operations managers, so that the dean could actually be strategic and deal with provincial issues and deal with broader institution issues, and without fighting fires every day, right?

ROGER: Yeah. All the nitty gritty.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: No, it was certainly – the deans were limited because of that, you're right. I mean most of the time that I was a dean I had two support staff, and sometimes half of another one and that was basically it. So, you did end up doing a lot of nitty gritty and not very much big picture. And I think that has limited the institution, because anything that you did above and beyond – if you wanted community outreach from a dean, then that was the only sort of big picture aspect that they had in their job. And that was handled in various ways depending on the individual. But, yes

certainly that was a major move forward to get the deans out of the – not stuck in the sand, but at least out of their office, being able to see beyond it.

JUDITH: The other thing we did, is we did what they called a triangulation. I remember when we used somebody from the office of the registrar, because we were just a sending institution, we weren't a receiving institution. So, we had to triangulate our courses with one and it would automatically go to all of these others. All of a sudden, we would become a receiving institution. It took us almost a year to do.

ROGER: Yeah, it was a significant amount of work once we were granted degrees.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: And so, eventually we get to the actual establishment of a formal Office for Research and Scholarship. And still in existence today. And so that again was an initiative that you were leading – a very important one.

JUDITH: Well I think part of it is who we knew when we started. I mean down the road it's become what it is, and scholarship is looked at in different... significantly different by faculty who are now receiving grants and we've got this whole grant thing set up.

[36:07]

But when we started off, we didn't have a lot of money. So, we decided how can we push this forward? That's why we went the institute way initially, because we only had so much money. And thought, "Okay, let's at least move this forward," because if we had 200 people applying for this, nobody's going to get anything, right? So, we might as well look at pockets of what we can do. So, it was our way of moving research ahead. I don't know if institutes are still here or not. But, I certainly think the faculty scholarship is here, and quite significantly too.

ROGER: Yeah, no it pushed ahead. So, we had Jim Matteoni of Horticulture and Noemi Gal-Or in Transborder Studies. And I think those were the first two.

JUDITH: Yeah, we were doing one in Health I think – yeah, we had one health too, I forget who was doing that. But I think we had a fourth one, but I can't remember.

ROGER: But it was a good way to get faculty into a position where they could have some time. Basically it was giving time assigned for research, that was the real push, and it worked for those people. And then as you say, it expanded outwards into - now you have a very active, effective Research Ethics Board. You have faculty who are able to engage in research. We have some people who have been able to get SSHRCC grants, or Dan Bernstein is kind of the chair. So, there's a variety of them who have been able to move that along and do quite well with it. In fact, when we started this, and I kind of started putting this project together, Alice said to me at one point, "Well shouldn't this go in front of the Research Ethics Board?" Well, duh, yeah. [Laughs].

JUDITH: [Laughs] Yes.

ROGER: Well, so that was a good fun thing. It's very well set up now. The one thing we found that maybe we need to talk to them about is, to have a category for retired, because I'm sort of listed as an administrator applicant as opposed to a dean emeritus or whatever, some other designation, where you're no longer an employee, but you're still doing something that involves the name of the institution being used in it. That was the only thing, but it was quite interesting to go through the process. So, that Office for Research and Scholarship, I think that Kwantlen still faces the issue of where do you get the money? I mean, yes, there's some. At the end it boils down to who's able to get a federal or external grant - overall. I mean there are some grants within that provide research support and time release, but the institution is kind of able to do that on a limited way, as opposed to a very significant fashion.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. I mean one of the ways that we had looked at it, especially when talking about 3 hour versus 4 hour classes, right? And I remember thinking that if we would – and I think we brought - some Faculties went down to 12 hours from 15. People thought we were going to go from 15 to 18 – I forget what it was, but there was a lot of controversy around that.

[40:01]

My thinking always was, if we could bring them down to 12 hours and timetable them into 3 days a week, they would then have other time to do – and part of it – a funny attitude also in terms of some select faculty who were research active. “Well I don't do research weekends, nor do I do it on my PD or holidays.” I remember saying, every time I go to a class at UBC, all profs are in their office on the weekend working, writing, doing whatever they need to on their research.

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

JUDITH: Why do we only do it on Thursday or Friday, right? I don't think researchers operate that way. But it was that whole attitude change, when you do research, you sort of never stop it, I don't think. But you can't put it on top of a heavy workload I don't think.

ROGER: Yeah, if you've got a tremendous marking load, for example, to add it on top creates some significant challenges.

JUDITH: I think the significant events that I've got down here, were when we became a member of AUCC, when we went through that process.

ROGER: Twice.

JUDITH: Twice, yeah. The first time were refused, and we just weren't ready. And that spearheaded the library expansion. It spearheaded how we began to look at research differently. We almost needed that external body saying, "You can't call yourself a university, and not have these things in place." So, that sort of changed what had to be put in place. It gave the Office of the Vice President, Academic a lot more push to say, if you want this prestige, you've got to put money behind it.

ROGER: Yeah, it's very important part of - I think it really created this impetus to move ahead. Arvinder Bubber, we integrated, he spoke about it as well. There were these two stages where it was turned down, and then the Board and everybody had to get on board to actually figure out how to make it happen.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: I think that was a very important stage, I was still around for part of that, and it was – for the refusal – and then for the move ahead.

JUDITH: But that was when we got DQAB exemption.

ROGER: Yes.

[42:52]

JUDITH: I mean we have the front end of curriculum well established. What got us through that gate was program review, right? And if you recall, we put out, I guess an advertisement for somebody to lead this in a gentle way and discuss with faculty that program review and renewal was not about cutting programs, it was about...

ROGER: It's a positive.

JUDITH: And Panetella Tiritches took that on, and it took him a year - I mean he just has that rapport with people, but it took him a year laying that ground work and also being a strong member of the Faculty Association, to say, this is not about cutting programs and laying people off. This is about proving the quality of programs. And it was because we had that advice, I think it was Carolyn Robertson that took on the first role as head of that committee, that we then started to put programs through that, so that people saw that it was supposed to be about improvement and addressing issues and not about cutting programs. At the same time, there's a natural life cycle to some programs, I've just found out over the years. Some programs are sunset. Labour market changes, there's not much you can do.

ROGER: Yeah, office practice changes. We had a very large program, Office Admin, for years.

JUDITH: Yes, we did.

ROGER: A number of people involved are in the retirees association, but it's the kind of one where technology sort of really started to change the whole thing. I mean the context of the change of technology. We had corrective typewriters that corrected about four letters back or something at one point, and that was kind of a big deal. And then a line, and then word processors operating from a mainframe. And all of this rolls into the kind of technological changes that certainly impacts jobs and all facets of the economy. But certainly, for a program like that, which was very large at one point. So, we talked a bit about the Faculty Association and university status. It's actually quite interesting, when I was going through the paper archives here, probably one of the most complete records is the KFA newsletter. Because, Senate minutes and Board minutes and head counts and so on, but once you get beyond that, there's not a lot that's gone in from different Faculties to put into the archives, so that the actual paper is very limited. But the KFA has this kind of continuous series of newsletters that provide a chronical, if you like, of various events from the perspective of the Faculty Association. So, that was as you mentioned, a very significant kind of challenge to work that out and work through it, but in the end, how did that play out?

JUDITH: Well I was here just for the first two years of transition and it was a tough two years.

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

[46:33]

JUDITH: And I think, I personally could have done some things better than I did. I think when I said that, when I did my oral defense, I said I would rely less on lawyers and lawyers' opinions, than I would on sitting down – even if we disagreed – having dialogue. Because we have a history with the institution, and we have to at least understand – and that's usually the way I've worked with faculty associations in any institution I've been at – is there - are things we may not agree with, but we have to understand... my bottom line is always going to be quality and academic excellence and student experience. And I will go to mediation and arbitration for that. So, as long as you understand what my bottom line is, I'm willing to talk with you about that, but don't go over that because I won't budge if you're going to interfere with that, or want to do something that interferes with the quality of what we're doing here. And that always seemed to work, but I think the cultural shift was so enormous, that even if we would have sat down and spoken – because what they wanted to do, for example with the Senate curriculum committees, they wanted to be at the table to help make those decisions. And, what was interesting is that the curriculum committee didn't want them there. They had no - committee could make decision based on academic merits, and once that decision was made and senate passed it, well administration and faculty association obtained nothing more, right? So, I thought okay, well, okay I guess it is up to us. Once we change a policy, and it's passed, the Board passes it, if it's a joint thing - I guess we better sit down and figure out how we're going to implement it. The other

interesting thing – when you saw the power shift was then there was – it was who could become a senator, right? And because in the College and Institute Act, librarians and non-affiliated faculty could serve on Ed Council. In the University Act, they couldn't. You had to be a faculty, right? So, that proposal came forward if you remember, when they established a faculty. I remember sitting at the table and thinking I wasn't involved in the discussion at all. It was the other faculty senators who were debating what it meant to be a faculty.

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

JUDITH: And I thought, this is where it's supposed to come from – it's not supposed to come from me. And they turned it out initially, I don't know in the end how they... but I think it was that growing pain of what does it mean to be a faculty. You can be an administrative unit, can you be a faculty? You know? Because that's what faculties do under legislation. So, it also comes back to legislation. How are you going to follow legislation? Even if it is – was a cut and paste job, I think, in terms of the University Act. I don't think it was well thought out.

ROGER: Yeah, and that was something that I was not here for. But it's always a very interesting to be outside and come back and do something for a limited period of time, and then be able to go outside again, and then maybe come back and do something else. It was a very interesting experience because we did a few things together that way after I guess I just travelled for two years and appeared around again. And somebody said, what would you like to do?

[50:52]

So, it was always interesting to watch that evolution. Even with the Faculty of Arts question to have initially had the Faculty of Arts up until Adrienne [McLaughlin] was president, who said, "Well that's too big a unit. The span of control is too large."

JUDITH: That's right. I remember that. It will be Social Sciences and Humanities, right? So, we went through all that. Then we amalgamated it again, right? But that again was an interesting time because it didn't go as well as we thought the first time, based on my recall.

ROGER: No, the faculty were very involved and in fact the members were very involved in the committee, and I was just acting as a resource. Like they'd say - well I did an initial read, here's what happening in the rest of Canada, here's the sort of structures that they have – the organizational structures that they have. And then they would ask for more information about X or Y or so on. So, it was an iterative kind of process we went through. And Dan Bernstein who was just, I guess a month or so ago when I was wandering around and said, "oh, you know, I was just looking at that stuff we did on the Faculty of Arts" and he said everything that you brought forward and we looked at, it's all proven out. And I thought, oh well that's pretty good. But it was that kind of involvement in faculty where they had a very big stake in it. So, to be able to be

involved in the process and bring forward the recommendations. I mean they felt sometimes – they did feel clearly that there was a top-down desire to do this.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: But they had to just get beyond that and say, well what do we really want? And will this work for us? Will it be negative? Will it be positive? Will it be neutral? How can we wrestle with it? So, not everyone agreed in the end and there was a... I mean, not a consensus, but there was a decision from that group that yes, we should go ahead with it, and then work through the various stages to make it actually function effectively.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: But I don't think that could have happened ten years, fifteen years before that. I think the ability of faculty to engage at that level and to take ownership wouldn't have been there in the same way. The top-down would have been much more....

JUDITH: The top down would have been... yes, it would have been. But I think that whole establishment of what a senate stands for, and that is: the power of academic decisions belongs to academics. Period. Based on academic rationale, right?

ROGER: Yeah.

JUDITH: Which we always have to remember is the underpinning, because you go back and they establish during my dissertation of medieval times –

[54:15]

I mean it's really interesting how these various professors would pick up their students and they would move from town to town, right? Because the townspeople were... or the church was interfering too much, or whatever. So, they would just move them, you know? And when you look at Cambridge and Oxford, Cambridge came into being because a number of them left off and went to Cambridge, right? And then when they come over to the U.S., they brought those traditions with them. And so that whole U.S. you know, that was interesting to look at, and then to look at what Canada then went through from the University of Toronto commission, and then to start to take it through. And there's still concerns about senate, there is concerns, and they seem to act too much they think is a rubber stamp. But some of the work that I was doing when I was Provost was she was talking about the council system, which to me is like faculty councils, right? So, if you have that decision making, goes up to the next level where those decisions are then looked at and debated again, and then it goes up to the final level. You haven't - it's not a rubber stamp, you've had this immense amount of discussion before it goes up. And it can still be turned down, you know? People bring in different points of view. But, the interesting thing about Senate, was when it was originally established – there were some motions put on the floor,

for example, that the voting should be by secret ballot. Fortunately, that was defeated. Because secret ballot - I mean secret ballot protects us in sort of our national elections and other types of elections, but what it does with a senate, is it doesn't allow the voices to be heard, so you don't know who's thinking what, who could change your mind, right? And the fact is, you have a responsibility as a senator to represent the institution, not a faction, and therefore you need to have that made public, because you're responsible for your decision, and a secret ballot takes that away, right?

ROGER: That's interesting, I didn't know that had occurred. Yeah, just kind of questioned the little idea of working together and collegiality of... yeah. Hmm.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: A new way of budgeting.

JUDITH: That's what I did when the new Act came in and said that the Senate had to have input into the project, the budget process changed. Because, Education Council never had input into budget at all. And it sometimes - I don't know what happened - well at the dean level you did because you worked with your chairs in terms of putting forth your budget request. But, in terms of understanding the institution- because when David Atkinson first set up those open budget meetings, everybody came and presented their budget. It wasn't me presenting anybody's budget. I was sitting at the table, taking notes and after we heard everybody, which included what the library needed, what facilities needed, what information technology needed, you understood the institution in a much broader way, and I think therefore, when we went in as a

[57:58]

Deans' group and with the business managers and we had so much money to spend on capital, people were willing to give up their money to move other things ahead.

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

JUDITH: And you saw that happening in an open floor, right? We want digital classrooms, we'll put this on the backburner if you give us these classrooms, right? So, it was thinking with a different, much more open way.

ROGER: You'd started some of that under the university-college model. The example I would give is, the capital budgets. You kind of got Brian Carr to lead with a big capital demand in Sciences and Horticulture was still separate and Trades were separate, and those were kind of the biggest capital demand areas. But others could also participate in the process and then to bring forward a proposal where everyone had their say - to say, "Okay, what's the big picture?" It's not just sciences, it's not just trades, it's a whole institution. And to bring forward a proposal to all the deans, who - many weren't involved in capital expenditure, but if they went to capital,

then something that might have been able to go to them wouldn't be there either. That was... I mean you already started that process.

JUDITH: I guess we had, because we had - I mean I remember sitting... we sat in a room for a day.

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

JUDITH: And we had...

ROGER: But that was at an administrative level.

JUDITH: Yes.

ROGER: So as much as we would go down, or Brian would go down to physics, or chemistry, or math, or whoever it would go down to... automotive, and trades, and carpentry, and discuss with Don Currie and so on. All of that would have probably occurred, but it was not in a totally open forum where everyone could witness this. That's very interesting. Hmm. Ah yes, "sending institutions". So, you talked a little bit about that. And of course, one of your associates ended up too, well two in a sense.

JUDITH: Well they both are at BCCATT [BC Council on Admissions and Transfer], aren't they now? Yes, yes, they are.

ROGER: It was Rob Adamoski and Rob Fleming.

JUDITH: I know, I know. I couldn't have found two better people in the system to lead that. I mean both of them were so important to this institution. I mean Rob Fleming was just...

[1:00:37]

was just a leader when we were establishing those umbrella degrees. And he'd just take on workloads that was just phenomenal.

ROGER: Mm-hmm, yeah. Absolutely. So, becoming a receiving institution of course was a big shift because we'd been established from 1970 until at least I would say post-2000. Because, before that the number of degrees were limited. To have all of that history of sort of 30 years of being a sending institution and now we're going to be a receiving institution. So, that was a huge cultural shift.

JUDITH: One of the things that was occurring at that time when we were establishing degrees, and I think probably changed the Ministry's stance on applied for us, was I remember being at a meeting with, was it Douglas College?... it was Kwantlen...I think it was at least the two of us, there may have been one other, I can't remember... with SFU. And we wanted priority admission of our associate degree students into degree completion, and they wouldn't give it to us. And

therefore, I think in retrospect that was one of the turning points when I said to the ministry, “Now look, you’ve got to lift this, because our students are not guaranteed to complete each degree.” For degree completion. And SFU, very rational, they had their strategic enrollment plan laid out and approved by the senate. They had no room to give all these students priority admission. It’s all about room and their enrollment plan. And I think that probably shifted things for us.

ROGER: Yes, it would make sense that it would. Although everything that happens doesn’t always make sense, but in this case, it seems to have. Well certainly getting people to think of themselves as a receiving institution. Getting faculty to accept that as a kind of reality, that you would be able to take students. And so, what are you going to say? It doesn’t have to be an exact match. Do you have to approve every single course from every one of ten institutions or more before a student can come in here and get credit for your history to whatever? That was a big discussion. Some faculty were pretty straight forward because they’ve been through the articulation process of having to argue their case with universities through the articulation committees, which got better and better with time, but it was still not kind of... oh you’re the senior, you’re the junior. And now Kwantlen is suddenly a “senior” accepting courses from others.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: So, I think using the triangulation was a good way to kind of set it out and say, “Here, why would we not if this is equal to this is equal?”

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

[1:4:04]

ROGER: So, that opened a lot of people’s minds to, well yeah, why are we worrying about whether someone will have exactly everything that I want to have before they take my 300 that I wanted from a 200?

JUDITH: I think the other thing during the transitioning changes is for many faculty, you never taught at the 3- or 400 level. I remember have these discussions about not doing four years of year one and two. You have to level up. That whole leveling up and matching your evaluation method to Bloom’s Taxonomy for example, was I think a big shift for a lot of people.

ROGER: Mm-hmm. It was. And I’m not sure how well – one of the things that always concerned me, partly I guess because of the way that I learn, I learn the best in seminars. And I was totally disappointed by university, because I thought I was going to a small university – then small, McMaster 1960, 3000 students or something, and of course they had 300 people sitting in

the lecture theater for Psych 100 and teaching French in English with 70 students – French Literature in English with 70 students in a lecture hall in the library. But we {Kwantlen] always had these small classes, but I always thought that by and large, most people were “sage on the stage”, and very few were merely acting as a “guide on the side”. So, I always wondered whether in third and fourth year, this would start to kick in more because the classes would be smaller. There were some that were I think structured as seminars, approved as curriculum - seminars. And whether they really got adjusted into that – being the guide on the side, or not.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. I think it's really - I think probably we could have done a lot more work on things like Bloom's Taxonomy. What does it mean when after you're through these first two levels – what does it mean? How do you adapt your teaching to meet these objectives? What does your evaluation look like to prove that you have done that, right? We didn't do a lot of that. I mean we started our Centre for Teaching and Learning quite late. And I don't recall when we first started it that we were doing a lot of that. You know, having done contract work for a couple of private colleges, both for profit and not for profit, you know and looking at degree submissions that have done a lot of work at the third and fourth year levels and saying “No.”

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

JUDITH: You're doing four years of the first- and second-year level and you can't do that. You're not going to get through your DQAB [Degree Quality Assessment Board] process, and you need to go back and ensure your faculty understand what this verb means. You know? And so, some of them are saying, yeah, you're right, I mean other than that, you're not going to reach program learning outcomes. So, I think we could have done a better job at that as we made the transition. I don't think we quite understood that at the time. Understand it now.

ROGER: Hindsight is wonderful.

[1:07:58]

JUDITH: Isn't it.

ROGER: And I've had to use it a lot in my life, for sure. So, you've had quite an outstanding leadership role in the institution. How do we – this is sort of unscripted - but how do we develop leaders? Because we have some, and some have left and gone elsewhere because they were plucked out with what was going to happen here, or the challenge – they wanted a different type of challenge like BCCAT for example, but do we do a good enough job of mentoring leaders?

JUDITH: Well I think you have to recognize, first of all, who has those innate qualities. And part of it is, I think, learning to live in difficult times... and, being respectful. I mean there's a lot more, but I keep thinking of a couple of those things. I think a couple of significant names that we've lost was because they didn't agree with some very specific things that were happening at the time – sort of by retirement, they did not agree, and they did not stay. So, I knew three of

them that decided they had to go someplace else. So, I think part of it also, is that whole culture of the atmosphere in which you work. And if you – like I could never work in a really authoritarian atmosphere. And so, one of the things that Skip [Tripplet] offered all of us was that he wasn't authoritarian. In fact, the one time he looked at David Ross and I and said, "The worst mistake I've ever made was to allow both of you to do a doctoral program at the same time. All you ever do is argue with me. Argue, argue, argue. Every time, you argue with me." [Laughs].

ROGER: [Laughs].

JUDITH: He said, "I'll tell you yes, and you'll say no that's not right, policy is this." You know, and he'd say, "what can I do with you two?" But you know, that was it too. He gave us an opportunity to continue studies, right?

ROGER: Mm-hmm. Yeah, and very important. I think that my impression is that with the need to not be a dean forever. To be able to go back to faculty or an associate – associate deans especially.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: To be able to go back to faculty and see sort of a role in leadership above the level of it being a Chair, because that's certainly another development level for leadership. I think especially as all of the things a university brings as opposed to a top-down model before, that the Chair can really be a position of leadership.

JUDITH: I think you need to have positions in place for enough of a period of time. And some of the institutions I'm working with, I'm saying three years isn't enough. First year you're just on a learning curve, second year you're beginning to do some things, third year you actually can implement and then you're gone, and then you're starting this whole cycle all over again. I found I was able to accomplish what I wanted to as a dean in a five-year period.

[1:11:53]

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

JUDITH: I found, as a Vice President, I stayed on for 11 years, mainly to help through the transition. But I was played out, you know? I mean, the heavy workloads, I don't think you can be a Vice President for life, and I don't think you can be a Dean for life either. Because, you're just - I saw a couple of our Faculties didn't move ahead into degrees until retirements occurred and new leadership came in. And those were deans who had been in positions for a long, long time, right? And so, I don't think that's healthy. So, I actually support that university model of five-year term and you both make a decision whether you'll do a second term and you get sabbatical and you get to go back and be a scholar, right?

ROGER: Yeah. I remember when I was a grad student, the former dean of Arts at Carlton that had a sabbatical and come back and was – what interested me was I really worked in all my grad courses to turn them into seminars, even if they weren't designed that way. So, I'd do an early paper and I'd say "I'm going to distribute this to all of you a week ahead and I'm not going to do it, you're going to critique it." Then it's kind of like peer pressure everybody has to follow. So I did this, and his critique was recommending other sources and what had kind of struck me very quickly was that he wasn't in touch with what was going on and this was history and the discipline, because of the amount of time he'd spent as a dean.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: Now I then emulated his example and spent probably too long as a Dean, but it was very instructive that you do lose touch, and I certainly lost touch with my disciplines over that time frame. Because sometimes history faculty would say, "why wouldn't you come back and teach?" You must be joking, I'm 25 and a quarter century out of being immersed in the discipline.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. Like no, there would be no way I could go back and teach nursing. Like I could probably teach some courses, but certainly not take on clinical roles at all, or you know, you have to recognize those things too in terms of going back into faculty. And usually people will, if they may move on to another institution, or they'll move on to another position because they want to continue on and there isn't a space for them to continue on in their own institution.

ROGER: Yeah, it's always been this kind of study of mine around leadership and how do you develop leaders and what makes a good leader and what is the difference between this kind of a setting and this kind of a setting, and this level and this level. And how do you mentor? How do you create leaders within where you are? Within your institution. And I think what we did somewhat in terms of identifying people who could succeed, at least at the dean level, so that there was somebody waiting and ready to go when one left and slammed the door.

[1:13:50]

JUDITH: Mm-hmm. Yeah, what I thought at – when I'd done a contract for VCC for two terms as their VP Pro-tem is that the people that are now moving into the decanal positions were serving on the education council and leadership positions in charge of their policy committee, or curriculum committee, or their program review committee. Where the chair and learning how to present something at a board level, you know? And dealing with the union issues at the same time wearing this academic hat and being a strong member of the faculty association. So, I think, and I talk in the dissertation about the need for private spaces to develop the public confidence as to how to speak in a public space, how to defend what you're saying so that you can articulate

this. And you can't - an example that I use here, was when we were changing the English requirements I think for entry. And we were increasing them because so many students were failing English 100. And the Board had this open access policy, right? They were intent on open access. So, the first time we went to the board and we brought the young researcher with us, and these board members I mean were very astute in high banking positions, who dealt with figures all the time, well they picked up errors. Well they just about destroyed her. She was never the same, right? And I remember learning from that. The next time we went, I said, "No, I'll present. You give me the material. I can take what is dished out at me and explain it or go back and correct it." So, you need that opportunity to develop I think that confidence and ability to speak.

ROGER: Yeah, and whatever it is, I think it's true. That confidence level that goes in almost jumps as you get a certain thing under your belt you sort of jump to the next level.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: And I've seen it in all kinds of settings where people think, my god, I've never been down below asleep, and my sailboat if these people were in it because they didn't know what to do, but then they figured it out and then wow, and then after two weeks they've totally changed their self-confidence and their ability. They know a lot more than they think they might know, but they haven't put it into practice.

JUDITH: Because you never gave them room to speak in public, right? And I think that's one of the things the senate did, is give them the ability to speak in public around quite difficult issues. I mean they called - whey they voted no confidence on the board after David Atkinson resigned, and they appointed a president that they felt they hadn't been consulted on.

ROGER: Right.

JUDITH: I mean can you imagine? Faculty having done that and articulating very strongly what it was about that process that they expected.

[1:19:07]

ROGER: Yeah, very good. Very important. That's quite amazing because you're right, people heard you previously, mainly the faculty association, who instead of and said oh just a minute, we've had this role in the past being represented on a committee, but not for a broader group to stand up and say that.

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: Interesting.

JUDITH: One of the things that just came to mind is when we went into – and this is just the year that I retired, I think a few months - I can't remember – we started negotiations – and who did we contract with to lead us through the first step? It was from the University of Victoria, really learned man – but one of the things he did, and I remember thinking, my god, you know how we usually sit at the table, right? I remember he said, "This is how we're going to start." So, he introduced himself and he said, I'm so and so, this is my background, I've taught for these many years. I'm a faculty member. And so, we went around the table, we all said we're faculty members, we've been faculty members. So, we're trying to decrease that distance between us. We just happen to be in this role right now, but we have all taught. We understand that experience of teaching. And that - I know that the other side of people were thinking, "My God, what just happened here." He said, "We've got to decrease this adversarial type of thing. It's you versus me. We're all in this for the same reason."

ROGER: Mm-hmm. Yeah. It's quite a good thoughtful approach to set it up that way.

ALICE: Fascinating as always. Thanks for letting me be the fly on the wall.

ROGER: Yeah, so we're moving along. We have some other people lined up, Joan [Belfry].

JUDITH: Mm-hmm.

ROGER: So that will be in I think a week or so. But we're sort of expanding, students are the hardest to find, we've got about three. We've gone one done, another one lined up, and one more in the wings all from different areas. And from working in quite different ways. Frank Bucholtz with *Surrey Leader* and also with the *Langley Times*, and then writing since he retired. One of my first students is retired. But, since he retired, he's been writing in the *Peace Arch News* in the weekly column. And then Steve Dooley's wife is going to be coming next week. And of course, she did a fashion degree first, diploma at least. And then she came back and did an Arts and then did a Master's in Planning at UBC, and now she's head of community planning or chief, but head of community planning for Surrey. So, it's quite interesting. I think we may be able to get the first student president of the... It was a this side of the river student, but president of the Douglas Student Association and he may be willing to come in.

[1:22:57]

JUDITH: We had some very active students on the Senate when we first set it up, they were sitting there with their Robert's Rule of Order, they know that backwards. But you know what, they all wanted someday to be in leadership positions, right? Somewhere, so they were practicing.

ROGER: So yeah, I mean we sort of said we're going to try and get 50 people altogether. But I don't see it ending there, I think it should be an ongoing project so that as students progress in their career and somebody says, here's where they are now, maybe we should have a talk with

them about their experience at Kwantlen, and that when people retire, they should sort of say alright in 2 to 5 years you should maybe come back and reflect on your experience at Kwantlen and capture all of that as the institution moves forward. But it's really fly on the wall fascinating – it's really, really rewarding to do it, because you get so many perspectives from people.

JUDITH: And we haven't even touched on the influence from the provincial government. I mean that would be another whole umbrella that comes over, right? And the decisions they make, and the policies they make, and how their policies force decisions on certain institutions. I think probably – except for the research universities, and I can probably name only three of them, I think of probably I could include... I think the rest are still vulnerable to government policy.

ROGER: Yes. Yeah.

JUDITH: I mean if the government came down, I remember Jim Soles who was ADM – “we'd never come down on UBC and tell them what to do, no, no, you don't do that”.

ROGER: Yeah.

JUDITH: You know, and so I think they're such an entity and a powerhouse on their own. So, if that whole aspect of just the political landscape of BC in particular.

ROGER: I think you're right, I think that's another whole area, before anybody writes the institutional history of Kwantlen, it's something that has to be explored. So Arvinder went into it a little bit, and Skip also, and that was with the Campbell government and that was when they were priming him. And so, they gave some ideas and insights but without doing it in a structured fashion.

JUDITH: If you just look at it chronologically and look and say, this is the party that was in place, these were the major policies they dealt with then that impacted education, and sort of walk through – see if you can tie that up in any way with the institution changes that were going on.

ROGER: Mm-hmm.

ALICE: That's a huge area that would be really fascinating.

[1:26:17]

ROGER: Yeah, and it even goes into sort of the Tech BC and Tech BC taking over and how that all eventually played out and getting moved over there – Surrey Centre, and then the meetings that were held with SFU, University of Fraser Valley, and Kwantlen.

JUDITH: As to who could take over. Remember we put in that submission? Yeah, but I was under the understanding that they already had that agreement.

ROGER: They already made their decision.

JUDITH: They already made agreement and it was just like, talk a little bit about the interplay, some of these forces worked with the university-colleges, and they played by Okanagan, were basically out maneuvered by Martha Piper.

ROGER: Yeah, they got caught. I think that some of the others were more adept at it, and their heads were enough below the horizon that they didn't get chopped off in the same fashion. Yeah, it's very fascinating. It's a whole other area. I wonder if anybody is doing a dissertation on it yet.

JUDITH: And part of it is you know some of this just by hearsay, and I don't want to take this out of script, but I do know one of the Presidents at one of the colleges in the lower mainland was a President and no longer is, because he thought a certain government was going to be lifted at one point in time, he put all his money on the table for that in terms of the submissions that he was making, and it didn't come to fruition.

ROGER: Hmm.

JUDITH: So, when you talk about being in that type of position - board, chair, president, I mean you're talking to your dean about another whole skillset of being able to read that political landscape, right?

ROGER: Yes, absolutely. And it is kind of a whip saw, because basically we're going from one part of the political spectrum to the other. And some people say it's from centre left to centre right, but it's more than there. I think it's much broader than that.

JUDITH: When I was working with Jim Soles, he gave me five points at the time, he said he followed these five points, and this was after he retired. He said, you'll come out with anything you want from the minister's office. He says, this is Martha Piper, he said she comes in with an issue that's a real issue, and she comes in with a solution at the same time. And then she lets you claim it's your solution. Those are sort of three of them, right? And everybody is happy. They get accolades, problem is solved, and she gets what she wants. So, it's really quite interesting to think, okay so that's how you do it.

ROGER: Well, thank you so much.

[1:29:29]

JUDITH: You're welcome.

[End of transcript]

