

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Room E3-262 Engineering and Information Technology Complex

Members Present

Dr. D. Barnard
Chair
Dr. C. Adams
Ms. K. Adams
Prof. B. Amiro
Prof. G. Anderson
Prof. M. Araji
Ms. B. Arte
Prof. J. Asadoorian
Dean J. Beddoes
Dean M. Benarroch
Prof. T. Booth
Mr. J. Botha
Mr. S. Bounket
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. M. Brabston
Ms. M. Brolley
Ms. S.-M. Chaillot
Prof. A. Chiu
Prof. N. Chow
Dr. D. Collins
Dean N. Davies
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. M. Edwards
Prof. M. Eskin
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Prof. M. Gabbert
Ms. M. Gabbs
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Dean N. Halden
Prof. B. Hann
Prof. R. Hechter
Prof. J. Irvine
Prof. T. Ivanco
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. E. Judd
Mr. R. Jung
Prof. V. Keown
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. J. Kettner
Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. B. Kleinsasser

Mr. P. Kochan
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Prof. J. Linklater
Prof. A. MacDonell
Prof. N. McArthur
Prof. R. McIlwraith
Prof. A. McIntosh
Prof. D. McMillan
Ms. V. Marriott
Prof. T. Mondor
Mr. S. Moreno
Prof. J. Morrill
Mr. J. Ossachuk
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. F. Parkinson
Prof. T. Podolsky
Prof. D. Polyzois
Ms. J. Rebizant
Ms. J. Sealey
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Prof. D. Smyth
Mr. L. Solomon
Prof. B. Southern
Prof. L. Strachan
Mr. D. Sytnik
Prof. R. Tate
Dean J. Taylor
Dean M. Trevan
Prof. C. Trott
Prof. C. Van Winkle
Prof. P. Venkatesh
Dean L. Wallace
Prof. L. Wang
Dean J. Watkinson
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld
Prof. K. Wrogemann
Mr. C. Yap
Prof. A. Young
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University
Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,

Recording
Secretary

Mr. D. Sushko

Assessors Present

Mr. J. Adams
Ms. J. Black
Ms. J. Chen
Dean H. Frankel
Prof. B. Hallman
Mr. C. James
Prof. T. Kucera
Mr. N. Marnoch
Dr. L. Smith
Ms. D. Young

Regrets

Prof. S. Alward
Prof. J. Anderson
Prof. D. Churchill
Mr. G. Csepregi
Prof. R. Desai
Dean J. Doering
Ms. A. Ducas
Prof. B. Elias
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. A. Farenhorst
Ms. S. Gottheil
Prof. J. Hanesiak
Prof. P. Hess
Mr. J. Kearsey
Prof. L. Landrum
Dean D. Mandzuk
Prof. D. Mann
Mr. C. Martin
Mr. J. Ngo
Prof. K. Nixon
Dean B. O'Connell
Dean B. Postl
Dr. J. Ristock
Dr. H. Secter
Prof. H. Soliman

Absent

Dr. J. Blatz
Prof. P. Blunden
Mr. R. Buchanan
Mr. I. Cook
Mr. S. Fazaluddin
Dr. G. Glavin
Mr. R. Hagemeister
Dean A. Iacopino
Ms. S. Jasper
Prof. A. Katz
Mr. E. Kraut
Ms. A. Maqsood
Prof. K. Matheos
Ms. A. Owuapu
Mr. Z. Pan
Prof. K. Plaizier
Mr. C. Smith
Dean R. Stern
Dr. M. Torchia
Dean L. Turnbull
Prof. H. Unruh
Dean M. Whitmore

Also Present

Ms. R. Dupuis
Prof. E. Epp
Ms. H. Long
Mr. T. Nakagawa
Ms. C. Préjet
Ms. B. Proven
Ms. M. Richard
Prof. C. Taylor
Ms. S. Utsunomiya
Ms. M. Watson

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Mary Brabston, I.H. Asper School of Business.

AGENDA

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

1. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Curriculum and Course Changes [October 16, 2012]** Page 4

Professor Brabston **MOVED**, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, **THAT** Senate approve the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes [dated October 16, 2012].

CARRIED

III ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVES

1. **Election of a Student Member to the Senate Executive Committee** Page 8

The Chair observed that the composition of the Senate Executive Committee provides for a member elected by the students to be a member of Senate Executive. He indicated that an election was required to fill a vacancy following the resignation of Mr. Olivier Gagné from Senate (effective October 1, 2012).

Ms. Arte MOVED, seconded by **Mr. Moreno**, **THAT** Senate approve the nomination of **Mr. Johanu Botha** to serve as the voting student Senator on the Senate Executive Committee.

CARRIED

IV MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [September 12, 2012]** Page 9
2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part A [October 2, 2012]** Page 12

Mr. Adams said the Senate Committee on Awards had approved one amended offer in a poll conducted on September 12th. At the meeting on October 12th, the Committee had approved two new offers and fourteen amended offers.

Referring to the Manulife Actuarial Scholarship, Professor Morrill noted that full-time enrollment should be defined as a “minimum 80% course load.”

3. **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research** Page 21
RE: CRC/CFI Strategic Research Plan Summary

Dr. Jayas informed members that the CRC/CFI Strategic Research Plan Summary is used in the allocation of Canada Research Chairs (CRCs), based on submissions from the faculties, and for prioritizing Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) applications. He indicated that the document had been discussed with Associate Deans (Research) of the faculties and had been endorsed by the Senate Committee on University Research.

4. **Implementation of Internationally Educated** Page 28
Agrologists Program

5. **Items Approved by the Board of Governors,** Page 29
on September 25, 2012

V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

1. **Presentation by the Campus Planning Office on the**
Visionary (re)Generation Open International Design Competition

The Chair welcomed Ms. Richard (Director, Campus Planning Office) and Ms. Dupuis (Architect, Campus Planning Office) to make a presentation on the Visionary (re)Generation Open International Design Competition.

Ms. Richard acknowledged that the University is located in Treaty One territory. She noted that, eighteen months ago, discussions focused on Southwood redevelopment. Through the engagement process, an opportunity came into view to transform the entire Fort Garry Campus from a commuter campus to a place where people want to stay, to live, work, learn, and play.

Ms. Richard provided an overview of the competition process. The Visioning Phase has resulted in a competition brief that describes instructions for the competition. The next phase will be an Open International Design Competition that will be an opportunity for the University to invite the world to participate in defining a new campus master plan. An international jury will gather at the University on November 9th and the competition will be announced shortly. The winning design team will be invited to participate in the Campus Master Plan Design Phase during which the team would expand their concept to create a pragmatic campus master planning document for approval by appropriate governing bodies at the University and external regulatory bodies.

Ms. Richard said efforts were made to gather input from various sources and through a number of venues including, the Sustainability Committee, a Board of Governors Visioning Framework Workshop, an Integrated Planning Kickoff and Workshop and design charette, the University of Manitoba Retirees Association, a newly established Neighbourhood Network, and elected officials.

Ms. Richard said the University has engaged a consulting firm, Phase Eins, of Berlin, Germany, to assist with the competition, which has been structured as a two-stage international competition. Eligible teams will include a registered professional architect, urban planner, or landscape architect. The first stage of the competition will be a broad call for design briefs, which the jury will use to arrive at a short list of five to seven finalists. The competition will be anonymous to ensure that the design teams are assessed based on the merit of their submission versus the reputation of team members. There is an expectation that the competition will be successful. International designers view Winnipeg as exotic because of the design challenges presented by the extreme climate and its location on a flood plain. It also offers an opportunity to demonstrate best practice in energy efficiency. As Manitoba Hydro is a leader in this area, the company has been invited to participate as a Primary Partner.

Ms. Richard said the competition would unfold over the next year. The jury will be announced on November 9th, Phase 1 will occur January – May 2013, Phase 2 will occur in May – September 2013, and the winning team will be announced in October 2013.

Ms. Richard indicated that the nine-member jury would include five technical jurors and four general jurors representing various stakeholders. A technical experts team, with expertise in energy, transportation, city planning, landscape architecture, and active living, and including a developer, has been assembled to support the jury.

Ms. Dupuis said the drafting process for the competition brief was initiated in July based on a comprehensive template provided by Phase Eins. More than fifty reviewers have seen the document and feedback from student and faculty participants in the October 11th Open House has been taken into account in the final draft. The competition brief includes: background and objectives; competition procedures; background information and context for the University, the city of Winnipeg, and the province of Manitoba; a detailed description of the task, which sets out guiding principles and design instructions.

Ms. Dupuis said the competition brand, Visionary (re)Generation, is reflected in the five guiding principles and the eight design objectives for the competition and in the overall vision, which is to transform the Fort Garry Campus into a live, work, learn, play environment. She briefly reviewed the five guiding principles to create a campus that is: (1) **connected**, by networking the campus, reaching out to the

community, and creating links to the city through active transportation and other means; (2) a **destination**; (3) **sustainable** and is a living lab where projects will link to research in sustainable development; (4) a **community** that is a compact urban area with a network of spaces for social interaction that reflect the multicultural diversity of the campus; (5) a **transformative** environment. Ms. Dupuis suggested that, if the first four principles can be met, the result would be a transformative environment that would create new research and learning opportunities for staff and students and contribute to the University's strategic planning priorities to be a centre of excellence for Indigenous achievement and to be internationally recognized for teaching and research excellence.

Ms. Dupuis reviewed the eight design objectives to: (1) put **people first**, which concerns human scale development and references multimodal transportation systems for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and vehicles; (2) provide spaces for **lifelong learning** to occur; (3) link **aesthetics and design** to sustainability; (4) **design to innovate**, which relates to the concept of the campus as a living laboratory; (5) be **fiscally responsible**; (6) be **flexible and adaptable** in order to arrive at a campus master plan that will serve the University over the long term and allow projects to be added over time; (7) incorporate **ecological infrastructure** as part of the design; and (8) take into account the **regional context**, including sociocultural and geographical contexts.

Ms. Dupuis said the competition brief describes the task for the design teams beginning with a description of the guiding principles and design objectives. It provides broad level system based instructions for four components of the campus (public realm, movement and circulation, built form, infrastructure and utilities) and requires that teams address edge conditions, in order to eliminate boundaries along the river and Pembina Highway, and consider ways to connect the various campus precincts. The design teams must submit a demonstration project, which might be the first construction project in the Southwood precinct after the Campus Master Plan has been completed. The mixed-use program must include student housing and must meet best practices for sustainability, the guiding principles, and the design objectives.

Dr. Barnard described the international design competition is an exciting opportunity for the University to think differently about, and to set a new direction for the campus plan.

Ms. Arte said, considering that the competition brief does set a direction for the campus master plan, the University of Manitoba Students' Union (UMSU) is concerned with the way the initiative has proceeded with respect to process and the lack of meaningful and fair representation of students. She called attention to the fact that Senate has had no prior opportunity to discuss the matter although the competition brief is to be presented to the Board of Governors on November 20th for approval. Ms. Arte added that this was her first opportunity, as a student

representative, to address the matter in an open session meeting. Student Senators had previously raised concerns about the lack of meaningful and fair representation of students in the process at meetings of the Campus Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC) and the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC, October 29th). Given the haste with which the process has proceeded, Ms. Arte contended, there was not sufficient time and opportunity for students to review the materials and provide constructive criticism of the plans before the competition brief was to be forwarded to the Board. Ms. Arte said that UMSU is particularly concerned that students would not be represented among the voting jurors and that no valid argument has been given as to why not. She expressed a concern that this might set a precedent for excluding the University's primary stakeholders, including students, from such decision-making processes. She remarked that, at SPPC, where an argument was made that the President would represent the University on the jury, she had noted that, legally, UMSU and the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) are the students' representatives.

Dr. Barnard noted that the matter of student representation on the jury had been debated in a number of contexts when UMSU representatives were present, including at the Finance, Administration, and Human Resources Committee (November 6th) where professionals in the field had pointed out that the jury in such competitions would normally include only design professionals. In addition, it has been noted that, were a student representative to be added to the jury as a primary stakeholder, it would open the door to other constituencies who could legitimately make a claim. If those constituents were to contribute in a voting manner, it would become necessary to include additional technical and design experts on the jury to maintain the attractiveness of having a high-powered set of design professionals involved in the decision-making process. The jury would become unwieldy. Dr. Barnard emphasized that the end result of the competition process is not the design of the campus plan but the selection of a design team that would work with the University community to develop that plan.

Ms. Arte noted that one distinction between technical and general jurors is that the latter have been included primarily to represent primary stakeholders. She noted that membership of the general jury reflects the University's priority for Aboriginal achievement. She and Ms. Black contended that, because students are primary stakeholders and an exceptional student experience is also an institutional priority, students should be represented among the general jurors. For the same reasons, the student experience should be reflected in the competition brief. Noting that students were involved in the process to select of a food services provider, Ms. Arte said there is precedent for including students in a meaningful way in an RFP process.

Dr. Barnard informed Senators that, in response to the concerns that students and faculty members had not been included on the jury, Ms. Arte and two faculty representatives, Professor Benbow (Faculty of Environment, Earth, and

Resources) and Professor Mondor (Faculty of Arts), have been invited to serve as guest jurors. Ms. Dupuis added that the guest component to the jury also includes two representatives from each of the University of Manitoba Retirees Association, the Board of Governors, and elected officials. Guest jurors will participate in all jury meetings but will not have a vote.

Ms. Richard suggested that the level of consensus with the process is strong. She recalled various contexts in which students and others have been engaged in planning for the competition including a design charette where architecture students participated as facilitators. In addition to the Open House, more than one hundred student organizations had been invited to participate in an engagement exercise. Ms. Richard indicated that the Campus Planning Office (CPO) had requested and received feedback on the engagement process at several meetings of CPAC. The Office had responded to feedback from that Committee and various other groups. Ms. Richard said she is confident that the input received resonates in the design principles in the competition brief. She indicated a willingness to discuss why particular input was not incorporated.

Ms. Black responded that UMSU would have liked the engagement process to have been more meaningful. Students have been invited to comment on the visionary principles but have not had an opportunity to discuss the competition brief or what the project would look like. Ms. Black said that, as a member of the Sustainability Committee, she had access to portions of the brief but not all of the research that informed portions of the brief. It was not possible, therefore, to review the foundational documents upon which the brief has been constructed.

Concerns raised by the student Senators resonated with some other Senators. Professor Owens said she would echo the students' concerns and added that, if lifelong learning is a design objective, it is also important for faculty to be involved in the process. Professor Gabbert said it is unfortunate there was no explicit reference to student experience in the presentation. He suggested it might have been possible to address some of the students' concerns if plans for the design competition had been brought to Senate for discussion earlier. He acknowledged there are other stakeholders in the surrounding community and the city, but maintained that students and faculty are not ordinary stakeholders.

Professor Gabbert asked how Senate's authority to make recommendations to the Board on the siting of buildings on campus would be taken into account once the jury has selected a design team to develop the campus master plan. He also enquired about the relationship between the existing campus plan, which was approved by Senate (March 6, 2002) and the Board, and the current campus planning initiative. The Chair replied that the role of Senate in the process is unchanged. He pledged that progress reports will be more regularly brought to Senate at future stages. Dr. Barnard underscored that the object of the competition is to identify a design team that the University will work with to

provide the next campus plan, which will be informed by the existing plan and also by developments that have occurred since that plan was written. Observing that the University is becoming surrounded by an urban context and that universities embedded in an urban context have different opportunities to interact with the surrounding community, he said that he is looking forward, in particular, to thinking differently about the University's boundaries and its presence along the Red River and Pembina Highway.

Professor Etcheverry asked how the University's situation in a floodplain would be taken into account; for example, would it be considered when reviewing the qualifications of design teams. Ms. Dupuis noted that the technical jury could call upon both members of the team of technical experts and researchers in the Faculties of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Architecture, and Engineering, who have expertise in this area.

Professor McIlwraith enquired about consultations with Victoria Hospital and whether steps would be taken to ensure that any plans for the campus would not negatively impact on access to the Hospital and emergency access especially. Ms. Richard agreed that access and egress to the Hospital are important and have been included as a requirement in the instructions for the design teams. She indicated that the Hospital has been made aware of what the University is contemplating with regard to the planning process. She noted that representatives of the Hospital had participated in the design charette and have also been invited to meet with the Campus Planning Office.

The Chair consented to Ms. Arte's request that a response to a question submitted for Question Period be provided as part of the discussion of the current item.

Ms. Black, UMSU Assessor, submitted the following question on behalf of the Student Senate Caucus.

Currently, the two student representatives on the International Design Competition Jury on behalf of both the University of Manitoba Students' Union and the Graduate Students Association are defined as non-voting guest jurors. Why aren't these two student representatives voting members of the jury?

Dr. Barnard restated the position that increasing the number of general jurors would require an increase to the number of technical and design jurors. The result would be a larger jury that would be difficult to work with. He noted there could be other legitimate concerns from other groups to be involved in the jury, as well. He noted again that, in response to concerns raised regarding representation, two students and two faculty members have been invited to participate in the consultation process without a vote. He said the intent is to

have full and free conversations and expressed his hope for strong consensus on the outcome.

Ms. Arte asked to introduce a motion. The Chair consented to deal with the motion under the current item rather than under item XI Additional Business.

Ms. Arte prefaced the motion by reiterating a concern that planning for the competition process has excluded meaningful engagement with students noting that student experience is not the main focus of any of the guiding objectives or design principles of the competition. Given this omission, she said that, if the University were to proceed with the competition, she would be concerned how students might be affected in the future. Ms. Arte said she is also concerned with what appears to be an explicit effort to exclude students from the voting process.

Ms. Arte MOVED, seconded by Professor Gabbert, THAT the Senate request that the Board of Governors ensure that the student representation on the Visionary (re)Generation Open International Design Competition jury have voting rights.

DEFEATED

The Chair thanked Ms. Richard and Ms. Dupuis for their presentation. He indicated that he appreciates the concerns students had raised and suggested that the Campus Planning Office might reflect on the brief in light of Senate's conversation.

VI QUESTION PERIOD

Senators are reminded that questions shall normally be submitted in writing to the University Secretary no later than 10:00 a.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

Ms. Black, UMSU Assessor, submitted the following question on behalf of the Student Senate Caucus.

With the expressed strategic pillar of the University of Manitoba on Indigenous Achievement and in cohesion with the role of the Indigenous Lead, does the University have any plans for founding an Aboriginal College or Institute that would centralize Academic Aboriginal Programming at the University of Manitoba and that would be led by the Aboriginal community at the University? In addition, does the University have any plans to coordinate the integration of other forms of non-western knowledge into the curriculum of the various course programs currently offered at the University of Manitoba?

Dr. Keselman said the University does not have plans to establish an Aboriginal institute or college. She recalled a presentation by Ms. Young, Executive Lead, Indigenous

Achievement, at Senate (March 7, 2012) when Ms. Young outlined the strategic framework, Pathways to Indigenous Achievement, which includes the pathway Sharing Indigenous Knowledge and Research. It is the University's intention, under the leadership of Ms. Young, to explore ways to ensure that First Nations, Métis, and Inuit values are integrated into, and embraced in, campus life. The approach includes working with departments, faculties, and others who develop curricula, to ensure that Indigenous cultures, traditions, and knowledge are both acknowledged and supported. Ms. Young is committed to working with faculties and departments to support existing strategies and to explore new methods to this end. She is currently working with the Faculties of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Architecture, Extended Education, Kinesiology and Recreation Management, Law, Science, and Social Work. Dr. Keselman added that roughly 120 courses representing Indigenous study are offered in a broad range of departments across the University. There is a plan to list these courses on the web portal, Indigenous Connect, to make their availability more widely known to students. The University also hosts an annual elders gathering in November, and traditional teachings are offered monthly at the Centre for Aboriginal Health Education at the Bannatyne Campus.

Dr. Keselman said there are no plans to coordinate the integration of other forms of non-Western knowledge into curricula. Various forms of knowing and learning are covered in curricula of many faculties and schools throughout the University.

The following question was received from Professor Kucera, UMFA Assessor.

What is the status of the review of the contract that the UM has with Navitas on the International College of Manitoba? Is there a process for determining whether there will be a renewal? Will this matter come to Senate?

The Chair said a review of the ICM programs on the University of Manitoba campus would be undertaken over 2013-2014, as he had indicated to Senate on September 9, 2009. Information on the process will be brought to Senate in January and, upon completion of the review, the results will be presented to Senate for discussion. The comprehensive review will provide an important opportunity to learn about the ICM programming, the results to date, and to identify issues related to the program. The Chair indicated that the University would review other elements of the agreement with Navitas, in light of the academic review. While the current agreement runs until 2017, should the results of the academic review warrant, reconsideration of elements of the agreement may occur prior to 2017. With respect to the consideration of a renewal of the agreement with Navitas for ICM, the Chair said he remains committed to bring any recommendation for renewal of the agreement to Senate and the Board for approval prior to the end of the current agreement.

The following question was received from Professor Kucera, UMFA Assessor.

There has been an announcement within the Faculty of Human Ecology that enrolment will be suspended for the Human Ecology General program and the Textile Sciences undergraduate program as of January 1, 2013. Will the proposed closing of these and any other programs in Human Ecology be coming to Senate for consideration and determination?

Dr. Collins prefaced his response by observing that the suspension and admission of students into academic programs is within the authority of the relevant dean subject to the provisions of governing documents including the policy on Enrolment Limitations. The latter policy specifies that the President, in consultation with the dean or director and Senate, is responsible for approving the establishment of, or changes to, enrolment limits. He identified a number of situations where suspension of enrolment might be considered including: the number of students who require supervision exceeds a department's capacity to provide that resource; there is limited interest in a program, as reflected in the number of enrolment applications; a concern regarding the quality of a program has been brought into question on the basis of a problematic academic program review.

Dr. Collins said the Dean of the Faculty of Human Ecology did forward recommendations to suspend intake into the Bachelor of Human Ecology General and the Bachelor of Science in Textile Sciences programs to the September 10, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Council. No motions in this regard were considered, however. Dr. Collins indicated that should the option of enrolment suspension be pursued in future, Senate would have an opportunity to discuss the recommendation. Referring to Professor Kucera's second question, Dr. Collins said there has been no discussion of program closure. He noted, for information, that Senate is responsible for the creation and closure of academic programs, as set out in the policy on Submission of Course, Curriculum, and Program Changes. Any proposal to close a program would also require the written approval of COPSE.

Professor Kucera suggested that suspension of enrolment is equivalent to closing a program. Once all students had completed the program it would, effectively, be closed. He reasoned, therefore, that suspension of enrolment is more serious than reducing an enrolment cap, which, he suggested, is the natural way of reading the policy on Enrolment Limitations. As such, it is not only an administrative matter but also an academic matter that would be of concern to Senate. Dr. Collins countered that there is a considerable difference between suspending enrolment and closing a program. Suspension might occur to allow a unit to make considerable program changes when, for example, a program is converted from a three- to a four-year program or from an undergraduate to a graduate program, or to allow concerns regarding program quality to be addressed. Different from the closure of a program, suspension of enrolment is a temporary rather than a permanent situation.

VII **CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 2012**

Professor Eskin MOVED, seconded by Dean Taylor, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on October 3, 2012 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

VIII **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES** - none

IX **REPORTS OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
AND THE SENATE PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE**

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 32

Comments of the Senate Executive Committee accompany the report on which they are made.

2. **Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee**

There was no report from the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee.

X **REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES OF SENATE,
FACULTY AND SCHOOL COUNCILS**

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B
[October 2, 2012]** Page 33

Mr. Adams said that, at its meeting of October 2nd, the Senate Committee on Awards had approved one new offer that appears to be discriminatory. The bursary has been established to encourage Aboriginal students to study in the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences. He called attention to two letters of support for the bursary, attached to the Report.

Professor McMillan MOVED, seconded by Professor Owens, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [dated October 2, 2012].

CARRIED

2. **Articulation Agreement Proposal: University of Manitoba,
Bachelor of Science (Human Nutritional Sciences) –
Red River College, Culinary Arts Diploma** Page 37

Dean Sevenhuysen said the Articulation Agreement Proposal between the University and Red River College had been developed to meet the needs of

graduates of the Culinary Arts Diploma who wish to pursue further studies in the Bachelor of Science in Human Nutritional Science (B.Sc.(HNS)) at the University. He informed members that due diligence had been done to ensure that, at the end of the degree program, the Red River graduates would meet the same academic standards as other students who graduate from the B.Sc.(HNS).

a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 58

Mr. Adams noted that, according to the details of the agreement, graduates of the Culinary Arts diploma would receive 60 credit hours of transfer credits upon admission to the B.Sc.(HNS) degree and would be required to complete an additional 60 credit hours at the University from a defined list of courses, as set out in the Articulation Agreement Proposal.

b) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 60

Dean Frankel reported that the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes had spent considerable time discussing the proposal. He suggested there are two ways to assess the proposal to offer advanced standing to graduates of the diploma program. One is to consider course-by-course equivalencies. The second, which had been adopted by the Committee, is a more holistic approach that takes into account the courses completed and experiences gained in the diploma program. The Committee was convinced that Red River graduates who complete the B.Sc.(HNS) degree will have met the same requirements as other students in the degree program.

Dean Sevenhuysen MOVED, seconded by Dean Frankel, THAT Senate approve the articulation agreement between the University of Manitoba and Red River College concerning advanced standing for graduates of the Culinary Arts Diploma program in the Bachelor of Science (Human Nutritional Sciences) degree program, for a term of five years effective January 1, 2013.

Professor Gabbert observed that Senate has a strong duty to defer to faculties and departments that bring forward changes to programs. It has a similar duty to the Senate committees that review those proposals. He indicated, however, that he was troubled by the idea that, instead of looking at particular courses, an argument was being made that a block of work completed in the diploma program is equivalent to the learning that B.Sc.(HNS) students would complete in their first two years at the University. He said he does not object to block transfers, in principle, but must be persuaded that the courses for which students would be given credit are courses that would conceivably be offered at the University.

Unallocated credit should not be awarded for courses that are determined not to be university-level courses. Indicating that he had taken the opportunity provided to review the course outlines, Professor Gabbert suggested that some of the Red River courses for which students would receive transfer credit (including Restaurant Cooking, Meat Cutting, and Menu Development) do not fundamentally have anything to do with human nutritional sciences or any other subject that might be covered in an elective course taken outside the Department of Human Nutritional Sciences. He noted that previously graduates of the Culinary Arts diploma have been offered only 30 hours of transfer credit toward the B.Sc.(HNS) degree.

Dean Sevenhuysen countered that the review process dealt with each course outline. Based on the review, it was determined that a block transfer of credits is the most logical way to recognize the learning experiences of graduates of the diploma program. Dean Sevenhuysen acknowledged that the review revealed that the proportion of contact hours spent on theory (30%) is less than in the degree program and there is a larger proportion of practical work. He observed that, given recent innovations and curriculum changes that have occurred at community colleges, the type of learning that takes place at Red River differs from twenty years ago when programs focused on individual or general trade skills. Programs now have stated goals that relate to economic growth and productivity in industry. Quoting the OECD's Economic Survey of Canada 2012, which states that, "...colleges are becoming proactive in directly meeting the needs of small businesses in areas of problem solving, process innovation and technical skills..." Dean Sevenhuysen argued that, in order to do so, the learning that takes place at colleges must include an understanding of conceptual processes in addition to skills. The decision to offer a block of transfer credits was informed by this changed context.

Professor Taylor observed that the Culinary Arts curriculum is designed to ensure that students learn about different aspects of food systems including, food procurement, preparation, and safety, economic and cultural aspects, and relationships to health. Diploma graduates would, therefore, enter the degree program with a broad range of knowledge of food systems. Once they graduate from the B.Sc.(HNS) degree, they would be poised to deal with challenges in the food industry to provide healthy, tasty food in forms palatable to consumers, and to promote the industry and knowledge.

Professor Young shared Professor Gabbert's concerns respecting the proposed block transfer of credits and course equivalencies. Observing that the 2000- and 3000 - level human nutritional sciences courses have

science prerequisites, which suggest the course content is based on sophisticated scientific principles, she raised an additional concern about the preparedness of the diploma graduates to complete the University courses required for the degree. Noting she had reviewed the course outlines, she suggested that the scientific and academic standards of courses in the diploma program are not at the level of University courses. Dean Sevenhuysen replied that, based on the review of the courses and discussions with staff at Red River College, the Faculty of Human Ecology is satisfied that graduates of the diploma program will be competitive with, and will graduate from the B.Sc.(HNS) degree with the same academic standards as, students who begin the degree program at the University.

Professor Young noted for the record that, contrary to the statement in observation of 5 of the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes, she saw no evidence that courses completed within the Culinary Arts diploma would satisfy the University's written English requirement.

Professor Kettner proposed that Senate should be concerned with the question of whether graduates of the Culinary Arts diploma would be able to integrate knowledge from all years of the degree program and to demonstrate they had achieved the same level of understanding and had met the same learning objectives as students who complete all four years of the degree program at the University. He asked if there is a process in place to evaluate the outcomes of the articulation agreement. Dean Sevenhuysen assured members the courses required to complete the degree have been selected to meet these objectives. He added that the Faculty has strong student advising and support functions. Every student is required to meet with a student advisor at least once a year. The Faculty will track student performance in the program and would respond with additional supports, if necessary. Dr. Collins observed that the articulation agreement would be reviewed at the end of five years. He noted that it will be possible to track outcomes for these students through the Office of Institutional Analysis.

The motion was **CARRIED**

3. **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research** Page 62
RE: Proposal for an Endowed Research Professorship
in Pediatric Allergy and Asthma

Dr. Jayas informed Senate that a proposal to establish an endowed Research Professorship in Pediatric Allergy and Asthma had been approved by the Vice-

President (Academic) and Provost and by the Senate Committee on University Research.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, seconded by Dr. Keselman, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors a proposal for an Endowed Research Professorship in Pediatric Allergy and Asthma.

CARRIED

4. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Revised Degree Regulations, B.Sc. in Geological Sciences – Major, Honours, and General Programs** Page 69

Professor Etcheverry said the degree regulations for the B.Sc. in Geological Sciences programs were being revised to limit the number of failures to 18 credit hours of “F” grades and to restrict enrolment in two upper year courses.

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding revised degree regulations for the B.Sc. in Geological Sciences, including the Major, Honours, and General programs, effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

5. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Direct Entry Procedures and Policy, Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources** Page 83

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding proposed Direct Entry Procedures and Policy for the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources, effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

6. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Faculty of Medicine Policy on Supplemental Examinations** Page 86

Professor Etcheverry said the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation was bringing forward a number of policies that formalize existing practices and procedures in the Faculty of Medicine respecting examinations.

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation

regarding the establishment of the Faculty of Medicine policy on Supplemental Examinations, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

7. Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Faculty of Medicine Policy on Deferred Examinations Page 97

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding the establishment of the Faculty of Medicine policy on Deferred Examinations, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

8. Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Faculty of Medicine Policy on Invigilation of Examinations Page 106

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding the establishment of the Faculty of Medicine policy on Invigilation of Examinations, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

9. Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Faculty of Medicine Policy on Remediation Page 114

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding the establishment of the Faculty of Medicine policy on Remediation, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

10. Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Faculty of Medicine Policy on Midpoint In-Training Evaluation and Final In-Training Evaluation Preparation, Distribution and Completion and Essential Clinical Presentation Preparation, Distribution, Audit, and Remediation Page 125

Professor Etcheverry explained that the proposed policy sets out processes to ensure that students in the Undergraduate Medical Education Program receive timely and accurate feedback on various assessments.

Professor Etcheverry MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding the establishment of the Faculty of Medicine policy on Midpoint In-Training Evaluation and Final In-Training Evaluation Preparation, Distribution and Completion and Essential Clinical Presentation Preparation, Distribution, Audit, and Remediation, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

11. **Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures
RE: Rules for Teleconference Meetings and Resolutions
in Writing for Standing and Ad Hoc Committees of Senate** Page 139

Ms. Adams said the Rules for Teleconference Meetings and Resolutions in Writing for Standing and *ad hoc* Committees of Senate had been developed in response to a question raised at the September 5th, Senate meeting.

Ms. Adams MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures concerning Rules for Teleconference Meetings and Resolutions in Writing for Standing and Ad Hoc Committees of Senate.

CARRIED

12. **Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations** Page 142

Professor Edwards informed Senate that the Senate Committee on Nominations had met on October 24, 2012 to consider nominations for number of vacancies on Senate Committees. There were no further nominations.

Professor Edwards MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated October 24, 2012].

CARRIED

XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

XII ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 18, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 142, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on November 7, 2012.