

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. S. Alward
Prof. B. Amiro
Prof. M. Araji
Prof. M. Atleo
Ms. F. Bakhtiari
Dean J. Beddoes
Prof. P. Blunden
Prof. T. Booth
Ms. M. Brolley
Mr. G. Chappellaz
Prof. D. Churchill
Dean N. Davies
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. R. Desai
Dean J. Doering
Prof. M. Edwards
Mr. C. Ekenna
Prof. B. Elias
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Prof. A. Farenhorst
Prof. M. Gabbert
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Prof. J. Guard
Dean N. Halden
Prof. J. Hughes
Prof. P. Hultin
Dean A. Iacopino
Ms. S. Jasper
Dr. D. Jayas
Mr. J. Kearsey
Prof. V. Keown
Prof. J. Kettner
Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. P. Kochan
Prof. L. Landrum
Prof. J. Linklater
Prof. A. MacDonell
Prof. A. McIntosh
Prof. D. McMillan

Dean D. Mandzuk
Prof. D. Mann
Mr. G. Mejicanos
Prof. J. Morrill
Mr. E. Okeke
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette
Prof. F. Parkinson
Mr. A. Pawlak
Prof. T. Podolsky
Prof. C. Roche
Ms. J. Sealey
Prof. K. Smith
Prof. H. Soliman
Ms. J. Tan
Prof. R. Tate
Dean J. Taylor
Mr. A. Thapa
Dean M. Trevan
Prof. C. Trott
Dean L. Turnbull
Mr. M. Vasconcelos
Prof. P. Venkatesh
Dean L. Wallace
Mr. B. Warnakulasooriya
Prof. K. Wrogemann
Prof. A. Young
Mr. K. Zeid
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University
Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,
Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. J. Adams
Ms. S. Ally
Dr. D. Collins
Mr. G. Csepregi
Mr. S. Dorge
Ms. A. Ducas
Dean H. Frankel
Dr. G. Glavin

Ms. S. Gottheil
Prof. B. Hallman
Prof. T. Kucera
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. K. Matheos
Dr. J. Ristock
Dr. L. Smith
Ms. M. Wetzel
Ms. D. Young

Regrets

Prof. G. Anderson
Prof. J. Anderson
Prof. J. Asadoorian
Dean M. Benarroch
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. M. Brabston
Prof. A. Chiu
Prof. N. Chow
Mr. Z. Courtemanche
Ms. K. Daaca
Prof. M. Eskin
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. J. Hanesiak
Prof. B. Hann
Prof. P. Hess
Prof. T. Ivanco
Prof. A. Katz
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. D. Lussier
Dean B. O'Connell
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. K. Plaizier
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dean B. Postl
Prof. S. Prentice
Dr. H. Secter
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Dean R. Stern
Dr. M. Torchia
Prof. H. Unruh
Prof. C. Van Winkle
Prof. L. Wang

Prof. D. Wirtzfeld

Absent

Dr. J. Blatz
Mr. R. Buchanan
Mr. L. Ford
Mr. J. Hart
Ms. M. Igweagu
Prof. J. Irvine
Prof. J. Johnson
Prof. E. Judd
Ms. M. Leaf
Ms. B. Lewicki
Prof. R. McIlwraith
Mr. S. Mack
Ms. H. Omichinski
Acting Dean R. Roshko
Prof. D. Smyth
Prof. B. Southern
Prof. L. Strachan
Dean J. Watkinson

Also Present

Ms. S. Bannatyne
Ms. K. Betker
Ms. S. Gagnon
Mr. B. Hughes
Mr. G. Juliano
Ms. H. Long
Prof. A. McNicol
Ms. C. Préjet
Ms. Y. Shang
Ms. S. Utsunomiya

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Dean Jeffery Taylor, Faculty of Art.

The Chair thanked faculty representatives to Senate whose terms will end on May 31st for their service on Senate.

**I CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES – MAY 2013**

Page 5

A copy of the list of graduands was available at the front table for examination by members of Senate.

Mr. Marnoch indicated that the Université de Saint-Boniface was recommending that one student be granted the degree Baccalauréat ès arts (général), notwithstanding that the student is deficient in a Minor. The student having been misadvised had completed course work toward a Theatre Major, although this option is not open to students at the Université, and a Français Minor. The error had been discovered at the point of graduation when it was also determined that the student had completed courses required for a Français Major. The requirement for a Minor would be waived in lieu of the courses the student had completed toward a Theatre Major.

Dean Taylor MOVED on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the candidate recommended for a degree notwithstanding a deficiency be approved.

CARRIED

Dean Taylor MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the list of graduands provided to the University Secretary by the Registrar be approved, subject to the right of Deans and Directors to initiate late changes with the Registrar up to May 17, 2013.

CARRIED

**II REPORT ON MEDALS AND PRIZES
TO BE AWARDED AT THE SPRING CONVOCATION**

The report was available at the front table in the Senate Chamber for examination by members of Senate.

Dean Taylor MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the report on medals and prizes provided to the University Secretary be approved by Senate.

CARRIED

III MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees

In keeping with past practice, the minutes of this agenda item are not included in the circulated minutes but appear in the original minutes, which are available for inspection by members of Senate.

IV ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVES

1. To the Board of Governors

Page 6

The Chair reminded members that three Senators represent Senate on the Board of Governors, at least one of who has no administrative responsibilities greater than those of a department head at the time of election. An election was required to replace Dean Halden (Environment, Earth, and Resources), whose terms ends May 31, 2013. The Chair noted that Dean Whitmore (Science) and Professor Embree (Medicine) currently represent Senate on the Board. As Professor Embree has no administrative responsibilities beyond department head, there was no restriction on nominees.

The University Secretary opened nominations. A motion to nominate Dean Halden was duly moved and seconded. On a motion duly moved and seconded, nominations were closed.

Dean Halden was declared **ELECTED** to the Board of Governors for a three-year term ending May 31, 2016.

2. To the Senate Executive Committee

Page 8

The Chair indicated that two faculty representatives were to be elected for three-year terms to replace Professor Asadoorian (Dentistry) and Professor John Anderson (Science), whose terms on the Executive Committee expire on May 31, 2013.

The University Secretary opened nominations. On a motion duly moved and seconded, Professor John Anderson (Science) was nominated to represent Senate on the Senate Executive Committee. No further nominations were received. On a motion duly moved and seconded, nominations were closed.

Professor Anderson was declared **ELECTED** to the Senate Executive for a three-year term ending May 31, 2016.

The Chair said that one representative is to be elected from among the Vice-Presidents, Deans of Faculties and Directors of Schools, to replace Professor Hess (School of Art), whose term will end on May 31, 2013. He noted that those eligible for nomination are listed on page 8 of the agenda. The Chair indicated that Professor Hess had indicated his willingness to let his name stand for re-election.

The University Secretary opened nominations. On a motion duly moved and seconded, Professor Hess was nominated. On a motion duly moved and seconded, nominations were closed.

Professor Hess was declared **ELECTED** to the Senate Executive for a three-year term ending May 31, 2016.

3. **Election of a Student Member to the Senate Executive Committee** Page 9

The Chair reminded Senate that the composition of the Senate Executive Committee provides for a member elected by the students to be a member of Senate. There is also provision for one assessor member chosen by and from the student Senators.

Mr. Vasconcelos MOVED, on behalf of the Student Senate Caucus, to nominate Mr. Gustavo Mejicanos to serve as the voting member on the Senate Executive Committee.

CARRIED

Mr. Vasconcelos informed Senate that Mr. Adam Pawlak had been appointed to serve as the student assessor on Senate Executive.

V MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 10

The Chair noted that, in keeping with past practices, any minor corrections to the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course changes should be reported to the Office of the University Secretary.

2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes on Lapsed Courses** Page 108

3. **Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies RE: Revised Regulations - English Language Exemption List [February 27, 2013]** Page 125

4. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes RE: Departments of Economics, Native Studies, Psychology, and Sociology [March 22, 2013]** Page 128

5. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes RE: Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, Department of Interior Design, and Faculty of Architecture [April 16, 2013]** Page 136

6. **Proposal from Extended Education for an Integrated Support Worker (ISW) Certificate** Page 139

Dean Taylor MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve:

- (i) the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes;**
- (ii) the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes on Lapsed Courses;**

- (iii) the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies regarding Revisions to the English Language Exemption List [February 27, 2013];
- (iv) the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes regarding the Departments of Economics, Native Studies, Psychology, and Sociology [March 22, 2013];
- (v) the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes regarding the Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, the Department of Interior Design, and the Faculty of Architecture [April 16, 2013]; and
- (vi) a Proposal from Extended Education for an Integrated Support Worker (ISW) Certificate.

CARRIED

VI MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

- | | | |
|----|--|----------|
| 1. | <u>2013-2014 List of Senate Members</u> | Page 207 |
| 2. | <u>2013-2014 Schedule of Meetings and Agendas Availability for Senate and Senate Executive Committee</u> | Page 211 |
| 3. | <u>Annual Reports of Standing Committees of Senate</u> | |
| a) | <u>Academic Computing</u> | Page 212 |
| b) | <u>Academic Dress</u> | Page 214 |
| c) | <u>Academic Freedom</u> | Page 215 |
| d) | <u>Academic Review</u> | Page 216 |
| e) | <u>Admissions</u> | Page 217 |
| f) | <u>Admissions Appeals</u> | Page 219 |
| g) | <u>Appeals</u> | Page 220 |
| h) | <u>Approved Teaching Centres</u> | Page 221 |
| i) | <u>Awards</u> | Page 222 |
| j) | <u>Calendar</u> | Page 226 |
| k) | <u>Curriculum and Course Changes</u> | Page 227 |
| l) | <u>Honorary Degrees</u> | Page 228 |
| m) | <u>Instruction and Evaluation</u> | Page 229 |
| n) | <u>Joint Master's Programs</u> | Page 231 |
| o) | <u>Joint Master's Programs Appeals</u> | Page 233 |
| p) | <u>Libraries</u> | Page 234 |
| q) | <u>Medical Qualifications</u> | Page 235 |
| r) | <u>Nominations</u> | Page 236 |
| s) | <u>Planning and Priorities</u> | Page 237 |
| t) | <u>Rules and Procedures</u> | Page 238 |
| u) | <u>University Research</u> | Page 239 |

The Chair reminded members that Standing Committees of Senate are required to report at least once a year unless otherwise specified in the terms of reference. He called attention to the annual reports for Standing Committees for the year 2012-2013, which were circulated with the agenda.

4.	Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – <u>Part A [April 9, 2013]</u>	Page 241
5.	Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review RE: Undergraduate and Graduate Program Reviews <u>[March 8, 2013]</u>	Page 249
6.	Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: I.H. Asper School of Business, Revised Regulation Regarding Courses Taken on Letter of <u>Permission [March 21, 2013]</u>	Page 258
7.	Items Approved by the Board of Governors, <u>on March 19, 2013</u>	Page 260
8.	Items Approved by the Board of Governors, <u>on April 16, 2013</u>	Page 261
VII	<u>REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT</u>	Page 262
VIII	<u>QUESTION PERIOD</u>	

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.

The following question was received from Professor Kettner, Faculty of Medicine.

My question relates to "A Proposal to Establish a Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Manitoba April 13, 2013."

What is the plan for deliberations by Senate with respect to this proposal before it is finalized and before it is presented to the Board of Governors for approval?

Dr. Barnard said that a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences had recently been considered by affected Faculty Councils and advisory votes had been taken. He indicated that the deans and directors of the faculties and schools involved and the Provost would be submitting the proposal for initial consideration by the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC) at its meeting of May 27th. Following consideration by SPPC, it is expected that the proposal would move forward to Senate Executive and to Senate in the fall.

Professor Kettner expressed his concern that, if the proposal were not discussed at Senate before the fall, Senate's input would not be effective or meaningful given that the process seems to be moving forward quickly and considering how far the process has progressed already. He indicated that he has a number of specific concerns that he believes would be of interest to the University community. Dr. Barnard indicated that he would consult with the Provost and with Senate Executive about the advisability of including a discussion of the proposal at the June Senate meeting.

**IX CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 3, 2013**

Professor Kettner recalled that there had been a discussion about the importance of Senate having an opportunity to discuss the academic restructuring initiative, including the proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences. The idea had been raised by Professor Blunden and had been supported by other Senators, including himself. Mr. Leclerc noted that the discussion referenced by Professor Kettner is reflected in the minutes in the first full paragraph of page seven.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, seconded by Dr. Adams, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on April 3, 2013 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

X BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - none

Dr. Barnard recalled that, at the previous meeting, he had pledged to speak to MP Bruinooge about a concern raised in the House of Commons. The concern related to a multi-part motion regarding support of scientific research but also had attached a specific concern encouraging the federal government to support the Experimental Lakes Area (ELA) Research Facility. Dr. Barnard reminded members that he had suggested that tying this very specific clause to a generic one would have made it difficult for those who were aware that discussions were underway with the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) concerning the ELA, to support the motion. He informed members that, during their discussion, Mr. Bruinooge had expressed his support for university research, and noted that Mr. Bruinooge has advocated on behalf of the University in the past.

Dr. Barnard reported that, on May 9th, Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the IISD had signed a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the ELA.

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

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee Page 272

Dean Taylor reported that Senate Executive met on May 1, 2013. Comments of the committee accompany the reports upon which they are made.

Dean Taylor MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the following nominations to the Senate Committee on Nominations be approved by Senate for three-year terms beginning June 1, 2013 and ending on May 31, 2016:

- **Dean Doering (re-appointment), representing Architecture and Engineering;**
- **Dean Davies (new appointment), representing Law, Pharmacy, and Environment, Earth, and Resources;**

- **Professor Edwards (re-appointment), representing Nursing, Social Work, and Student Affairs.**

CARRIED

2. Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

Ms. Ducas reported that the committee had completed its consideration of a proposal from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management to establish a Community Recreation and Active Living Diploma; a Strategic Enrolment Management Planning Framework; and undergraduate course changes in the Faculty of Social Work beyond nine credit hours. All three proposals would be brought forward to Senate in due course. The committee had also considered an articulation agreement proposal between the University of Manitoba and the Inner Mongolia Agricultural University to offer credit in B.Sc. degrees offered by the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences and proposed curriculum changes to the Master of Social Work program involving a net increase of greater than nine credit hours.

XII REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES OF SENATE, FACULTY AND SCHOOL COUNCILS

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [April 9, 2013]

Page 273

Professor Hultin said the committee had considered a number of awards that might be deemed as discriminatory. The four awards are targeted to support students who have self-identified as Aboriginal. The committee recommends that this is a justifiable form of discrimination and supports their approval.

Professor Hultin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [dated April 9, 2013].

CARRIED

2. Proposals from the Université de Saint-Boniface RE: Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in International Studies, Bachelor of Arts (Honours) and Bachelor of Arts (Advanced) in Political Studies

Page 288

Dr. Csepregi (Vice-President Academic and Research, Université de Saint-Boniface) said the proposed Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in International Studies would be an interdisciplinary program that would focus on the study of the central questions of human rights, international relations, and international development. He noted that the Canadian Museum of Human Rights would inspire the content of some courses in the program that deal with peace, democracy, and the evolution of the concepts of human rights and human dignity. The program would emphasize the development of empathy, critical thinking, and imagination, which are all necessary in the pursuit of international careers. Dr. Csepregi said the proposed program would draw upon faculty expertise in social sciences at

the Université, would respond to a strategic objective to create more four-year honours programs at the Université.

Dr. Csepregi indicated that the establishment of the B.A.(Hons.) in International Studies, which would involve the creation of several new Political Studies courses as outlined on pages 92-93 of the agenda, would also make it possible for the Université to introduce a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) and a Bachelor of Arts (Advanced) in Political Studies.

a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 305

Dean Frankel referred members to the observations of the committee in the report. He said the committee strongly supports the program proposals.

Dean Frankel MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve a proposal from the Université de Saint-Boniface regarding the introduction of a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in International Studies, and a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) and a Bachelor of Arts (Advanced) in Political Studies.

CARRIED

3. **Articulation Agreement Proposal: University of Manitoba - Bachelor of Science in Agribusiness / Assiniboine Community College – Agribusiness Diploma** Page 312

Dean Trevan reminded members that graduates of the Agribusiness Diploma program at the University who are subsequently admitted to the B.Sc. in Agribusiness are allocated 60 credit hours toward the degree provided they have achieved at least a “B” average. The proposed articulation agreement would extend the same arrangement to graduates of the Agribusiness Diploma program at Assiniboine Community College. He said the 60 credit hours of transfer credits include courses that can be mapped onto University of Manitoba courses as well as unallocated credits. Dean Trevan said the articulation agreement would potentially attract students from southwestern Manitoba, who might otherwise study at the University of Saskatchewan, and so would retain some of these students in the province. It is expected that five students would be admitted each year but the agreement provides for a maximum of ten students annually. Dean Trevan indicated that the Faculty has sufficient places in the courses so no new resources would be required to support the agreement. He said the transfer program has proven to be very successful for graduates of the Faculty’s diploma program, as it provides a different form of education for the students that results in graduates who are highly employable in agri-food industries.

a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 318

Ms. Gottheil said the proposed articulation agreement supports an initiative of the provincial government to enhance student mobility within

the province. She said that the Senate Committee on Admissions is fully supportive of the proposal.

b) Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes Page 319

Dean Frankel said the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes felt it was important to support the proposal, which he described as very strong, given its potential to retain students in the province.

Dean Trevan MOVED THAT Senate approve the articulation agreement between the University of Manitoba and Assiniboine Community College concerning credit for graduates of the Agribusiness diploma in the Bachelor of Science degree in Agribusiness, for a term of five years effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

4. Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies Page 321
RE: Revised Regulations – Academic Guide
[February 27, 2013]

Dean Doering reminded members that the Academic Guide is included in the Graduate Calendar. He noted that revisions to the Academic Guide, which were informed by a survey of other U15 universities, had been reviewed by the Academic Guide Committee, the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies, and Senate Executive. He briefly outlined some of the more significant changes proposed.

- A preface, including definitions, has been added to section 1.
- Section 2.2 Academic Performance now articulates that two consecutive “in need of improvements” will normally require that a student withdraw. The statement formalizes current practice.
- In section 4.4.7, the maximum time for completion of the Master’s program, for full-time students, has been reduced from five (5) to four (4) years (section 4.4.7). The maximum time for completion for part-time students is unchanged.
- The lapse of credit of courses at the masters and doctoral levels has been reduced from eight (8) to seven (7) years (sections 4.7.2 and 5.4d).
- Provision for a dissenting voice has been incorporated into various sections throughout the document.
- The maximum time for completion of the doctoral program has been reduced from seven (7) to six (6) years (section 5.5b). The maximum time for completion for part-time students is unchanged.
- The revised thesis defense process would include three distinct steps: (i) examination and sign-off by the internal examining committee; (ii) examination by an external examiner; and (iii) the oral examination.
- Advisors will be required to recommend three individuals who might serve as an external examiner, which is in keeping with practice at other U15

institutions. The same section (5.11b) articulates the characteristics of someone who would be eligible to serve as an external examiner.

- A flowchart describing the process for submission, examination, and defense of a Ph.D. thesis has been added.
- A revision to section 5.14 will require that a doctoral student submit an electronic copy of his/her thesis to MSpace before the student is recommended for graduation. With the recent approval of new policy on MSpace by the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies, submission of the thesis to MSpace becomes a *pro forma* decision. Students would have an option to either release the thesis immediately or delay the release by four or six months if there are implications concerning publication or intellectual property rights.
- In section 9 Appeals – Procedures and Guidelines, the grounds to appeal have been clarified so they are consistent with the recently revised policy on Senate Committee on Appeals (Senate, March 7, 2012).

Dr. Doering indicated that following sentence, on page 356 of the agenda, is to be deleted from the document: “If the external examiner **plus** two or more internal examiners indicate a pass, then the candidate passes the examination.” He noted that it is not consistent with the next ensuing sentence in the document.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor Etcheverry, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies regarding revisions to the Faculty of Graduate Studies Academic Guide, as amended, effective September 1, 2013.

Professor Blunden expressed a concern that a three-stage formal process for the thesis defense process, which might require as many as ten weeks (section 5.11f) plus time for processing, might negatively affect students’ time-to-completion. He noted that the process at some other U15 institutions does not involve two formal stages prior to the oral examination. He cited, as an example, the process at the University of Alberta, which requires only four weeks from submission to defense and allows the thesis defense to be scheduled once the internal review is completed. Professor Blunden proposed that the initial step might be an informal one that would, nonetheless, require members of the internal committee to sign off on the thesis prior to external distribution but would also be part of the iterative process giving the student an opportunity to make changes without being formally assigned a pass or fail. In other words, the informal, internal evaluation would not count as one of the two attempts. Professor Blunden urged that consideration be given to amending the timeline for the process, to allow three rather than four weeks for the first two steps in the process, and to include a provision for the oral examination to be scheduled once the internal review is completed. He acknowledged that the objective of the proposed three-stage process is important; that an inferior thesis is not sent to an external examiner.

Dean Doering said the proposed process would not necessarily require ten weeks. In response to members’ questions, he clarified that the examination by the internal examining committee would not involve a formal gathering of the committee and that, if a member of the committee had read and approved the

thesis as a member of the candidate's advisory committee, that member would not have to read the document a second time as a member of the examining committee. The initial step could, therefore, be quite expedient. Dean Doering maintained that a formal internal examination process is required to ensure that all members of the internal examining committee read and critique the thesis before it is sent to the external examiner. He explained that, historically, the thesis has been distributed to the internal examining committee and the external examiner simultaneously. Often, the thesis is failed internally but passed externally, which makes it necessary for the external examiner to review a revised draft of the thesis.

In response to Professor Blunden's suggestion that the internal review should not be a formal assessment, Dean Doering said the view of the Faculty of Graduate Studies is that the review of the thesis by the internal examining committee constitutes a formal examination of the student based on the student's submission of a written document. The formal process is meant to ensure theses are ready to go to defense before they are sent to external examiners, by compelling internal reviewers to review the document closely. Dean Doering indicated, and Professor McNicol (Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies) confirmed, that other U15 universities do require internal examiners to formally sign off on the thesis (including Dalhousie University, the University of Ottawa, the University of Toronto, the University of British Columbia, and the University of Western Ontario), while others have a more informal process or no process for internal approval.

Referring to section 5.12b, which stipulates that participation of the external examiner by voice or video conferencing is expected where he or she is unable to attend the oral examination, Professor Hultin said resources would be required to ensure that working video conferencing facilities would be available for this purpose. He noted that some disciplines would require facilities with equipment for interactive sharing of real-time white boards. Professor Hultin recommended, and others concurred, that the Faculty of Graduate Studies work with Information Services and Technology to provide appropriate facilities, as departments would not have the necessary resources.

Referring members to the penultimate paragraph on page 345 of the agenda, Professor Kucera remarked that a number of questions raised by the University of Manitoba Faculty Association (UMFA) concerning the proposed Advisor Student Guidelines had been addressed by the Faculty of Graduate Studies in a recent draft of that document. Dean Doering acknowledged the constructive input received from Ms. Guse (Executive Director, UMFA) and others. He indicated his intention to bring the Advisor Student Guidelines to Senate in June. If the Guidelines are not approved by Senate in June, the fifth paragraph on page 336 of the agenda and the penultimate paragraph on page 345 would be deleted from the Academic Guide.

Recognizing there is a trend in North America to reduce the time-to-completion for doctoral students to six years, Professor Churchill observed that a number of comprehensive studies, including the Graduate Education Initiative (GEI) of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, show this is difficult to achieve in doctoral programs in the humanities, which continue to be based on the Yale model, even

when increased financial incentives (e.g. scholarships, research funds) to finish sooner are available. He noted that, although fewer resources are available for graduate student support at the University as compared to other institutions, a proposal to increase support is not part of the current proposal to reduce time-to-completion. Professor Churchill contended that the proposed change is not sensible and would result in many petitions for extensions unless significant changes are made to what constitutes a doctoral program in the humanities at the University. He noted that students who remain in their program for seven or eight years tend to finish the program, which is also important to consider given the time and resources invested by both the students and the University.

Dean Doering replied that the proposed change to the maximum time for completion would affect six percent of the doctoral student population. He reasoned that it would be preferable to deal with these students on a case-by-case basis in order to signal the expectation of how long it should take to complete a doctoral degree. He noted that the University has made significant increases to graduate student support in the previous three years, which is a clear signal that Administration views graduate education as a priority.

Mr. Okeke asked on what grounds a student might be granted an extension to complete his or her degree program. Dean Doering replied that requests for extensions are adjudicated the Associate Deans on a case-by-case basis. He said there are many factors that might be considered including a student's home, financial, or medical circumstances. He noted that rarely is a first request for an extension denied but the amount of additional time required will be negotiated. Dean Doering suggested that overall the decisions are quite compassionate.

In response to questions from members, Dean Doering clarified some elements of the process for selecting an external examiner. With reference to the final paragraph on page 353, he said the external examiner is not confidential. He noted that the external examiner would be selected from a list of individuals recommended by the candidate's advisor in consultation with the advisor or the advisory committee. Dean Doering confirmed that the advisor must provide the names of, and contact information for, three potential external examiners. He noted that all other U15 universities require at least two and most require three. He indicated that the Faculty of Graduate Studies would follow up with the individuals to obtain their curricula vitae. In response to a concern that it might be difficult to ask distinguished researchers to provide a curriculum vitae, Professor McNicol said that Graduate Studies will not request full curricula vitae but will provide a form requesting a brief biographical summary.

Dean Doering remarked that often advisors believe that the external examiner must be an individual who is highly specialized in a particular area. He clarified that an external examiner does need to be an expert in the field; the student should be the expert in the area of the thesis. An external examiner should, however, be someone with significant experience supervising doctoral students who understands the expectations of the field as well as the limitations of doctoral research and who can comment on the scholarship and quality of the thesis.

The motion, as amended, was **CARRIED**.

5. **Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures** Page 374
RE: Revisions to the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences Council Bylaw

Dean Doering MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures regarding revisions to the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences Council Bylaw, effective upon approval by Senate.

CARRIED

6. **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research** Page 381
RE: Responsible Conduct of Research - Code of Research Ethics

Dr. Jayas informed members that Senate was being asked to consider and recommend to the Board of Governors, the policy Responsible Conduct of Research – Code of Research Ethics. He indicated that two other documents had been provided for information. The policy Responsible Conduct of Research would be considered for approval by the Board of Governors, and the Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures are to be approved by the President.

Dr. Jayas informed Senate that the Tri-Council had developed a framework on the responsible conduct of research that sets out various expectations that institutions are required to meet if they are to continue to be eligible to receive funding from the Tri-Council agencies. One expectation is that institutions have a policy regarding responsible conduct of research. The policy Responsible Conduct of Research constitutes a revision of the existing University of Manitoba Policy on Academic Fraud. The Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures support the revised policy and are in alignment with the Tri-Council policy framework. The policy Responsible Conduct of Research – Code of Research Ethics is a statement regarding what the University expects of its researchers in terms of the conduct of research.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research regarding the establishment of the policy Responsible Conduct of Research – Code of Research Ethics.

Professor Guard suggested that some language used in the documents is not consistent with a stated objective of the policy Responsible Conduct of Research to provide a fair and thorough investigation process into allegations that research has not been conducted with integrity. She and others, including Professor Gabbert, spoke against a provision in the Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures for accusations based on anonymous materials. She contended that such a provision is not consistent with other protocols at the University or with other documents approved by Senate. Professor Gabbert noted, in particular, that Senate and its committees had ensured there was no language in professional unsuitability bylaws recently established by several faculties (Dentistry, Education, Social Work, Nursing) that allowed either for anonymous accusations or restricted access of the accused to evidence.

Professor Gabbert noted that many who would be affected are UMFA members and that the collective agreement, which would supersede the policies and procedures, includes strong protections against disciplinary action based on anonymous materials. He contended, nonetheless, that the procedures should not suggest that an investigation might proceed on the basis of anonymous accusations. Members were concerned that other researchers who are not protected by the UMFA collective agreement should have a similar protection against the use of anonymous accusations. Professor Churchill suggested that graduate researchers working on research teams, who are often the frontline researchers working with human subjects, would be particularly vulnerable.

Professors Guard and Gabbert identified as a concern the possibility that a person accused of a breach might not be given access to all of the evidence against him or her, or be provided with copies of that evidence to share with an advocate. Section 2.27 (b) specifies that the investigation committee would decide how much information would be shared with the person accused. Professor Gabbert noted that, without access to all of the evidence, it might be difficult for a person accused of a breach to respond to an allegation, as provided for in section 2.27 (c). He contended that the investigation procedures would be improved if section 2.27 (b) and section 2.34 were deleted. Professor Alward suggested that sections 2.14 through 2.19, which would allow for an Initial Investigation to occur without an individual accused of a breach ever being informed, are also problematic.

Members raised concerns regarding the composition of the Investigation Committee (sections 2.20 through 2.22). Professor Guard noted that because the terms of reference for the Investigation Committee would allow non-academic staff, post-doctoral fellows, students, and external experts to be appointed to the Committee, none of whom might be expert in research, a faculty researcher accused of a breach would not necessarily face a committee of his or her peers. She and Professor Alward expressed specific concerns about the involvement of a representative of Human Resources on the committee. Professor Guard noted that the same HR staff person might already have been called upon as a technical resource. Professor Alward objected on the basis that, in grievance proceedings, HR staff might be perceived as being required to take the perspective of the administration in matters that allege misconduct by academics.

Professor Guard raised a concern regarding the possibility that the Designated Officer, who completes the initial review and determines whether an investigation is appropriate, might appoint himself or herself to serve as the Chair of the Investigation Committee. Given he or she might already have formed an opinion about the merit of the accusation, he or she may not be neutral. Professor Guard noted that the procedures are not clear about who would designate a replacement if the Designated Officer was found to have a conflict of interest in a particular case. She proposed that the Investigation Procedures might include procedural guidelines for the investigation. Professor Alward noted her view that the process should set out the circumstances and timeline when the files noted in section 2.38 should be destroyed.

Dr. Jayas noted that the comments made concerned the Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures. He reminded members that this document

had been provided to Senate for information. He invited Mr. Juliano (Director, Office of Fair Practices and Legal Affairs) to address some of the concerns raised.

Mr. Juliano said the authors of the policies and procedures had received and had considered feedback from various stakeholders. He explained that the provision for anonymous accusations and the right of the Investigation Committee to decide what evidence would be provided to a person accused of a breach had been included to protect persons who make an allegation, as required by the Tri-Council. Mr. Juliano underscored that the policy applies to everyone involved in research at the University, including students, research assistants, and others, and not only faculty members. He asked members to bear in mind that sometimes the circumstances in which an allegation is raised can present some danger to persons who raise the allegations. The Tri-Council framework requires institutions to protect these individuals to the extent possible. For this reason, statements are qualified by rules of natural justice and procedural fairness, which will require that there be good and fair interpretation of the rules by the Investigation Committee on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Juliano indicated that, in the vast majority of cases and particularly where it would not be possible to be fair to a person accused without disclosing the evidence, Legal Counsel's advice to an Investigation Committee would be to disclose the majority of the information.

With respect to the composition of the Investigation Committee, Mr. Juliano explained that the intent is to allow for flexibility in terms of the composition of the Investigation Committee, as these Committees would investigate allegations ranging from very minor to serious. Flexibility is also required because it is not possible to anticipate the types of allegations that might be made. Mr. Juliano agreed that academic staff should be judged by their peers but noted that there will be circumstances in which the Committee will require members who have expertise in areas outside of academe. He noted, as an example, that the Tri-Council is requiring that the definition of academic fraud include financial wrongdoing. In such cases, the Investigation Committee might require the assistance of a forensic accountant.

Members acknowledged that the University is obligated to protect persons who make an accusation, but they contended that, to ensure a fair process, the University is also obliged to provide a person who is accused with all of the information pertaining to the accusation. Professors Gabbert and Hultin were not reassured by Mr. Juliano's pledge that the procedures would be interpreted and applied in congruence with fairness and justice. Professor Hultin contended that, if it is sometimes necessary that evidence be withheld from a person who is accused, there must be rules that describe and limit the circumstances in which this would occur. Professor Gabbert said he would encourage the President not to accept the document exactly as it is drafted, as strong as it is in other respects. Professor Hultin urged the authors to find language that would protect both those who bring forward allegations and those who are accused.

Professor Blunden observed that Senate's approval of the policy Responsible Conduct of Research – Code of Research Ethics would not imply consent with the Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures. He asked if it

would be appropriate for Senate to recommend changes to the latter document. Mr. Leclerc said the Investigation Procedures are administrative procedures that would be enacted by the President, who could consider Senate's feedback in deciding what the final procedures would be. President Barnard said he would take advice received on matters raised at the meeting and would work with Dr. Jayas and Mr. Juliano to revise the Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures for further discussion at the next meeting.

Professor Gabbert expressed appreciation that Senate had been given an opportunity to comment on the document and, given the discussion at the previous meeting, expressed his hope that this type of opportunity would continue to be provided to Senate.

Professor Ouelette asked if a member of the community, for example, a resident of an Indigenous community in northern Manitoba, who had a concern regarding a researcher in the community could make a complaint and, if so, how the individual would determine who the Designated Officer is. Dr. Jayas replied that the policy would allow members of the community to make a complaint. He said that the Designated Officer would be identified on the informed consent form completed by the research participant.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

7. **Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations** Page 406

Professor Edwards referred members to the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [May 15, 2013]. 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 May 15, 2013].

CARRIED

XIII ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. **Revised Policy on Co-Curricular Record** Page 298

Ms. Gottheil recalled that the policy on Co-Curricular Record was established at Senate three years earlier (June 23, 2010). Since that time, it has proven effective as a tool to increase student engagement and enhance students' experience at the University. There are now almost 400 activities listed on the co-curricular record. Ms. Gottheil indicated that responsibility for coordinating and implementing the policy rests with Student Life, under the leadership of Mr. Hughes (Director) and Mr. Grad (Coordinator). Ms. Gottheil briefly reviewed proposed changes to the policy including the creation of a separate document outlining procedures; the addition of a new area of recognition, foundational skill development, which would include research activities; and changes to the membership of the Co-Curricular Record Review Committee that are intended to improve the process by which programs are reviewed and to ensure the quality of programs eligible for the co-curricular record. In addition, with the

implementation of a new software tool, the co-curricular record will now be separate from students' transcripts.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, seconded by Professor Atleo, THAT Senate approve the revised policy on Co-Curricular Record and corresponding Co-Curricular Record Procedures, effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

XIV ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 18, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 419, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on May 15, 2013.