

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
Prof. B. Amiro
Prof. G. Anderson
Prof. J. Anderson
Prof. J. Asadoorian
Prof. M. Atleo
Prof. H. Aukema
Dean J. Beddoes
Dean M. Benarroch
Prof. P. Blunden
Prof. T. Booth
Prof. M. Brabston
Prof. D. Brewin
Ms. M. Brolley
Prof. M. Campbell
Prof. P. Cattini
Mr. G. Chappellaz
Prof. N. Chow
Acting Dean D. Clarke
Dean N. Davies
Dean E. Dawe
Dean J. Doering
Prof. M. Edwards
Mr. C. Ekenna
Prof. B. Elias
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Mr. L. Ford
Prof. M. Gabbert
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Dean N. Halden
Prof. P. Hess
Prof. P. Hultin
Dean A. Iacopino
Prof. T. Ivanco
Prof. J. Johnson
Mr. J. Kearsey
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. J. Kettner
Mr. A. Konowalchuk
Prof. L. Landrum
Prof. J. Linklater

Prof. A. MacDonell
Prof. D. MacPherson
Prof. D. McMillan
Dean D. Mandzuk
Mr. G. Mejicanos
Prof. J. Morrill
Mr. E. Okeke
Prof. R.-F. Ouellette
Prof. F. Parkinson
Mr. A. Pawlak
Ms. E. Popowich
Prof. S. Prentice
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Mr. J. Silverstein
Prof. K. Smith
Prof. D. Smyth
Dean R. Stern
Prof. R. Tate
Dean J. Taylor
Dean M. Trevan
Prof. C. Trott
Mr. A. Turnbull
Dean L. Turnbull
Mr. M. Vasconcelos
Prof. P. Venkatesh
Dean L. Wallace
Mr.. Warnakulasooriya
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld
Prof. A. Young
Mr. K. Zeid
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University
Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,
Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. J. Adams
Dr. D. Collins
Ms. A. Ducas

Dean H. Frankel
Dr. G. Glavin
Ms. S. Gottheil
Prof. B. Hallman
Prof. T. Kucera
Mr. N. Marnoch
Mr. M. Rahimian
Dr. J. Ristock
Dr. L. Smith

Regrets

Ms. K. Adams
Prof. S. Alward
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Mr. R. Buchanan
Prof. A. Chiu
Mr. Z. Courtemanche
Mr. G. Csepregi
Ms. K. Daaca
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. A. Farenhorst
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. J. Guard
Mr. J. Hart
Prof. J. Hughes
Ms. E. Hunzinger
Ms. S. Jasper
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. E. Judd
Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. P. Kochan
Ms. M. Leaf
Prof. D. Lussier
Prof. A. McIntosh
Prof. K. Matheos
Dean B. O'Connell
Prof. T. Podolsky
Dean B. Postl
Prof. C. Rocke
Ms. J. Sealey
Dr. H. Secter
Prof. B. Southern
Prof. C. Van Winkle
Prof. L. Wang

Dean J. Watkinson
Ms. M. Wetzel
Ms. D. Young

Absent

Ms. S. Ally
Prof. M. Araj
Dr. J. Blatz
Ms. F. Bakhtiari
Prof. T. Chen
Prof. R. Desai
Prof. D. Funk
Prof. B. Hann
Ms. M. Igweagu
Prof. V. Keown
Ms. B. Lewicki
Mr. S. Mack
Prof. D. Mann
Prof. A. Menkis
Ms. H. Omichinski
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. D. Polyzois
Acting Dean R. Roshko
Ms. J. Tan
Mr. A. Thapa
Dr. M. Torchia
Prof. H. Unruh

Also Present

Ms. J. Feuer
Ms. S. Gagnon
Mr. G. Juliano
Ms. H. Long
Prof. M. Porter
Ms. C. Préjet
Ms. S. Utsunomiya

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Peter Blunden, Faculty of Science.

The Chair welcomed newly elected and re-elected Senators.

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVE

1. To the Senate Executive Committee Page 5

The Chair indicated that one faculty representative was to be elected for a three-year term. The University Secretary opened nominations. On a motion duly moved and seconded, Professor Asadoorian (Dentistry) 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 Asadoorian was declared **ELECTED** to the Senate Executive for a three-year term ending May 31, 2016.

III MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

1. Reports of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes

a) RE: Department of Biosystems Engineering Page 6
[February 27, 2013]

b) RE: Department of Accounting and Finance Page 7
[April 30, 2013]

c) RE: Department of English, Film, and Theatre Page 9
[April 30, 2013]

2. Report of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres Page 10

Professor Blunden MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve the Reports of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes concerning the Departments of Biosystems Engineering, Accounting and Finance, and English, Film, and Theatre, and the Report of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres.

CARRIED

IV MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Page 13
Part A [May 14, 2013]

2.	Report of the Senate Committee on Awards <u>[May 21, 2013]</u>	Page 22
3.	Implementation of Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in <u>Anthropology</u>	Page 25
4.	Implementation of Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in <u>Criminology</u>	Page 26
5.	Report of the Implementation Working Group <u>for the Cooper Commission Report [May 27, 2013]</u>	Page 27

The Chair invited Dr. Smith, Co-Chair of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission Report to speak to the report. Dr. Smith called attention to observation 3 of the report, which identifies several policies, procedures, and other documents that will be brought to Senate for its consideration in the fall of 2013.

V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Page 29

Dr. Barnard reported that the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) had informed him that it had established an Ad Hoc Investigatory Committee to “examine the situation in the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba.” Its terms of reference are to: (i) investigate whether there has been an attempt to eliminate or significantly reduce the heterodox tradition in the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba; (ii) determine, if such an attempt is found to have occurred, whether it constitutes a violation of academic freedom; (iii) make any appropriate recommendations. Dr. Barnard said the CAUT’s decision to undertake this investigation is a matter of great concern. He said he had expressed to Dr. Turk, President of CAUT, that its actions stem from a position of perceived bias, do not respect the University of Manitoba’s institutional autonomy, and undermine an already-initiated process within the Department of Economics to identify and address some areas of concern within that unit. More specifically, with respect to the issue of bias: the terms of reference of the investigation present the situation in the Department of Economics as one in which the academic freedom of those holding so called “heterodox” views being potentially put at risk by the others in the Department. This polarized characterization ignores the complexity and diversity of views held within the Department. It also suggests that CAUT has positioned itself as planning to represent or promote the interests of the “heterodox” group – though notably, how this concept is defined remains unclear. Further the diverse interests of the other members in the Department end up being characterized as a homogeneous oppositional group when that is not the case.

Dr. Barnard said that, although the CAUT had been informed, by himself and by the Dean of Arts, of the pre-existing internal process being led within the Department of Economics, it had decided to proceed nonetheless. He said that, in his view, the CAUT, a voluntary, external organization, has neither the standing to insert itself in these discussions, nor the ability to access the appropriate information that would allow its committee to make an informed assessment of the workings of the Department. Rather than respecting the University’s internal process, the CAUT had suggested that the results of the University’s internal review would be taken into account by its committee, which would have the effect of relegating the University’s internal collegial process to the lesser status of providing input into a CAUT process. Dr. Barnard informed Senate that

he had shared this view with Dr. Turk, the investigation committee, the Dean of Arts, and all members of the Department of Economics. He had also said that these matters are internal to the University and are being addressed through a system of collegial governance that is, and should be, the way academic decisions are made.

Dr. Barnard said, to cloak this issue under the mantle of academic freedom, ignores the tradition within the academy of colleagues deciding together what to include or emphasize in teaching programs and research. He remarked that collegial decision-making and academic freedom could come into conflict, but questioned on what basis the CAUT had come to the view that it could be happening in the Department of Economics since nothing about the motivation for their investigation had been revealed in their communication. Dr. Barnard posited that an increasingly loose definition of academic freedom carries a significant risk to all universities; it is a shaping idea for the academy, but is at risk of becoming seen as meaningless if stretched too far.

Dr. Barnard reported that, in early June, he had received a request from the CAUT's investigation committee to meet with them when they were on the campus the previous week. He said, given his perspective that the CAUT has no standing to pursue an investigation, he had declined to meet with the committee and had suggested instead that the CAUT respect the University of Manitoba's autonomy in this matter. He had also advised members of the Department that they had no obligation to meet with the committee, but if they chose to do so that they had every right to express their opinions on issues impacting their academic pursuits. In so doing, they would need to comply with the University's policies and legislative requirements with respect to privacy and confidentiality.

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.

The following question was received from Professor Julie Guard, Faculty of Arts.

My question is, how did it happen that the UM has agreed to prioritize Blue Bomber games over university classes? This question arises out of my experience of having a class that has been cancelled because it conflicts with a Bomber game. One of our courses meets on Monday and Tuesday evenings 6-9 pm. The class that would have met on June 12 will have to be cancelled because students will not be allowed to drive on campus at all that day (unless they have a parking pass, which few students have). Most of our students drive to evening classes, and none of those who normally drive will switch to the bus. In some cases, it's virtually impossible for them to travel by bus because of where they live. The instructor, who also does not have a parking pass, would have to park elsewhere and walk onto campus or come by bus. Since very few or perhaps no students would be there, however, the only real option is to cancel the class.

We knew in advance about regularly scheduled Blue Bomber games in the fall and have scheduled our classes (such as the one that meets on Saturdays) to accommodate game days. But the summer schedule was not available in advance, so it wasn't possible to schedule around the games. The consequence is that classes will be cancelled and students will have no real option of making them up.

In my view, it seems perverse and wrong for the UM to prioritize Bomber games over course delivery. Would you please explain how it happened that this situation, where Bomber games can result in cancelled classes, came about?

The Chair invited Mr. Konowalchuk, Associate Vice-President (Administration), to respond.

Mr. Konowalchuk observed that the University of Manitoba has a history of engaging the broader community as a partner for sport and active living events citing as examples the Pan Am Games, the annual Manitoba Marathon, and the upcoming Canada Summer Games. He recalled that more than four years ago the University had partnered with the Province and the City of Winnipeg to locate the Investors Group Field within the University's Active Living precinct. The partnership had resulted in several agreements as part of the construction of the Investors Group Field, one of which is the Comprehensive Event Day Plan. The Event Day Plan takes effect for any major event at the Investors Group Field that is anticipated to have over 15,000 people in attendance. The typical schedule of Major Events would include ten Winnipeg Blue Bomber Football games and up to four concert events. The Event Day Plan represents the best efforts from University of Manitoba, the BBB Stadium Inc., and the Winnipeg Football Club to accommodate all partners and the surrounding community during event days. The University had worked to ensure there was a balance between the needs of visitors to events and the needs of faculty, staff, and students.

Mr. Konowalchuk said that, in the weeks leading up to the first major event, concerns had been received from faculty, staff, and students regarding the availability of parking on a casual basis on event days. He reported that the former Southwood Golf Club parking lot had been made available to faculty and staff for casual parking, with a capacity of approximately eighty stalls and a fee of \$4.00 per stall. A memo had been sent to all Deans, Directors, and Department Heads, and approximately sixty passes had been sold for June 12th. Mr. Konowalchuk said the Director of Summer Session had indicated that no summer session classes had officially be cancelled. At the discretion of instructors and students, some courses had been cancelled, relocated off campus or rescheduled. Based on instructor feedback, classes held on June 12th had varied participation. On average, attendance was over 70 percent, with one class as low as 25 percent and some others having reported 100 percent attendance.

Mr. Konowalchuk said the University would resolve the matter of parking for students attending classes or exams on event days. Based on observations made during the June 12th event, the reserved permit holder parking lots had capacity to accommodate the casual parking pass demand for those students registered in evening classes on event days who do not hold parking permits. In addition, given the first experience and taking into account feedback from faculty, staff, and students improvements would be made to accommodate traffic flow on event days. Transit access to the University would be improved with a dedicated bus lane along University Crescent and changes would be made to the event permit holder parking process to enable better flow of traffic around the University and off of major arteries, particularly Pembina Highway.

Mr. Konowalchuk informed Senate that an e-mail had been sent to all employees and students to communicate that the University would accommodate those attending a class or exam or teaching on campus during an event day by issuing a "casual event

day parking pass,” which would be available at Parking Services. Mr. Konowalchuk said individuals with a parking permit or the new casual event day pass would be given priority access via Kings Drive on event days. He observed that this entry point proved very successful for faculty, staff, and students on the first event day. He pledged that improvements to the process for access to the University would continue to be made as lessons are gained from further events.

VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAY 15, 2013

At Professor Gabbert’s request, the final paragraph on page 14 was amended to reflect first, that he had opposed any provision that would involve withholding evidence from the accused and second, that the imposition of any procedure involving the use of anonymous materials and restricted access of the accused to evidence would be inconsistent with other policies recently approved by the University related to unprofessional conduct of students enrolled in the Faculties of Education, Nursing, and others.

In the final paragraph on page 16, the third sentence was revised to read: “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.”

Dean Halden MOVED, seconded by Dean Turnbull, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on May 15, 2013 be approved as amended.

CARRIED

VIII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures Page 36 *(revised, for information)*

The Chair recalled that, at the previous meeting, members had raised several concerns regarding proposed Investigation Procedures that relate to the policy on Responsible Conduct of Research. He had pledged to work with Dr. Jayas, Chair of the Senate Committee on University Research, and Mr. Juliano, Director, Office of Fair Practices and Legal Affairs, to respond to Senate’s concerns and to share a revised document with Senate, with an opportunity for further discussion. The Chair invited Mr. Juliano to speak to the changes.

Mr. Juliano noted that, since the last meeting, the related policies Responsible Conduct of Research and Responsible Conduct of Research – Code of Research Ethics had been approved by the Board of Governors (May 21, 2013). Approval of the Responsible Conduct of Research – Investigation Procedures by the President is pending Senate’s consideration of changes made to the document since the last meeting. The changes take into account some of Senate’s comments and the requirements of the Tri-Council. In some cases it was not possible to adopt changes proposed by Senate, as the policy must be sufficiently flexible to address diverse types of activities that might be covered by the policy and the diverse types of people who might be engaged with policy, including faculty members, research associates, students, and staff. Mr. Juliano briefly

summarized a number of changes made to the Investigation Procedures, as described in the following paragraphs.

Referring to a concern that an Initial Review might occur without an individual being made aware of the complaint against him or her, Mr. Juliano said section 2.17 had been added to the Investigation Procedures to ensure that individuals would be advised of the complaint, even where the Initial Review did not lead to an investigation. He clarified that the Initial Review, which would be initiated when the Designated Officer received a complaint, would be a vetting to determine whether the policy would be triggered rather than an investigation.

Mr. Juliano said, in response to a concern that individuals should be judged by their peers, the revised procedures would not allow persons who provide support to an Investigation Committee, including Human Resources representatives, to be voting members of the committee. The revised document also clarifies that individuals who do not hold an academic appointment, including students, post-doctoral fellows, and research assistants, would only serve on an Investigation Committee where the investigation involved a peer and, even in these cases, the committee would comprise a majority of academic staff.

Mr. Juliano said it would be difficult to amend the Investigation Procedures to respond to concerns regarding anonymous accusations or cases where the person who has made a disclosure would not be immediately known to the person being investigated. The procedures must provide for anonymous accusations, as the University has a responsibility to investigate credible allegations to ensure the integrity of research. Mr. Juliano referred members to the authors' response to Senate, on pages 51 – 57 of the agenda, which describes how the procedures would be interpreted and applied. He said that in the majority of cases there would be full disclosure. Observing that the rules of natural justice and procedural fairness, to which the University is bound, require that an individual accused is able to make a full answer in defense, he said the University would not be served by withholding information where it is possible to disclose it. Mr. Juliano said a provision for anonymous allegations is not inconsistent with other documents at the University. Section 11.1.8 of the UMFA Collective Agreement anticipates the need for the same kind of flexibility. The Safe Disclosure policy also anticipates anonymous complaints and protection of the identity of witnesses.

Mr. Juliano said it is necessary to ensure that complaints that are made are responsible. Complaints that are not credible would be rejected during the Initial Review process and would not proceed to an Investigation. He called attention to the addition of section 2.53, which is intended to discourage irresponsible complaints and to indicate there would be disciplinary consequences for irresponsible complaints.

Professors Gabbert and Kucera proposed that some of the supplementary comments provided with the agenda, and specifically those concerning the provision for anonymous complaints, might be incorporated into the Investigation Procedures, as they clarify the meaning of the procedures. Professor Kucera acknowledged the need for flexibility but suggested that many of the concerns that had been raised regarding anonymous accusations might be addressed by

using more tightly-worded language, with clauses to indicate that exceptions would have to be made in some cases. He observed that the Investigation Procedures, as currently written, are most useful with the accompanying commentary but worried that the existence of the explanatory comments in the Senate record might be forgotten over time.

Professor Gabbert said it would be useful if section 2.27 (e) specified that an advocate would, as part of the Investigation Process, have the right to participate and ask questions.

Professor Gabbert reiterated a concern that section 2.27 (b), which gives the Investigation Committee the authority to decide how much evidence the accused would receive, is problematic. He said it would be difficult to imagine a situation in which a person accused of a breach would not be advantaged by receiving all of the evidence. Recalling Mr. Juliano's indication that, in the vast majority of cases there would be full disclosure of the evidence, he asked for examples of the minority of cases where an Investigation Committee would not convey all of the evidence to a person accused of a breach. Noting that only members of the Investigation Committee would have access to all of the evidence, he asked how anyone else would know that evidence had been withheld. Mr. Juliano said that, typically, in situations where no evidence is provided, there has been a decision not to pursue any disciplinary action because the evidence cannot be relied on or is insufficient, a strong case cannot be made, or it is necessary to protect an individual. In situations where the disclosure of evidence is delayed, there is typically a need to either protect an individual or to ensure the preservation of evidence. Mr. Gabbert suggested that the Investigation Procedures might be amended to indicate the right of the accused to receive all evidence that is relied upon through the course of the Investigation Process.

Professor Kucera proposed the Investigation Procedures might be revised to distinguish between the two different ways the term "anonymous" is used in the document; one with reference to the receipt of materials where the authorship is unknown and the second where the authorship of the materials is unknown to the person accused but not to members of the Investigation Committee.

The Chair said consideration would be given to suggestions to migrate some of the commentary provided into the final draft of the Investigation Procedures.

The Chair recalled that, at the previous meeting, Professor Kettner had proposed that Senate have a discussion of a proposal to establish a Faculty of Health Sciences. He had indicated the proposal was to be considered by the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee (SPPC) in May, but he would consult with the Provost and Senate Executive regarding the advisability of discussing the matter at Senate in June. Based on those consultations and in order to respect the process that had been followed for similar proposals in the past, he proposed that Senate discuss the proposal when it comes to the committee from SPPC.

Professor Kettner said he was disappointed in the decision suggesting it is not the decision that would best serve the University community. He said he supports the intention of the proposal but has concerns about its success based on its content and the consultation process to date. He expressed concern that

b) **Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee** Page 59
RE: Strategic Enrolment Management Planning Framework
2013 – 2018 [April 29, 2013]

Ms. Ducas recalled that Senate had previously received a presentation on the Strategic Enrolment Management Planning (SEMP) Framework at its meeting on January 9, 2013 and had received a report from the SPPC on Undergraduate Enrolment Targets at the March 6, 2013 meeting. Referring to the proposal to establish a SEMP Framework 2013 - 2018, she noted that the broad goals outlined in the framework had been developed by the SEMP Committee in consultation with various faculty councils and the SPPC. She observed that targets to increase graduate enrolment and to increase the ratio of doctoral to (research-based) masters students reflect that the University is Manitoba's only research-intensive university. Targets for Aboriginal student enrolment and improved student outcomes are consistent with the University's priorities for Indigenous achievement and an exceptional student experience. Ms. Ducas called attention to the SPPC's observation that some initiatives and activities that would be required to achieve some of the targets would require additional resources. In particular, the goal to increase graduate student enrolment to 20 percent of the total enrolment would require additional resources for graduate student support and for grants for faculty researchers. The SPPC had underscored the importance of continuing to lobby the provincial government for funds in support of graduate research and education. Ms. Ducas said the SEMP Committee acknowledges that some of the goals are aspirational, including, the targets for increased graduate and Indigenous student enrolment. She noted that the SEMP Committee has committed to report annually to Senate and the Board of Governors on the status of the implementation of the framework and related resource implications.

Ms. Gottheil expressed appreciation for the feedback previously provided by the SPPC and Senate, which is reflected in the SEMP Framework proposal before Senate. Pending approval of the Framework, which sets out broad goals, she said the next step would be to reconvene the subcommittees of the SEMP Committee to work with academic and administrative units across the University to develop implementation and action plans. Meetings with deans and associate deans to discuss the implications of the broad goals for undergraduate and graduate programs would occur in the fall. Ms. Gottheil restated the SEMP Committee's intention to report annually on progress made toward achieving global goals identified in the Framework.

Ms. Ducas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee concerning the Strategic Enrolment Management Planning Framework 2013 - 2018.

Professors McMillan and Prentice commented on the immediate imperative for housing and childcare if the University is to meet the proposed target for increasing the proportion of Aboriginal students by

2018. They remarked that such facilities and services are integral to the academic success of many Aboriginal students. Professor McMillan suggested these resources should be in place already if the University is to meet the 2018 target and asked how the SEMP Committee envisions the goal will be attained. Ms. Gottheil replied that the Committee is conscious of both the need for housing and daycare, which are just two of several priorities identified in the SEMP Framework, and the fact that these issues will not easily be resolved given the resource implications. She said the Child Care Working Group, a sub-committee of the Student Experience Committee, had recently submitted a draft report on child care on campus that had been prepared in consultation with University of Manitoba Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Association. Discussions have occurred regarding the need for additional residences on both the Fort Garry and Bannatyne Campuses in the short term (three – five years). In the longer term, there would be opportunities to incorporate residences and daycare facilities into the development of the Southwood Lands. Dr. Barnard concurred adding there is an expectation that development of the Southwood Lands would include high density housing, including housing for families and more child care facilities, to provide a richer environment for students. He observed the challenge will be to fit these priorities into the plan and to identify financing.

Observing that the University has made a commitment to laddering certificate into degree programs, Dean Wallace asked if there is a place in the SEMP Framework for increasing registration and success of students in certificate programs. Ms. Gottheil replied that the SEMP Committee would be taking certificate programs into account as it continues to review SEM targets and perhaps set new ones.

Referring to the final bullet on page 63 of the agenda, Professor Tate enquired about an apparent contradiction between a target for 75 percent graduation of doctoral students within nine years, by 2018, and a maximum time to completion of six years. Dean Doering explained that the target corresponds to a metric used by the U15, which reflects that students frequently receive extensions beyond the various maximum-times-to-completion set by different institutions and that students who require more than nine years typically do not complete their degree.

The motion was **CARRIED**

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

**1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards –
Part B [May 14, 2013]**

Page 92

Professor J. Anderson MOVED, seconded by Dean Benarroch, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [dated May 14, 2013].

CARRIED

2. **Articulation Agreement Proposal: University of Manitoba - Bachelor of Science Degrees (in Agriculture, Agribusiness, Agroecology, Food Science) – Inner Mongolia Agricultural University, Joint Student Transfer Program** Page 97

Professor Amiro said the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences is proposing that the University renew an agreement with the Inner Mongolia Agricultural University (IMAU), in China, for an additional five years. The articulation agreement requires that students complete two years and 60 credit hours of course work at each institution; the University of Manitoba and the IMAU. He reported that, over the last six years, thirty students admitted to the University under the agreement had completed a degree program with a 100 percent completion rate. Eight IMAU students are expected to enter the University in the Fall of 2013.

a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 112

Ms. Gottheil reported that the Senate Committee on Admissions had met on April 30, 2013 and had endorsed the proposal.

b) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 114

Dean Frankel said the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes had endorsed the proposal. He observed that some students would require more than two years to complete the requirements of their degree program at the University, as they would be required to complete more than 60 credit hours of course work.

c) **Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee** Page 116

Ms. Ducas said the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee had endorsed the proposal. The committee had observed that the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences has indicated that no additional resources would be required for courses and that existing resources would be used to provide student support.

Professor Amiro MOVED, seconded by Professor Brabston, THAT Senate approve the articulation agreement between the University of Manitoba, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, and the Inner Mongolia Agricultural University (IMAU) concerning credit for students, in a Bachelor of Science degree offered by the Faculty, who have successfully completed two years in the Joint Student Transfer Program at IMAU. The agreement is for a term of five years effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

3. **Proposal from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management RE: Community Recreation and Active Living Diploma** Page 118

- a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 205

Dean Frankel reported that the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Courses Changes had endorsed a proposal to establish a Community Recreation and Active Living Diploma. The program would articulate into degree programs offered by the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management and the Faculty of Social Work and would potentially articulate to other programs at the University. The program would both draw on and contribute to the University's focus in the inner city.

- b) **Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee** Page 207

Ms. Ducas called attention to observation 6 in the Report, which outlines the cost of the program and potential sources of revenue including, \$119,911 in new funding from COPSE, \$81,000 from tuition fees that would be returned to the program, and \$42,000 in kind from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management. Resources would be required for salaries and benefits one FTE faculty position, one full-time Community Engagement/Student Support Coordinator and one part-time administrative assistant; salaries for two sessional instructors; and stipends for Aboriginal Elders, cultural advisors, and tutors.

Ms. Ducas reported that, on the basis of the SPPC's criteria for assigning priority to new programs and initiatives, the committee recommends that a high priority level be assigned to the proposal for the Community Recreation and Active Living Diploma.

Dean Frankel MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors a proposal from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management regarding the Community Recreation and Active Living Diploma.

CARRIED

4. **Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies RE: Revised Regulations, Advisor – Student Guidelines [April 30, 2013]** Page 210

Dean Doering said the proposed Advisor – Student Guidelines had been drafted the previous summer. During the fall, the Associate Deans, Faculty of Graduate Studies, had visited and sought feedback from all academic units that work with the Faculty. Dean Doering acknowledged all those who had provided feedback, remarking that the proposed document had been significantly shaped by feedback received during that process.

Dean Doering said the Advisor-Students Guidelines are useful as best practice in graduate education and graduate studies. He stressed the importance of a

student and an advisor discussing expectations for the student's program. He reported that the Guidelines have been endorsed by the Graduate Students' Association.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Dr. Keselman, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies concerning proposed Advisor – Student Guidelines, effective July 1, 2013.

CARRIED

5. Undergraduate Course Changes Beyond Nine Credit Hours Page 217
RE: Faculty of Social Work, SWRK 3152

a) Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes Page 227

Dean Frankel said the introduction of SWRK 3152 would bring the curriculum of the Bachelor of Social Work in line with accreditation standards. The course would allow students, who have experienced being supervised by a professional social worker in the field, to complete an alternative assignment in place of a requirement for a field placement.

b) Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee Page 229

Ms. Ducas called attention to observation 2 in the Report, which clarifies that a student who fails SWRK 3152 or an individual course assessment would have the right to repeat the course or improve their standing and to appeal a grade, as provided for by existing policies and procedures.

Dean Frankel MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the introduction of SWRK 3152 Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition of Field Practice in the Faculty of Social Work, effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

The Chair informed Senate that Dean Frankel had indicated his intention to resign his position as Chair of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes. He thanked Dean Frankel for his contribution to the committee during the previous six years.

6. Graduate Course Changes Beyond Nine Credit Hours Page 231
RE: Master of Social Work

a) Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies on Program and Curriculum Changes Page 265

Dean Doering said the Faculty of Social Work is proposing significant restructuring of the Master of Social Work Program. Referring to pages 235 – 236 of the agenda, he noted that the current program consists of two streams, Social-Clinical Intervention and Social Services Administration. When restructured, there would be a single stream with four components: core courses (9 credit hours), cluster courses (9 credit

hours), elective courses (6 credit hours), and an option to complete either an additional 3 credit hours of course work or a thesis. He noted that the revisions respond to a graduate program review. A transition plan is provided on page 242.

b) **Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee** Page 270

Ms. Ducas observed that the Faculty of Social Work had indicated that no new resources would be required to offer the new courses. No additional resources would be required for teaching, as the number of credit hours in the program would remain the same.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Dean Frankel, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies concerning graduate course changes beyond nine credit hours in the Master of Social Work program.

CARRIED

7. **Reports of the Senate Committee on Admissions**

a) **RE: Revisions to the Minimum Requirements for the TOEFL ibt** Page 272

Ms. Gottheil informed Senate that Enrolment Services is proposing changes to the minimum requirements for the TOEFL internet based test (TOEFL ibt), for admission to undergraduate programs. Recent concerns regarding the academic preparedness of some students admitted to the University had prompted a review of English language proficiency requirements for the two tests that are most commonly used by international applicants, the TOEFL ibt and the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Ms. Gottheil said Enrolment Services is not recommending changes to the minimum requirements for the IELTS, as the current requirement for a minimum score of 6.5 is in keeping with requirements established at other like institutions. Observing that the University had not revisited the requirements for the TOEFL ibt since TOEFL moved from a paper-based to an online test in 2005, Ms. Gottheil said Enrolment Services is recommending that the minimum requirement be increased, as the current requirement is lower than standard set at other institutions. She advised Senate that applicants do receive conditional admission offers and the English Language Centre offers courses on English for Academic Purposes, to prepare students to be successful in undergraduate degree programs.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning revisions to the minimum requirements for the TOEFL internet based test score, effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

Responding to a question from Dean Benarroch, Ms. Gottheil said approximately 15 percent of applicants admitted under the previous

requirements would not be admissible under the revised TOEFL ibt requirement.

b) **RE: Proposal to Adopt a Standard Manitoba Resident Definition for Admission Purposes** Page 275

Ms. Gottheil explained that a proposal to adopt a standard definition of Manitoba resident for undergraduate admission purposes arose out of the Optimizing Academic Resources (OARs) Project, with a recommendation from the Rules, Regulations, and 'Red Tape' Project Team to review the multiple definitions currently used by various faculties and programs. She noted that the Office of Legal Counsel had indicated that there is no legal definition for a 'resident.' The proposed definition, as set out on pages 275 – 276 of the agenda, had been developed in consultation with faculties and schools that now use Manitoba residency for admission purposes. Moving forward, the proposed definition would be used by any faculty or school that would use this criterion for admission to its undergraduate programs.

Ms. Gottheil said Dean Doering, Faculty of Graduate Studies, had indicated support for the proposal and had indicated that a proposal to adopt the same definition would be considered by that Faculty.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal to adopt a standard definition of Manitoba Resident for undergraduate admission purposes, effective September 1, 2013.

Rector Adams asked how the proposed definition of Manitoba resident relates to the definition used by Manitoba Student Aid. Mr. Adams reiterated that there is no standard definition of Manitoba resident, even among government agencies. For this reason, the proposed definition would not be consistent with those definitions used by external agencies and institutions. Mr. Adams said the proposed definition would not disadvantage students who apply for Manitoba student aid.

Dean Benarroch asked if an analysis had been done to determine the potential impact of the proposed changes on applicants to the faculties and programs involved. Ms. Gottheil said this type of analysis had not been done. She noted that admission to most faculties that currently use Manitoba residency as an admission criterion, including the Faculties of Dentistry, Medicine, and Pharmacy, is highly competitive and there is a concern that some applicants game the system in order to meet the residency requirement. An analysis of the potential impact would, therefore, be unclear. Ms. Gottheil suggested that the proposed definition would be fair and equitable for Manitobans.

Some members objected to criterion (iii) of the proposed definition, which would allow faculties and schools to choose between requiring either one year or two consecutive years of full-time studies at a university in

Manitoba. Professor Kettner contended that it would be preferable to have one standard definition of Manitoba resident to be used across the University rather than a variable definition. Professor McMillan suggested the criterion is problematic as it would hinder students' ability to transfer between faculties.

Professor Etcheverry explained that, when it was first discussed, the criterion in question required two consecutive years of full-time study at a university in Manitoba. The intent was to discourage applicants who game the system to obtain admission to programs like Medicine that have many more applicants than spaces. That initial discussion, however, did not take into account the Respiratory Therapy program, which requires only one year of full-time university study for admission. Noting that it is the only program of its type in Canada, Professor Etcheverry said the School of Medical Rehabilitation would encourage prospective students to come to Manitoba to complete the prerequisite requirement to enter the program. A requirement for two years of consecutive study would have excluded these individuals. Professor Kettner countered, and Professor McMillan concurred, that it would be preferable to establish a single definition of Manitoba resident for the purposes of the University, and to address the need for different admission requirements, including access for either Manitoba or out-of-province applicants, in the various admission regulations of individual faculties and schools. He suggested further that it is problematic to define a Manitoba resident on the basis that some applicants game the system, as competition for admission to the programs would change over time. He proposed that the problem would be better addressed by evaluating individuals' reasons for application through other means including interviews. Ms. Gottheil replied that the proposed definition reflects lengthy consultations with the affected faculties and schools, including, in particular, the Dean and Associate Dean (Student Affairs) of the Faculty of Medicine.

Professor Kettner MOVED, seconded by Professor McMillan, THAT a proposal recommending the adoption of a standard Manitoba resident definition for admission purposes be referred back to the Senate Committee on Admissions to establish a standard definition to apply to all faculties, schools, and programs at the University.

Professor Etcheverry spoke in favour of the original motion on the basis that the proposed definition together with the observations included in the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions (SCADM) clarifies how the various faculties and programs currently identify Manitoba residents for admission purposes. Professor Parkinson remarked that the different admission requirements for Medicine and the Respiratory Therapy programs dictate the need for the variability described in criterion (iii) of the definition.

Observing that there was considerable ambiguity regarding how to define Manitoba resident, Professor Prentice endorsed the motion to refer the proposal back to the committee.

A vote was called on the motion to refer the proposal back to the committee.

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

A vote was called on the original motion.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

8. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation RE: Revised Student Assessment Policy, Four-Year Baccalaureate Nursing Program, Faculty of Nursing** Page 277

Dr. Ristock reported that the Faculty of Nursing is proposing changes to its Student Assessment Policy for the Four-Year Baccalaureate Nursing Program to align the policy with a recent change in the grading mode for seven clinical courses from letter grades to pass / fail.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning revisions to the Student Assessment Policy for the Four-Year Baccalaureate Nursing Program, effective September 1, 2013.

CARRIED

9. **Reports of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures**

- a) **RE: Revisions to the Faculty of Nursing Council Bylaws** Page 283

Referring to the proposed changes to the Faculty of Nursing Council Bylaws, Dean Doering noted that an issue had arisen at Senate Executive (March 20, 2013) regarding proposed changes to the process to determine student representation on the Council. He said the matter had been referred to the University Secretary, who had determined that the proposed change is consistent with provisions of the University's governing legislation, which specifies that Senate has the authority to determine the composition of faculty and school councils.

Dean Doering MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures concerning revisions to the Faculty of Nursing Council Bylaws.

CARRIED

- b) **RE: Revisions to the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council Bylaws** Page 290

Dean Doering remarked that the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies strives to bring together the breadth of graduate cultures across the University. He said the objective of proposed changes to the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council Bylaws and particularly changes to the

membership are intended to result in a more engaged membership that would have more fulsome discussion of matters before the Council and communicate more effectively with graduate units. At present, the proportion of members who do not attend Faculty Council meetings is larger than those who do attend. The revised membership would include one representative from each academic unit with a graduate program who deals with that unit's graduate issues. Normally that person would be the unit's graduate chair.

Dean Doering MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures concerning revisions to the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council Bylaws.

CARRIED

10. Reports of the Senate Committee on University Research

- a) **RE: Proposal for an Endowed Professorship in Pharmacy Research** Page 296

Dr. Glavin 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 concerning a proposal for an Endowed Research Professorship in Pharmacy Research.

CARRIED

- b) **RE: Proposal for an Endowed Professorship in Stem Cell Research** Page 303

Dr. Glavin 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 concerning a proposal for an Endowed Research Professorship in Stem Cell Research.

CARRIED

- c) **RE: Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes: Centre on Aging** Page 310

Dr. Glavin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research on the Periodic Review of the Centre on Aging regarding a recommendation that the Centre be renewed for a five-year period, effective September 3, 2013.

CARRIED

- d) **RE: Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes: Winnipeg Institute for Theoretical Physics** Page 313

Dr. Glavin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research on the Periodic Review of the Winnipeg Institute of Theoretical Physics regarding a recommendation that the Institute be renewed for a five-year period, effective September 3, 2013.

CARRIED

- e) **RE: Formal Approval of the Professorship in Government** Page 316

Dr. Glavin 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 concerning a proposal for a Professorship in Government.

CARRIED

11. **Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations** Page 322

Professor Edwards said nominations had been received to fill vacancies remaining on several committees [June 7, 2013]. She thanked students who had agreed to let their names stand for election to fill vacancies for student representatives on the 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 June 7, 2013].

CARRIED

12. **Proposal from the Faculty Council of Engineering to Revise the Name of the Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering** Page 325

Dean Beddoes informed Senate that the Faculty of Engineering was proposing to change the name of the Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering to the "Department of Mechanical Engineering." He explained that the Department no longer offers the Bachelor of Science in Engineering (Manufacturing). The last student admitted to the program had been admitted in 2008 and the last graduate from the program had convocated in May 2013. He noted that the manufacturing engineering discipline is now offered as an option within the Bachelor of Science in Engineering (Mechanical) program.

Dean Beddoes MOVED, seconded by Dr. Keselman, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors a proposal to change the name of the Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering to "Department of Mechanical Engineering", effective upon approval by the Board of Governors.

CARRIED

13. **Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review
RE: International College of Manitoba (ICM)
Academic Review Process [March 8, 2013]**

Page 328

Dr. Collins said the Senate Committee on Academic Review (SCAR) had considered a revised proposal to establish the International College of Manitoba (ICM) Academic Review Process after Senate Executive had referred the matter back to SCAR at its meeting on December 12, 2012. He called attention to observation 2 in the report, which outlines the comments from Senate Executive, and to observations 3 through 9, which describe SCAR's responses to those comments. Referring members to observation 8, Dr. Collins indicated that, subsequent to the March 8, 2013 meeting of SCAR, the final paragraph of the proposed terms of reference for the review had been modified to reflect a recent discussion between the President and Navitas regarding Senate Executive's proposal that the review process include an option for a classification of the program as "inadequate" with a recommendation that the program should be eliminated. The modification provides for a staged response to addressing inadequacies that might be identified in a review.

Dr. Collins MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review concerning the International College of Manitoba (ICM) Academic Review Process.

Professor Gabbert stated that he does not hold the current Administration responsible for the presence of ICM at the University. He indicated that he would not support the motion as Navitas is not an educational institution but a business, with its only links to education being its provision of the University's academic programs. Given this, he said there is no justification for the participation of representatives of the Navitas corporate management group, represented by the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC), in the internal review process. He suggested further that the review process should not be led by administrators who directly report to the President given central administration's commitment to ICM. As evidence of that commitment, he referred to Dr. Barnard's statement at the September 9, 2009 Senate meeting that, "On the basis of everything that I have learned about the experience of Navitas colleges elsewhere and about ICM on our campus, I believe strongly that ICM represents a wonderful opportunity for international students and for our University." Professor Gabbert said the real issues raised by the existence of ICM at the University cannot be resolved by an academic review. He identified these issues as the original usurpation of Senate's right to approve academic programs and regulate teaching by instructors who are not employees of the University; the contracting out to private, for-profit entities of the University's academic programs; and the lack of protection of academic freedom or a collective agreement for ICM instructors.

Dr. Collins underscored that SCAR was faced only with putting together a review process for ICM's academic programs. The committee considered the proposed process to be a reasonable one. The committee had not considered the issue of whether or not the University should have engaged in a relationship with ICM.

Professor Kucera proposed, and Dr. Collins agreed, that items (1) through (6) of the terms of reference for the review committee be revised to use neutral rather

than weighted language that projects positive outcomes from the review process. He also commented on the absence of a process of remediation or what outcomes might be indicated if the ICM Academic Program Review would result in an assessment of “adequate” but requiring revision or restructuring or “inadequate” and requiring major revision or restructuring.

Responding to Professor Kucera’s suggestion that the concerns of academic units that have refused to be involved with ICM should be taken into account as part of the academic review process, Dr. Collins maintained that academic units not engaged in delivering the ICM program should not be part of the review process, as they cannot know anything about the program. Nonetheless, these departments would be engaged in the process through the participation of a coordinator provided by the Faculty. Professor Young countered that, although the units have refused to take part, the courses being delivered are the same courses, with the same course numbers, as courses delivered in those departments. She contended, therefore, that the departments do have an understanding of the program and a vested interest in the process. She suggested that the coordinators provided by the faculty cannot fully understand courses outside of their discipline and so are not adequate to assess those courses.

Referring to observation 9 on page 329, which indicates that the results of the academic review would not lead to a review of the University’s contract with Navitas, Professor Kucera asked what a negative review would lead to. Dr. Collins said a negative review would lead to a remediation process, as indicated in the final paragraph of the proposed program review process

The motion was **DEFEATED**.

Dr. Collins remarked that, in some respects, the outcome of the vote is unfortunate as Senate’s discussion of the University’s contract with Navitas, which is to take place in 2017, would occur largely in the absence of information that might have been provided through the review process. The opportunity for a objective review had also been lost.

XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. Governing Document Development and Review Policy and Procedures Page 334

Mr. Juliano (Director, Office of Fair Practices and Legal Affairs) said the proposed policy and procedures on Governing Document Development and Review developed out of a project of the Resource Optimization and Service Enhancement (ROSE) Program. The project involves two parts; one to create policy and procedures for developing, reviewing, revising, and revoking governing documents and a second to complete a comprehensive review of the existing policies. The intent of the proposed policy and procedures is to ensure: (i) that governing documents are clearly and consistently drafted, in order to avoid disputes related to the interpretation of the documents; (ii) the University is compliant with legislative, regulatory and contractual requirements; (iii) due diligence occurs as governing documents are developed in terms of internal

consultations, research into common practices, and obtaining required approvals from appropriate governing bodies and levels of administration; (iv) governing documents are regularly reviewed. An internal audit had shown the University is only about 30 percent compliant with review dates on governing documents.

Mr. Juliano said the process for developing administrative and Board of Governors policies would differ from that for developing Senate policies, to ensure that appropriate supports are in place. Responsibility for development of administrative policies would rest with a Responsible Executive Officer (REO), who might enlist the help of Legal Counsel or the University Secretary when drafting the document, before bringing the document forward to the appropriate approving bodies. Senate, including Chairs of Senate committees, would have access to the same supports to achieve a quality document, but administration would not have the right to delay or hinder the collegial development of an academic or Senate policy.

Mr. Juliano said the proposed policy and procedures call attention to the responsibility of the REO to communicate and educate the University community on new and revised policies; members of the University community to educate themselves on policy; and the Office of Legal Counsel and to administer the review process to ensure policies are current.

Dean Stern MOVED, seconded by Dean Frankel, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the Governing Document Development and Review Policy and Procedures.

Professor Kettner asked if the proposed format for the policy and procedures would require that processes be set out for evaluating the effectiveness of a policy, perhaps before the end of ten years where a policy appears not to be effective. He proposed that each policy might include a statement on measureable outcomes that could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy. He also proposed that each policy describe a process for resolving disagreements regarding the interpretation of a policy. Mr. Juliano noted that the default is a ten-year review but an approving body could establish a different review period for a particular policy. Mr. Juliano suggested that mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of a policy or resolving disputes regarding interpretation are not required within policies and procedures. He explained that the reason for creating the concept of a Responsible Executive Officer is to ensure there is an individual who is responsible for ensuring the policy is enforced. It is expected that this person would raise the questions of whether a policy was effective and clear as part of the required review.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

XII ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 23, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 349, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on June 19, 2013.