

**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. G. Anderson  
Prof. John  
Anderson  
Prof. Judith  
Anderson  
Prof. M. Araji  
Prof. B. Austin-Smith  
Dean S. Baum  
Mr. B. Bawdon  
Dean J. Beddoes  
Dean M. Benarroch  
Ms. D. Bennet  
Prof. R. Biscontri  
Prof. T. Booth  
Very Rev. R. Bozyk  
Prof. D. Brewin  
Ms. M. Brolley  
Prof. F. Burczynski  
Mr. T. Burton  
Prof. A. Calder  
Prof. J. Carlberg  
Prof. P. Cattini  
Prof. T. Chen  
Prof. A. Chiu  
Dean J. Doering  
Prof. J. Embree  
Prof. P. England  
Prof. R. Eni  
Prof. E. Etcheverry  
Prof. A. Farenhorst  
Prof. G. Fitzell  
Acting Dean Frankel  
Mr. R. From  
Prof. J. Gilchrist  
Prof. J. Guard  
Dean G. Hepburn  
Prof. D.  
Hiebert-Murphy  
Prof. J. Honeyford  
Prof. J. Hughes

Prof. P. Hultin  
Dr. D. Jayas  
Prof. V. Keown  
Dr. J. Keselman  
Prof. W. Kinsner  
Mr. P. Kochan  
Mr. B. Kohistani  
Mr. J. Lieberman  
Mr. E. Loewen  
Prof. A. MacDonell  
Prof. D. MacPherson  
Ms. J. McConnell  
Prof. D. McMillan  
Prof. A. McNicol  
Dean D. Mandzuk  
Dean J. Mulvale  
Dean B. O'Connell  
Ms. L. Oakes  
Dr. C. Ould Moulaye  
Prof. T. Papakyriakou  
Prof. F. Parkinson  
Ms. K. Penner  
Ms. C. Plumton  
Prof. D. Polyzois  
Dean B. Postl  
Prof. C. Rocke  
Ms. M.-J. Romaniuk  
Ms. A. Roscoe  
Prof. M. Singer  
Prof. M.A. Steggles  
Ms. O. Stein  
Dean R. Stern  
Prof. R. Tate  
Dean J. Taylor  
Mr. A. Thapa  
Prof. C. Trott  
Ms. C. Uchime  
Ms. D. Vafabakhsh  
Prof. B.-C. Wang  
Mr. J. Leclerc,  
University Secretary  
Dr. S. Coyston,  
Recording  
Secretary

**Assessors Present**

Mr. J. Adams  
Prof. P. Blunden  
Dr. D. Collins  
Ms. A. Ducas  
Ms. R. Kunzman  
Mr. N. Marnoch  
Prof. K. Matheos  
Dr. J. Ristock  
Prof. G. Smith  
Dr. D. Stewart  
Dr. M. Torchia

**Regrets**

Ms. C. Amadi  
Prof. N. Bhatnagar  
Prof. M. Brabston  
Prof. M. Campbell  
Recteur G. Csepregi  
Dean N. Davies  
Dean E. Dawe  
Prof. T. Falkenberg  
Prof. M. Faubert  
Ms. S. Gottheil  
Dean N. Halden  
Prof. B. Hallman  
Ms. S. Jordan  
Mr. J. Kearsey  
Prof. J. Kettner  
Prof. L. Landrum  
Ms. F. Lee  
Prof. S. McClement  
Ms. L. Rempel  
Dr. H. Sector  
Prof. H. Unruh  
Mr. G. Westdal  
Prof. L. Wang  
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld  
Ms. D. Young

**Absent**

Dr. J. Blatz

Prof. O. Botar  
Dean. D. Brown  
Ms. S. Connelly  
Mr. J. Danyluk  
Ms. A. Dewar  
Mr. J. Diamond  
Mr. E. Ekine  
Prof. B. Elias  
Prof. D. Funk  
Prof. G. Giesbrecht  
Dr. G. Glavin  
Prof. R. Hechter  
Dean A. Iacopino  
Ms. E. Isabey  
Prof. E. Judd  
Ms. I. Kaur  
Mr. T. Krawetz  
Ms. T. McVannel  
Prof. A. Menkis  
Mr. M. Michalak  
Mr. M. Mommoh  
Prof. J. Owens  
Ms. B. Silverstein  
Prof. D. Smyth  
Ms. R. Taylor  
Mr. A. Turnbull  
Dean L. Turnbull

**Also Present**

Ms. C. Davidson  
Ms. A. Domingo  
Ms. P. Gareau  
Prof. P. Graham  
Ms. T. Lussier  
Ms. K. McQuarrie  
Smith  
Ms. P. Trupish  
Ms. S. Utsunomiya  
Ms. M. Watson

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

The Chair invited Dr. Keselman, Vice-President (Academic) and Provost to introduce two new members of Senate and of the University community. Dr. Keselman welcomed Dean Stefi Baum, Faculty of Science, and Ms. Mary-Jo Romaniuk, University Librarian.

**I CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,  
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES - OCTOBER 2014**

Page 3

Mr. Marnoch informed Senate that the Faculty of Graduate Studies was recommending three students for degrees notwithstanding a deficiency, all of which result from errors in advising. Two students would graduate from the Master of Public Administration degree program. One student has a deficiency of 3 credit hours, with respect to required 7000-level courses, and one is short 3 credit hours in the program. The third student, who would graduate with a Master of Science in Agribusiness and Agricultural Economics, has a deficiency of 3 credit hours, with respect to required 7000-level courses.

**Professor Anderson MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the list of candidates recommended for degrees notwithstanding a deficiency be approved.**

**CARRIED**

A copy of the list of graduands was available at the meeting for examination by members of Senate. Mr. Marnoch observed that 5,029 students graduated from the University in 2014.

**Professor Anderson 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 October 3, 2014.**

**CARRIED**

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

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

**Professor Anderson 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 RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE - none**

**IV MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

- 1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part A  
[August 18, 2014]**

Page 4

2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part A [September 2, 2014]** Page 12
3. **Report on Research Contract Funds Received, January 1, 2014 – June 30, 2014** Page 15
4. **Transfer of Administration of Human Ecology Programs to Faculty of Health Sciences** Page 20

**V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

1. **President’s Report [October 1, 2014]** Page 22

The Chair informed Senate that there had been changes in leadership at three of the provinces six universities in recent months, including at Brandon University, the Université de Saint-Boniface, and the University of Winnipeg. He reported that, at the first meeting of that group of presidents, he had been encouraged by the new spirit of willingness to work collaboratively.

2. **Draft University of Manitoba Strategic Plan, 2015 – 2020** Page 30

The Chair invited Dr. Keselman to make a presentation on the Draft University of Manitoba Strategic Plan, 2015 – 2020. He said that, following the presentation, Senators would be invited to offer general feedback on the plan and to respond to the questions outlined on page 30 of the agenda.

Dr. Keselman said the President had launched a process to update the Strategic Plan in January 2014, with the establishment of a Strategic Planning Committee (SPC). She said the SPC included broad representation, including herself as Chair, Dr. Jayas as Vice-Chair, and members from among Senate, the Board of Governors, faculty members at large, staff, and students. She referred members to the membership list included as an appendix to the draft Plan. Dr. Keselman said the objective of the process was to develop, through a consultative process, an updated Strategic Plan to guide the direction of the University for the next five years. The initial consultative process (early February – mid April, 2014) included more than fifty input sessions, involving close to 1200 individuals, including sessions with faculty and school councils, Senate committees, the Board of Governors, and Senate. Also, close to 100 individuals from across the University community had provided feedback through an online portal established for this purpose. Dr. Keselman said that, through the summer, the SPC had reviewed and considered the input that it had received and had developed the draft University of Manitoba Strategic Plan 2015-2020.

Dr. Keselman said the second phase of the planning process, which had been initiated the previous week and which is designed to gather input on the draft document, would be critical to developing the final plan that would be brought to Senate and to the Board of Governors for consideration. Advice would be sought through an online portal and from the Graduate Student’s Association, the University of Manitoba Students’ Union, from alumni who had participated in the first consultative phase, and from the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee, the Senate, and the Board. Feedback received through the process would be

considered by the SPC and incorporated into a revised plan that would be brought back to Senate.

Dr. Keselman said the draft Strategic Plan is intended to build on the existing Strategic Plan (2009 - 2014). It does, however, signal a stronger commitment to Indigenous achievement, which continues to be a separate priority but also is embedded throughout the document, including in an acknowledgement section and in a revised vision statement; place greater emphasis on innovative and high quality teaching and an outstanding student experience, with goals and actions embedded across all priorities; include a broader conceptualization of what it means to be an employer of choice; and includes a new pillar focusing on engaging with the external community, locally, nationally, and internationally.

Referring to the section, Implementation, at the end of the document, Dr. Keselman called attention to a listing of example metrics. She underscored that the examples provided should be viewed as a starting point and indicated that it would be necessary to develop a more robust set of both qualitative and quantitative indicators to measure progress on priorities set out in the plan.

There was general and strong support among Senators for the increased focus on, and commitment to, Indigenous achievement throughout the draft Strategic Plan.

In response to a question regarding the use of the terminology “Indigenous” rather than “Aboriginal,” Dr. Keselman said the SPC had made a choice to use “Indigenous” to represent First Nations, Métis, and Inuit. The Chair said the decision to use “Indigenous” had been informed by advice from members of the Indigenous community. He indicated that the SPC might review the document to ensure that the terminology used is consistent throughout.

Some members identified as a concern an overemphasis on reputation in the document. Professor Austin-Smith said it is not the institution’s national reputation, in terms of branding, that drives her work. She said she is concerned with the University as a local manifestation of her discipline and is motivated to advance work within that discipline and between disciplines at the institution. Professor Calder suggested that it would be helpful to think about different kinds of reputation. Professor Bing-Chen Wang countered that the draft Strategic Plan does not focus enough on reputation. He suggested that institutional reputation should be reflected in the priorities of the plan, as a strong reputation and strong placement in international rankings is important to attracting strong graduate students, who are necessary to support research programs, which are, in turn, necessary to attract research funding. A strong institutional reputation is also important to graduates who will compete with graduates of other institutions with stronger reputations.

Several members remarked that the supporting actions for various goals identified in section II. Driving Discovery are not actions that would support the attainment of those goals but are measurements that might be used to assess whether those goals have been met. Professor Austin-Smith raised a concern that a reference to the development of discipline-specific measurements of research, scholarly works and creative activities and mechanisms for annual

reporting on these measurements would, in her view, be used as performance indicators, which is something that faculty members have consistently resisted.

Referring to section II., goal (a) and its supporting action, several members expressed concern that, given the focus on quantitative metrics and on metrics tied to research revenues and research dollars per faculty member (i.e. monetary measures), the draft Strategic Plan does not adequately take into account that, in some disciplines, including those in the humanities and basic sciences, assessing research excellence cannot always be measured using quantitative means. Some contended that it would be impossible, in some disciplines, to establish any research metrics; for example, in disciplines where faculty members' scholarship involves the production of creative works such as poetry or film. Professor Austin-Smith suggested it might be helpful to use different language in the document, to encompass enhancements of things that are qualitatively essential to a quality postsecondary education but cannot be measured, such as intellectual insight or engaging minds in classrooms. She also suggested, and others concurred, that the SPC might revisit language used in the document to give more emphasis to, and to signal that the University values, research in a broader range of disciplines, including the creative arts and humanities, in particular. So rather than speaking only of research "impacts," which are measurable, the document might also refer to "effects" or "influence" of research, in terms of the contributions made to knowledge, to critical thinking, and to society and communities, which are not measurable. Professor McPherson observed that, if the intent is to have academic units develop discipline-specific metrics, the Strategic Plan itself must be clearer that qualitative measures would be equally valued, particularly if the Plan is to be viewed as a guiding document that units would look to when establishing unit-specific metrics that would align to the Strategic Plan.

Professor Austin-Smith acknowledged that the document indicates that units would develop their own metrics. She reiterated, though, that metrics would be inappropriate for units in which faculty members undertake a broad range of creative activities and in which the word "measurement" makes no sense. She reasoned, for example, that because it would not be possible to say whether a screenplay weighs more than a poem, it would not be possible to evaluate the scholarly contributions of different individuals. She said it would not be appropriate to measure these types of works, although these can be experienced, understood, described, or assessed. The Chair observed that, in every unit, comparisons and choices are made in hiring one candidate over another, so it is possible to have some sense collectively of the assessments that are used.

Professor Brewin suggested that, if metrics were to be established, it would be important to also measure efficiency, to ensure that the cost of developing particular outcomes or attaining particular goals is taken into account.

With respect to the second supporting action for goal (h), in section II, to enhance the University's national and international research reputation, Professor Guard raised a concern that, to foster connections only with select institutions of global standing might serve to ignore established research connections elsewhere. She

noted that it is not always the case that dealing with more prestigious institutions produces the best research.

Referring to section IV. Building Community, Professor Chen remarked that, with respect to questions of equity and diversity, the draft Strategic Plan appears to give greater emphasis to gender and Indigenous issues. She proposed that the document might more clearly communicate the University's commitment to equity and diversity in the broadest sense of these things.

With reference to goal (a), in section I. Inspiring Minds, Professor Chen cautioned that given the current fiscal climate, it will be important to bear in mind that, when decisions are made about what would constitute an appropriate range of academic programs for the University, the decisions are based on academic priorities and not only resources questions.

Referring to the goal to be an internationally engaged university (section V. Forging Connections, goal (c)), Professor Chen observed that the supporting actions might include promoting or fostering knowledge of other parts of the world.

Referring to the thematic research areas and signature research areas of excellence set out in section II. Driving Discovery, Professor Hultin expressed concern that none pertain to the Faculty of Science. He suggested that this communicates that the contributions of researchers in this unit are not valued. It would also require that researchers in Science find ways to align their research programs with one of the thematic areas. Professor Hultin observed that the Faculty of Science is a central part of the University. As one of the largest faculties it carries a large share of the responsibilities for teaching and its members bring in significant research funds to the institution. Professor Judy Anderson suggested that, in section II, goal (e) might be amended to indicate that the University would attempt to retain some flexibility to invest in emerging research areas that do not fall under one of the thematic research areas.

Professor Blunden raised a concern that the thematic and signature research areas defined in the draft Strategic Plan signal a shift away from the University's fundamental mandate to undertake basic research, in order to advance discovery and knowledge, toward prioritizing research areas that are narrowly focussed on current societal issues. He contended that to move in this direction would diminish the University's research capacity. He remarked that, as the modern university has many missions and many duties to society, there is value in both basic and goal-oriented research. While many organizations undertake goal-oriented research, however, including governments, private agencies, and companies, basic research is undertaken almost exclusively at universities. Professor Blunden suggested that what is proposed in the draft Strategic Plan would not facilitate growth and discovery in areas of basic research. Given this view and considering that science disciplines are not reflected in the thematic areas, Professor Blunden forecast an uncertain future for the Faculty of Science. He expressed a concern that funding for research, including internal resource allocations and institutional support for external funding applications, would be directed to other areas. Without the necessary resources and infrastructure, this, in turn, would undermine objectives to increase graduate enrolment as the best

graduate students (and faculty) would go to other institutions that place more value on the great intellectual questions of the day.

Responding to Professor Blunden's view that the thematic research areas identified in the draft Strategic Plan represent a narrowing of research, Dr. Keselman observed that they are not dissimilar to the research foci in the current Strategic Plan, which was approved by Senate in 2009 and include; healthy, safe, secure and sustainable food and bioproducts; sustainable prairie and northern communities; human rights; innovations in public and population health; new materials and technologies; and culture and creativity.

Referring to the supporting action for goal (g), in section V. Forging Connections, Mr. Thapa asked if it would be possible to reach the \$500 million target set for a comprehensive campaign. He asked how much government and alumni are expected to contribute to the campaign. Dr. Barnard said the \$500 million target would be achievable with hard work and would have significant benefits across the campus. He said the campaign is already approaching \$100 million raised.

Observing that the University of Manitoba is a commuter campus, including many students who travel to the University from rural locations, Mr. Bawdon asked whether the strategic planning process would involve discussions on how to build community in the sense of a physical, local community that also exists beyond the nine-to-five business hours of the University. He asked, in particular, whether the strategic planning exercise would include planning for development of the Southwood Lands. Mr. Kochan replied that the Visionary (re)Generation Project would include discussions of creating physical infrastructure on the Southwood Lands, which would largely be a residential area but would include a range of things. He indicated that more information would be provided to Senate as the project is developed further.

Dean Postl remarked that the thematic and signature research areas also do not pertain to professional health sciences in the Faculty of Health Sciences. He contended, however, that, if the document were developed to be so diffuse so as to satisfy every faculty or discipline finding themselves in it, it would not constitute a strategic plan but would represent an inventory of research at the University. Dean Postl suggested that the University could either take a decision to be strategic as it moves forward or to proceed with what it has been doing without ever questioning or changing. He said he would not be supportive of the second alternative.

Dr. Keselman thanked members for their comments. Referring to the discussion related to the challenges concerning assessment, she emphasized that the intent is to be inclusive and holistic, to allow the development of discipline-appropriate metrics. She said Senate's comments would be communicated to the SPC for further consideration.

Dr. Barnard thanked Senators for their participation in the discussion of the draft Strategic Plan.

**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. No questions were received.

**VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 3, 2014**

It was noted that Ms. Young was listed twice in the attendance list.

**Professor McMillan MOVED, seconded by Dean O'Connell, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on September 3, 2014 be approved as amended.**

**CARRIED**

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

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

**1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee Page 52**

Professor Anderson said Senate Executive met on September 20, 2014. Comments of the committee accompany the report on which they are made.

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

Ms. Ducas said the committee is considering course proposals beyond nine credit hours, from the Department of Civil Engineering and the Department of German and Slavic Studies, and a proposal to establish an Institute in Geopolitical Economy.

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

**1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [August 18, 2014] Page 53**

**Professor Hultin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [August 18, 2014].**

**CARRIED**

2. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B** Page 57  
**[September 2, 2014]**

**Professor Hultin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part B [September 2, 2014].**

**CARRIED**

3. **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 60  
**RE: Proposal for Aboriginal Special Consideration**  
**Category for ENGAP, Faculty of Engineering**

Mr. Adams said the Faculty of Engineering is proposing to create an Aboriginal Special Consideration category for admission to its programs in Year 2. Eight supernumerary seats would be created specifically for students in the Engineering Access Program (ENGAP). The proposal would not affect the number of seats open to students applying through the general stream. Mr. Adams noted that students in the ENGAP program would first compete for admission through the general stream and, if they were not successful, would be considered for admission under the proposed category.

**Dr. Collins MOVED, seconded by Dean Beddoes, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal for an Aboriginal Special Consideration Category for ENGAP, Faculty of Engineering, effective for the September 2015 intake.**

**CARRIED**

4. **Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations** Page 64

Dean Doering referred members to the Report for nominations to fill one vacancy on each of the Senate Committee for Libraries and the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee.

There were no further nominations.

**Dean Doering MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated September 18, 2014].**

**CARRIED**

## **XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

1. **Revised Chairs and Professorships Policy and Procedure** Page 65

Dr. Keselman said a proposed change to the policy and procedure on Chairs and Professorships would allow greater flexibility to in the appointment process and, in particular, to allow for the appointment of individuals with academic qualifications commensurate with the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor.

**Dr. Keselman MOVED, seconded by Dean Postl, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the revised policy and procedure on Chairs and Professorships.**

Professor Blunden suggested that wording in the current policy, which specifies that individuals appointed to Chairs and Professorships would normally have academic qualifications commensurate with an appointment at the rank of Professor, is already sufficiently flexible to appoint someone at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor. He expressed concern regarding the possibility of appointing individuals at the rank of Assistant Professor to a Chair or Professorship. He observed that senior faculty with a significant record of research normally hold these positions, which are fairly prestigious. Observing that the responsibilities for a Chair or Professorship are typically narrowly described, in terms of research and teaching, he raised a concern that an Assistant Professor named to hold a Chair or Professorship might be disadvantaged when applying for tenure, given that that assessment is based on a broader range of responsibilities for research, teaching, and service.

Dr. Keselman noted that exceptions to the current policy are not uncommon, but require that faculties recommend the candidate notwithstanding that the individual does not hold the rank of Professor. She noted that the proposed change is not inconsistent with the eligibility requirements for a Tier 2 Canada Research Chair (CRC), which individuals can hold upon completing a doctoral degree. Dr. Jayas noted, in addition, that faculty holding appointments at any rank can hold a MB Research Chair, NSERC – Industrial Research Chairs, including Senior Industrial Research Chairs and Associate Industrial Research Chairs. Given there are a number of exceptions, it is proposed that the University revise its policy and procedures for consistency.

**The motion was CARRIED.**

**2. Request from the I.H. Asper School of Business to  
Convert the Professorship in Agricultural and Risk  
Management and Insurance to a Chair**

Page 76

Dean Benarroch recalled that the original proposal to establish a Chair in Agricultural and Risk Management and Insurance presented to Senate indicated that it would meet the prescribed funding model (Senate, June 2012). As one funder had been delayed in providing funds, the Chair had subsequently been converted to a Professorship (Senate, September 2012). As sufficient funds to support a Chair are now in place, the I.H. Asper School of Business is requesting that the Professorship be converted back to a Chair. Dean Benarroch indicated that the faculty as allocated a tenure-track position to this Chair.

**Dean Benarroch MOVED, seconded by Acting Dean Wittenberg, THAT Senate approve, and recommend that the Board of Governors approve, a request to convert the Professorship in Agricultural and Risk Management and Insurance to a Chair, as originally approved by Senate, June 20, 2012.**

**CARRIED**

## **XII    ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 11, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 81, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on October 1, 2014.