

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. John
Anderson
Prof. Judith
Anderson
Prof. M. Araji
Prof. B. Austin-Smith
Prof. E. Baraban
Dean S. Baum
Mr. B. Bawdon
Dean J. Beddoes
Ms. D. Bennet
Prof. R. Biscontri
Prof. T. Booth
Prof. O. Botar
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Prof. M. Brabston
Prof. D. Brewin
Ms. M. Brolley
Dean. D. Brown
Prof. F. Burczynski
Mr. T. Burton
Prof. A. Calder
Prof. J. Carlberg
Prof. P. Cattini
Prof. T. Chen
Ms. S. Connelly
Recteur G. Csepregi
Dean E. Dawe
Ms. A. Dewar
Dean J. Doering
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. P. England
Prof. T. Falkenberg
Prof. A. Farenhorst
Acting Dean
H. Frankel
Mr. R. From
Prof. G. Giesbrecht
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Ms. S. Gottheil
Prof. J. Guard

Dean N. Halden
Dean G. Hepburn
Prof. D.
Hiebert-Murphy
Prof. J. Honeyford
Prof. J. Hughes
Prof. P. Hultin
Dr. D. Jayas
Ms. S. Jordan
Mr. J. Kearsey
Mrs. V. Keown
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. P. Kochan
Mr. B. Kohistani
Prof. L. Landrum
Mr. J. Lieberman
Prof. A. MacDonell
Prof. D. MacPherson
Prof. S. McClement
Ms. J. McConnell
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. A. McNicol
Dean D. Mandzuk
Prof. A. Menkis
Dean J. Mulvale
Dean B. O'Connell
Ms. L. Oakes
Dr. C. Ould Moulaye
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. F. Parkinson
Prof. T. Peter
Ms. C. Plumton
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dean B. Postl
Prof. C. Rocke
Ms. A. Roscoe
Prof. M. Singer
Dean J. Taylor
Ms. R. Taylor
Mr. A. Thapa
Prof. C. Trott
Dean L. Turnbull
Ms. C. Uchime
Ms. D. Vafabakhsh
Prof. B.-C. Wang

Mr. G. Westdal
Acting Dean
K. Wittenberg
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,
Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

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

Regrets

Ms. C. Amadi
Dean M. Benarroch
Prof. N. Bhatnagar
Prof. M. Campbell
Prof. A. Chiu
Dean N. Davies
Prof. B. Elias
Prof. R. Eni
Dean E. Etcheverry
Prof. G. Fitzell
Prof. R. Hechter
Dean A. Iacopino
Prof. J. Kettner
Ms. F. Lee
Mr. E. Loewen
Mr. M. Mommoh
Prof. T. Papakyriakou

Ms. K. Penner
Ms. L. Rempel
Ms. M.-J. Romaniuk
Dr. H. Sector
Dean R. Stern
Prof. R. Tate
Mr. A. Turnbull
Prof. H. Unruh
Prof. L. Wang
Prof. D. Wirtzfeld

Absent

Prof. G. Anderson
Ms. K. Banera
Ms. T. Choong
Mr. J. Danyluk
Mr. J. Diamond
Mr. E. Ekine
Prof. D. Funk
Dr. G. Glavin
Ms. E. Isabey
Prof. E. Judd
Ms. I. Kaur
Mr. T. Krawetz
Ms. T. McVannel
Mr. M. Michalak
Ms. B. Silverstein
Prof. D. Smyth
Prof. M.A. Steggle
Ms. O. Stein

Also Present

Ms. O. Alaka
Mr. N. Botar
Prof. D. Collins
Dr. J. Cooper
Ms. C. Davidson
Ms. A. Domingo
Ms. S. Duval
Ms. P. Gareau
Mr. B. Hughes
Ms. K. Legris
Ms. D. Lukie

Also Present
(continued)

Ms. K. McQuarrie
Smith
Ms. M. Magsino
Prof. I. Ripstein
Ms. P. Trupish
Ms. B. Usick
Ms. S. Utsunomiya
Ms. M. Watson

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Brenda Austin-Smith, Faculty of Arts.

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | <u>Proposed Academic Schedule for 2015-2016</u> | Page 4 |
| 2. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres [October 3, 2014]</u> | Page 23 |
| 3. | <u>Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes RE: Departments of Physiology and Pathophysiology, Medical Microbiology, and Electrical and Computer Engineering [September 25, 2014]</u> | Page 24 |

Professor Austin-Smith MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve:

- the Academic Schedule for 2015-2016;
- the Report of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres [dated October 3, 2014];
- the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes concerning the Departments of Physiology and Pathophysiology, Medical Microbiology, and Electrical and Computer Engineering [dated September 25, 2014].

CARRIED

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 1. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [September 23, 2014]</u> | Page 28 |
| 2. | <u>Items Approved by the Board of Governors, on September 23, 2014</u> | Page 35 |
| 3. | <u>Notice of Program Conclusion: Student Transfer Agreement - Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences and Northwest A & F University, China</u> | Page 36 |

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

- (a) Dr. Barnard indicated that he would not make a report, in order to allow time for the next agenda item.

Dr. Keselman recalled that, at the previous meeting, Senate had received a draft of the Strategic Plan, 2015 – 2020, for comment, and that a review of the process leading up to that draft had been provided at that meeting. The discussion that had occurred at the October 1st Senate meeting was one part of a broader consultation process that had generated a significant volume of thoughtful feedback on the draft document. Dr. Keselman said the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) had taken that input into account when developing the final draft of the Strategic Plan.

Dr. Keselman thanked members of the SPC for their work over the previous ten months, including, in particular, Senators who had served on the committee and members of the SPC Working Group, Dr. Jayas, Dean Beddoes, Dean Taylor, and Ms. McQuarrie-Smith.

Dr. Keselman reviewed several significant changes made to the Strategic Plan based on feedback received through the consultation process. She observed that, in some instances, given the diverse nature of the University community, feedback that was received was sometimes conflicting. The SPC, therefore, had had to consider the full range of views and determine the best way to address the feedback.

Dr. Keselman said feedback was received from some who suggested that, in the draft plan, insufficient attention had been given to the importance of the liberal arts and science programs versus professional programs. Others had communicated concerns that the opposite was the case. In order to reconcile the two views, the SPC has attempted to ensure that emphasis is given to both of these, which are key parts of the University's mission, in the final draft. Changes had been made to the Introduction and to some of the goals in terms of the description of programs.

Dr. Keselman said considerable feedback had been received on example metrics included in the draft Strategic Plan. The examples included a set of metrics established by the Board of Governors for measuring progress made on the current Strategic Plan. Concerns had been raised that the example metrics were incomplete and, because they focused on quantitative, rather than on both qualitative and quantitative metrics, they would not be appropriate for certain disciplines. The example metrics were deleted from the document and have been replaced in the section, Implementation and Accountability, with a statement that it will be necessary to develop ways of assessing progress on the goals and supporting actions. The SPC or an ad hoc working group of the SPC will be asked to develop an assessment framework that includes both qualitative and quantitative metrics.

Referring to Section IV. Building Community, Dr. Keselman said the SPC had received feedback questioning the connection that had been drawn between performance evaluation and performance management and enhancing employee satisfaction in the draft Strategic Plan. Comments that had been received indicated that people do not feel that performance evaluation contributes to employee satisfaction but might take away from it. Concerns had also been

raised that particular types of assessments might be imposed on individuals. Dr. Keselman said the intent is not to impose performance evaluations and assessments but to ensure that faculty, staff, and students receive regular feedback from a personal growth and development perspective. Section IV has been revised to reflect this intention. It has also been reorganized to better reflect the focus on building community.

Dr. Keselman said feedback received indicated that there were concerns with reference to thematic and signature areas of research in the draft document. She said the intent had been to link the Strategic Plan to a Strategic Research Plan that is under development but has yet to be brought forward for discussion at Senate. Specification of thematic and signature research areas had generated a concern that it communicates a lack of commitment to research, scholarship, and creative works in the broadest sense of those terms. Concerns had also been expressed regarding the identification of particular thematic and signature areas. References to these had been removed from the document and replaced with more general language referring to establishing areas of research that would be defined within the context of faculties, colleges, and schools, and also the University's planning. Revised language is also more inclusive regarding the University's commitment to, and support of, a broad range of scholarship and creative works.

Dr. Keselman said that, in response to feedback that had been received, the heading for Section II. had been changed to "Driving Discovery and Insight". Revisions had also been made to address concerns regarding what appeared to be, first, a focus on assessment versus support and, second, too narrow a focus on dissemination of research findings.

Dr. Keselman reminded Senators that the Strategic Plan is intended to build on the framework approved by Senate and the Board of Governors in 2009. The Plan represents extensive planning and identifies broad priorities, with supporting goals and actions, which have been established through a broad consultation process that involved a large number of faculty, staff, and students, and broader community. Dr. Keselman said the proposed Strategic Plan is a result of that work and represents a consensus of the SPC, which is recommending the whole report for consideration by Senate.

Professor John Anderson, who had served as a Senate representative on the SPC, said he had gained much by participating in the process of developing the Strategic Plan, given the opportunity it had provided to hear the views of different constituencies, including support staff. He reported that the process had been a transparent and open one in which the various members of the SPC had felt comfortable sharing their views. Professor Anderson said the degree to which feedback gathered through the consultation phase is reflected in the final document is impressive. He said that, while he does not agree with everything in the document, it does represent the consensus of the SPC.

Dr. Keselman MOVED, on behalf of the Strategic Planning Committee, THAT Senate recommend that the Board of Governors approve the University of Manitoba Strategic Plan, 2015 – 2020, as a planning document.

Professor Guard said Faculty of Arts Senators had met to consider the Strategic Plan. She reported that they are unanimously supportive of the final draft of the Strategic Plan and of the extent to which the SPC had engaged in the process of collegial governance. She identified two changes that had been suggested, so the idea of collegial governance would be specifically included in the document. One is that “collegial governance” might be added to the list of values included on page 47 of the agenda. The second is that goal (a), in Section I. Inspiring Minds, might be amended to read: “Maintain and sufficiently support an appropriate range of liberal arts, science and professional programs for Manitoba’s research university in the context of stable or diminishing resources, by normal collegial mechanisms.”

Dr. Keselman said she would not consider “collegial governance” to be a value but a mechanism by which the institution is governed. She suggested that the notion of collegiality is connected to, but is different from, the governance mechanism. Observing that the SPC had a significant discussion of the list of values, including things to be included and excluded, she said she wanted to be mindful of the process by which it had been established.

Dr. Barnard proposed that the Message from the President, which is included at the beginning of the document and had not been generated by the SPC, might be revised to indicate that the University values collegial governance. Professor Booth suggested that “collegiality” is an important value and proposed that it be added to the list. Professor Guard indicated that either of the solutions proposed would satisfy Arts Senators. Dr. Keselman agreed that “collegiality” is a value and suggested that other members of the SPC would not object to the proposed change.

Professor Guard MOVED, seconded by Professor Booth, THAT The University of Manitoba Values, as set out in The University of Manitoba Strategic Plan, 2015 – 2020, be amended to include “collegiality.”

CARRIED

Senators who commented on the revised document generally expressed their appreciation for the work of the SPC and for the reflection of the consultations in the final draft of the Strategic Plan.

Professor Owens suggested that, in Section II. Driving Discovery and Insight, the wording for supporting action (vi), for goal (a) implies that there are, at present, no unit-level means of assessing research, scholarship, and creative works. She suggested that a number of units have established means of assessing these things. At Professor Owen’s suggestion, supporting action (vi) was revised to read: “Establish or refine, and articulate, through a process of unit-level collegial discussion, discipline-specific and/or area-specific means to assess and evaluate the impacts and outcomes of research, scholarly works, and creative activities.” This amendment was agreed to by Senate.

Referring to Section V. Forging Connections, Professor Chen proposed that a supporting action be added to goal (a), to indicate the University’s commitment to building connections with the community. She proposed that the following statement might be added as supporting action (ii), in order to mirror language

used for supporting actions for goal (a) in Section II. Driving Discovery and Insight: “Recognize and support collegial and/or community assessment and evaluation of research and academic work in diverse communities.” Dr. Keselman replied, and Dr. Jayas concurred, that community-based activities and their impacts are encompassed under the supporting actions for goal (a), in Section II. In addition, community-based activities are referenced in Section III. Creating Pathways and throughout the document in relation to the broad range of the University’s activities. She said she did not support the proposed amendment to the document.

Referring to the supporting action (i) for goal (b), in Section IV. Building Community, Professor Parkinson asked how “gender” is defined for the purposes of the document. Dr. Ristock said the intention is for the definition to be broad, and to encompass, male, female, and transgender.

Referring to the third supporting action for goal (b), in Section II., Professor Blunden suggested, based on a discussion that had occurred at Senate Executive, that exploring the possibility of offering jointly authored, multidisciplinary, graduate theses would be contentious. Observing that other action items are quite specific and this one is speculative, he questioned whether including this in the Strategic Plan would communicate a higher level of intention than it deserves considering that it is an idea that has yet to be broadly discussed at the University. Dr. Keselman underscored that the supporting action only signals that the University would explore the possibility. She said feedback received on the draft document included as many comments in support of the idea as there were comments from those who are wary. Dr. Jayas said the idea would only be explored in areas where multiple disciplines could come together to develop team projects.

Professor Austin-Smith raised the possibility of broadening the supporting action in question to indicate the possibility of exploring new approaches to the completion of graduate theses. Dr. Keselman said that, at the end of the October Senate Executive meeting, it was noted that a committee would need to be struck to explore the possibility of offering jointly authored, multidisciplinary, graduate theses. She indicated that the work of such a committee might be expanded to consider Professor Austin-Smith’s suggestion.

Professor MacPherson contended that removing the supporting action would not preclude exploring the possibility of offering jointly authored theses but it would address a genuine concern raised but those who oppose the idea. Dr. Keselman replied that the SPC felt that it should be included in the document. The Chair observed that, if this statement were removed on the basis that some objected to it, the same argument might be extended to other statements in the Strategic Plan. He noted that it had been challenging to reach consensus on the text in the document and that the inclusion of the statement in question does not imply a commitment to anything more than think about the possibility of offering jointly authored, multidisciplinary theses.

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

On behalf of Senate, Dr. Barnard thanked members of the Strategic Planning Committee, the many people who had participated in the consultation process, and especially Dr. Keselman for Chairing the SPC. He remarked that the University has been well served by the work of the committee.

V 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.

VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 1, 2014

Professor McMillan MOVED, seconded by Dean Taylor, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on October 1, 2014 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

VII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - none

VIII REPORTS OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE SENATE PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Page 63

Professor Austin-Smith said Senate Executive met on October 22, 2014. Comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they were made.

(a) Annual Schedule of Senate Meetings

Professor Austin-Smith reported that Senate Executive had considered and endorsed a recommendation from the University Secretary to amend the Annual Schedule of meetings and, in particular, to remove the September meeting from the schedule for the reasons outlined in Mr. Leclerc's memo to the Chair of Senate (dated September 6, 2014). Beginning in 2015, Senate would meet nine times per academic year on the first Wednesdays in October, November, December, January, February, March, and April, the third Wednesday in May, and the last Wednesday in June. Senate Executive had also endorsed a number of amendments to the Standing Rules of Senate that would follow from proposed changes to the schedule, as noted in the attachment to the Report.

Professor Austin-Smith MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve revisions to the Annual Schedule of Senate Meetings and to the Standing Rules of Senate, as set out in the attachment to the Report of the Senate Executive Committee, effective January 1, 2015.

CARRIED

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

Ms. Ducas reported that the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee had completed its deliberations on a proposal to establish an Institute for Geopolitical Economy. The proposal will be forwarded to Senate Executive in due course.

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

1. **Revisions to Academic Regulations, Faculty of Engineering** Page 66

(a) **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions** Page 71
RE: Revised Admission Regulations

Ms. Gottheil said the Faculty of Engineering is proposing changes to its Admission Regulations for Advanced Entry. She noted that the admission requirements intersect with academic progression requirements. The proposal is to clarify and to simplify what the requirements are, for students. Ms. Gottheil said the progression requirements state that any student who has completed less than 72 credit hours would not be eligible for admission if they have accumulated more than 18 credit hours of D and F grades. The purpose is to identify students who do not mathematically have a chance of succeeding in Engineering and to intervene at an earlier point in their academic career in order that they can be advised appropriately and have a chance to be successful.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions regarding revised Admission Regulations, Faculty of Engineering, effective for the September 2016 intake.

CARRIED

(b) **Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and
Evaluation**

(i) **RE: Student Progress and Academic Status** Page 72

Dr. Ristock said the Faculty of Engineering is proposing changes to the wording of its regulation on Student Progress and Academic Status, to clarify the circumstances in which a student is not eligible to proceed in the program. The revised wording clarifies an existing rule.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding revised Academic Regulations concerning Student Progress and Academic Status, Faculty of Engineering, effective September 1, 2015.

CARRIED

(ii) **RE: Students Applying to an Engineering Program**

Page 73

Dr. Ristock indicated that the Faculty of Engineering is proposing revisions to its regulations concerning students applying to the Faculty from another faculty, college, or institution.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding revised Academic Regulations concerning Students Applying to an Engineering Program, Faculty of Engineering, effective September 1, 2016.

CARRIED

(iii) **RE: Dean's Honour List**

Page 75

Dr. Ristock said the Faculty of Engineering is revising the wording for its regulations regarding the Dean's Honour List, to better convey the requirements and to clarify the process for assessing graduating students in order to determine their eligibility.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding revised regulations for the Dean's Honour List, Faculty of Engineering, effective September 1, 2015.

CARRIED

2. **Reports of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation**

(a) **RE: Accommodation for Postgraduate Medical Residents with Disabilities**

Page 77

Dr. Ristock said the College of Medicine is proposing to establish a policy on Accommodation for Postgraduate Medical Residents with Disabilities. She said that the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation had reviewed the document and found it to be in compliance with other governing documents at the University.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding the establishment of a policy on Accommodation for Postgraduate Medical Residents with Disabilities, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

- (b) **RE: Revised Examination Conduct Policy,
College of Medicine** Page 93

Dr. Ristock said revisions to the Examination Conduct policy, for the Undergraduate Medical Education program, complement the University's policy on Final Examinations and Final Grades.

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding a revised policy on Examination Conduct for the Undergraduate Medical Education program, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

- (c) **RE: Revised Remediation Policy,
College of Medicine** Page 108

Dr. Ristock MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation regarding a revised policy on Remediation for the Undergraduate Medical Education program, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

3. **Reports of the Senate Committee on University Research**

- (a) **RE: Proposal for Endowed Research
Professorship in Hematology** Page 126

Dr. Jayas said the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost and the Senate Committee on University Research (SCUR) recommend that the Professorship in Hematology be established under the policy on Chairs and Professorships. He said the proposed Professorship would meet the requirements set out in the policy.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve, a proposal for an Endowed Research Professorship in Hematology.

CARRIED

- (b) **RE: Proposal for Endowed Research
Chair in Multiple Sclerosis** Page 134

Dr. Jayas said the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost and SCUR recommend that the Chair in Multiple Sclerosis be established under the policy on Chairs and Professorships. The proposed Chair would meet the requirements for an endowed Chair, as set out in the policy.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve, a proposal for an Endowed Research Chair in Multiple Sclerosis.

CARRIED

(c) RE: Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes: Spinal Cord Research Centre

Page 144

Dr. Jayas recalled that, when the Spinal Cord Research Centre was previously reviewed, SCUR had recommended that it be renewed for one year, with the provision that the Centre provide SCUR with additional information. Dr. Jayas reported that the Centre had complied and, based on the additional information provided, plus indications of support from the Head, Department of Physiology and Pathophysiology, and from the Dean, Faculty of Health Sciences, SCUR is recommending that the Centre be renewed for a period of five years.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research, on the periodic review of the Spinal Cord Research Centre, regarding a recommendation that the Centre be renewed for a period of five years, effective January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2019.

CARRIED

4. Reports of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures

(a) RE: Faculty of Health Sciences Faculty Council Bylaw

Page 147

Dean Doering said the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures (SCRIP) had met on October 6, 2014, to consider a recommendation from the Faculty of Health Sciences Faculty Council, which had held its inaugural meeting on September 18th, to establish the Faculty of Health Sciences Faculty Council Bylaw. He said the Faculty Council Bylaw specifies membership, meeting rules, powers to act and to recommend, and provides for the creation of a Faculty Executive Council, the creation of College Councils, and the election of Faculty Council members to Senate.

Referring to observation 4 in the Report, Dean Doering noted that the Faculty of Health Sciences Faculty Council had approved a template for College Council Bylaws, which vests the governance of professional programs at the College Council level, with the College Councils recommending on these matters directly to Senate.

Dean Doering MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures regarding the proposed Faculty of Health Sciences Faculty Council Bylaw, effective upon approval.

CARRIED

- (b) **RE: New and Updated Governing Documents Related to the Implementation of the Faculty of Health Sciences** Page 170

Dean Doering said the creation of the Faculty of Health Sciences, with its constituent colleges, requires that Senate approve proposed College Council Bylaws and revisions to the following, governing documents: Faculty and School Council General Bylaw; Election of Academic and Support Staff to Senate policy; Election of Students to Senate policy; Senate Committee on Appeals policy and procedures; Admission Appeals procedures and guidelines. Revisions to the composition of several Senate Committees, as set out on page 170 of the agenda, and to the schedule of representation on the Senate Committee on Nominations are also required.

Dean Doering said SCRP is recommending that Senate recommend that the Board of Governors approve the new Definitions of Academic Units policy and the revised Faculties, Schools, Professional Colleges, Departments, Divisions, and Institutes policy.

Dean Doering MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures regarding New and Updated Governing Documents Related to the Implementation of the Faculty of Health Sciences.

CARRIED

- (c) **RE: Revisions to the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences Council Bylaws** Page 226

Dean Doering said the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences is proposing that its Faculty Council Bylaws be revised to include part-time Instructors I and II and Senior Instructors as members of the Council.

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.

CARRIED

X ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. **Proposal for The University of Manitoba Accessibility Policy and Procedures** Page 229
- (a) **The University of Manitoba Accessibility Policy** Page 231
- (b) **Student Accessibility Procedure** Page 234
- (c) **Student Accessibility Appeal Procedure** Page 244

Ms. Usick noted that her covering memo to the Chair of Senate (dated October 15, 2014) sets out two recommendations of the *ad hoc* Committee of the Senate Executive to Examine Accommodation of Students with Disabilities and Governance Procedures Related to Academic Requirements (the Cooper Commission) that have led to the new or revised governing documents included with item X 1. on the agenda. She said The University of Manitoba Accessibility policy is a new document that is meant to act as an umbrella policy for the institution. The Student Accessibility Procedure is a revised document that replaces the existing procedure, Accessibility for Students with Disabilities. The Student Accessibility Appeal procedure is a new document, which introduces a formalized appeal process. Ms. Usick said the three documents had been provided to members of the Cooper Commission at a meeting, with the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission, on September 2, 2014.

Professor Brabston MOVED, seconded by Dean Taylor, THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve The University of Manitoba Accessibility policy and the related Student Accessibility procedure and Student Accessibility Appeal procedure, effective January 1, 2015.

CARRIED

2. **Report of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission Report RE: Guidelines for Developing *Bona Fide* Academic Requirements for Programs not Subject to External Accreditation**

Page 248

Dean Taylor recalled that, in April 2012, Senate had approved the Report of the Cooper Commission, which had been struck to examine the accommodation of students with disabilities and governance procedures related to academic requirements. The Cooper Commission had made two recommendations concerning standards identification. One was that programs subject to external accreditation or approval establish essential skills and abilities documents, for Senate approval. The second was that units that offer programs that are not subject to external accreditation be required to identify *bona fide* academic requirements (BFARs), with written rationales, for new and existing programs, for Senate approval. Dean Taylor said the Report of the Implementation Working Group included with the agenda is concerned with the implementation of the second recommendation.

Dean Taylor provided the definition of a BFAR, as set out in the Report of the Cooper Commission, and provided in the current report, on page 252 of the agenda. He explained further that BFARs are the essential and minimum requirements of a program, which cannot be waived and include knowledge, skills, and assessment methods.

Dean Taylor reminded Senators that, Senate had referred the Cooper Commission's recommendations to Senate Executive for implementation, which had, in turn, established the Implementation Working Group of the Cooper Commission Report, in May 2012. In September 2013, Senate had considered

two documents developed by a subcommittee of the Implementation Working Group that outlined proposed processes for developing essential skills and abilities documents and BFARs. In October 2013, Senate had approved a process for developing essential skills and abilities documents for programs subject to external accreditation.

Dean Taylor said that, following Senate's discussion of a proposed process for developing BFARs, in September 2013, the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) had conducted a pilot project involving three programs, to develop draft BFARs. The purpose of the pilot was to inform the creation of an implementation plan for the development of BFARs for programs not subject to external accreditation. Dean Taylor referred members to page 253 of the agenda for a list of recommendations that emerged from the pilot. He called attention to two of those recommendations, in particular. One is the recommendation that BFARs first be developed for service courses, to prevent discordant BFARs arising from the various programs that use the courses as prerequisites. The second is a recommendation that course-based BFARs should be developed before program-based BFARs, to prevent the development of blanket program BFARs that may or may not be applicable to individual courses in a given program (i.e. the course-to-program method).

Dean Taylor said a draft of the document, *Developing Bona Fide Academic Requirements for Programs not Subject to External Accreditation*, and the recommendations of the Implementation Working Group had been shared with the original members of the Cooper Commission at the meeting on September 2nd, for comment. Based on their feedback, the first recommendation had been revised to indicate that graduate programs would be given priority in the development of BFARs.

Dean Taylor noted that a significant difference between the document under consideration and the draft considered by Senate in September 2013 is that the current document is less prescriptive. The earlier draft had specified that units would follow one of two routes to the development of BFARs, either from courses to programs or from programs to courses, and that units would develop course and program learning outcomes before developing BFARs. The current draft recommends but does not require the course to program route, for reasons already noted, but leaves it to units to decide whether or not to develop learning outcomes as part of the process of establishing BFARs. Dean Taylor said that units would work with CATL to determine the best process for their unit.

Dean Taylor reviewed the recommendations of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission Report, as outlined on pages 249 – 250 of the agenda.

Dean Taylor MOVED, on behalf of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Implementation Working Group for the Cooper Commission Report regarding Guidelines for Developing Bona Fide Academic Requirements for Programs not Subject to External Accreditation.

Professor Owens asked if there would be flexibility in terms of the language used. She suggested that, in some programs, it is difficult to speak about “outcomes”. Dean Taylor said there are different ways of viewing outcomes, but BFARs are the various aspects of a course or program that students are expected to know or to have acquired at the end of the course or program. He underscored that units would not be asked to develop learning outcomes. In the view of the Implementation Working Group and the subcommittee, once units begin to think about the essential elements of courses or programs (i.e. BFARs) the discussion would necessarily include learning outcomes, as BFARs are a subset of learning outcomes.

Professor Chen sought clarification of the function of service courses and the recommendation that BFARs be developed for these courses first, to prevent discordant BFARs arising from different programs that use the courses. She asked if there is a presumption that a particular service course has the same function and academic objectives in all programs that use the course. Professor Chen asked if Dean Taylor might elaborate on why the course-to-program method is being recommended and why the program-to-course method apparently did not work for some programs involved in the pilot. She surmised that program BFARs might be met in a range of ways and by a number of different courses, but said she was unclear about what units would be asked to lay out.

Dean Taylor replied that the first step in the implementation process would be to determine which programs should be given priority. This task would be undertaken by staff in CATL, who would identify programs that are fairly prescriptive and those that use a larger number of electives. Dean Taylor said the program-to-course method would work well for programs with a prescribed curriculum but, in the case of programs that include a larger number of elective courses, it would not be possible to map program BFARs down to courses. He said the Implementation Working Group is recommending the course-to-program method for most programs taking into account the need to identify course-based BFARs for service courses but also because students who request an accommodation often do so at the course level rather than at the program level. Dean Taylor offered the example that the Department of History could establish program level BFARs that might map down to History courses but not to courses in other disciplines that a student would require to complete a History Major. In order for the Department of History to understand what the various BFARs might be for those courses in its programs, it would require information on the course BFARs from the other disciplines or departments.

Several Senators indicated that they were unclear about about the distinction made between an accommodation and a waiver. Some members indicated by their comments and questions that they understood that the two terms were being used interchangeably. These members contended that, in their programs, every requirement could be accommodated in some way, and argued that no requirement should ever be waived. Dean Taylor replied that a BFAR could neither be waived nor accommodated. If, for example, a program identified a written examination as a BFAR, that examination could not be waived. The program would have to establish a written justification of that BFAR. If the written examination could be accommodated, it would not be a BFAR. Dean Taylor

remarked that some units might discover that they do not have any BFARs if they determine that it is possible to accommodate all of the course and program requirements. Dr. Cooper drew attention to the Cooper Commission Report, which includes clear definitions of both “accommodation” and “waiver”. She said the Commission had recognized that common definitions for many of these terms did not exist and had spent considerable time establishing these. Ms. Usick said the definitions are also enshrined in the new procedures documents provided with the preceding agenda item and include, in particular, definitions of the different types of accommodations, including “modification”, “substitution”, “waiver”, and “degree not withstanding a deficiency”.

Professor Austin-Smith said she would be concerned that, as the articulation of BFARs proceeds, the disciplinary practices, norms, and depth of diversity of programs across the University not be erased in what she characterized as a search or drive for abstraction. She also expressed concern that there might be a move from standards to standardization and said there should be a commitment to disciplinary differences and diversity. Dean Taylor said the process of establishing BFARs would be a collegial one, and it would be the units that would determine the BFARs for their programs. The diversity of programs would, therefore, be respected through that process. Dean Taylor said there is no attempt in the process to establish standards. The only objective is to identify BFARs and to establish written rationales for those.

Professor Guard remarked that there seemed to be some confusion between what are BFARs and assessment mechanisms. She suggested that a written examination is only an assessment mechanism and that it could not be a BFAR as a written examination or any other mechanism of assessment could always be replaced with a different mechanism. Dr. Barnard recalled that the circumstance that led to the exercise of examining accommodation of students with disabilities involved a very rigid interpretation of a requirement for a particular type of assessment. He said it is good to hear that the present discussion indicates that the University community is expressing a different set of views.

Professor Menkis observed that a modification relates to changing the content of a course or program and that it would be preferable to provide an accommodation rather than a modification to a requirement. He suggested that the notion of a waiver, which would allow a student to complete a program without meeting a particular requirement, would be concerning, but providing accommodation should be part of the institution’s core values.

Referring to the second recommendation from the pilot study, which indicates the need to develop a communication plan to better explain the concept of BFARs, the rationales for development, and the methodology of creation of BFARs, Professor Calder asked if the document, Developing Bona Fide Academic Requirements for Programs not Subject to External Accreditation, intended to provide that communication plan or if clarity would be provided at some future point. She said that she found the documentation provided confusing and indicated that she would, therefore, be reluctant to approve the Report. Dean Taylor replied that the recommendation referenced reflects that the discussion of examining accommodations for students with disabilities had been initiated some time ago and that some at the University not be aware of the history of the

discussion and the circumstances that led to it. Given this, the Implementation Working Group recognizes that there needs to be clear communication about what the exercise of identifying BFARs is being undertaken and what the eventual outcome would be. Dean Taylor said that much of the communication would occur as a result of CATL working with individual units to identify BFARs and written rationales for their programs.

Ms. Usick remarked, from the perspective of Student Accessibility Services, that even if a unit were to determine that its program(s) do not have any BFARs, this would facilitate the work of Advisors when they contact an instructor to determine an appropriate accommodation for a student, as it would preclude an instructor from providing an accommodation on the grounds that a particular requirement is a BFAR that cannot be waived or accommodated in some other way.

Professor Singer observed that the proposed process for developing BFARs makes specific reference to programs. He asked when the focus had been directed at establishing course-level BFARs. He suggested that the exercise of developing course BFARs would be more challenging than identifying program BFARs. Dean Taylor said the recommendation is a requirement to establish program BFARs, but the Implementation Working Group believes that, in practice, units would be looking at course-based BFARs at the same time. This is because students often request accommodation at the course level and also takes into account the issue of services courses. Dean Taylor said that some units have established certain requirements that apply to all of the courses in that unit. For example, the Department of History requires that each course include an examination of a particular form. Although the requirement is determined at the unit level, because it applies to all courses, it is, in practice, a course-based requirement.

Dr. Cooper said that, because most requests for accommodation are made and the course level and are made to a course instructor, it is necessary for an instructor to know, for particular courses, whether there are course-based BFARs so they know whether or not an accommodation can be provided.

Professor Booth asked if essential skills would apply only at the program level or also to courses. Dean Taylor replied that essential skills are at the program level in the sense that, in professional programs, there are expectations for particular skills that must be communicated to students prior to starting the program, so they are aware of the skills that are required to successfully complete the program. To some degree, the essential skills would also apply at the course level.

Professor Booth indicated that he could support only the first of the Implementation Working Group's five recommendations.

Several members were concerned that, if programs were to identify BFARs, students who do not require an accommodation might challenge the need to complete certain program requirements on the basis that those requirements had not be identified as BFARs and so are not essential to completing the program. Professor Chen asked if BFARs would be limited to questions of accommodations or whether they would be understood to be the minimum

requirements for a program. Professor Hultin said the Department of Chemistry believes that the ability to demonstrate laboratory skills is a vital part of its programs. As there are aspects of Chemistry that do not require laboratory skills, accommodation would be provided to students with a physical or visual impairment who could not complete the laboratory requirements. He surmised that a student, who did not require an accommodation and who realized that the laboratory requirement had not been identified as a BFAR, might contend that they could not be required to complete that requirement. He suggested that it would be difficult to formulate in detail the circumstances in which a laboratory would and would not be a BFAR. Dean Taylor replied that identifying BFARs would not preclude a unit from establish general, academic program requirements. He said that only students who have a basis for requesting an accommodation would be able to request a waiver of a program requirement. Ms. Usick said the Student Accessibility Procedure, which had been provided for the previous item on the agenda, clearly identifies that BFARs are used in context of providing reasonable accommodation and only for individuals with a documented disability and would not be used outside of that context.

On behalf of the Student Senate Caucus, Ms. Kunzman thanked Ms. Usick for her presentation to the Caucus on November 3rd. She said the Student Senate Caucus supports the recommendations of the Implementation Working Group of the Cooper Commission on the basis that the recommendations and continued efforts of the Implementation Working Group benefit students with disabilities.

The Chair called for a vote on the motion.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

XI ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:18 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 19, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 255, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on November 5, 2014.