

February 1, 2012

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
Ms. K. Adams
Prof. B. Amiro
Prof. S. Alward
Prof. John Anderson
Prof. J. Asadoorian
Prof. B. Bacon
Dean J. Beddoes
Dean M. Benarroch
Prof. T. Booth
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Ms. M. Brolley
Prof. K. Coombs
Dean D. Crooks
M. G. Csepregi
Ms. T. Daodu
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. R. Desai
Dean J. Doering
Prof. M. Edwards
Prof. E. El-Salakaway
Prof. B. Elias
Ms. S. Enns
Prof. M. Eskin
Dr. E. Etcheverry
Mr. A. Fazaluddin
Mr. L. Ford
Dean H. Frankel
Prof. M. Freund
Prof. M. Gabbert
Mr. O. Gagne
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Dr. G. Glavin
Ms. S. Gottheil
Prof. J. Guard
Ms. J. Guise
Dean N. Halden
Prof. J. Hughes
Dean A. Iacopino
Mr. P. Karari

Mr. A. Kassum
Dr. A. Katz
Mr. J. Kearsey
Prof. W. Kinsner
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Ms. J. Krahn
Mr. W. Liang
Dean R. MacMillan
Mr. R. McGuire
Prof. R. McIlwraith
Prof. A. McIntosh
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. D. Mann
Dr. K. Matheos
Prof. J. Morrill
Prof. S. Palahicky
Mr. P. Panchhi
Prof. S. Pistorius
Prof. K. Plaizier
Prof. T. Podolsky
Prof. S. Prentice
Mr. A. Reisacher
Mr. L. Sader
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Prof. L. Simard
Prof. D. Smyth
Prof. H. Soliman
Prof. L. Strachan
Ms. C. Tapp
Dr. R. Tate
Dean J. Taylor
Dr. C. Trott
Prof. J. Trottier
Dean L. Turnbull
Prof. P. Venkatesh
Prof. D. Watt
Ms. M. Wayne
Ms. M. Wetzel
Dean M. Whitmore
Prof. A. Young
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University
Secretary
Dr. S. Coyston,

Recording
Secretary

Assessors Present

Ms. J. Chen
Ms. A. Ducas
Mr. P. Dueck
Dr. B. Hann
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. C. Morrill
Ms. N. Rashid
Dr. L. Smith
Dr. M. Torchia
Ms. D. Young

Regrets

Prof. Judy Anderson
Prof. P. Blunden
Ms. C. Bone
Prof. M. Brabston
Rector D. Bracken
Prof. T. Chen
Dr. D. Collins
Prof. E. Comack
Prof. I. Davidson-Hunt
Dean N. Davies
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. G. Giesbrecht
Dr. K. Grant
Prof. J. Hanesiak
Prof. P. Hess
Prof. P. Hultin
Prof. J. Irvine
Ms S. Jasper
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. E. Judd
Dr. J. Keselman
Mr. R. Lucenkiw
Mrs. D. McCallum
Prof. T. McLachlan
Dean B. Postl

Ms. D. Salem
Prof. M. Scanlon
Mr. H. Sector
Prof. W. Simpson
Dean R. Stern
Dean M. Trevan
Prof. K. van Ineveld
Dean L. Wallace
Dr. D. Wirtzfeld
Prof. E. Worobec
Prof. K. Wrogemann

Absent

Mr. R. Akther
Prof. M. Enns
Prof. R. Hechter
Mr. E. Kuz
Ms. C. Laforge
Prof. J. Linklater
Prof. J. Ngo
Dr. I. Ripstein
Dr. J. Ristock
Ms. J. Sealey
Prof. J. Van Rees
Prof. M. Vrontakis
Dean J. Watkinson

Also Present

Ms. B. Baines
Mr. J. Beaupre
Prof. C. Butterill
Ms. J. Graham
Mr. K. Kent
Ms. M. Mays-Wiebe
Ms. J. Nachtigall
Mr. P. Nawrot
Ms. C. Préjet
Mr. D. Waycik

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Mark Gabbert.

**I CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES – FEBRUARY 2012**

Mr. Marnoch indicated that there are 752 graduands, and no degrees notwithstanding.

Professor Gabbert 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 February 3, 2012.

CARRIED

II MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees

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

III MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE - none

IV MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [December 15, 2011] Page 3

2. Annual Report of the University Discipline Committee Page 13

In response to a question from Professor J. Morrill, Professor John Anderson indicated that there are not standardized penalties for specific infractions that can be applied across faculties. Discussions at UDC of establishing standardized penalties have fallen on faculty lines and have resulted in an inability to do so. Dr. Smith, Executive Director, Student Services/Student Affairs, informed members that a working group of the Associate Deans (Undergraduate)/Undergraduate Liaison Officers has created a webpage that includes suggested penalties for various violations.

3. Items approved by the Board of Governors [December 6, 2011] Page 74

V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Page 75

President Barnard referred to a communication circulated to the campus community on January 19th regarding the University's academic structure, which, he observed is complex compared to other medical doctoral institutions of a similar size. The University has twenty faculties and a large number of departments (seventy-eight) compared to an average of thirteen at comparable institutions. Dr. Barnard suggested that the complex academic structure imposes some unfortunate realities on the institution. First, the large number of deans makes it difficult to consult widely on academic matters and decisions.

Second, because each faculty requires its own infrastructure (including human resources and budget management, for example), there is a significant cost associated with maintaining and administering the current structure. Third, the complex structure can make it difficult to negotiate across unit boundaries in order to work collaboratively. Dr. Barnard noted that, in the Employee Experience Survey completed the previous fall, the importance of being able to work effectively across departmental boundaries was ranked quite high, but employees' assessment of how effectively this is working ranked considerably lower. He suggested that one reason for this is the sheer complexity of the University's structure.

Dr. Barnard said he has asked Dr. Keselman, Vice-President (Academic) and Provost, to move discussions of the University's academic structure beyond those that have taken place at two retreats of Provost's Council to the next level of wider engagement. In the first instance, this will include the faculties in the health sciences cluster. There is no predetermined structure but objective is a simpler structure that minimizes administrative costs. The entire process is expected to take several years but progress within the health sciences cluster is expected by the end of the calendar year. Depending on the results of that review, the discussion would move to other faculties as they identify opportunities to make structural changes.

Professor Cam Morrill asked about the process for involving academic staff in the discussion; for example, might deans and directors bring the discussion to their councils. Dr. Barnard replied that this would be determined in the next stage of the conversation. It is one of the first questions that Dr. Keselman will address.

Professor McMillan asked what models or evidence will inform the direction of the review. She expressed concern about the lack of clarity on what is to be changed and why and a lack of evidence that the proposed direction for change will support the stated goals. Dr. Barnard replied that he and others, including deans and members of Provost's Council, see that the complexity of the institution does impact the work of the University and has a financial cost. Opportunities to do things differently have been identified in the health sciences cluster. For example, the professional faculties recognize a need to deliver inter-professional education, as their graduates will work in inter-professional settings. A shared administrative structure for, and expertise on, accreditation reviews that many of the health sciences faculties must undergo periodically, and which pull faculty away from their work, might also be considered. The presence of the Faculty of Pharmacy and the Department of Pharmacology in different buildings on the Bannatyne Campus also raises the question of whether there are opportunities to reorganize.

Professor Desai acknowledged that discussions of the academic structure must take into account concerns of cost and administrative efficiency. She suggested that, before the University implements any changes, the discussions must also take into account evidence of whether or not the current structure negatively affects the provision of student services or enhances faculty members' ability to work. Dr. Barnard replied that there are various considerations to be taken into account and it is for this reason that he has asked Dr. Keselman to begin the discussion with deans of the relevant units.

Ms. Tapp asked Dr. Barnard to respond to students' concerns regarding comments in the Winnipeg Free Press that the Faculty of Human Ecology will not be in the makeup of the new structure. Dr. Barnard replied that he had not, at any time, indicated that any

particular unit will not exist. He said there is no expectation that program and degree structures would change. The review is not focussed on the work being done at the University but on how the institution is organized to do that work and whether or not the existing structure is the optimal one.

Dean Iacopino expressed support for the review. Commenting from the perspective of a dean in the health sciences cluster, he noted that the objective of the review is to identify a structure that will allow the faculties to maximize resources (by eliminating duplications and sharing resources for laboratories and research, for example) and to increase strengths in particular areas, including academic programs, student support services, teaching and research, and faculty development, through collaboration.

Dr. Barnard invited members to contact him or Dr. Keselman with questions or to offer suggestions or advice. He indicated that Senate will be kept informed of the discussion and be given opportunities to comment on changes that might be proposed.

VI QUESTION PERIOD

The Chair reminded Senators 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 Chair asked Ms. Gottheil to respond to a number of questions submitted by Professor Young.

Ms. Gottheil prefaced her response to Professor Young's questions with an update on the implementation of the Ad Astra Schedule Suite, which had been purchased as part of the ROSE project objective to optimize resources and, in particular, to optimize the use of instructional spaces on campus. The University is in the midst of implementing the system and schedulers and event planners have begun to use it to plan next year's schedules. Ms. Gottheil said that Ad Astra Information Systems would share the results of a strategic scheduling check-up the following week and make observations and recommendations on space utilization for the University to consider.

Ms. Gottheil informed Senate that a committee chaired by Dr. Collins, Vice-Provost (Academic Planning and Programs), is reviewing the University's Space Planning and Space Policies and will develop guiding principles for the use of instructional space. The revised policies, including the guiding principles will be brought to Senate for discussion at a later date.

The following questions were submitted by Professor Arlene Young, Faculty of Arts.

I have several questions that I would like to raise with regard to the memo sent out on January 25th by Neil Marnoch regarding the allocation of classrooms. I raise these questions in Senate because of the broader implications the proposed allocation of classroom has for the University's core academic programs.

Mr. Marnoch expresses concern for the time spent on classroom allocation by a staff member in the Intensive English Program in Extended Education. Since we are moving to an automated classroom allocation system, why is this automated system not relieving the problem? What is the point of the automated system if it doesn't? What is the academic justification for giving room allocation priority to programs such as ICM, the

Intensive English Program in Extended Education, and the English Language Program, which are not the core programs of the University?

Ms. Gottheil said the allocation of classrooms to the Intensive English Language Program and the International College of Manitoba is consistent with long-standing practices based on logistical considerations. For the Intensive English Language program, logistical considerations include a pedagogical requirement that classes be taught in blocks of four or five hours. She noted that the spaces allocated have low rates of utilization (10 – 15 percent or less).

Professor Young: Mr. Marnoch notes in his memo that “as these programs continue to expand, more rooms may be required” and he wants to identify “additional rooms” for their use.

Ms. Gottheil suggested that the prediction for continued expansion of the Intensive English Language and ICM programs may have been premature, although both programs have shown significant enrolment increases in the past. She said it will be necessary for the University to assess the space needs of all programs on an ongoing basis and to adjust space allocations, build new facilities, or renovate existing ones in response to enrolment levels.

Professor Young: Although he wants to add these rooms “without compromising the ability to deliver faculty programs,” it is difficult to understand how commandeering sets of classrooms for entire terms could fail to do so. Most of the rooms on the proposed allocation list are seminar rooms, some of which are used in my department for Honours and Graduate seminars, and we often have trouble getting the rooms we need. Why are the University’s Honours and Graduate Programs not given priority?

Ms. Gottheil said that a preliminary report by Ad Astra Information Systems indicates that small classrooms and seminar rooms are being under-utilized and that there is no shortage of such spaces on campus. She expressed confidence that it will be possible to find suitable spaces for all undergraduate and graduate classes based on currently available data on classrooms.

Ms. Gottheil reported that a number of units had contacted Mr. Marnoch to advise that a number of the rooms listed in his memo are being updated or renovated and will be used next year. Based on this information, these rooms will be put back into the general classroom pool. Ms. Gottheil remarked that the process of allocating classroom space is one of give-and-take and working with faculties, departments, and programs to ensure the best use of classroom space.

Professor Young: Are any other programs or units going to be granted special privileges as well? If so, could I please request that English, Film, and Theatre be listed for consideration?

Ms. Gottheil responded that every program and class will be scheduled in accordance with attributes and preference indicated by the departments, with respect to class size, smart classroom technology, for example. It may not always be possible to accommodate requests for specific rooms or preferred time slots.

Professor Young expressed concern that priority is being given to programs that are not core programs of the University. She said it can be difficult to find spaces for some seminar classes, which also require three-hour time slots. In the Faculty of Arts, seminars must be scheduled during one of three blocks of time: 8:30 – 11:30 a.m., 11:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m., and 2:30 – 5:30 p.m. Professor Young contended that the latter time slot is not preferred and that the second covers every legitimate lunch hour. Ms. Gottheil replied that, normally, classes are scheduled in blocks of one to three hours; anything different than this (e.g. four or five hours) can be more difficult to schedule. The Registrar's Office is committed to providing classroom allocations that match the needs submitted by departments but cannot guarantee that classes will be assigned to preferred time slots, as the class schedule must take into account the needs of the entire program and utilize all facilities across the entire instructional week. Ms. Gottheil invited Professor Young to contact Mr. Marnoch to discuss her concerns further.

Professor Guard raised a concern that programs delivered through ICM are assigned priority classroom space, considering that the University's space is funded by taxpayers and the College is operated by Navitas, which is a for-profit organization. Ms. Gottheil suggested that the use of classroom space by ICM is stipulated in the agreement between Navitas and the University. She stressed that no program is given absolute priority and that all classes, for all programs, will be scheduled through the Ad Astra Schedule Suite. She added that a very small number of classrooms have been set aside and the majority have been reserved for the University's Intensive English Language programs, rather than ICM.

In response to a question from Professor Desai, Ms. Gottheil said data on the amount of classroom space per hour allotted to ICM is not available. She noted that ICM does have close to one hundred percent utilization of the classroom space that it has been assigned, from 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. The University's space utilization rates are much lower.

The Chair indicated there would be other opportunities to discuss space allocations as more data become available. He noted that space is very expensive and that all units have legitimate aspirations for space use. The available data show that space is most flexible in classrooms. If it is possible to use classroom space more effectively and in different ways, there may be low-cost ways to address space needs without having to create new spaces.

**VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 11, 2012**

Professor McMillan MOVED, seconded by Professor Coombs, THAT Senate approve the minutes of January 11, 2012, as circulated.

CARRIED

VIII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

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

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee Page 94

Professor Gabbert reported that Senate Executive had met on January 18, 2012. The comments of the committee accompany the reports on which they were made.

2. Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

Ms. Ducas reported that the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee is completing reviews of a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences for the Internationally Educated Agrologists Program and of a Report of the Senate Committee on University Research regarding a proposal to establish the Centre for Human Rights Research.

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

**1. Report of the Senate Committee on University Research Page 95
**RE: Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes:
the Institute for the Humanities****

Professor Glavin MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research on the Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes regarding a recommendation to renew the Institute for the Humanities for a five-year term ending June 30, 2016.

CARRIED

XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Mr. Leclerc called attention to an email message circulated to members on the previous day regarding a Senate survey being conducted by the University Secretaries of the Universities of Manitoba and Saskatchewan (Ms. Lea Pennock) and Professor Glen Jones of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. Thirty-eight institutions have been invited to participate in the survey, which follows-up on one conducted ten years ago by Dr. Jones. The authors of the survey hope to publish the results, including a discussion of the changes observed between the two survey periods. He encouraged members to complete the online survey, which will be open until the end of March and requires approximately ten minutes to complete.

XII ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 7, combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 97, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on February 1, 2012.