

7 July 1999

Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Room 245 Engineering Building.

**Those Present:**

Prof. K.C. Ogden,  
Chair  
Prof. I. Adamson  
Prof. D. Amundson  
Prof. J.E. Anderson  
Prof. R. Bhullar  
Dean H. Bjarnason  
Prof. B. Blakley  
Prof. R. Bose  
Prof. J. Boyd  
Prof. E.A. Braid  
Prof. R. Burleson  
Prof. R. Chernomas  
Prof. D. Chow  
Prof. W. Christie  
Prof. J. Cooper  
Dean J. de Vries  
Dean B. L. Dronzek  
Prof. H.W. Duckworth  
Prof. M.L. Duckworth  
Mr. J. Edwards  
Dean N. Fetterman  
Prof. A. Gole  
Dean J. Gray  
Dean D. Gregory  
Prof. N. Holliday  
Prof. L. Horne  
Dean D. Hrycaiko  
Dean J.C. Jamieson  
Ms. M. Jay  
Prof. E. Judd  
Prof. L. Kaminski  
Prof. E. Kroeger  
Prof. R. Kueneman  
Dean B. Levin  
Ms. G. Lewis  
Prof. J. Long  
Prof. I. Macdonald  
Prof. M. McKay  
Ms. H.D. McKeen  
Dean R. Magsino  
Dr. V. Olender  
Prof. J. Page  
Dean A. Percival  
Ms. C. Presser  
Dean D. Ruth

Mr. P.A. Saydak  
Dean A. Secco  
Dean H. Sector  
Rector J. Stapleton  
Prof. M. Stern  
Prof. G.C. Tabisz  
Prof. M. Thomas  
Mr. K.D. Toyne  
Dr. G. Walz  
Prof. R. Wedgewood  
Prof. P. Zahradka  
Ms. B. Sawicki,  
University Secretary  
Ms. S. Plett,  
Recording Secretary

**Assessors Present:**

Prof. P. Blunden  
Prof. B. Cameron  
Mr. P. Dueck  
Mr. G. Fletcher  
Prof. N. Halden  
Mr. R. Levin  
Prof. S. Simonovic

**Also Present:**

Dean J. Dean  
Ms. H. Kideckel  
Prof. W. Kops

**Regrets:**

Prof. S. Abeysekera  
Prof. L.M. Batten  
Dean M. Cox  
Mr. H. Eliasson  
Prof. M. Feld  
Mr. S.P. Foucault  
Prof. M. Gabbert  
Dr. J.S. Gardner  
Dr. G. Glavin  
Ms. L.M. Grabowecy  
Prof. L. Guse  
Mr. J.B. Hochman  
Warden J. Hoskins  
Prof. T. Howorth

Mr. E. Janzen  
Mr. C.J. Kazina  
Dr. J.C. Keselman  
Ms. M. Magsino  
Dr. A.V. Mauro  
Mr. R.K. Mehta  
Ms. Michaud-Oystryk  
Dean R. O'Kell  
Mr. N. Singh  
Dr. I.C.P. Smith  
Dr. E.J.E. Szathmáry  
Prof. K. Vessey  
Dr. L. Wallace  
Prof. K. Wrogemann

**Absent:**

Ms. L. Archer  
Prof. K. Barker  
Ms. J. Basra  
Prof. F. Berkes  
Dean R. Bird  
Prof. T. Booth  
Prof. R. Bruno-Jofre  
Prof. E. Comack  
Mr. J.E. Cox  
Dean F. de Toro  
Mr. W.R.L. Ewanchuk  
Mr. S.J. Fletcher  
Dean D.M. Fuchs  
Prof. J. Gartner  
Dr. G. Gerbrandt  
Prof. G. Giesbrecht  
Dean B. Hennen  
Ms. L.N. Karanja  
Prof. P. Kaufert  
Mr. C. Koscielny  
Prof. J. Kwong  
Mr. E. Latif  
Mr. J. Leclerc  
Dr. R. Legal  
Prof. S. Macdonald  
Mr. M.W. McAdam  
Prof. G. McClarty  
Prof. B. McKenzie  
Dr. D.R. Morphy  
Prof. C. Mossman  
Mr. A. Neufeld

Prof. N. Pettigrew  
Prof. G.N. Ramu  
Prof. W. Rennie  
Prof. R.T. Ross  
Recteur P. Ruest  
Ms. K.L. Rutledge  
Ms. D.A. Selymes  
Prof. K. Simons  
Prof. D. Smyth  
Mr. S. Stanley  
Prof. B. Stimpson  
Prof. D. Strong  
Mr. D. Wahl  
Ms. C. Wood  
Ms. R. M. Wover  
Dean G. Zhanel

I **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION** - nil

II **MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE**

1. **Report of the Senate  
Committee on Awards** Page 17

Professor Chow advised that the Executive Committee endorsed the report to Senate.

With reference to the *Manitoba Scholarships and Bursaries Initiative Bursary* (page 21), Dean Secco noted that it was intended for the "best and brightest" students, but that one of the criteria was a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0. This seemed to him to be a conflict.

Mr. Dueck explained that there was no conflict. The intent of this bursary was two-fold: 1) to keep the best and brightest students in Manitoba; and 2) to control and reduce the debt load for students.

MOVED by Professor Cooper, seconded severally, that the report of the Senate Committee on Awards be approved by Senate.

CARRIED

2. **Report of the Faculty  
Council of Graduate Studies  
re New Courses and Course Changes** Page 35

Professor Chow advised that the Executive Committee endorsed the report to Senate.

MOVED by Dean Secco, seconded severally, that the report of the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies be approved by Senate.

CARRIED

3. **Report of the Senate  
Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes** Page 40

MOVED by Dean Dronzek, seconded severally, that the report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes be approved by Senate.

Professor Duckworth observed that the proposed program changes in the Faculty of Nursing would have considerable impact upon the Department of Chemistry, as the majority of these students had taken Chemistry courses in the past and the Department had received considerable resources from this.

Dean Gregory advised that these changes had been discussed with the Dean of Science. Dean Jamieson indicated that it was difficult to predict which courses students would take in the future, but he did not believe there would be a major change.

Dean Dronzek's motion was CARRIED.

III **MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

1. **Correspondence from the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost re Appointments**

- a) **Dean of Agricultural and Food Sciences** Page 45
- b) **Dean of Engineering** Page 46
- c) **Acting Dean of Human Ecology** Page 47
- d) **Dean of Management** Page 48

Professor Ogden introduced and welcomed the following recently-appointed Deans: Dr. Harold Bjarnason (Agricultural and Food Sciences), Dr. Doug Ruth (Engineering), Dr. Nelma Fetterman (Human Ecology) and Dr. Jerry Gray (Management). This was met with a round of applause.

Professor Ogden also welcomed those who had been appointed earlier or who were returning from leave: Dr. Robert O'Kell (Arts), Dr. David Collins (Pharmacy), Dr. Harvey Secter (Law), Dr. Brian Hennen (Medicine), Dr. David Gregory (Nursing), and Dr. Dale Amundson (Art). This was met with a round of applause.

2. **Senate Membership 1999-2000** Page 49

3. **Correspondence from St. Andrew's College re New Principal** Hand-out

Professor Ogden introduced and welcomed Dr. Vivian Olender to Senate. This was met with a round of applause.

IV **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT** - nil

V **QUESTION PERIOD**

No questions had been submitted in written form, nor were any asked from the floor of Senate.

VI **CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 2 JUNE 1999**

Dean Levin advised that the second sentence of the second paragraph on page 7 should be corrected to read: "There would be a standard faculty fee, and the intention was to offer these courses at a lower cost to the students."

MOVED by Dean Secco, seconded by Dean Dronzek, that the minutes be approved as amended.

CARRIED

VII **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES** - nil

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

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

Page 54

MOVED by Professor Chow, seconded by Dean Secco, that the following nominations to the Senate Committee on Nominations be approved by Senate (all are three-year terms ending on 31 May 2002): Professor Robert Chernomas (Arts), Professor Donna Chow (Medicine & Dentistry) and Professor Bill Kops (Management & Continuing Education Division).

CARRIED

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

Professor Ogden expressed thanks to Professor Cooper for her services as Chair of SPPC, and she then welcomed the new Chair, Professor Norm Halden of Geological Sciences. This was met with a round of applause.

Professor Halden reported that SPPC was currently considering a proposal for an Internet Innovation Centre in the Faculty of Engineering and a proposal for a research and treatment centre for arteriosclerosis in the Faculty of Medicine.

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

1. **Report of the Faculty  
Council of Graduate Studies  
re Policy on Adjunct Professors**

Page 56

Professor Chow advised that the Executive Committee endorsed the report to Senate.

Professor Tabisz referred to the guidelines for the appointment of adjunct professors (page 59), and he requested clarification of the word "co-supervision". Dean Secco responded that a definition was being developed.

Professor Duckworth drew attention to a possible Catch-22 situation in the guidelines for the appointment of external adjunct professors (page 60), as the individuals recommending the appointment may be unable to show how students would benefit because they may not know who the students would be. Dean Secco indicated that difficulty existed in the existing policy as well. He suggested that department heads go ahead with a recommendation if they felt an individual would bring expertise to the position even if they did not know the names of the students.

With regard to the steps to be followed when recommending an appointment (page 57), Professor Kueneman asked what would happen if one individual did not support the appointment but all the others did. Dean Secco noted that the basis for the proposed revisions to the policy had arisen from the Dean of Graduate Studies' feeling that he was merely rubber-stamping the names. For external appointments, the approval of the Dean

of Graduate Studies was required. If he or she did not support the recommendation, good reasons would have to be provided.

In answer to a question about why the seventh guideline (page 59) was being deleted, Dean Dronzek advised that with the current technology available, it had been felt that the ability to communicate rapidly and clearly meant it could be removed.

MOVED by Dean Secco, seconded by Professor Bose, that the revisions to the policy on adjunct professors be approved by Senate.

CARRIED

2. **Report of the Senate**  
**Committee on Nominations**

Hand-out

Dean Dronzek advised that three nominations remained to be filled, and they would be brought to the September meeting of Senate. He then noted that, under the Committee on Appeals, Professor J. Page should be shown as a member of the Faculty of Science.

Professor Burleson advised of two corrections in spelling under the Committee on Admission Appeals: Professor P. Paterson and Professor R. Burleson.

MOVED by Dean Dronzek, on behalf of the Committee on Nominations, that the report be approved by Senate.

CARRIED

3. **Report of the Senate**  
**Committee on Approved Teaching Centres**

Page 61

Professor Chow advised that the Executive Committee endorsed the report to Senate.

MOVED by Professor Stern, seconded by Dean Jamieson, that the report be approved by Senate.

Professor Duckworth wondered how teachers for inter-disciplinary courses were approved. Professor Stern advised that the same people who had responsibility for the courses taught on campus would have the responsibility for the courses at the approved teaching centres.

Professor Stern's motion was CARRIED.

4. **Report of the University**  
**Research Committee of Senate**

Page 64

Professor Ogden advised that, although the donor's name was being kept confidential at this point, the University had accepted gifts from this individual in the past.

Professor Chow advised that the Executive Committee endorsed the report to Senate.

Professor Braid inquired about the distinction between Endowed and Designated Chairs.

Ms. Sawicki advised that the Guidelines for the Establishment of Chairs read as follows: "Chairs which are supported in full or principally from funds either donated to the University or committed by outside agencies, corporations or persons for specified time-periods of not less than five years."

Dean Dronzek added that Senate had approved numerous Chairs with finite time-periods in the past, and the Chairs simply disappeared at the end.

MOVED by Dean Jamieson, seconded by Dean Secco, that Senate approve the establishment of a Designated Chair in Cell Biology as recommended by the University Research Committee of Senate at its meeting of 3 June 1999.

CARRIED

X **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

1. **Courses in High Schools Proposal**

Page 67

Professor Ogden advised that, in response to the concerns raised at the last Senate meeting, Dean Levin had prepared a new document which had been considered by Deans and Directors Council as well as the Executive Committee of Senate.

MOVED by Professor Chow, on behalf of the Executive Committee, that admissions criteria for the "Courses in High Schools" proposal be established by Senate, requiring eligible students: 1) to have completed a minimum of 20 high school credits, including English 30S, Mathematics 30S, and Social Studies 30S, with an overall average of at least 80 percent; or to have completed a minimum of 22 high school credits, including two 40-level courses with an overall average of at least 70 percent; and 2) to have received a written recommendation of academic ability from their high school principal (or designate); and 3) to be currently registered in high school on a full-time or part-time basis.

Professor Cameron noted that if these were to be University 1 students, then University 1 and its resources should be made available to them, including orientation and student advising. The students however would not be able to come to orientation because they would be in classes at that time, which meant that University 1 personnel would have to go into the schools. It seemed to her that higher resource costs would be required of University 1, and she was also concerned about properly "aculturating" the students to the University.

Dean Levin indicated that many students enter the University at an advanced level with no orientation. He undertook to work with University 1 personnel on orientation and advising issues for these students.

Professor Tabisz was opposed to the proposal in principle, as it was his belief that bringing courses into the high schools would de-value all the University's courses and programs.

Dean Levin introduced Ms. Hope Kideckel, the Co-Ordinator of Career Development Programs at Sisler High School. He added that the high schools and their students were very interested in the proposal, and that similar programs were already carried out at many universities across Canada and the United States.

Ms. Kideckel advised that Sisler offered a University of Manitoba Calculus course which had

been a resounding success for over three years. A great deal of interest was expressed in this course by high school students starting as early as grade ten, and she believed that this was a tremendous way of reaching out to the community. She added that three-quarters or more of Sisler's students were non-white, many of whom did not see themselves as part of the University setting, and it was her firm belief that the proposal would help them to do that.

Mr. Fletcher expressed enthusiastic support for the proposal as a tremendous method of attracting students to this University, and he encouraged Senators to vote in favour.

Professor Wedgewood also expressed support, and indicated that this was not a new idea, as many universities had been doing this for some years. He added that these were the University's courses, that the University would retain full control, and accordingly the standards would not change.

Professor Blunden thought this was not in fact equivalent to programs being offered elsewhere. In the University of Winnipeg's accelerated program, the high school students were actually in a University classroom together with first-year University students. The courses being proposed here would be exclusively for high school students in a high school setting, and would not provide a true University experience. He noted that the University of Manitoba's strong points in the annual *McLean's* survey were the tenure-track and value-added components, and it would not be possible to extol the virtues of being a research institution if courses were being farmed out to the high schools. He also expressed concern about the courses being offered at reduced rates, because that would reduce the revenues flowing to the University, and he concluded that this was sending completely the wrong message.

Dean Levin stated that the decision on who taught the courses would always be that of the department, and he assumed that department heads would take this as seriously as they did for on-campus courses. There was nothing in the proposal about rates; Dean Levin noted that the Continuing Education Division staffed many courses on the basis of additional-stipend teaching. There was a maximum of twelve credit hours which could be earned this way, and Dean Levin pointed out that it was already possible for individuals to earn their entire degree without ever setting foot on the campus. Although revenue was not an issue for Senate, he noted that if 10-15% of the students came to the University eventually, a net financial benefit would be produced.

Professor Kaminski spoke in support of the proposal, adding that many University of Manitoba courses were already being taught at other locations.

Mr. Toyne expressed reservations about the proposal, and he wondered how this would affect scholarships such as the *Leaders of Tomorrow*, which were based on subjective criteria. He was concerned that 40S classes were not a requirement, as he thought 40G courses were not academically demanding enough.

Mr. Dueck advised that the criteria for scholarships would not be affected in any way, and he did not see this as a stumbling block.

Mr. Edwards also opposed the proposal. He expressed concern that students would become lost in the system while being shuffled from one unit to another, i.e. Continuing Education Division to University 1 to Faculty. He did not see this as a legitimate preview of the University experience, as the high school environment was too sheltered, involving a

quantum leap from high school to the post-secondary education level. He was also concerned that Senate would have no say over the professors named to teach the courses.

Dean Levin pointed out that the admission requirements being proposed were significantly higher than would be the case a few months later for the same students wishing to take the same courses. In addition, the high schools were being asked to provide written recommendations of the students' academic abilities. The students would not be bouncing from program to program, as they would be in University 1. Although Dean Levin could not say for sure that the proposal would attract students, it was his belief that it would do so. The proposal was not intended to be a University preview; rather, it was designed to help students determine whether they might be interested in attending University. It would not replace the on-campus experience and was not intended to do that. Senate was not involved in the selection of professors, other than those at Approved Teaching Centres, and the instructors would be selected no differently than for all regular courses. Dean Levin reiterated that many students already obtained their degrees without ever coming to campus.

Professor Anderson asked about the size of the program, and Dean Levin replied that it would be small. It was anticipated that up to six course sections might be offered in four school divisions in the first year.

Professor Chow's motion was then CARRIED.

2. **Revocation of B.A. (General) Degree**

Hand-out

Dean Dean explained that Senate was being asked to revoke the B.A. (General) degree which was awarded to Ms. Hazel Cheng (student number 6711524) in May 1999. The request was being made by Ms. Cheng, who wished to complete a B.A. (Advanced) degree instead of the B.A. (General). After having applied to graduate with a B.A. (General) degree in May 1999, Ms. Cheng made a further application for graduation with a B.A. (Advanced) degree in May 2000. Apparently she thought that the second application would cancel the first.

MOVED by Dean Dean, seconded by Professor Thomas, that Senate revoke the B.A. (General) degree awarded to Ms. Hazel Cheng, student number 6711524, so that she may be allowed to pursue the B.A. (Advanced) degree as per her request.

CARRIED

XI **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

These minutes, pp. 1 to 8, together with the material handed out at the door as well as the agenda, pp. 15 to 76, distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate of 7 July 1999.

/sgp