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:**

Dr. E.J.E. Szathmáry, Chair Prof. J.E. Anderson Ms. L. Archer Prof. L.M. Batten Prof. F. Berkes Dean R.E. Berry Prof. R. Bhullar Dean E.A. Braid Prof. R. Bruno-Jofre Prof. R. Burleson Prof. D. Chow Prof. E. Comack Prof. J. Cooper Dean M. Cox Dean R.F. Currie Ms. M.P. Davidson Ms. H. de la Cruz Dean F. de Toro Dean J. de Vries Ms. B. A. Dobran Dean B.L. Dronzek Prof. H.W. Duckworth Mr. J. Edwards Mr. H. Eliasson Dean J.I. Elliot Prof. M. Feld Prof. R. Foster Dean D.M. Fuchs Prof. M. Gabbert Dr. J.S. Gardner Dean J. Gray Dean D. Gregory Prof. L. Guse Prof. D. Hlynka Prof. N. Holliday Prof. L. Horne Warden J. Hoskins Prof. T. Howorth Dean D. Hrycaiko Prof. N.R. Hunter Dean J.C. Jamieson Prof. E. Judd Dr. J.C. Keselman Mr. C. Kozier Prof. R. Kueneman

Mr. K. Kustra Mr. J. Leclerc Mr. J. Legault Prof. H. LeJohn Ms. J. Lepp Ms. G. Lewis Mr. M.W. McAdam Ms. M. McKav Dean R. Magsino Ms. Michaud-Ovstrvk Mr. B. Millar Dr. D.R. Morphy Dean R. O'Kell Mr. P. Osiegbu Dean A. Percival Ms. D.N. Pinnock Ms. C. Presser Mr. J. Prvchitko Prof. G.N. Ramu Prof. E. Rosenbloom **Recteur P. Ruest** Ms. C. Schachter Dean A. Secco Ms. D.A. Selvmes Ms. L. Skromeda Mr. S. Stanley Prof. B. Stimpson Ms. K.A. Stroh Prof. G.C. Tabisz Mr. J.D. Trenaman Prof. K. Vessey Dr. G. Walz Ms. C. Weselake Prof. J. Whiteley Ms. C. Wood Ms. B. Sawicki. University Secretary Ms. S. Plett, **Recording Secretary** 

#### Assessors Present:

Prof. B. Cameron Dean R. Bird Mr. P. Dueck Prof. P. Fortier Mr. R. Levin Prof. K.C. Ogden Prof. S. Simonovic Dr. L. Wallace Mr. S. Wilson

#### Also Present:

Ms. E. Goldie Dean D. Ruth

#### Regrets:

Prof. S. Abeysekera Prof. I. Adamson Dean N. Anthonisen Prof. R. Bose Dr. G. Glavin Lt.Col. L.Hetherington Dean B. Levin Prof. J. Lona Prof. B. McKenzie Ms. K.R. McLure Dr. A.V. Mauro Prof. R.T. Ross Dean D. Shields Prof. K. Simons Dr. I.C.P. Smith Rector J. Stapleton Prof. M. Stern Prof. R. Wedgewood Prof. K. Wrogemann

#### Absent:

Prof. T. Booth Prof. R. Boyar Prof. J. Brewster Mr. K.B. Daymond Mr. R. de Grave Prof. M.L. Duckworth Mr. S.J. Fletcher Prof. J. Gartner Dr. G. Gerbrandt Prof. G. Giesbrecht Prof. A. Gole Prof. S. Higgins Mr. A. Hillar Mr. R.I. Holloway Prof. J.C. Irvine

Prof. L. Kaminski Prof. P. Kaufert Ms. C.L. Kionke Prof. J. Kirkpatrick Dr. R. Legal Prof. I. Macdonald Prof. S. Macdonald Prof. G. McClarty Mr. B. Metcalfe Prof. N. Pettigrew Prof. R. Postuma Mr. A. Puvirajah Prof. W. Rennie Prof. D. Smyth Prof. D. Strong Mr. J. Tyson Dean G. Zhanel





## 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. They appear in the original minutes which are available for inspection by members of Senate.

#### CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES, **DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES - FEBRUARY 1999**

MOVED by Dean Elliot, on behalf of the Executive Committee, that the list of graduands provided to the Secretary by the Director of Student Records be approved, subject to the right of Deans and Directors to initiate late changes with the Director of Student Records up to 5 February 1999.

CARRIED

Page 17

#### MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE Ш

#### 1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards**

Page 18

MOVED by Dean Elliot, on behalf of the Executive Committee, that the report be approved by Senate.

Professor Tabisz asked why the two retirees in the Graduate Award for Excellence in Mathematics (page 23) were not identified by name.

Professor Batten explained that a number of individuals had retired recently from the department, and the award had been drawn up to accept donations on behalf of all those people.

Ms. Morphy added that at least one of the original principals had been involved in setting up the terms of the award.

Dean Elliot's motion was CARRIED.

#### MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION IV

- 1. An Update on Libraries Consolidation
  - Statement of Intent: Ph.D. in Natural Resources and Environmental Management

Page 40

Page 38

**Report of the Faculty** 3. **Council of Graduate Studies re** the University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship

Page 45

Professor Whiteley was pleased to see the increase in value of the fellowship. However, he expressed concern about the reduction in the number of awards, as he feared this would

2.

ł

11

have a tremendous negative impact on graduate programs, and he wondered whether consideration had been given to alternative methods of increasing the value.

Dean de Toro explained that \$100,000 of new money was to be allocated to this fellowship for the next seven years, and thus the number of funded students would increase also. In addition, if the proposed budget for research assistantships was approved, the number of awards would be back to the current level within two or three years.

Professor Batten expressed support for the increase in funding. She believed it would result in more students getting NSERC grants.

Dr. Szathmáry also supported this initiative by Graduate Studies. She pointed out that the University had lost 59% of its NSERC scholarship holders in the last year because the amount of money being offered to them was so minimal. The need for more graduate scholarships was well recognized. *Plan 2000* had recommended that up to \$1 million be directed from the operating budget towards building a pool of graduate scholarships. That had been suspended some years ago, but the Task Force on Strategic Planning had recommended that this allocation be resumed until the amount of \$1 million for graduate fellowships, scholarships and so forth was reached. In addition, the government had been approached with the need to provide funding for graduate student support.

Professor Chow asked whether the University had a policy for top-up awards.

Dean de Toro replied there was no such Graduate Studies policy, but that it was left up to individual units and departments.

A number of Senators spoke in support of the move to increase the amount of the fellowships, but the Faculty of Graduate Studies was encouraged to find ways to increase the numbers of awards and to increase the level of funding for Master's students.

Ms. Goldie advised that Private Funding was working hard to enhance funding for bursaries and scholarships.

4.

#### Annual Report of the University Discipline Committee: <u>1 September 1997 to 31 August 1998</u>

Page 56

Mr. Kustra asked where the monies collected from fines was directed.

Mr. McAdam was not sure, although he assumed those funds were directed into general revenue. Dr. Morphy agreed to ascertain this for the next Senate meeting.

Mr. Kustra suggested that the money be allocated to the student hardship fund, and indicated that he would be placing a notice of motion to that effect.

With regard to item #8 (page 59), Professor Feld thought that the instructor leaving the room during a test should not be regarded as a mitigating factor.

Professor Vessey drew attention to item #50 (page 67), where a female student was found using the men's washroom. Professor Fortier pointed out that there was a dearth of women's washrooms in many buildings on campus, and this may in fact point to a serious problem.

Page -4-

Dean Braid suggested that in future the annual report should include information on who took the disciplinary action.

Ms. Presser noted there were at least eight cases of plagiarism in the report, and she urged faculty members to do everything possible to raise awareness on this issue.

Dr. Gardner advised that plagiarism and use of the Internet was a significant problem. It was his hope that instructors were addressing the issue of how to handle information obtained from the World Wide Web.

Dr. Szathmáry reminded individuals of the institution's annual Academic Integrity Week. She also pointed out that 78 infractions by over 16,000 students showed that only a tiny fraction of students committed disciplinary offences.

Mr. Edwards drew attention to cases #41 and 45 (page 66). He noted that the offences appeared to be quite similar but that there was significant disparity in the punishments.

Dean Jenkinson responded that one of the reasons for circulating an annual report was to promote uniformity. He added that in all likelihood the two events would have taken place in separate Faculties so that there would have been no prior sharing of information.

#### V <u>REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT</u>

1.

## Status of Recommendations <u>Contained in the Task Force Report</u>

Page 71

Dr. Szathmáry advised that all the recommendations in the report of the Task Force were being dealt with. It was her intention to provide a summary description of those recommendations which had been completed, which would be forwarded to Senate in due course.

Dean Currie suggested that recommendation #57 should include the B.A. (General) and B.A. (Advanced) in Global Political Economy.

Dean Berry thought that recommendations #50 and 51 should have been included in the column Alternate Proposal/Not Done rather than In Progress.

Dr. Szathmáry observed that planning meetings were ongoing, with Deans and Directors making submissions on proposed budgets.

Dr. Keselman advised that submissions for phase 2 of the Canada Foundation for Innovation applications had now been finalized. In addition, her office was already gearing up for the next round of competitions, which she expected would take place in late 1999 or early 2000.

The University of Manitoba had achieved the highest success rate in Canada in the latest MRC competition in terms of the number of awards (61% compared to a national average of 26%). This was met with a round of applause.

The institution recently received a Tier 2 award from CIDA for a project in the area of human resource development in environmental health in Cuba, to be led by Dr. Yassi of Community Health Sciences. This was a \$750,000 award for a five-year project.

#### Page -5-

Professor Standing (Physics & Astronomy) had received the Canadian Society for Mass Spectrometry award for his outstanding research contributions. This was met with a round of applause.

Dr. Gardner announced that a new Dean of Medicine had been appointed: Dr. Brian Hennen will begin his term on 1 July 1999.

The office of the President now has an office at the Bannatyne Campus, and Dr. Gardner indicated that each member of the President's Office would be spending some formal time there.

Dr. Gardner invited all members of the University community to attend the annual Duckworth Challenge, which is being held this year on 10 and 19 February.

Mr. McAdam advised that the first meeting of the Budget Advisory Committee was scheduled for 16 February, and that interviews of the short list for University Ombudsman would begin on 4 February 1999.

Dr. Szathmáry indicated that she had sent flowers and Senate's wishes for his recovery to the Chancellor of Brandon University.

#### VI **QUESTION PERIOD**

The following question was received via e-mail from Professor Holliday:

"On 22 January 1999, many people in the University received an e-mail from the Faculty of Graduate Studies indicating that effective 25 January 1999 and until further notice, the Faculty of Graduate Studies office hours are from 10:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Investigation indicates that not only does this mean that no personal visitors can gain access to the Faculty of Graduate Studies but that the office will not respond to telephone enquiries. Since the Faculty of Graduate Studies interacts with very many academic units within the University, the curtailing of office hours has a significant impact upon the effectiveness with which graduate education can be administered. This is in addition to its impediment to graduate students seeking service at the office.

"University policy #235 specifies the University Office Hours and clearly indicates that all offices open to the public are expected to be open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in the interests of consistent hours throughout the University and maximizing of service to the public. Variations from these hours are to be granted only in "exceptional circumstances".

"My questions are: 1) Were the procedures of policy 235 followed with respect to the modification of office hours of the Faculty of Graduate Studies? 2) What are the exceptional circumstances that justify such a significant reduction in service by this office? 3) Does this deviation from the norm set in policy 235 indicate a shift away from the general principles of this policy, and towards the chronological anarchy of administrative offices independently establishing hours for their own convenience?"

Dr. Gardner advised that a supplementary message had been sent to members of the University community advising them that this was a temporary move and that normal office hours would resume on 1 March 1999. He answered the specific questions as follows: 1) yes; 2) the office had experienced significant changes in staffing and jobs, which necessitated time for staff training; and 3) no.



## VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 6 JANUARY 1999

MOVED by Dean Elliot, seconded by Dean Jamieson, that the minutes be approved as circulated.

#### CARRIED

#### VIII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

With regard to the question about posting student grades (page 4), Mr. Kozier indicated that the majority of students agreed it was of benefit to post grades, particularly for those courses which were pre-requisites for second-term courses. However, some concerns had been expressed, especially in small classes where it was comparatively easy to identify individuals. Possible solutions included: put student numbers in numerical order rather than by alphabetical listing of surnames; e-mailing students with their grades; and consideration being given to students who requested their grades not be posted. Mr. Kozier had also discussed this with other universities, and it was his belief that the University of Manitoba currently had one of the best systems in the country. However, there were some legitimate complaints which warranted further investigation, and Mr. Kozier undertook to provide a written report for consideration by the Senate Committee on the Academic Evaluation of Students.

With reference to her observation that perhaps Faculties and Schools should produce annual reports summarizing the publications in each area (page 6), Dr. Szathmáry advised that this was being actively pursued and a report would be forwarded to Senate in due course.

Dr. Szathmáry reminded Senators that the issue of secret ballots when considering mergers of academic units had been referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures (page 7). A report was being prepared, and should be available for the March meeting of Senate.

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

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

Page 89

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

Professor Cooper reported that items currently being considered by SPPC included: the process by which the Committee's comments on the budget are forwarded to the Board of Governors; research needs and maintenance of equipment; information on the new nursing building and the parkade; the Smart Park; and a new building project which is in the developmental phase.

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

#### 1. Report of the Senate Committee on Appeals

Warden Hoskins advised that, since last reporting to Senate, the Committee on Appeals had completed work on two appeals.

The first one was held on 11 December 1998, and was an appeal against the Faculty of Arts decision not to grant an authorized withdrawal on courses in the 1997-98 regular session. Compassionate grounds were cited. This appeal was denied.

The second appeal was heard on 26 January 1999, and was chaired by Professor Stuesser, the Vice-Chair of the Senate Committee on Appeals. It was an appeal against a Faculty of Science decision not to grant a retroactive withdrawal from a course taken in the 1997-98 regular session. Procedural problems were cited as the grounds for this appeal, and it was upheld.

A further appeal against a Faculty of Arts decision was received, but it became apparent that information was being presented which had not been made available to the Arts appeal panel. The Faculty of Arts agreed to reconsider the appeal in light of this new information.

## XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

#### 1. <u>University 1 Honour List</u>

Page 90

MOVED by Dean Elliot, on behalf of the Executive Committee, that the proposal be approved by Senate.

Dean Braid commented that a sessional grade point average of 3.50 was not outstanding, and he suggested that the requirement be raised to 3.75.

Mr. Dueck advised that 3.50 was the standard set for the Canada Scholars program, and Professor Cameron added that it was the grade point average currently required by Arts and Science.

Dean Elliot's motion was CARRIED.

# 2. Report of the University Discipline Committee re Revisions to the Student Discipline By-Law Page 91

# a) <u>Comments of the Executive Committee</u> Page 119

Dean Jenkinson explained that most of the proposed changes to the by-law were intended to make the document more user-friendly. The only significant change was to section 1.3 dealing with matters affecting more than one Faculty or School, and it was an attempt to do away with double-jeopardy situations.

MOVED by Dean Elliot, on behalf of the Executive Committee, that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the adoption of the Student Discipline By-Law as revised.

Dean Secco drew attention to #1.1.5(a) on page 95, and expressed concern with the delay in obtaining a transcript if a temporary hold were placed on it. He wondered whether it would be reasonable to place a notation on the transcript that the student was currently under disciplinary review, and he suggested that the students should be able to choose whether they wanted the transcript annotated or withheld.

Dean Jenkinson thought that annotating a transcript may prove even more detrimental to the student. It was his belief that these investigations were dealt with expeditiously.



#### Page -7-

Dean Currie expressed concern with the proposed wording of section 1.1.1 (page 94), and the proposed relationship between the Dean of Graduate Studies and graduate students in disciplinary matters. It seemed to him that the person having the closest connection with alleged breaches for graduate students would be heads of departments, and accordingly he suggested that item #1.1.1.2 be modified to read: "Student disciplinary matters involving academic dishonesty or academic fraud of a graduate student shall be investigated by the person(s) having the closest connection with the alleged breach and, if satisfied a breach has been committed, shall be referred to the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, who shall in turn inform the budget Dean or Director prior to imposing any disciplinary action." Similarly, he suggested that item #1.2.2.3 (page 97) be amended to read: "In matters involving the academic dishonesty or academic fraud of a graduate student, the Department Head shall make his or her recommendation for discipline to the Dean of Graduate Studies".

These suggestions seemed reasonable and consistent to Dean Jenkinson, but he thought they should be referred back to the University Discipline Committee for consideration.

Dean Ruth drew attention to item 1.3 dealing with matters affecting more than one Faculty or School (page 101), and he expressed concern about Faculties being precluded from taking action.

Ms. Sawicki explained that the proposed change would preclude Faculties from taking independent action. Rather, the two Deans involved would have to come up with a common solution, to be outlined in a joint letter.

Professor Anderson referred to the long list of possible disciplinary actions on page 102, and she wondered whether there was any mechanism to allow individuals to determine standard penalties.

Dean Hrycaiko observed that he reviewed past annual reports of the University Discipline Committee in such cases.

Dean Jenkinson added it may be possible to establish a Web-site where reports were posted as they occurred.

Mr. Edwards wondered why only University College was noted in section 2.4 (page 109).

Ms. Sawicki explained that the University of Manitoba did not have the same authority over St. John's, St. Paul's or St. Andrew's College as it had over University College. That did not mean that instances of plagiarism in University of Manitoba courses, for example, would be treated differently for students who are registered as members of St. John's, St. Paul's or St. Andrew's College.

A number of Senators spoke in support of Dean Currie's suggestions.

Dean Braid thought it was inevitable that the Department Heads would be consulted within the process, and that in fact the entire procedure would not work without wide consultations. Accordingly, he suggested that there were no substantive reasons to refer the report back to the University Discipline Committee.

Professor Gabbert drew attention to sections 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 on page 95. It seemed to him that the two sections were not consistent, and he suggested that item 1.1.4 be deleted and #1.1.3 be amended to read: "Every reasonable effort shall be made to ensure that the student who is the subject of a disciplinary matter be informed as early as possible that: ...".

MOVED by Dean O'Kell, seconded by Dean Jamieson, that the report be referred back to the University Discipline Committee for further consideration.

CARRIED

Environmental Design and Interior Design Admission Bulletins: 1999		Page 120
a)	Comments of the Executive Committee	Page 121

Dr. Gardner advised that the proposal was a transitional measure.

MOVED by Dean Elliot, on behalf of the Executive Committee, that the admission guidelines as stated in the 20 December 1998 memorandum from Professor Thomsen be approved by Senate.

CARRIED

XII ADJOURNMENT

3.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

These minutes, pp. 1 to 9, together with the material handed out at the door as well as the agenda, pp. 15 to 121, distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate of 3 February 1999.

/sgp

#### Page -9-