

# SENATE MINUTES

December 5, 2001

---



UNIVERSITY  
OF MANITOBA

OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY SECRETARY

December 5, 2001

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 M Abrahams  
Ms M Alcock  
Prof D Amundson  
Prof J Anderson  
Mr S Bajaj  
Mr G Bhatt  
Dean R Bird  
Ms L Bissett  
Dean H Bjarnason  
Prof B Blakley  
Prof M Bowring  
Prof J Boyd  
Prof B Bright  
Mr N Chadha  
Prof D Chow  
Prof W Christie  
Dean D Collins  
Prof J Cooper  
Prof G Crow  
Dean F de Toro  
Dean J de Vries  
Prof B Dronzek  
Prof H Duckworth  
Mr G Dureault  
Prof M Feld  
Mr D Foster  
Prof H Friesen  
Dean D Fuchs  
Prof M Gabbert  
Dr J Gardner  
Prof S Gessler  
Prof G Giesbrecht  
Ms E Goldie  
Prof A Gole  
Prof L Graff  
Dean D Gregory  
Prof L Guse  
Ms J Henderson  
Dean B Hennen  
Warden J Hoskins  
Prof T Howorth  
Dean D Hrycaiko  
Prof E Judd  
Prof L Kaminski  
Dr J Keselman  
Mr J Kuffner

Prof B Law  
Prof J Long  
Mr N Louizos  
Prof A Louka  
Mr S Macleod  
Mr M McAdam  
Prof G McClarty  
Mr V Mattheos  
Ms Michaud-Oystryk  
Prof C Mossman  
Ms P Nicholls  
Dr W Norrie  
Mr B Nurbakhsh  
Dean R O'Kell  
Prof B Payne  
Dean A Percival  
Ms C Presser  
Prof D Punter  
Mr J Raftis  
Recteur P Ruest  
Dean D Ruth  
Dean H Sector  
Prof G Sevenhuysen  
Prof K Simons  
Prof P Singal  
Prof M Stern  
Prof B Stimpson  
Prof J Svenne  
Prof G Tabisz  
Prof A Tate  
Prof L Taylor  
Ms W Thiessen  
Prof M Thomas  
Mr K Toyne  
Prof R van Acker  
Prof J van Rees  
Prof L Wallace  
Prof E Walz  
Prof J Whiteley  
Dean J Wiens  
Prof R Wiest  
Prof J Williams  
Dean D Witty  
Prof K Wrogemann  
Mr C Yeung  
Prof A Young  
Ms M Zirk  
Ms B Sawicki,  
University Secretary  
Ms S Plett,

Recording Secretary

**Assessors Present:**

Prof B Cameron  
Mr P Dueck  
Mr J Fiorino  
Prof P Fortier  
Prof N Halden  
Prof E Haque  
Prof W Kops  
Mr J Kusie  
Mr R Levin  
Dr R Lobdell  
Mr M Niziol  
Prof K Ogden

**Regrets:**

Prof D Bose  
Dean J Gray  
Dean D Jamieson  
Dr D Jayas  
Prof D Lonis  
Prof S Ludwig  
Dr V Olender  
Prof A Secco  
Prof L Spearman  
Prof D Strong

**Absent:**

Prof A Angel  
Mr D Azuelos  
Prof P Choy  
Mr A Dixon  
Prof J Gartner  
Dr G Gerbrandt  
Mr S Gordiyenko  
Prof L Grant  
Ms L Herzog  
Prof J Irvine  
Ms C Isaak  
Ms A Jones  
Mr A Kaushal  
Prof E Kroeger  
Ms A Lawson  
Mr P Lomza  
Prof K Markstrom  
Dr D Morphy

Dr J Raymond  
Prof W Rennie  
Ms R Singh  
Mr D Smith  
Prof D Smyth  
Mr J Spark  
Rector J Stapleton  
Dr R Théberge  
Ms C Vatamaniuck  
Prof P Zahradka

**Visitors Present:**

Prof E Anderson  
Prof D Barber  
Mr D Barbour  
Prof T Baureiss  
Mr P Crocker  
Dr W Dahlgren  
Mr D Fast  
Prof M Fortier  
Prof A Gerhard  
Prof J Hanesiak  
Mr J Hay  
Prof T Henley  
Prof T Hogan  
Prof K Hunter  
Mr E Keenes  
Prof P McCormack-  
Speak  
Ms P Pachol  
Mr R Patterson  
Ms A Roberecki  
Prof G Robinson  
Dr L Smith  
Ms K Tait  
Mr V Teetaert  
Mr R Warren  
Ms M Welyki  
Mr J Yackel

**I 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.

**II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE**

**1. Report of the Senate  
Committee on Medical Qualifications:  
Dr Ian Gibson**

Page 17

Section 64 of "The Medical Act" states: "The university is...the examining body of medicine in the province, and the university may grant to any person a certificate under the academic seal of the university that the person mentioned in the certificate is, by way of medical education, a proper person to be a member of the college..."

The Senate Committee on Medical Qualifications makes recommendations to Senate on the acceptability of International Medical Graduates for registration by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba.

The Senate Committee on Medical Qualifications unanimously approved that Dr Ian Gibson be recommended to Senate for registration and licensure under Section 64 of the Act, in the areas of Adult Surgical Pathology and Adult and Pediatric Nephropathology. It is expected that once in Winnipeg, Dr Gibson will make representation to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba with the support of the Faculty of Medicine for recognition as a specialist under Section 12(2) of the regulations.

Dean Percival advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

Professor Duckworth suggested that, in future, individuals' *curricula vitae* not be included in the Senate agenda.

**It was MOVED by Dean Hennen, seconded by Dean Fuchs, THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Medical Qualifications regarding Dr Ian Gibson dated October 3, 2001.**

**CARRIED**

2. **Report of the Senate Committee  
on Curriculum and Course Changes: Part A** Page 36

The Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes met on October 9, 19, 25 and 26, 2001 to consider requests from various units for course and curriculum changes of less than 10 credit hours per department.

Professor Tate pointed out that references to the "Department of Environmental Design" should be corrected to read the "Environmental Design Program" (pages 58 and 62).

Professor Mossman pointed out that there is a problem with the pre-requisite for course **061.3XX Agribusiness Portfolio Management**, and Professor Dronzek took it under advisement. [Subsequent to the meeting, it was determined that the pre-requisite should be changed to read: "Major in Agribusiness or Accounting and Finance, and 60 credit hours, **and 018.120 and 009.110**, or permission of instructor" (change shown in bold face). In addition, the statement "Not for credit with 009.220" should be deleted.]

**It was MOVED by Professor Dronzek THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes dated October 1, 2001.**

**CARRIED**

3. **Proposed Academic Schedule for 2002-2003** Page 115

The 2002-2003 academic schedule was prepared by the Director of Student Records. It has been reviewed by each Faculty and School, the Director of Admissions and Rabbi Stern (re religious holidays).

Dean Percival advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

**It was MOVED by Professor Feld, seconded by Professor Walz, THAT Senate approve the proposed academic schedule for 2002-2003 (under cover of a memorandum from the Director of Student Records dated November 8, 2001).**

**CARRIED**

**III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards** Page 122

At the April 5, 2000 Senate meeting, the terms of reference for the Committee on Awards were changed to allow the Committee to approve and inform Senate of all

new offers and amendments of awards that meet the published guidelines for awards.

At its meeting on October 25, 2001, the Senate Committee on Awards approved six new awards, twelve award amendments, and two award withdrawals (as set out in the report of the Senate Committee on Awards dated November 6, 2001). All these award decisions comply with the published guidelines of November 3, 1999, and are reported to Senate for information.

2. **Statement of Intent:**  
**Ph.D. Program in Cancer Control** Page 130

The Faculty of Nursing and the Department of Community Health Sciences are proposing a new Ph.D. program in cancer control.

This program will provide a sequenced and structured process to produce a major shift toward evidence based nursing practice in cancer control including three domains of nursing: cancer care, palliative care, and cancer prevention.

The program will make use of existing courses and staff members, and accordingly will not need additional resources from the Council on Post-Secondary Education (COPSE).

3. **Statement of Intent:**  
**B.Sc. Minor in Ecology** Page 143

The Faculty of Science is proposing the introduction of a Minor in Ecology. There will be no change to the already existing Ecology program; the minor will simply allow students in other disciplines to indicate an area of academic focus on their transcript. It will consist of a total of 18 credit hours.

The program can be offered without additional resources from the Council on Post-Secondary Education (COPSE).

4. ***In Memoriam:***  
**Dr R Imogene McIntire** Page 147

and

5. ***In Memoriam:***  
**Mr Warren Herbert Belyea** Page 148

Professor Punter noted that the references to "Memoriam" should be corrected to read "Memorium".

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

1. Status Report Re: Task Force Report Page 149
2. President's Report December 5, 2001 Page 155

Dr Szathmáry drew attention to the commentary in her report about the *Maclean's* rankings (page 156). The University of Manitoba has been placed 15<sup>th</sup> out of 15 participating universities in the medical-doctoral category. The most heavily weighted factor is the "reputational" survey (15%), and the rankings in this category were based on a 14.3% return rate (which is much less than the 70% return that experts regard as the minimum return for validity of survey results).

The next most heavily weighted factor is the entrance average (11% weighting). The U of M placed last in this category also, though the entrance average increased last year to 80.5%. Our "low" average relative to medical-doctoral universities elsewhere reflects this institution's philosophical commitment to accessibility.

On a positive note, U of M students were tied for 11<sup>th</sup> position (with Western Ontario) in the five-year tally of the number of students (per 1000) who have won national awards. University of Manitoba professors were tied for 9<sup>th</sup> position (with Ottawa) in the five-year tally of the number of full-time professors (per 1000) who have won national awards. In terms of alumni support, the University ranked seventh over a five-year period.

V QUESTION PERIOD

The following questions were submitted by Professor Gordon Giesbrecht of the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation Studies:

"My colleagues and I were disappointed during Saturday's Vanier Cup football game to see that St Mary's University had at least 3 promotional television advertisements while the University of Manitoba did not choose to run any. Given our new capital campaign and our low *Maclean's* ranking, this was a golden opportunity to build up the University of Manitoba for a national audience that was generally interested in University affairs. My questions include:

- 1) Why did the University of Manitoba not run any promotional ads during the Vanier Cup?"

The Vice-President (External) explained that the University was given the opportunity to air 30-second clips during the Vanier Cup. Unfortunately, we had only 60-second clips available and this the station was not willing to accept. Currently the University does not have any 30-second clips, and was unable to produce them in the time available. However, such videos will be produced in order to be able to take full advantage of the next such

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

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** Page 172
2. **Report of the Senate  
Planning and Priorities Committee**

Professor Halden reported that SPPC currently has nothing on the table, although it expects to receive at least two proposals shortly.

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

1. a) **Report of the Senate Committee  
on Curriculum and Course Changes: Part B** Page 173
- b) **Report of the Senate  
Planning and Priorities Committee  
on Undergraduate Changes with  
Resource Implications or Course  
Additions Beyond Nine Credit Hours** Page 208
- c) **Report of the Senate  
Planning and Priorities Committee  
on Undergraduate Changes with  
Resource Implications or Course  
Additions Beyond Nine Credit Hours** Page 210

This part of the reports of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes and the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee deals with course change proposals for units where the net increase is more than nine credit hours, or involves significant program changes: Art (+45 credit hours), English (+15 credit hours), History (+15 credit hours), Native Studies (+18 credit hours and an Aboriginal Governance stream), Electrical and Computer Engineering (+14 credit hours), Ecology (introduction of a Minor), Genetics (introduction of an honours cooperative option), Microbiology - Chemistry Joint Program in Biochemistry (introduction of an honours cooperative option), Physics and Astronomy (+15 credit hours), and Zoology (introduction of an honours cooperative option).

Professor Halden noted that observation #8 should be deleted from the SPPC report (page 209).

Dean Percival advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

Professor Amundson provided the following statement with regard to the proposed changes in the School of Art: "The Graphic Design program revisions currently before Senate respond to the changes in the profession and in graduate education preparation standards that have occurred over the past few years as a result of the explosive effect of technology upon the field. For this revised program to accomplish what it is intended to and what it is capable of doing, replacement of full-time academic staff lost to budget cuts in 1995 is essential. Although, as SPPC has noted, the program could be implemented solely with sessional staff, assuming that the funds exist to hire sessional staff, the essential quality of the program would be severely compromised, and we would have another example of "just getting by" as a result of the failure to recognize the value of this program to the University and to the community. I, therefore, wish to inform Senate that the School of Art will delay introduction of this program until such time as we are assured that at least one full-time academic staff member will be hired in Graphic Design by the time the program is fully implemented."

Professor Dronzek noted that the deletion of the diploma program will accordingly be delayed also, as the two are coupled together.

**It was MOVED by Professor Dronzek THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes dated October 26, 2001 and the two reports of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee dated November 13, 2001.**

**CARRIED**

- |    |  |          |
|----|--|----------|
| 2. | <b>Report of the Faculty<br/>Council of Arts on a Proposal<br/>for an Arts Co-op Program</b> | Page 216 |
|    | a) <b>Report of the Senate Committee<br/>on Curriculum and Course Changes</b>                | Page 225 |
|    | b) <b>Report of the Senate<br/>Planning and Priorities Committee</b>                         | Page 227 |

The Faculty of Arts is proposing to expand its B.A. degree to include a cooperative education option. Such an option will integrate regular employment into students' academic programs, where students will work for four month terms and will be paid at market wage rates.

The Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes has endorsed the proposal. So has the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee, with the following proviso: "That the Vice-President Academic not proceed with the introduction of the program until new funds in the amount needed have been defined within the Faculty



and/or University budgets”.

Dean Percival advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was **MOVED** by Dean O’Kell, seconded by Professor Walz, **THAT** Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the proposal for an Arts co-op program (as endorsed by the report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes dated October 26, 2001 and subject to the report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee dated November 13, 2001).

**CARRIED**

**3. Report of the Senate Committee on Appeals**

Warden Hoskins reported that since last reporting to Senate, the Senate Committee on Appeals has heard six appeals.

The first of these was heard on September 6, 2001. This appeal was against the Faculty of Nursing decision to require the appellant to withdraw from Nursing under the professional unsuitability bylaw. The grounds cited were extenuating personal circumstances and undue hardship. This appeal was denied.

The second appeal, which was against Enrolment Services, was first heard on October 1, 2001. The appellant claimed that the eligibility criteria for the University of Manitoba Employees Scholarship had been inappropriately applied in this case. The Committee heard the opening statements and then moved into an *in camera* meeting, during which the following motion was made:

Notwithstanding, **THAT** this Committee is properly constituted under Policy 1301 - Senate Committee on Academic Appeals terms of reference and that the Committee members are not in a conflict of interest to hear this matter, an issue of a possible perception of an administrative bias has been raised by the appellant. The Committee therefore feels compromised in proceeding and requests the Secretary of the Senate Committee on Academic Appeals to constitute another Committee panel to hear this matter.

A newly constituted panel is scheduled for January 2002.

The third appeal was heard on October 16, 2001, and it was an appeal of a decision of the Continuing Education Division Appeals Committee with respect to an appeal of a failing final grade in a course. The grounds cited were an incomplete consideration of the appeal by the Division, a misinterpretation of key facts, use of

vague, irrelevant and unjustified arguments and bias on the part of the Division. This appeal was denied.

The fourth appeal was also heard on October 16, 2001. This appeal was against a decision of the Faculty of Science not to grant a retroactive authorized withdrawal from a course taken in the 1996-97 regular session. The grounds cited were compassionate and undue hardship. This appeal was denied.

The fifth appeal was heard on November 13, 2001, and was an appeal of a decision of the Faculty of Arts not to grant retroactive authorized withdrawals in courses taken in the 1993 regular session. The grounds cited were compassionate. This appeal was denied.

The sixth appeal was heard on November 20, 2001 and it was an appeal of a decision of the Faculty of Engineering not to grant retroactive authorized withdrawals in courses taken during the 2001 regular session. Compassionate grounds were cited. The Senate Committee on Appeals received additional supporting information that had not been presented to the Faculty Committee. This appeal was sustained.

X     **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

1.     **Report of the *ad hoc* committee  
to Consider Issues  
Relating to the Academic Schedule**

Page 229

At the Senate Executive Committee meeting of February 21, 2001, an *ad hoc* committee was established to consider a number of issues with regard to the academic schedule, including the following:

- ▶     should the study week in February be discontinued, and the Christmas break be extended by a week, or the spring term be ended a week earlier;
- ▶     should a trimester system be reconsidered;
- ▶     resuming lectures on a Thursday is not logical: should this be coordinated with the public school system; and
- ▶     regarding the use of study week: there is a problem with being able to schedule enough teaching days to meet accreditation requirements.

The *ad hoc* committee is now recommending that:

- 1)     the study week remain as it stands;
- 2)     January 3<sup>rd</sup> be the established start date for second term, unless it falls on a Thursday or Friday; and
- 3)     a trimester system not be implemented at this time.

Dean Percival advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

**It was MOVED by Professor Cooper, seconded by Professor Tabisz, THAT Senate approve the report of the ad hoc committee to consider issues relating to the academic schedule dated October 24, 2001.**

**CARRIED**

- |    |    |  |          |
|----|----|--|----------|
| 2. | a) | <b><u>Proposal for a Faculty of Earth, Environment and Resource Sciences</u></b> | Page 234 |
|    | b) | <b><u>Proposal for a School of Environmental Studies</u></b>                     | Page 252 |
|    | c) | <b><u>Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee</u></b>             | Page 283 |

The Senate Executive Committee, at its September 19, 2001 meeting, considered proposals for a Faculty and a School. The Committee did not discuss the academic merits of the two proposals at that time, but rather the process by which they should be handled. It was agreed that both proposals should be submitted to the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee for consideration.

The following additional items were identified for SPPC's consideration:

- "1) SPPC may wish to meet with proponents of both proposals, in order to gain information from a wide cross-section of the University community;
- 2) SPPC may want to request additional background information from the proponents;
- 3) it would be helpful if SPPC were to provide a compendium, without prejudice, of the issues in which the two approaches differ;
- 4) the two proposals cannot be considered as stand alone proposals at Senate; and
- 5) in the interest of resolving this in a timely manner, the Executive Committee requests that SPPC provide a response as soon as is possible."

The Planning and Priorities Committee provided its response. Its recommendation is for "the formation of a new Faculty to be responsible for teaching, research and service in the broad areas of the earth, the environment, sustainable development and resources".

At its meeting on November 21<sup>st</sup>, the Senate Executive Committee decided to forward all 3 proposals to Senate without any endorsement. The following motion was approved by the Executive Committee: "That Senate Executive send to Senate without comment the FEERS proposal, the School proposal, and the report of the

Senate Planning and Priorities Committee”.

The University Secretary asked the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures (SCRIP) to recommend a process to deal with the three proposals in relation to the creation of a new Faculty or School at the December 5, 2001 Senate meeting.

**It was MOVED by Dean Sexter, seconded by Dean de Toro, THAT Senate move into “As if in Committee of the Whole” and that the following process be adopted:**

1. **that the time limit for the discussion will be one hour;**
2. **that no motions will be made until the suggested time limit has expired or discussion has ceased, except for the following:**
  - (a) **to “Rise and Report” (as it cannot adjourn), and**
  - (b) **to appeal a ruling from the Chair;**
3. **that a proponent for each of the three proposals be given ten (10) minutes to speak to their proposal;**
4. **each member interested in participating in the discussion would then be given three (3) minutes to speak;**
5. **at the end of the hour, “As if in Committee of the Whole” will rise and report to Senate.**

**CARRIED**

Senate then moved into “As if in Committee of the Whole”.

With regard to the proposal for a Faculty of Earth, Environment and Resource Sciences, Dr Gardner stated that the objectives are: “to provide visibility to education, research and service activities in the environmental area such that the university is regarded as a center of excellence and achievement; to provide well-articulated degree programs in the area to undergraduate and graduate students; to enhance the opportunities for individual and group research and scholarship which is attentive and sensitive to emerging knowledge and global environmental issues; to respond to the critical research needs of communities and societies at large; and, to use the University’s increasingly limited resources more effectively and efficiently in doing this.” The proposal is a very serious attempt to position the University in this millenium as a significant force through its mandate for education, research and scholarship and service in addressing very serious challenges of environmental stewardship and sustainability at the local through global scales. Dr

Gardner drew attention to the eleven expected outcomes listed on page 247, and concluded by stating that the University has no option but to act, and it cannot maintain the *status quo*. Further, Dr Gardner noted that he favours the SPPC recommendation to create a new faculty over his own proposal.

With regard to the proposal for a School of Environmental Studies, Professor Hunter explained that the Environmental Science Program was established in the Faculty of Science roughly a decade ago, and its first graduating class was in 1993-94. There were 66 students enrolled in the program that year, with 4 graduates, minimum support and teaching staff, and no courses of any kind. Since then it has developed and expanded in the number of teaching and support staff members, with 17 courses being offered under the 128 department number. The total number of undergraduate student credit hours is just under 2800, and to date there have been 277 graduates. In this past year, researchers have obtained \$632,000 in operating and small equipment grants, and another \$630,000 in CFI funding. At present there are 18 graduate students in the program. Thus, it is a very successful and rapidly growing program. Professor Hunter noted that if the School proposal is approved, it will develop graduate programs that are truly interdisciplinary at the Master's and PhD levels, perhaps initially offered under the interdisciplinary graduate degree program. These can be offered by the current faculty of the Environmental Science Program. It will also allow for the continuation of the already existing undergraduate program. Most fundamentally, however, the proposal for the School truly incorporates the establishment of an environmental studies program in the Faculty of Arts. The establishment of the School of the Environment would place the University of Manitoba at the leading edge of the current movement across Canada to link interdisciplinary environmental education into a single administrative unit.

With regard to the report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee, Professor Svenne indicated that the Senate Executive Committee asked the SPPC to consider the proposals for a Faculty and a School. SPPC recognizes that the University of Manitoba needs to have a structure which will coordinate all activities in the area of the environment, resources of the earth and sustainable development, will minimize overlap between courses and programs, and will minimize competition for attracting students. Most importantly, it will achieve greater visibility for the University of Manitoba in this area, and will allow the institution to compete with programs at other universities and to relate to government and the private sector. SPPC believes that a Faculty makes more sense, because a Faculty is a budget unit, because it has financial and academic control over its courses and programs, and because a Faculty has greater visibility outside the University. In addition, a Faculty offers a greater and clearer direction for students interested in pursuing studies in the environmental area. SPPC believes that if the Faculty is to have the word "environment" in its title, and if it is to have at least some responsibility for undergraduate and graduate studies of environment, resources, and sustainable development, then it must have an undergraduate program in environmental science and a program in environmental studies. Professor Svenne noted that

SPPC's three recommendations are for the creation of a new Faculty, that appropriate resources be made available to establish the Faculty, and that provision be made for space requirements and consolidation.

Dean Hennen spoke in favour of the SPPC report. As Dean of a Faculty which incorporates within it a School, he believes that what is needed is a Faculty without a mid-management structure.

Professor Duckworth spoke in favour of the School proposal. The current Environmental Science Program is functioning very well, and should not be removed from the Faculty of Science. The Environmental Science Program is the result of genuine academic vision, and its staff is unwilling to join a new Faculty. The SPPC proposal is not attractive to staff in the Environmental Science Program. It is his belief that the proposal for a School is the only acceptable proposal before Senate.

Professor Giesbrecht spoke in favour of the SPPC proposal. He thinks it important that three of the four units involved, namely Geography, Geological Sciences, and the Natural Sciences Institute, are in favour of a new Faculty.

Dean de Toro spoke in favour of the SPPC report. He believes it is time that Senate acts on this. A new Faculty will streamline the curriculum, will retain students who now go elsewhere, and will put the University of Manitoba on the map of environmental studies in Canada.

Dean Ruth suggested that Senate not vote today. He thought that the model which should be followed is that of University 1, and an implementation committee should be established. The single thing missing from all three proposals is a curriculum.

Dr Haque noted that we are behind as a university and as a province in this area. Speaking as the Director of the Natural Resources Institute, he indicated that we have different programs and departments at this time, which are isolated and not efficient. The Natural Resources Institute is an interdisciplinary unit as it stands. The SPPC recommendation has vision, and he supports its proposal. This is a proposal about restructuring: there will be some pain involved, but also gain. It is time to move on.

Dr Keselman supported the SPPC report. The vision of her Research Office is to be a leader on the research front, and the SPPC proposal will move the University forward in that regard. It will help us recruit and retain outstanding faculty and students. She pointed out that the SPPC report has the support of three of the four units most affected. It will provide a better environment to support research, it will address space challenges and it will position us for CFI awards.

Mr Toyne spoke in favour of the SPPC report. The students are strongly supportive of a new Faculty, and he hopes Senate abides by the wishes of the students.

Professor Anderson supported the SPPC report. Change is inevitable, the Faculty proposal is structurally sound, and it has greater potential for scholarly growth.

Dean O'Kell said that he understands the reasons behind both proposals, but he asked why Senate would push for the creation of a Faculty which will not work, when staff members do not wish to be transferred.

Mr Kusie stated that the student Senate caucus, at its meeting on Monday evening, supported the SPPC proposal.

Ms Henderson, speaking as a student in the Natural Resources Institute, indicated that students have been meeting to discuss both the Faculty and School proposals. They support the SPPC report, and she urged Senate to act today on this matter.

Dr Szathmáry noted that the hour originally scheduled for this debate is now over. Senate then agreed to an extension of an additional half-hour in "As if in Committee of the Whole" to allow the remaining speakers to speak.

Dean Bird believed there should be a Faculty dedicated to environmental issues, which will give students and researchers greater visibility and credibility. At present the University has many units with similar names, which is confusing.

Professor Gabbert opposed the SPPC report, as it is not robustly interdisciplinary. We must encourage interdisciplinarity, and a new Faculty will not do that. In addition, the question of resources has not been addressed.

Professor Taylor agreed that a curriculum is missing from the discussion. The structure will not matter if the curriculum is not there.

Dean de Vries spoke in support of SPPC. He is also Dean of a Faculty which incorporates a School, and he believes that creates problems. Schools within Faculties do not control their own budgets, and students tend to lose identity. He urged Senate not to create another level of reporting structure.

Dean Fuchs reminded Senate that Social Work used to be a School, before it became a Faculty, and he echoed the comments against having a School within a Faculty. He supports the creation of a new Faculty, as it will provide focus for new research, and consolidate programs which are now fragmented.

Professor Kristina Hunter spoke as a faculty member of the Environmental Science Program. The program's graduates are doing well in a number of areas and backgrounds. There is a need for overlap and integration within many units, and she supports the changes which are ongoing in the Environmental Science Program.

Professor David Barber spoke as Head of the Department of Geography. The department's curriculum is 90% made up of environmental courses. His concern

with the creation of a School is that it will create an environmental studies program and an environmental science program; there already is too much overlap. He believes they can focus much more clearly under a common Dean, and the Department supports the proposal of SPPC. He encouraged Senate to act today on this matter.

Mr Peter Crocker spoke as Co-Chair of the Environmental Science Student Council. The Environmental Science students support the proposal for a School, as they fear that creation of a Faculty will place the program in a dangerous situation, leading to the loss of staff and the end of the program.

Professor Halden spoke as Head of the Department of Geological Sciences in favour of the SPPC proposal. The impact of people on the environment is considerable, and we are consuming resources. A careful approach is essential to the future.

As the time extension was up, the "As if in Committee of the Whole" arose, and Senate moved back into regular session. The Chair summarized the gist of the presentations on the three proposals, as well as the speakers' comments.

**It was MOVED by Professor Svenne THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee on proposals for a Faculty of Earth, Environment and Resource Sciences, and an Interdisciplinary School of the Environment dated November 13, 2001.**

Professor Feld indicated that proponents of the School proposal should be given opportunity to make a substitute motion. There being no such motion made, Professor Svenne's motion was **CARRIED, 55-17.**

3. **Proposal to Establish a  
Chair in Business Leadership**

Page 292

Section 2.1 of policy 428 on "Chairs and Professorships" outlines the steps to be followed in the establishment of Chairs or Professorships. In accordance with that policy, the Asper School of Business is recommending the establishment of a Chair in Business Leadership.

The purpose of the proposed Chair is to assist the School in attracting and retaining Deans with outstanding academic and leadership skills by providing a mechanism that will assist future Deans in aggressively pursuing the School's strategic goals. The Chair will be funded through a combination of endowment funds and annual gifts.

Dean Percival advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.



**It was MOVED by Dean Hogan, seconded by Dean de Toro, THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors the proposal to establish a Chair in Business Leadership.**

**CARRIED**

**XI     ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

These minutes, pp 1 to 18, together with the material handed out at the door as well as the agenda, pp 17 to 294, distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on December 5, 2001.

/sgp

S:\University Secretariat\MINUTES - BOG & SENATE\Senate\5December01.wpd