

December 7, 2005

Minutes of a Meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Room E3-262 Engineering Building

Members Present

Dr. E.J.E. Szathmáry,
Chair
Prof. S. Abeyssekera
Mr. K. Adane
Prof. W. Akinremi
Prof. J. Anderson
Ms. A. Aziz
Prof. R. Baydack
Prof. T. G. Berry
Prof. M. Birouk
Prof. C. Blais
Prof. T. Booth
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Dean. D. Care
Prof. K. Clare
Dean D. Collins
Prof. L. Connor
Prof. K. Coombs
Prof. J. Cooper
Dean J. de Vries
Dean J. Doering
Prof. B. Dronzek
Ms. A. Ducas
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Ms. H. Fernandes
Prof. M. Gabbert
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. G. Geller
Prof. J. Ghomeshi
Mr. D. Gordon
Dr. K. Grant
Ms. B. Hamilton
Dr. J. Hoskins
Prof. P. Hultin
Prof. T. Ivanco
Mr. G. Jawanda
Dr. R. Kerr
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. P. King
Prof. S. Kirby
Prof. G. Krause

Ms. M. Kuzmeniuk
Mr. N. Lesage
Dr. R. Lobdell
Prof. J. Long
Prof. K. MacKay
Prof. R. Mazurat
Ms. D. McCallum
Prof. M. McKay
Prof. S. McLachlan
Prof. A. McNicol
Ms. A. Meisner
Mr. A. Moreau
Dr. D. Morphy
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. J. Page
Prof. S. Pistorius
Ms. C. Presser
Dean D. Ruth
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Dean R. Sigurdson
Prof. P. Singal
Prof. D. Smyth
Rector J. Stapleton
Ms. C. Steer
Mr. H. Su
Prof. T. Sullivan
Prof. C. Taylor
Dean M. Trevan
Prof. C. Trott
Prof. J. Van Rees
Prof. L. Wallace
Ms. C. Wallcraft
Dean M. Whitmore
Dean D. Witty
Prof. K. Wrogemann
Mr. H. Xu
Mr. C. Yeung
Prof. A. Young
Prof. P. Zahradka
Mr. R. Zegalski
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Ms. N. Schneider,

Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. P. Dueck
Ms. M. Gallant
Prof. N. Hunter
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Mr. N. Marnoch
Ms. C. Van De Kerckhove

Regrets

Prof. T. Anna
Prof. U. Annakkage
Dr. P. Cattini
Ms. S. Cheung
Ms. A. Dufour
Prof. E. Epp
Dean G. Feltham
Ms. E. Goldie
Dean D. Hrycaiko
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. L. Kirshenbaum
Mr. G. Kler
Prof. C. Kristjanson
Prof. B. Law
Mr. B. Miller
Dean R. Mullaly
Prof. P. Nickerson
Dr. W. Norrie
Dean A. Percival
Prof. S. Prentice
Mr. S. Reddy
Mr. T. Sargeant
Dean H. Secter
Mr. D. Smith
Prof. S. Taylor-Henley
Prof. G. Thompson
Prof. J. Welsh
Dean J. Wiens

Absent

Ms. A. Atkinson
Prof. M. Brabston
Ms. H. Brownlee
Ms. J. Bunn
Dean I. Diallo
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. C. Eyland
Ms. B. Famuyide
Prof. E. Forget
Dr. G. Gerbrandt
Prof. Y. Gong
Prof. G. Hatch
Prof. P. Hawranik
Mr. L. Hildebrand
Prof. J. Irvine
Dean L. King
Ms. C. Leach
Ms. M. Maharaj
Prof. S. Mai
Prof. K. Matheos
Prof. J. Nagy
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dr. C. Rabinovitch
Dr. J. Raymond
Ms. L. Robson
Dean D. Sandham
Ms. C. Schultz
Prof. M. Vrontakis
Ms. M. Wayne
Mr. S. Zamick

Also Present

Mr. D. Barbour
Dr. R. Currie
Mr. S. Dorge
Ms. R. Gotthilf
Mrs. J. Gripp
Mr. J. Miller
Ms. L. Paturel
Prof. E. Reddy
Ms. I. Tougas

Dr. Szathmáry advised Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive was Professor Peter King.

Senate agreed to deal with item IX 6, as Dean Emeritus Raymond Currie was present to speak to the item.

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

**6. Proposal of the Joint Senates Committee on Masters
Programs for the modification of the Joint Masters
Programs General Regulations**

Page 211

Changes are being proposed in order to streamline and simplify the regulations and to avoid repetition of procedures that are already in place and covered by other regulations. This Committee was chaired by Dean Emeritus Raymond Currie. The proposed changes have been approved by the Senate of the University of Winnipeg.

Dr. Currie stated that Senate had received the proposal as well as the rationale. He highlighted two significant changes: the first is that the approval procedures for new programs have been incorporated into the document. The committee debated whether it should be pro-active and seek out submissions for new programs or just receive submissions. The decision was to receive submissions and respond to them. The second change is to the size and composition of the Joint Senates Committee. Alternate members of the committee were to be removed. The Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of Manitoba and the Vice-President (Research, Graduate Studies and International) at the University of Winnipeg would become voting members of the Committee. The manner of choosing graduate students on the committee would be changed to reflect the actual procedures in place.

Dr. Currie noted that all recommendations were unanimously approved by the Committee, and have been approved by the University of Winnipeg's Senate.

In response to a question asked regarding section four of the report (approval procedures for new Joint Master's Program proposals), Dr. Lobdell responded that the procedure for approval of new programs has not changed. The procedures are set out by the Council on Post-Secondary Education.

Ms. Gallant expressed a concern regarding changing section 6.1, Size of Composition of JSC. Currently two students are proposed by the Graduate Students' Association. This change will see only one student being proposed by the Graduate Students' Association.

In response, Dr. Currie noted that that particular section had been handled by Dr. Grace at the University of Winnipeg. It was his understanding that the graduate student appointment procedure had been reviewed. Dr. Currie noted that it has been very difficult getting students to attend meetings and often students are

not appointed to the committee.

Dr. Dronzek asked for confirmation that the committee structure is moving from three to four representatives from each university. Three members appointed in the regular way, one member as a result of the position they hold on campus, and the alternate members would no longer be part of the committee. Dr. Currie confirmed this was correct.

Kofi Adane proposed an amendment, having section 6.1 point 3 and 4 of the report removed and reverts back to the current model of student representation on the Committee.

It was MOVED by Mr. Adane, seconded by Ms. Aziz THAT the current proposal section 6.1, point 4 be amended to: “one graduate student, enrolled in the Joint Masters Program, to be selected by the Graduate Students’ Association of the University of Manitoba and approved by the University of Winnipeg.”

DEFEATED

Dean Whitmore asked if the University of Winnipeg had a Graduate Students’ Association, and was informed that they do not. He further asked if the concern regarding the proposal is related to input from the Graduate Student Association or to the University of Winnipeg’s decision.

Mr. Adane replied that the current proposal has the chairs of departments selecting the student representatives, not the students themselves. Therefore student’s interests may not be heard.

A comment was made regarding the appropriateness of chairs choosing student representation rather than students choosing their representatives.

Ms. Aziz pointed out that the motion is not proposing a change, but is proposing keeping the process as it currently is. The University of Winnipeg students would be adequately represented.

Professor Anderson commented that she is sensitive to the fact that the University of Manitoba Senate is directing the University of Winnipeg Senate to change their mind and sensitive to the Graduate Students’ Association to want to represent both bodies (University of Winnipeg and University of Manitoba students). She suggested that perhaps it would be best to table the item and request clarification from the students.

Dr. Currie responded. He understood the intent of the change is for students from both institutions to have a voice on the committee. Representation of students over the past four years has been difficult, as appointments are not

always made by the Graduate Students' Association. The best effort was made to ensure student representation by the past chair of the three programs (some chairs are from the University of Manitoba and some are from the University of Winnipeg). Dr. Currie reiterated that this proposal was reviewed by the Dean of Graduate Studies and passed by the University of Winnipeg's Senate. The focus was to have balance between the two universities on the Committee

Ms. Gallant raised the point that the University of Winnipeg does not have a Graduate Students' Association. Students registered in the Joint Master Programs are members of the University of Manitoba's Graduate Student Association. Furthermore, she has not seen any record of consultation with the Association by the Joint Senates Committee.

Dr. Currie noted the Committee has been working on this proposal during 2004 through to 2005. The Committee had four meetings during this time. The intent of the changes is to ensure that there is representation from both universities.

Professor Gabbert noted that students registered in the joint masters programs do not necessarily identify with either university. He agreed it would be best to table the proposal and do some more consultation.

It was MOVED by Professor Gabbert, seconded by Professor Owens, THAT this proposal be postponed until consultation with students takes place.

A question was asked regarding how the University of Winnipeg selects a graduate student if there is no Graduate Student Association? Professor Gabbert replied it is the students in the program who select their representative, not the Universities of Manitoba or Winnipeg.

Ms. Aziz added that it is not clear in the proposal that the student must be a University of Winnipeg student. She supports a postponement of the issue.

Professor Gabbert stated that if the intent is to have representation from both universities that needs to be stated. In the current proposal that is not clear.

Professor Etcheverry commented that the intent of the proposal is they both university senates have the opportunity to approve the student representatives.

Professor Anderson noted the lead sentence of point six supports the understanding that each university has equal responsibility.

Professor Cooper stated that there is a dilemma on who can make representation to Senate at the University of Manitoba and to the University of Winnipeg. The University of Manitoba Nomination Committee can forward to the University of Manitoba Senate. The University of Manitoba Graduate Students' Association has no legal way to nominate a student to the University of Winnipeg

nominating committee and their Senate. The interfacing is done by the chairs of the Joint Masters Program.

Professor Gabbert's motion was then **DEFEATED.**

Professor King advised that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was MOVED by Dr. Raymond Currie, on behalf of the Committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Joint Senates Committee on Masters Programs for the modification of the Joint Masters Programs General Regulations [dated September, 2005].

CARRIED

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION

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 Curriculum and Course Changes - Part A Page 17

The Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes met on several occasions in the months of October and November, 2005 to consider requests from various units for course and curriculum changes with a net change of less than 10 credit hours per department.

In speaking to the report, Professor Dronzek, Chair of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes highlighted observation two on page 17 which comments on the report using both the old and new course numbers. The 2006-2007 calendar will report all courses in the new numbering system.

Professor Dronzek noted on page 68 of the report, in the courses to be modified in 2008/09 it reads "not to be held with the former 049.216" and it should say "049.217".

Professor Dronzek commented that with a report of this size there is likely to be the occasional error. He would appreciate people bringing the errors to his attention after Senate and an addendum to the minutes will be prepared for the next Senate meeting.

It was MOVED by Professor Dronzek, on behalf of the Committee, THAT

Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes dated November 24, 2005.

CARRIED

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

2. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards Page 88

At its meeting on November 3, 2005, the Senate Committee on Awards approved 5 new awards, 9 award amendments, and 2 award withdrawals [as set out in the report of the Senate Committee on Awards dated November 5, 2005]. All these award decisions comply with the published guidelines of November 3, 1999, and are reported to Senate for information.

3. In Memoriam Professor Edmund Berry Page 95

Dean Sigurdson spoke in tribute to Professor Edmund Berry, noting that Professor Berry had a good sense of humour and gracious behaviour with both students and colleagues. In addition, he was an outstanding scholar.

4. In Memoriam Distinguished Professor Paul A. Fortier Page 96

Dean Sigurdson spoke in tribute to Professor Fortier, noting that many Senators knew him well and that he left us far too early. Professor Fortier lived the life he was given and threw himself into the life at university, in all aspects. He was a Distinguished Professor and a champion of a liberal arts education and humanities in particular. Professor Fortier was a champion of the rights of faculty members. He was always ready to stand-up for what he thought was right and willing to challenge ideas.

5. In Memoriam Professor Richard Wesley McAmmond Page 97

Professor Long spoke in tribute to Professor McAmmond, noting he came to the University after being an instructor at the Manitoba Teachers College.

6. In Memoriam Dean Marlene Reimer Page 98

Dean Care spoke in tribute to Dean Reimer, noting she joined the Faculty July 1, 2005 and passed away November 1, 2005. She was only with the University for a short time. She was a graduate of the University of Manitoba, with her career based in Calgary where she was an active researcher. She had returned home to Manitoba to take on the position of Dean in the Faculty of Nursing, and will be sorely missed.

7. In Memoriam Professor Donald Bruce Sealey Page 99

Professor Long spoke in tribute to Professor Sealey, noting that Professor Sealey was the founder of the cross-cultural courses in education and that he developed in the Master's of Education program.

8. **Correspondence from COPSE re: B.Sc. in Health Sciences and B.A. in Health Studies** **Page 100**

The Council on Post-Secondary Education (COPSE) has approved the statements of intent for the B.Sc. in Health Sciences and the B.A. in Health Studies and authorized the development of full program proposals.

9. **Correspondence from Council on Post-Secondary Education re: B.Sc. (Gen) in Geological Sciences** **Page 101**

The Council on Post-Secondary Education (COPSE) has approved the statement of intent for the B.Sc. (Gen) in Geological Sciences and authorizes the development of a full program proposal.

10. **Correspondence from Council on Post-Secondary Education re: Master of Physical Therapy** **Page 102**

The Council on Post-Secondary Education (COPSE) has reviewed the statement of intent for the Master of Physical Therapy. The Council is deferring a decision on the Statement of Intent until the Coordinating Committee for Entry to Practice Credential Change (CCETPC) has completed its assessment of a similar program request from Dalhousie University. A decision should be made by February, 2006.

11. **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research** **Page 103**

The Dean of Medicine recommended the establishment of the Community Acquired Infections Research Group. The proposal was reviewed by SCUR and approved by the Vice-President (Research) pursuant to Policy 1405, Research Centres, Institutes and Groups.

12. **Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom Re: language of clauses regarding academic freedom In donor contracts** **Page 110**

On December 1, 2004 Senate approved a motion that directed the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom to consider the language respecting clauses regarding academic freedom in agreements with university benefactors and report its findings to Senate.

In response to a question, Dr. Szathmáry responded that she is still reflecting on point 7 of the report.

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

- a) **President's Report December 7, 2005** **Page 112**
- b) **Annual Progress Report: Building for a Bright Future
a Strategic Academic Plan for the University of Manitoba** **Page 134**

The President noted that the report is organized in two sections. The first section deals with general, academic, research, administrative and external matters. The second section starts on page 127 and contains a list of external engagements.

The University recently received two Synergy Awards which to date makes a total of eight synergy awards for the University. The University is tied with British Columbia for first place in Canada for the number of awards received. It was also noted that Wilbur Smith Distinguished Transportation Education Award from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) was awarded to Professor Alan Clayton, Civil Engineering. This is the first time this award has been given to a Canadian.

Professor Van Rees noted that the enrolment currently sits at 28,000, but the *Building for a Bright Future* states the optimal enrolment figure is 26,000 students, and asked if the discrepancy could be explained?

In response, Dr. Szathmáry noted that the university ought not to wait for students, but needs to have an appropriate manageable number of students to provide income to remain solvent. The 26,000 students is that solvency number.

Dr. Kerr added that in 1992 enrolment was 26,000 and had declined. Recently enrolment had grown and the university wants to stabilize that number. Thus a target of 26,000 was established as the optimal enrolment figure.

Dr. Kerr, Vice-President (Academic) and Provost reported that interim deans will carry through till June 2007 while a search goes on for the Faculties of Music and Nursing. Currently, Dr. Juliette (Archie) Cooper is the Interim Dean for Music. He noted that when Dr. Cooper was introduced to the faculty and students, she was greeted with warmly.

Dean Care is the Acting Dean of Nursing until the end of December. At that time, it is hoped there will be an interim dean named until June 2007.

In January, Dean Collins of Pharmacy will be taking an administrative leave, and

Dr. Cheryl Zelenitsky will be Acting Dean.

Dr. Keselman, Vice-President (Research) reported that there have been additional Canada Research Chairs provided to the University bringing the total to 36. These include:

- Dr. Grant Hatch, Health – Molecular Cardiolipin Metabolism - Tier I
- Dr. Dean McNeill, Natural Sciences and Engineering – Information Processing for Intelligent Infrastructure - Tier II
- Dr. Mostafa Fayek, Natural Sciences and Engineering – Isotope and Environmental Geochemistry - Tier II

Dr. Keselman also noted that five Canada Research Chairs have been renewed for five more years. These include:

- Dr. Brian Cox
- Dr. Geoffrey Hicks
- Dr. Larry Hryshko
- Dr. Lorrie Kirshenbaum
- Dr. Hélène Perreault

Dr. Szathmáry highlighted pages 113-144 of her report, noting it dealt with the MacLeans review. She read a brief article on research that did a comparative analysis of ratings and graded ratings systems. MacLeans was rated the very worst of those reviews analyzed. This article can be found at Dill, D. D. and Soo, M. (2005) Academic Quality, League Tables, and Public Policy: A Cross-National Analysis of University Ranking Systems. Higher Education, 49(4): 495-533.

V QUESTION PERIOD

The Chair reminded Senate of the regulations governing question period.

- It is the Chair's responsibility to determine if the question is relevant to Senate.
- Questions are to only be asked by Senators.
- Question period is to be 15 minutes in length. To go longer than that requires a two-thirds majority vote by Senate.

Four questions had been received, but only one was from a Senator. The Chair will answer all the questions this time, but will not in the future.

The first question has five parts and was received from Kofi Adane, Student Senator:

The first part of the question is: "With the creation of a committee to look at the restructuring of Graduate student fees, and with the limited access to information I would

like to hear about any information that the University has with respect to this proposed grad fee restructuring.”

Dr. Kerr responded that the question misconstrues his approach to matters. His process is to consult with the people in his office before considering what to do. One issue surrounding the graduate student fees is related to graduate programs and the lack of flexibility to offer off-campus programs, due to program fees. He asked people in his office to examine what other universities do.

Part two of the question: “I would also like to know why students were being kept in the dark with respect to this very important issue.”

Dr. Kerr responded that the working group met to discuss what was found, before going on. At this point, a request for student participation was made.

Part three of the question: “I would also like to receive input or feedback from professors about these proposed changes.” And part four, “ Do the professors know what is going on and what is being proposed?”

Dr. Kerr responded that if as a result of the groups discussion, action is needed, then the information will be vetted through the appropriate Committee.

Part five of the question: “What academic impacts would they foresee, by having grad students pay for courses by the credit hour instead of a program fee and continuing fee? “

Dr. Kerr responded that at this time there are various options under discussion. He indicated he can not comment as it is only in the discussion stage, and no recommendation has been made to him.

The following question was received from Cathy Van De Kerckhove, Senate Assessor:

“What are the plans for the review of the Board of Governors Bylaw #26 - the Patents and Copyright Bylaw, which appears to be outdated and is meant for old teaching and lab videos, but has been used by the University to attempt to block the release of the “Seeds of Change” video?”

Dr. Szathmáry, Chair of Senate noted that this is a Board of Governors Bylaws and is not Senate jurisdiction. However, she did ask Mrs. McCallum if she wanted to comment.

Mrs. McCallum responded that there is a process for reviewing bylaws. This bylaw has been the subject of bargaining with UMFA. A joint committee was struck and chaired by Dr. Bruce MacDonald in 1998 and by Dr. Raymond Currie in 2001. Neither joint committee was successful in advancing a recommendation that was acceptable to both parties.

The following question was received from Meghan Gallant, Senate Assessor:

“Are there any plans at this time or in the future to have some sort of independent or even internal inquiry into what actually happened with respect to the release of this publicly-funded research project?”

The Chair responded stating that the question alleges that public funding was for the production of a video. In fact that is not the case. The research was funded; the production of a video was a commercial component that was at the heart of the discussion. Currently the professor involved has a grievance underway. Until it is concluded it is inappropriate to comment.

The following question was received from Cathy Van De Kerckhove, Senate Assessor:

The first part of the question: “I would like to know if all contracts that the University signs with the private sector (that may be research related or not) are available to the Senate?”

The Chair, in response noted that there are thousands of contracts signed and not all are relevant to this body.

The second part of the question: “If they are not available, then what is the assurance that there are no academic implications in having an increased private sector presence on campus and that pressure from industry will not influence the curriculum, the direction and results of research projects, and/or faculty hirings?”

In response, the Chair noted that the most straight forward reply is that common sense will prevail. She asked Dr. Kerr to address the risk of influence on the curriculum, and faculty hiring. Dr. Kerr noted that issues of curriculum come to Senate for debate and approval and the University’s contract with UMFA governs the faculty appointment process.

Dr. Keselman added that in terms of research she had answered this question in 1999. It was answered by detailing, for Senators, the principles that guide the University in negotiating all research contracts, principles that are, in fact, designed to ensure the University’s academic integrity. The design and direction of the research project rests with the University, through its faculty, and must be free to state the University retains the right, through its faculty and students, to present or fully publish the results of research arising under research contracts, in other words, it will not engage in secret research. The progress of a graduate student who participates in contract research must not be impeded. Normally, the University retains ownership of all intellectual property (IP) arising from the result, such IP to be handled in accordance with University policy. Dr. Keselman believes that there is a rigorous process of research contract review that provides the assurance being sought through this question. Dr. Keselman noted that Senators may be interested to know what fraction of the University’s current research funding comes from the private sector. In 2004-2005, of the \$91.9-million received in external research support, less than \$2.8-million (3.1%) of this came from industry. It is also important to note that, of the 3.1% not all of these funds came in the

3 new applications that appear to be discriminatory under policy number 419 on Non-Acceptance of Discriminatory Scholarships, Bursaries, or Fellowships. The Committee received letters of support for the Enterprise Rent-A-Car Foundation Scholarship from Dr. Glenn Feltham, Dean of the I.H. Asper School of Business and from Ms. Kali Storm, Director of the Aboriginal Student Centre. For the Farm Credit Canada Scholarship, letters of support were received from Dr. Michael Trevan, Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, from Dr. Glenn Feltham, Dean of the I.H. Asper School of Business and from Ms. Kali Storm, Director of the Aboriginal Student Centre. Finally, for the Winston Samlalsingh Scholarship, letters of support were received from Mr. Peter Dueck, Executive Director of Enrolment Services and Ms. Kali Storm, Director of the Aboriginal Student Centre.

A question was asked regarding why these awards must be deliberated. Is it because of cultural criteria?

Mr. Dueck responded that Senate had previously approved that any awards appearing discriminatory in nature should come to Senate for approval, otherwise the committee approves the awards and they come to Senate for information.

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was MOVED by Professor Baydack, on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards PART B [dated November 3, 2005].

CARRIED

2. Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions

- a) re: Proposal from the Admissions Office (Enrolment Services) and University 1 to amend the General Entrance Requirements of the University and the Specific Subject Requirements of University 1**

Page 183

Changes to Manitoba high school course numbering systems, curricula and graduation requirements have changed significantly over the past years and this is not reflected in either the General or Subject requirements of the University's admission requirements. Current requirements are complex making interpretation difficult for students and counsellors. The proposed changes would enable recruiters and potential students to focus more on the strengths, services, supports, and academic programs offered by the University. The changes would also align the entrance requirements of the University of Manitoba with

the majority of similar-sized universities across the country.

Dean Whitmore spoke to the proposal, noting that most of the points have been made before, but the Faculty of Science would like to put all of them before Senate.

He noted that the Faculty of Science, its departments and senators, including the ones from the biological sciences, have considered this proposal at length and come to a common position. The Faculty is speaking with one voice on this.

Dean Whitmore observed that the Faculty has supported a number of changes in the past year with regards to entry. In particular, a mechanism for including AP and IB grades, and the changes originally described as “conditional entry”, although they worked hard to try to get some modifications included.

With regards to these changes now, the Faculty fully supports the idea of simplifying the entry requirements, and bringing them into line with what is done at other universities. However, Science cannot support the dropping of math as proposed. Dropping math is a major change, it would not align us with other universities, and it could well make it impossible for non-Science majors to fulfill the requirements of University 1.

Dean Whitmore felt that the proposal document misses some fundamental points. He reminded Senate that students who are admitted to University 1 are guaranteed admission to Science (or Arts). The essential point is that, unlike all the other Faculties here, the admission requirements to U1 are, by definition, the entry requirements to Arts and Science. Changing the admission to U1 is changing the admission to Science. He felt that If Senate does this against the wishes of Science, then it would be equivalent, for example, to Senate dropping math from the entry requirement to Engineering, against the wishes of Engineering.

With regard to entry to other universities, as far as Dean Whitmore could tell, with the exception of two universities, and probably those in Quebec, all other universities admit students directly to a degree program. It might be as specific as a subject major, e.g., history or physics, or it might be a Faculty, e.g., Arts or Science. The point is that all entering students must satisfy the general requirement plus the program requirement. And all Science programs require high school math or, in a few isolated cases, particular science instead of math. All require at least one of math or science.

The two exceptions are Memorial and Manitoba. In these cases, students come into a more general year, and then move on to a degree program. Currently, at both these universities, high school math is required. Thus, ALL universities currently require high school math (or in isolated cases

some science) for entry into a science program.

If the math requirement is dropped, Dean Whitmore is concerned that the University would be trying to graft other universities' entry requirements onto our first year structure. The result is that we would be the only Faculty of Science in Canada that does not require high school math or science for entry.

Dean Whitmore also expressed the Faculty's concern that this university might be moving in the opposite direction from what is going on nationally. He noted that a number of universities are adding in math requirements for all programs, including Arts. He also noted that beginning next year at Simon Fraser University, all programs specify at least some high school math.

In Dean Whitmore's estimation, the fundamental problem is that the University is trying to combine two incompatible systems. He outlined two possible solutions:

1. Keep math as an entry requirement, and keep the first year structure as is.
2. Drop the math, but this would necessitate introducing an admission to Science process. This would have a number of features.
 - a. The addition of more appropriate math and science requirements (rather than just the generic math requirement now in place), and generally raise, rather than lower, the entry requirements.
 - b. The importance of math and science could be highlighted.
 - c. Science would need to introduce direct entry as well, similar in principle and structure to what Engineering is doing. Most importantly, he thought the University could do this and still maintain the distribution requirement of our current U1 program, so not hurt in any way this fundamental feature of our first year programs.

If math is dropped from the requirement, Dean Whitmore felt that the University will need new entry procedures.

It was MOVED by Dean Whitmore, seconded by Professor Van Rees, THAT this motion be postponed until the June, 2006 meeting of Senate, to provide time for the Faculty of Science to prepare the required admission regulations, for consideration by Senate at the same June 2006 meeting.

Mr. Dueck, in response to the comments noted that he was baffled by the

Faculty of Science's comments. Nothing in the proposal suggests eliminating math as a requirement for science programs. In Manitoba, students require a math course in order to graduate from high school. Mr. Dueck indicated he was not sure why Science felt they would need new entrance requirements. Mr. Dueck noted that students are currently admitted to University 1 with the option of a consumer math. That student today is not guaranteed entry into Science. The proposed requirements are very explicit and can be explained clearly to students, leaving more time to discuss specific programs with students.

Dean Trevan observed that the number of potential students from Manitoba is on the decline. The University will become more dependent on students from outside of Manitoba, and perhaps Canada. Currently, if students are eligible for entrance to a university in their home country, then they would be allowed to enter the University of Manitoba, many of which do not require math.

Dean Sigurdson stated that originally the Faculty of Arts was sceptical about this new proposal. However, they are now convinced of the streamlining benefits. It is easier and cleaner and brings the University of Manitoba more in line with other universities. They are convinced that there are no real changes for students in particular programs, as they have their pre-requisites in place. He stated he was concerned if this proposal on admission requirements was tied with University 1 transiting. He accepts this proposal.

A question was asked, how will students get the courses they need if we drop the math requirement?

Mr. Dueck responded that in the Manitoba High School Curriculum, students must take a math course in their Senior 4 year. Currently about 90% of the students admitted to the University of Manitoba graduate from a Manitoba high school. Also, students have the option of taking the math skills course at University.

Professor Berry commented that there are four senior math courses, but the Department of Mathematics only recognizes one of those courses. Math skills is a suitable substitute but not the best way for a student to get the courses. He asked if Senate removes the math requirement, is Senate "signing a death warrant" for the M courses?

Mr. Dueck responded not necessarily. Manitoba high school students have math, international students have pre-calculus. The University of Manitoba requires students to have math for Science. It is a requirement for all but one of the programs in Science.

Dean Whitmore noted that students get into university and transit into degree programs. They do not necessarily have to have completed a

math course. The table of programs in Science (in the proposal) does not include a general Science program, which accounts for 66% to 70% of Science students. It is to this program that most of the students transit from U1. He is concerned that math will be dropped and that Science will not have been able to put into place regulations needed to deal with the consequences of the dropped requirement.

Mr. Dueck, in reply to Dean Whitmore's observation noted that even students seeking a general degree in Science require either pre-calculus or applied mathematics at the high school level, in order to meet the breadth requirements of the three year general B.Sc. degree. He noted that in order to graduate with the three year degree students must complete six credit hours in each of four subject areas and that only three, astronomy, biology, and statistics do not have a math prerequisite. Therefore, in order to meet the requirements for graduation, students would have to complete a course from a subject area that requires high school math.

Dr. Kerr pointed out that this proposal is to go into effect September 2007. So, if the Faculty of Science feels they need to make changes, they would have time to do so. What is known about students is that those who do well at high school tend to also do well at university. Other admission policies have been put in place to try to deal with the other students.

Dean Whitmore's motion was then **DEFEATED**

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was MOVED by Dr. Morphy, on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Admissions Office (Enrolment Services) and University 1 to amend the General Entrance Requirements of the University and the Specific Subject Requirements of University 1, effective for the September 2007 academic session [dated November 3, 2005].

CARRIED

- b) **re: Proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences to amend its entrance requirements for students entering the Bachelor of Science (Agribusiness) program**

Page 195

The Bachelor of Science (Agribusiness) degree does not require students to take university level chemistry and therefore does not require the high school chemistry as a prerequisite course. This proposal recommends

that students no longer be required to have standing in high school chemistry for admission to the Faculty.

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was MOVED by Dr. Morphy, on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences to amend its entrance requirements for students entering the Bachelor of Science (Agribusiness) program effective for the September 2006 academic session [dated November 3, 2005].

c) re: Proposal from the Faculty of Human Ecology to amend its admission requirements, setting program-specific quotas

Page 196

Currently, the Faculty of Human Ecology admits students directly to the Faculty. This proposal would see students being admitted to a major within the Faculty. There will be a maximum of 80 students admitted for each regular session. If applicants exceed 80, the top 80 will be chosen for regular session admission.

In response to a question asked, Dean Sevenhuysen stated that there currently is not a limit on admissions to the Faculty.

In response to a question asked, Dean Sevenhuysen stated that admission will be based on GPA plus subject area requirements.

Further clarification was sought regarding the number of students in the Faculty and why a cap is being implemented. Dean Sevenhuysen responded that there are 450 students. The reason for the cap is that there is uneven distribution of students between programs in the faculty, and the resources are not able to handle this.

Clarification on the adjusted grade point was sought. Mr. Dueck explained that an adjusted grade point is usually based on core courses and certain required courses. For the Faculty of Human Ecology, it will be based on the most recent 30-60 credit hours.

In response to a question regarding how many students would have been effected by the cap this year, Dean Sevenhuysen responded five or six students. It is expected that one program will be effected at this time, but in the near future another program will also reach the cap.

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was **MOVED** by Dr. Morphy on behalf of the Committee: **THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Faculty of Human Ecology to amend its admission requirements, setting program-specific quotas effective for the September 2006 academic session [dated September 30, 2005].**

CARRIED

- d) **re: Proposal from the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation Studies to change the admission requirements for the undergraduate degree programs (Exercise and Sport Science, Recreation Management & Community Development, Physical Education)** **Page 197**

Based on the Faculty curriculum review in the fall of 2004, a recommendation was made “that admission to all undergraduate degree programs (Exercise and Sport Science, Recreation Management and Community Development and Physical Education) be based solely on GPA”. This change was considered because the extra entrance requirements (e.g., interviews, skills and leadership forms, etc.) were determined by the Selection Committees to not add value to the admissions process.

In speaking to the proposal, Dr. Morphy noted that resource issues are also part of the consideration for the change in the admission process.

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was **MOVED** by Dr. Morphy on behalf of the Committee: **THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning Proposal from the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation Studies to change the admission requirements for the undergraduate degree programs (Exercise and Sport Science, Recreation Management & Community Development, Physical Education) effective for the September 2006 academic session [dated September 30, 2005].**

CARRIED

3. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation**

- a) **re: Voluntary Withdrawal Policy 1303** **Page 198**

The current policy on Voluntary Withdrawal was introduced in 1993 in

response to concerns about the high rate of withdrawals from courses and the negative effects of withdrawals on the classroom experience. The implementation of *Aurora Student Information System* has led the University to re-examine the ways in which it handles Voluntary Withdrawals, as the current practices cannot be supported under Aurora. To improve the student experience and to facilitate the implementation of the Aurora Student Information System, the Committee is recommending eliminating the limit on the total number of Voluntary Withdrawals a student may take, and applying the limited access policy only to selected high demand courses as determined by the Faculty or School offering the courses.

A comment was made by a Senator that she believed this policy change was a result of *Aurora*, not for the students, to which Dr. Grant replied that there will be a full review done of the policy. While researching for this proposal, it was noted that the VW rate at the University of Manitoba were higher than elsewhere. The Committee wants to see if there is a relationship between VW, performance and completion rates. The Committee is unable to undertake a full review at this time, as they are dealing with a review of the SEEQ, but will be looking into VW's later in 2006.

Professor Hultin noted that he felt that this is the tail wagging the dog. He disagrees with software dictating how the University runs its business. He feels the software has taken over the policy making process.

In response, Mr. Marnoch stated that implementation has required us to review how the University does business, and that he sees it as an opportunity to review practices.

In response to a question on observation seven, Mr. Marnoch stated that the system can track limited access courses. This is related to repeat courses, not just VWs. Many faculties wish to speak to students before they can re-register for a course. Aurora will not distinguish by grade or faculty. It will block all students who have a VW or failed grade. This will provide an opportunity for advisors to meet with students.

Professor Dronzek commented he was glad there was a review. He remembers the original debate for establishing the rule. It was a resource issue. Students could register for a six-credit hour course and then VW in December. Faculties would be left with instructors and no students to teach.

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate.

It was MOVED by Dr. Grant, on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Instruction

and Evaluation concerning amendments to Voluntary Withdrawal Policy 1303 [dated November 7, 2005] effective for the 2006 Summer session.

CARRIED

b) re: Grade Point Averages and Policy 1304 Page 203

The implementation and maintenance of the Aurora Student Information System requires a uniform policy for all faculties and schools for the calculation of cumulative, term, and degree Grade Point Averages (GPA). Under the proposed policy, all students will have three GPAs reported; the Cumulative GPA (CGPA), the Term GPA, and the Degree GPA (DGPA). Due to the proposed policy on GPAs, amendments to Policy 1304 Challenge for Credit are also proposed.

In speaking to the proposal, Dr. Grant noted that this is partially driven by the definition of terms. The terms will now be referred to as Fall, Winter, Summer1 and Summer 2.

This will also provide an institutionally defined GPA and will report on three types of GPA; Term GPA, Cumulative GPA, and Degree GPA. Cumulative GPA will provide a GPA for all courses taken at the same degree level while degree GPA will be for all courses leading to a degree or program.

In response to a question asked regarding courses taken at an undergraduate level but for a graduate program, Mr. Marnoch responded that it is possible to attach multiple levels to courses, so a course could have an undergraduate and graduate level attached to it. If it is not part of a persons program, they can also audit the course.

It was noted by a Senator that the challenge for credit portion of the policy was being removed. Mr. Marnoch responded that faculties had been given the option to vary from the policy, but not had chosen to do so, and so now it was being removed from the policy.

In response to a question regarding repeat courses, Mr. Marnoch stated that currently how a faculty deals with repeat courses varies from faculty to faculty. This policy will allow an institutional policy. For most faculties it will mean no change.

A question was asked regarding student NSERC funding and the reporting of GPA's. Will they understand our new GPA system? Mr. Marnoch responded that it was his understanding the NSERC did their own Adjusted GPA for funding, and furthermore, other universities currently use the *Banner* system, upon which *Aurora* is based.

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate

It was MOVED by Dr. Grant on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation concerning the proposed Grade Point Averages Policy and amendments to Policy 1304 [dated November 7, 2005], effective for the 2006 summer session.

CARRIED

X ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. Proposal for an amendment to the 2005-2006 Academic Schedule

Page 222

A proposal has been made to hold a session of Convocation for the graduates of the Faculty of Medicine on the Bannatyne Campus beginning in 2006. An amendment to the 2005-2006 Academic Schedule is required for this to occur.

In speaking to the proposal, Mr. Leclerc noted that the Convocation would be for MD.'s and B.Sc. (Med) and would be held on May 12, 2006.

Professor King advised that that the Senate Executive Committee endorses the report to Senate

It was MOVED by Professor King, on behalf of the Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve the amendment to the 2005-2006 Academic Schedule, as outlined in the University Secretary's memo dated November 10, 2005.

CARRIED

XI ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 22, combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 222, distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on December 7, 2005.

/nis