

February 6, 2008

**Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:50 p.m. in Room 343
Drake Building**

Members Present

Dr. E.J.E. Szathmáry,
Chair
Prof. T. Anna
Prof. M. Ballance
Prof. S. Barakat
Prof. T. Berry
Prof. T. Booth
Rector D. Bracken
Ms. K. Broughton
Ms. C. Chauvin
Dean D. Collins
Prof. L. Connor
Prof. K. Coombs
Dr. G. Cronin
Dean E. Dawe
Prof. H. Dean
Dean J. Doering
Prof. J. Embree
Prof. E. Epp
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Prof. C. Eyland
Dean G. Feltham
Prof. A. Frederiksen
Prof. M. Gabbert
Rectrice R. Gagné
Mrs. E. Goldie
Mr. C. Greenahalgh
Dean N. Halden
Prof. N. Hansen
Prof. G. Hatch
Prof. P. Hawranik
Ms. J. Horner
Dr. J. Hoskins
Prof. P. Hultin
Dean A. Iacopino
Dr. R. Kerr
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. P. King
Prof. W. Kinsner
Prof. S. Kouritzin
Ms. M. Kuzmeniuk
Mrs. D. McCallum
Dr. R. McIlwraith
Mr. B. McKeen
Mr. M. McLean
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. A. McNicol

Ms. E. Milliken
Dr. D. Morphy
Dean R. Mullaly
Ms. A. Murawski
Mr. P. Nawrot
Prof. J. Page
Ms. A. Pochinco
Prof. S. Prentice
Ms. C. Presser
Mr. J. Rose
Dean D. Ruth
Dean D. Sandham
Dean H. Sector
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Dean R. Sigurdson
Prof. L. Simard
Prof. A. Sloane-Seale
Mr. D. Smith
Mr. G. Sran
Prof. E. Troutt
Prof. M. Vrontakis
Mr. J. Vroom
Dean L. Wallace
Dean M. Whitmore
Dr. K. Wiebe
Dean D. Witty
Prof. A. Wright
Prof. A. Young
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Ms. M. Brolley,
Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Dr. C. Blais
Dean I. Diallo
Mr. P. Dueck
Ms. R. Heinrichs
Prof. N. Hunter
Prof. K. Jensen
Dr. R. Lobdell
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. B. McKenzie
Ms. C. Rosa

Regrets

Prof. J. Anderson
Mr. R. Bataluk
Ms. N. Bhullar
Mr. B. Bowman
Dr. P. Cattini
Prof. M. Brabston
Prof. E. Cowden
Dean D. Crooks
Prof. G. Geller
Dr. K. Grant
Prof. T. Henley
Prof. M. Joyal
Prof. L. Kirshenbaum
Prof. K. MacKendrick
Prof. K. Matheos
Prof. R. Mazurat
Ms. H. Milan
Prof. P. Nickerson
Dr. W. Norrie
Prof. J. Owens
Dr. I. Ripstein
Dean M. Trevan
Ms. C. Wall
Dean J. Watkinson
Dean J. Wiens
Prof. P. Zahradka

Absent

Mr. H. Ahmed
Prof. W. Akinremi
Ms. C. Bone
Dr. G. Bourgeois-Law
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Dr. D. Burke
Prof. M. Campbell
Mr. A. Coolidge
Dr. G. Gerbrandt
Prof. Y. Gong
Prof. B. Hann
Mr. M. Henderson
Prof. J. Irvine
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. S. Kirby
Prof. D. Kuhn
Ms. C. Kveder
Prof. R. Lee

Dr. A. MacDiarmid
Prof. S. Pistorius
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dr. C. Rabinovitch
Ms. M. Rodrigue
Mr. A. Sabouni
Mr. P. Sharma
Mr. C.B. Singh
Dr. D. Smyth
Prof. T. Sullivan
Dr. R. Tate
Prof. C. Taylor
Prof. J. Trottier
Prof. J. Van Rees
Mr. D. Vasey
Prof. E. Walz
Mr. W. Wu
Mr. S. Zerr
Mr. J. Zhang

Also Present

Mr. D. Barbour
Ms. N. Chislett
Ms. S. Coyston
Mr. J. Danakas
Prof. R. Dean
Mr. S. Dorge
Mr. G. Dyck
Ms. S. Foster
Ms. J. Funk
Ms. R. Gaywish
Ms. T. Giesbrecht
Ms. A. Jonson
Ms. P. Mani
Mr. T. Moyle
Mr. K. Mytruk
Mr. R. Raeburn
Ms. L. Rashid
Mr. S. Rashid
Mr. C. Rigeux
Ms. C. Rocke
Dr. L. Smith
Mr. J. Sopotiuik
Mr. B. Stone
Mr. M. Tripple
Ms. T. Vandehart
Prof. E. Worobec
Ms. M. Zelaya

Dr. Szathmáry advised Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive was Professor John Page.

**I CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES – FEBRUARY 2008**

Mr. Marnoch, Registrar, reported that the number of February 2008 have reached an all time high of 828 Graduands.

Mr. Marnoch noted that there was one request for a degree to be granted posthumously notwithstanding a deficiency in the Masters of Social Work with a deficiency of 3 credit hours.

It was MOVED by Professor Page, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the candidate recommended for degree notwithstanding a deficiency be approved.

CARRIED

It was MOVED by Professor Page, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the list of graduands provided to the University Secretary by the Registrar be approved, subject to the right of Deans and Directors to initiate late changes with the Registrar up to February 8, 2008.

CARRIED

II MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees

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

III MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE - none

IV MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

**1. Statement of Intent for Internationally-Educated
Engineers Qualification Program (IEEQ)**

Page 17

The Council for Post-Secondary Education has approved the development of a full program proposal for the IEEQ program. The Internationally-Educated Engineers Qualification Pilot Program (2003-2008) has been delivered with year-to-year project funding; a permanent, baseline funding commitment allows the program to expand its student capacity and it now seeks to offer a university credential to those successfully completing the program: a post-baccalaureate diploma. The delivery components of the program remain substantively unchanged from those of the pilot program.

The principal objective of this program is to facilitate foreign credential recognition for recent immigrants who hold engineering credentials obtained outside of Canada and who wish to acquire a Professional Engineering (P.Eng.) license in Manitoba.

2. Report of the Senate Committee on Awards Page 24

The Senate Committee on Awards met on December 3, 2007, to approve fifteen new offers and eight amended offers, and the withdrawal of two offers, as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards. The report was distributed to Senate for information.

3. Annual Report of the University Disciplinary Committee for the period September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007 Page 33

This is the annual report of the University Discipline Committee for the period September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007. The Board of Governors has jurisdiction over the discipline of students; however, Senate has traditionally reviewed this report before it is forwarded to the Board of Governors. There were no questions from Senate on this report.

V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Page 98

The President indicated that the report contained in the agenda includes Part A containing items of general interest to Senate and items arising in the portfolios of the Vice-Presidents, and Part B which contains information on the President's external engagements.

The President gave the second part of her report orally. She reported that the University has entered into an agreement with Navitas with regard to the International College of Manitoba (ICM). The contract is binding and it is the obligation of the University to move forward to implement the agreement. She expressed confidence that having this agreement with Navitas will enable the University to recruit international students who will have the preparation to be successful in university studies.

The President stressed that the University operates within a tripartite structure with specific responsibilities assigned to the Board, Senate, and Administration. One of the responsibilities of the Administration is to negotiate and conclude agreements on behalf of the University and, where required, to receive approval of the Board or Senate before concluding agreements. As has been noted, in the case of the Navitas agreement, specific approvals were not required prior to completing the agreement as the contract is consistent with existing procedures.

This matter was considered by Senate at its December 2007 and January 2008 meetings and is scheduled for further discussion at today's meeting. Further, the President reported that the matter was considered by the Board of Governors at its January 23, 2008 meeting at which time the following motion was defeated: *"Be it resolved that the Board of Governors refer the contract between the University and Navitas to the Senate and its appropriate Committees for review."*

The President indicated that the above mentioned discussions have included presentations in an attempt to address the concerns that have been raised. She acknowledged that the communications with Senate and the Board with regard to the agreement could have been handled better.

The President stated that, while there has already been extensive exposition and discussion, some members of Senate continue to question the University's partnership agreement with Navitas. She repeated that the Board of Governors has declined to refer the contract for review by Senate, that legal counsel has advised that referral of the contract to neither Senate nor to the Board of Governors was necessary, and that it is Administration's responsibility to handle contracts. Because the contract is binding, there is an obligation to move forward, bearing in mind that awareness and advice can make the agreement between the University and Navitas (known in Manitoba as the International College of Manitoba) function for the purposes intended:

- Improve the success of international students recruited to our University, and
- Reduce the University's costs in the recruitment of international students, while assuring a steady flow of such students here.

The President indicated that she has asked Dr. Kerr to take two actions:

1. Contact the Director of ICM, Ms. Susan Deane, and establish the Academic Advisory Committee as specified in the agreement. The Academic Advisory Committee has six members and a chair with the University naming the chair and three of the members, and ICM naming the remaining three members. To this purpose, Dr. Kerr has advised that the University's representatives will be:
 - Dr. Norman Hunter, Head, Department of Chemistry and Chair, Senate Planning and Priorities Committee
 - Dr. Richard Sigurdson, Dean of Arts, and
 - Dr. Mark Whitmore, Dean of Science.

The Vice-Provost (Programs), Dr. Richard Lobdell, will be Chair.

The President noted that the Academic Advisory Committee would set its own terms of reference and monitor and provide advice on the component of ICM's program that may lead to transfer of credit.

2. Prepare a framework document that:
 - Will provide a précis of the academic component of the agreement, and
 - Will address questions raised about the agreement at the December 2007, January 2008 and February 2008 meetings of Senate, and
 - Will be available not only to Senate but to the University community.This framework document is to be available as soon as possible, but no later than the March meeting of Senate.

The President concluded that she has taken these steps to implement the agreement with ICM and to make clear that the agreement is in keeping with procedures on academic matters that have long existed at the University of Manitoba.

VI QUESTION PERIOD

The President reported that 14 questions had been received by the deadline of 10:00 a.m. on the day preceding the Senate meeting.

The following two questions were received from Ms. Rachel Heinrichs, on behalf of the Student Senate Caucus.

1. In the Annual Report of the University Discipline Committee, there was considerable variance between the penalties assigned for the same offences, even when the mitigating and aggravating factors were taken in to consideration. For example, a student found talking to another student during an exam and showing the same student their exam paper was given a warning only. A student who was witnessed talking to another student received an F-CW, notation of academic dishonesty on their transcript and a suspension. There are many examples of this through the Report, as the Vice-Chair of the University Discipline Committee noted in the observations preceding the report. She also noted that "students in some faculties are dealt with much more stringently than other students for similar offenses." The Respectful Work and Learning Environment Policy states that students have the right to equal opportunities and prohibits discriminatory practices. The current Student Discipline Bylaw, and the newer version currently under review, does not provide a basis for any kind of uniformity among penalties. What is the University doing to ensure that students are being treated fairly and equally and what is the University going to do to resolve this situation?

The President responded that one of the principles guiding the administration of Student Discipline is that incidents should be handled at the level closest to the student as possible (i.e., department first) and that individual units should have discretion within certain parameters to assess disciplinary actions. The distribution of the annual report of the UDC is to provide a reference for discipline authorities to use when considering disciplinary actions.

2. In the Annual Report of the University Discipline Committee, the rate of students who appealed either the finding against them or their penalty was extremely low. The Student Senate Caucus is concerned that students may not know about the consequences or options available to them when they find themselves accused of academic dishonesty or inappropriate behaviour. For example, in reading through the Report, many students were unaware that sharing a pass card with someone else could result in disciplinary action. The University of Manitoba undergraduate and graduate printed calendars do include the Student Discipline Bylaw but many students use the Aurora system to look up course descriptions instead. It is important that the University adapt to changing technology when communicating with students. What is the University doing to ensure that students are informed of their rights and responsibilities throughout their academic careers?

Dr. Szathmary replied that matters involving the rights and responsibilities of students are published on the University website, through the Student Handbook and disseminated through orientation programs. It is the students' responsibility to be aware of their obligations, and the University seeks to communicate with students in as many ways as possible. In addition, students are informed at the time of disciplinary action of their right to appeal, and to whom an appeal ought to be directed.

The question expresses concern that the relatively low appeal rate is the result of students being unaware of their rights. It is equally possible that the low appeal rate is

the result of students accepting their guilt and the penalties assigned and moving on. At any rate, the University sees communicating with students as an important priority and would remind students of the important notice that appears on page 2 of the Calendar "it is the responsibility of the student to familiarize themselves with the university's academic regulations and policy in general".

The President indicated that she had not received the remaining 11 questions, all of which concerned the International College of Manitoba, until 4:00 p.m. the previous day as she had been in meetings all day until that time. The rules of Senate state that: "*If there is not sufficient time to prepare an adequate response for the ensuing meeting of Senate, the Chair shall so inform Senate and indicate when the response may be expected.*" The President advised Senate that this was the case and the Dr. Kerr's framework document, which be available no later than the March 5, 2008, Senate meeting, would address the questions submitted.

VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2008

Professor Owens asked that her statement regarding pre-approval of transfer credits for Navitas students on page 6 be changed from "*is the request made each year or by the individual student*" to read instead, "*if the request for credit transfer would be made each year [by each student seeking admission] or if the request for transfer credit would be a one-time thing [with the initial approval then providing blanket coverage for the next few years].*"

Professor Gabbert noted that on page 4 of the minutes that Dr. Kerr reported that an agreement with Navitas "*has since been accepted by McMaster University*". Professor Gabbert indicated that this is not the case and that Navitas reported on their website that there would be no final solution until at least March 2008 when the Senate of McMaster University will consider the proposal.

Professor Prentice asked that her statement during question period as reported on page 9 of the minutes be deleted.

Dr. Keselman MOVED, seconded by Professor Berry THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on January 9, 2008, be approved as amended.

CARRIED

VIII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. Notice of Motion

Page 117

Professor Gabbert MOVED, seconded by Professor Hultin THAT the University administration provide Senate with copies of the provisions in the Recognition and Educational Services Agreement between the University and Navitas that relate to educational/academic matters, academic staffing, administration, recruitment of students, and provision of University resources, and with all other documentation relevant to Senate's consideration of the matter of Navitas International College of Manitoba; and

THAT the matter of Navitas International College of Manitoba—including specific details related to academic/educational matters, academic staffing, administration, recruitment of students, the provision of University resources and any other relevant issue—be referred to the appropriate Senate committees, including the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes, the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee, the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom, and any other relevant committee, so that each may carry out an assessment in the usual way and make a full report with observations and recommendations to Senate; and

THAT the Senate committees report back to Senate and that Senate take any action that it considers appropriate.

Professor Gabbert indicated that he was prompted to make this motion by administration's refusal to provide documents for the scrutiny of Senate. He expressed profound disagreement with the administration's right to enter into contracts in opposition to the powers of Senate to have general oversight on matters of academic concern. He summarized that, since the beginning of these discussions at Senate, it had been a duel of legal opinions with the administration's primary justification of the International College of Manitoba (ICM) as not being an affiliated or associated college, in fact, that ICM it is not a college at all. Professor Gabbert referred to the University of Manitoba Act, subsection 34(1)(j) which indicates that

34(1) The senate has general charge of all matters of an academic character; and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the senate shall ...

(j) have power to recognize courses of study that are given in any college or institution in the province not affiliated with the university and admit students who have taken such courses of study to examinations of the university;

He indicated that there is no existing policy regarding transfer credit from unaccredited institutions and that transfers from ICM would not fit under the existing University policies governing: the Admission and Transfer Credit for Students from Community Colleges, Technical Colleges, Bible Colleges and Other Accredited Colleges Study; Pre-University Studies (which deals with transfers of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses); nor does it fit under the policy of Approved Teaching Centres.

Professor Gabbert went on to quote the following subsection of the Act:

34(1) The senate has general charge of all matters of an academic character; and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the senate shall ...

(t) determine procedures and policy in respect of lecturing and teaching on the university premises by persons other than members of the staff of the university;

Professor Gabbert noted that this subsection does not single out visiting lecturers only. He emphasized that the failure to establish a policy in this regard does not extinguish the rights of Senate over this matter raising issues of academic freedom and due process. Professor Gabbert reiterated that Senate has charge of all academic character clauses which were meant to be read explicitly.

Professor Gabbert referred to the ICM website which indicated that ICM students would have access to University resources such as: libraries, computer labs, recreation facilities, and health services. He noted that the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee has a duty to look at proposals with resource implications and report to Senate. He indicated that ICM is essentially the creation of a sub-faculty or sub-unit of University 1 for purposes of dealing with specific students. He noted that the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources was not established without a recommendation from SPPC and approval from Senate. This occurred where courses, resources and units were already in existence. Professor Gabbert questioned why once a deal is made that Senate has no input. He indicated that the one fundamental difference in this situation is that it is a private for profit institution involved, saying that the aim of Navitas is not education.

Professor Gabbert indicated that the aim of this motion is to point out that this agreement was entered into inappropriately. The purpose of the motion is to remedy to some degree the injury to collegial governance that he feels has occurred. He indicated that this can be accomplished if full information on academic related matters is sent to the Senate committees and Senate. Those matters not in the purview of the Committees of Senate should be sent to Senate as a whole so that Senate is aware of what Navitas is doing. Professor Gabbert added that, in five years time when the agreement is up for renewal, Senate should have a role in the renewal process. He emphasized that Senate's role must be reasserted or Senate risks losing its rights; that the failure of Senate to act now will lead to further erosion of its rights. He emphasized that he is looking for a compromise in this situation. He is not asking for the contract in its entirety to be brought before Senate and its committees, but just those pieces of an academic nature.

Professor Hultin then spoke in support of the motion. He thanked the President for the clear statement of her position and agreed with the comments of Dean Witty at the last Senate meeting regarding the commendation of the administration's commitment to student success. He went on to indicate his deep mistrust of for profit colleges and institutions. He indicated that the evidence must be evaluated before a judgment can be made; this arrangement may well provide a good transition for international students. He did, however, express concern that Senate had been bypassed in the process. He indicated acceptance that contracts negotiated by the administration are binding and must be confidential. Professor Hultin reiterated that the *University of Manitoba Act* specifies that Senate is in charge of matters of an academic nature (taking into consideration the rights of the Board of Governors in specific areas). Professor Hultin emphasized that the *University of Manitoba Act* places the determination of academic matters with Senate. Having consulted the policies, he indicated that no where does it give the administration the power to override Senate

Professor Hultin referred to subsection 34(1)(t) of the *University of Manitoba Act* regarding Senate jurisdiction of those lecturing and teaching on university premises without qualification or limitation. He suggested that, just because it had not been invoked previously, does not mean it cannot be implemented by Senate when required. He suggested that the procedure followed at McMaster University where the agreement with Navitas was awaiting Senate consideration, is how the item should have been handled at the University of Manitoba wherein the agreement would be examined by Senate Committees and then be brought to the floor of Senate for debate where policy and procedures on academic matters could have been determined. Professor Hultin

expressed disagreement with the established policy and procedures followed as there has never been a private for profit commercial college on campus before. The University of Manitoba has a policy for courses taught at other institutions but Senate has control over the teaching on this campus by those not employed by the University.

Professor Hultin indicated that Senate had been in a similar situation with the introduction of the Aurora Student Information System where Senate was presented with no option but to alter several policies on academic matters in order to accommodate the new system. He expressed concerns about decisions within Senate's purview being made without Senate input.

Professor Prentice indicated that Senate has jurisdiction over transfer credits through the Senate Committee on Admissions. She expressed concerns about ICM providing guarantees on its website of entry into second year for its students. The University has a well established policy on transfer from other institutions including a 1995 pan-Canadian transfer agreement. ICM does not fit into any of these policies and she expressed concern that the contract with ICM may have agreed to the transfer of credits which falls under Senate's jurisdiction.

Dr. Blais indicated that University 1 courses are the ones under discussion. She indicated that University 1 has 850 international students (new and returning) each year. These students enter University 1 with have overall average grades of 84.5% with 84.56% in math and 74.77% in English. It is generally accepted that, on average, students' grades drop about 10% in their first year. This leaves about 30% of students with a GPA below 2.0 after first year, a number which has been consistent since 2001. Currently, University 1 has special programs for at risk students. International students who usually have trouble with English are limited in where they can go for help; the Learning Assistance Centre is turning students away due to lack of resources.

Dr. Blais made the following points. 1. Grant's Tutoring which has been offered on campus for some time is not an accredited institution, 2. Navitas can fulfill two roles a) educating students to have the skills to succeed and compete in the same way as other students for admission to the University of Manitoba, and b) will take unsuccessful students and turn them into successful students. 3. Regarding the use of facilities such as the food bank, would we turn anyone away from this type of resource? 4. No senators came to ask her, as Director of University 1, about how international students are coping in University 1. Dr. Blais wondered whether the focus is on student success here?

Mr. Sran indicated that he disagreed with for profit institutions and questioned the rights and responsibilities of students of ICM; for example, what rules could these students be regulated under in residence as the University of Manitoba Residents Association would have no jurisdiction over them? How would these students be associated with student organizations such as UMSU?

Ms. Pochinco questioned how the University of Manitoba could accept students from ICM while not accepting students from other for profit institutions such as Gisele's. While she agreed that there could be benefits from ICM, she expressed the wish that Senate had discussed it. She indicated that there were inconsistencies between statements made by the University administration and claims made on the ICM website guaranteeing admission of ICM students to second year at the University of Manitoba.

Ms. Pochinco noted that the only Navitas College in Canada was losing money and suggested that the University cut its losses.

Professor Young emphasized that all Senators are concerned about students but the issue here is the erosion of the rights of Senate. She expressed her concern that a contract was signed without any due consultation with Senate and the risk of setting a bad precedent in this area.

Dean Feltham indicated that he fully understands the concerns expressed by Senators but that the motion to bring contractual terms to Senate is inappropriate and that the motion undermines university governance. He stressed the importance of trust between parties.

Dean Sigurdson confirmed that at the December 18, 2007, Faculty of Arts Council there was a vote in favour of a motion very similar to the one presented by Professor Gabbert. Six weeks later, however, more information has been distributed to Senate. As a member of the Board of Governors, elected by Senate, Dean Sigurdson reported that the Board had discussed and defeated a similar motion at their January 29, 2008 meeting. He encouraged Senate to respect the decision made by the Board which does not easily give into any erosion to the tripartite division of power in the University. He indicated that, as a practical person, this contract is a binding agreement and stressed the importance of making sure as academics that this would work for the students and for the University. He applauded that the framework document would be made available.

Professor Booth spoke in favour of the motion in order to support Senate's roles, rights, responsibility and duty of diligence in this matter.

Dean Witty spoke to the various subsections of the *University of Manitoba Act* section 34(1) and emphasized that times have changes since the *Act* was written. He emphasized that this agreement with ICM is essential as the University is failing students and this need must be addressed.

Dean Doering indicated that he did not believe that this agreement illustrated an erosion of Senate's powers indicating that the debate had been highly selective in the items discussed. He reported that there are certainly parts of the ICM website which clearly indicate that ICM students are not guaranteed admission . He accepts what the administration says about the agreement because it makes sense. He applauds such an agreement which is student-centred and targeted at addressing attrition rates. Senate should be satisfied that the administration will be providing a précis of the arrangement.

Dean Iacopino agreed that Senate has responsibility to provide due diligence in academic matters. After all of the discussion and material presented, he concluded that this agreement is a good idea to help students.

Dean Whitmore indicated that he takes seriously Senate's role in academic matters and indicated that the elements are present to move forward successfully with this contract. The President indicated that a précis on the academic matters related to the agreement would be provided to Senate and the University community and that an advisory committee would be in place to monitor the agreement. It is time to move forward positively.

The question was called. The motion was **defeated** with a vote of 34 in favour, 41 against.

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

1. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee** **Page 119**

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

The Chair will report at the next Senate meeting.

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

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research
-Periodic Review of Research Centres and Institutes**

- a) **Manitoba Nursing Research Institute (MNRI)** **Page 120**

The Senate Committee on University Research (SCUR) reviews all research centres/institutes on a periodic basis. A sub-committee of SCUR exists for each research centre/institute to review and recommend whether a full review is necessary. If a full review is not necessary, this sub-committee recommends continuation or termination of the centre/institute.

The Institute has developed a broader focus in its work and, as such, the Faculty of Nursing is proposing that the MNRI be renamed to reflect this.

The sub-committee for the Manitoba Nursing Research Institute recommended and SCUR approved the recommendation, that the Manitoba Nursing Research Institute should continue for a three year period beginning January 1, 2008, under the new name, *The Manitoba Centre for Nursing and Health Research*, to reflect the broader focus of the Institute's work.

Dr. Keselman MOVED on behalf of the Senate Committee on University Research: THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research [dated December 7, 2007] on the continuation of the Manitoba Nursing Research Institute for a three year period beginning January 1, 2008 under the new name *Manitoba Centre for Nursing and Health Research*.

CARRIED

b) **Proposal from the Division of Extended Education**
RE: Aboriginal Environmental Stewardship Diploma Page 124

Ms. Cathy Rocke, Program Director, and Ms. Rainey Gaywish, Acting Area Director, Aboriginal Focus Programs, Extended Education, spoke to this proposal which offers a post-secondary education program that teaches environmental assessment, monitoring, protection, management, sustainability, legal requirements and current issues in the environment field. Aboriginal Focus Programs has partnered with Building Environment Aboriginal Human Resources (BEAHR) to coordinate work experience which will allow students to gain practical industry experience. This program proposal has been in development for three years and meets an educational need and moves towards issues of human sustainability in the aboriginal community. This program is a move by the Aboriginal Focus Program to expand programming beyond the areas of health and social services.

This program consists of 60 degree credit hours which will be transferable into the Bachelor of Environmental Studies program at the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth, and Resources.

This proposal, endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee, has been approved by the Senate Committee on Course and Curriculum Changes and the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee. The Diploma would be offered on a cost recovery basis.

Dean Wallace MOVED, seconded by Dean Doering: THAT Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors, the proposal for the Diploma in Aboriginal Environmental Stewardship [as endorsed by Senate Executive December 12, 2007, the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes October 15, 2007, and the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee on October 29, 2007].

CARRIED

XI **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS** - none

XII **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 12, combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 167 plus the one page handout, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on February 6, 2008.

/mb