

March 5, 2008

**Minutes of a meeting of Senate held on the above date at 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Room E3-262 Engineering and Information Technology Complex**

---

**Members Present**

Dr. E.J.E. Szathmáry,  
Chair  
Prof. W. Akinremi  
Prof. J. Anderson  
Prof. T. Anna  
Prof. M. Ballance  
Mr. R. Bataluk  
Prof. T. Berry  
Ms. N. Bhullar  
Ms. C. Bone  
Prof. T. Booth  
Very Rev. R. Bozyk  
Prof. M. Brabston  
Rector D. Bracken  
Prof. M. Campbell  
Ms. C. Chauvin  
Dean D. Collins  
Prof. L. Connor  
Mr. A. Coolidge  
Prof. K. Coombs  
Dr. G. Cronin  
Dean D. Crooks  
Prof. H. Dean  
Dean J. Doering  
Prof. J. Embree  
Prof. E. Etcheverry  
Prof. A. Frederiksen  
Prof. M. Gabbert  
Rectrice R. Gagné  
Prof. G. Geller  
Mr. C. Greenahalgh  
Dean N. Halden  
Prof. B. Hann  
Prof. G. Hatch  
Prof. P. Hawranik  
Mr. M. Henderson  
Prof. T. Henley  
Ms. J. Horner  
Dr. J. Hoskins  
Prof. P. Hultin  
Prof. M. Joyal  
Prof. P. King  
Prof. W. Kinsner  
Prof. S. Kirby  
Prof. S. Kouritzin  
Ms. M. Kuzmeniuk  
Dr. A. MacDiarmid

Prof. R. Mazurat  
Mrs. D. McCallum  
Dr. R. McIlwraith  
Prof. D. McMillan  
Prof. A. McNicol  
Ms. H. Milan  
Dr. D. Morphy  
Dean R. Mullaly  
Prof. J. Owens  
Prof. J. Page  
Prof. S. Pistorius  
Ms. A. Pochinco  
Prof. S. Prentice  
Ms. C. Presser  
Dr. I. Ripstein  
Ms. M. Rodrigue  
Dean D. Ruth  
Mr. A. Sabouni  
Dean D. Sandham  
Dean H. Sector  
Dean R. Sigurdson  
Prof. L. Simard  
Mr. C.B. Singh  
Prof. A. Sloane-Seale  
Mr. D. Smith  
Mr. G. Sran  
Dr. R. Tate  
Prof. C. Taylor  
Dean M. Trevan  
Prof. E. Troutt  
Prof. J. Van Rees  
Mr. J. Vroom  
Ms. C. Wall  
Dean L. Wallace  
Dean J. Watkinson  
Dean M. Whitmore  
Prof. A. Wright  
Prof. A. Young  
Prof. P. Zahradka  
Mr. J. Zhang  
Mr. J. Leclerc,  
University Secretary  
Ms. M. Brolley,  
Recording Secretary

**Assessors Present**

Dr. P. Cattini  
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. S. Barakat  
Dr. G. Bourgeois-Law  
Mr. B. Bowman  
Ms. K. Broughton  
Prof. E. Cowden  
Dean G. Feltham  
Dean E. Dawe  
Mrs. E. Goldie  
Dr. K. Grant  
Prof. N. Hansen  
Dean A. Iacopino  
Dr. R. Kerr  
Dr. J. Keselman  
Prof. K. MacKendrick  
Prof. K. Matheos  
Mr. B. McKeen  
Ms. E. Milliken  
Mr. P. Nawrot  
Prof. P. Nickerson  
Dr. W. Norrie  
Prof. D. Polyzois  
Dean G. Sevenhuysen  
Prof. T. Sullivan  
Prof. J. Trottier  
Dr. K. Wiebe  
Dean J. Wiens  
Dean D. Witty  
Mr. S. Zerr

**Absent**

Mr. H. Ahmed  
Dr. C. Blais  
Dr. D. Burke  
Prof. E. Epp  
Prof. C. Eyland  
Dr. G. Gerbrandt  
Prof. Y. Gong

Prof. J. Irvine  
Dr. D. Jayas  
Prof. L. Kirshenbaum  
Prof. D. Kuhn  
Ms. C. Kveder  
Prof. R. Lee  
Ms. A. Murawski  
Dr. C. Rabinovitch  
Mr. J. Rose  
Mr. P. Sharma  
Dr. D. Smyth  
Mr. D. Vasey  
Prof. M. Vrontakis  
Prof. E. Walz  
Mr. W. Wu

**Also Present**

Mr. J. Alho  
Mr. D. Barbour  
Mr. J. Danakas  
Mr. S. Dorge  
Mr. M. Einarson  
Ms. S. Foster  
Ms. A. Jonson  
Ms. T. Lussier  
Mr. M. McLean  
Prof. C. Mossman  
Mr. C. Rigaux  
Mr. A. Simms  
Dr. L. Smith  
Ms. M. Zelaya

Dr. Szathmáry advised Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive was Dean Mark Whitmore. The President also thanked the student Senators, whose terms expire March 31, 2008, for their service.

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

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

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** - none

**III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION**

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

The Senate Committee on Awards met on January 16, 2008, to approve five new offers and two amended offers, and the withdrawal of three offers, as set out in Appendix A of the Report of the Senate Committee on Awards. Professor Hultin, Vice-Chair, Senate Committee on Awards notified Senate that, on page 21 of the agenda, the amount bequeathed to Dr. Richard Douglas Oatway Memorial Fellowship should be corrected to read "\$300,000" rather than \$400,000. There were no questions on the report.

**2. Report on Research Contract Funds Received Page 23**

**3. Correspondence from the Registrar  
RE: Change of date for Senate Meeting in May 2008 Page 27**

The President reported that, at the February 13, 2008 meeting, Senate Executive approved the request from the Registrar to move the May meeting of Senate from May 21, 2008, to May 14, 2008, as the meeting currently falls too close to the first convocation date of May 27, 2008, for adequate preparation time.

**IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

The President reported to Senate that she participated along with several other members of the University the last week in February on a provincial trade mission that was in Australia, specifically to the states of South Australia and Victoria. This was at the invitation of the province. She reported that it was a highly unusual as a large proportion of those on the trip were from the University of Manitoba. The President reported that in 2006 the province had signed memoranda of agreement with the state of South Australia and also with the state of Victoria agreeing to work on items of mutual interest and to their mutual benefit. The Premiers of these states and our province are most interested in economic development and moving their states forward through the application of science. Some members of the University of Manitoba had received funds to conduct research to be undertaken internationally and a group went to Australia last August where they encountered partners for the undertaking of joint research. The Premiers of our province

and South Australia announced, in the last week of February, funding for joint research projects that would be funded together by the Province of Manitoba and the State of South Australia. These announcements focused on three areas: one involved the area of agricultural biotechnology and involved Dr. Rob Hill from the Department of Plant Science; the Richardson Centre for Functional Foods and Nutraceuticals is undertaking a project with partners from the University of South Australia; and a third project involving Dr. Wilkins of the Centre for Proteomics and Systems Biology. In order for these types of projects to occur, formal arrangements must exist between the institutions. The President reported that the funds that are available to support these projects total \$1.8 million dollars over a three year period. The way was paved for these agreements as Dr. Kerr had visited a number of institutions in Australia with Ms. Rhonda Friesen from the Office of International Relations, and Dr. Blais, in the fall 2006 to consider if they would be suitable for the University to facilitate student exchanges. While the University receives a number of Australian students, at the time there were few Australian universities with University of Manitoba students. Thus, many of these institutions were aware of the University of Manitoba and some had arrangements with the University but not in South Australia. The University signed agreements with the University of Adelaide, University of South Australia and Flinders University and these agreements were witnessed by the two Premiers.

The delegation moved on to Victoria where much the same happened except the projects that are being supported focus on cancer genesis and involve Geoff Hicks, Manitoba Institute of Cell Biology, and his counterparts at Monash University. In Victoria, the funding for projects involved not only the Province of Manitoba and the State of Victoria but also Monash University. The President spoke about the development of a project involving the exchange of mouse stem cells along with provision of training specific to the use of these new technologies and a specific project involving the use of knock out mice and identification of the role that these genes have in specific disease. The group will allow the holding of international symposia at least once a year. The first of these symposia was held when the delegation was there and the President noted that the welcoming introductions were made by the Governor of the State, a prominent cancer researcher himself, who indicated that he was taking the day off in order to attend. The University signed an agreement with Monash University, there was an existing agreement with Deakin University, and agreements were signed with the University of Sydney.

Mrs. McCallum, Vice-President (Administration), reported that the annual fire drills on campus had been completed and that the results have been reported on the Environmental Health and Safety website. The University is required to conduct these drills at least once per year. The criteria used to evaluate these drills are the time required to evacuate the building and the presence of well identified fire wardens. Mrs. McCallum reported that results were rated on a scale of 0 to 30 and that one unit scored 2. While she was happy to report that the Administration Building scored highest at 27, she indicated that this was perhaps due to the fact that this building did not contain classrooms or laboratories to be evacuated. This information was presented to Deans and Directors who were asked to look at the summary reports and take the appropriate action.

Mrs. McCallum further reported that the building projects were proceeding well in spite of the cold weather. The Library Storage Building and the Aboriginal Centre appear to be on schedule for the spring and the Apotex Centre, due to open July 1, 2008, is also on schedule. Construction on the Robert B. Schultz Lecture Theatre at St. John's College is running into a number of challenges.

Mrs. McCallum reported that the Budget Advisory Committee had been meeting and are currently awaiting the provincial budget.

Mr. Alho, Associate Vice-President (External), reported that the Alumni Association is planning a reception in Brandon. 4300 invitations have been sent out and the response so far has been high. Mr. Alho commented on the Winnipeg Free Press coverage of the Amundsen CFL research in the North. He also mentioned that the Thomas Glendenning Hamilton Photograph Collection was the top video in the educational division of YouTube last week. Mr. Alho referred Senators to the Government Relations website for information on the impacts to university research coming out of the recent federal budget. Lastly, in Development and Advancement, Mr. Alho reported that \$24.8 million had been raised year to date.

## V QUESTION PERIOD

Senators are reminded that questions shall normally be submitted in writing to the University Secretary no later than 10:00 a.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

The President indicated that a number of questions submitted for Question Period at the February meeting of Senate were answered in writing and distributed to members of Senate by email on March 3, 2008. She also indicated that two questions had been submitted to Senate:

### **The first question was submitted by Professor Phil Hultin, Faculty of Science.**

1. This question arises from Dr. Kerr's "Information to Members of Senate – International College of Manitoba".

*" 12. Why was Senate not asked to approve the contract with ICM?"*

*The agreement with ICM is entirely consistent with established policies and practices concerning admissions and transfer credits. ICM is not an affiliated or associated college of the University. The University and ICM have not entered into a system of joint teaching or joint instruction of courses or programs. In short, there is nothing in this agreement requiring Senate approval."*

Could the Administration please explain their interpretation of the phrase "nothing in this agreement requiring Senate approval" explicitly in the context of the University of Manitoba Act, Article 34(1) (t): "the Senate shall 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"

Dr. Lobdell, Vice-Provost (Programs) responded to the question in Dr. Kerr's absence. He noted:

" Section 34(1)(t) of the University of Manitoba Act, referred to in Professor Hultin's question, refers to "lecturing and teaching on the university premises by persons other than members of the staff of the university". We understand this to be in respect of university courses, not courses offered on campus by other groups or organizations. Examples of the latter would

include, a first aid course offered by the Canadian Red Cross Society in one of our buildings; or, "Grant's Tutoring", an organization which apparently offers tutorial services to students on campus. Senate has not concerned itself with such lecturing and teaching.

With respect to University courses, many persons who are not members of the staff of the university are regularly involved in lecturing and teaching on campus. It is very common for guest lecturers to participate in university courses on campus – probably everyone in Senate knows of specific examples. As a further example, in some Faculties (for example, Law and Management), members of the relevant profession regularly deliver lectures and teach courses on campus. In keeping with normal practice, Heads and/or Deans are responsible for these arrangements. The University's long-standing custom has been to welcome such persons to campus.

In summary, whether in respect of University courses or of other courses, Senate has never determined "procedures and policy in respect of lecturing and teaching on the university premises by persons other than members of the staff of the university". We do have, however, established practices and customs and these were considered sufficient for the case of ICM."

**The second question was submitted by Professor Mark Gabbert, Faculty of Arts.**

2. Has the University administration made any provisions to protect the academic freedom of instructors who will be employed by Navitas to teach courses for University credit?

Dr. Lobdell, Vice-Provost (Programs) responded to the question in Dr. Kerr's absence.

He noted that he felt that Professor Gabbert's question implies that our evaluation of courses taught elsewhere for possible transfer credit includes as a criterion "the academic freedom of instructors" of those courses. He noted that this is not so and that he could not ensure Senate that the many thousands of courses for which the University now grants transfer credit have all been taught by instructors who enjoy academic freedom in their work.

He went on to note that Instructors of International College of Manitoba courses must be approved in advance by the Head of the relevant academic department of the University. This is to ensure that they are properly qualified. These instructors are employees of ICM. The University has no right to set the terms and conditions under which ICM instructors are employed by ICM. Nor would we claim such a right in respect of instructors employed by other institutions.

Professor Gabbert responded that he understood the issues of accepting transfer credits from institutions afar where instructors do not have academic freedom. He continued by pointing out that on the business cards of the Principal of the International College of Manitoba not only have "University of Manitoba" on the cards but that the cards also indicate "Your gateway to the University of Manitoba". He indicated that he, as a department head would be much more intimately involved in this matter than in approving transfer credits from afar as he would have a role in approving both instructors and course outlines for these courses.

Professor Gabbert asked what happens in a situation where he has approved the instructor, approved the course outline, has assessed in some way or other in a manner which is not clear yet, whether the course is properly offered or not and then finds out that the person he has approved turns up in his office indicating that the reading list approved has a book on it that six

or eight of my students feel is offensive, the students are raising a big objection and the Principal of Navitas is going to pull it off of the syllabus. Professor Gabbert indicated that this was the type of issue he was talking about and assumed, from the response, that this would be up to the Principal of Navitas and not up to the University to deal with.

The President indicated that Professor Gabbert's point is well taken and reminded him that there is going to be an academic oversight committee including Professor Norm Hunter, Chair of SPPC, Dean Whitmore of Science, Dean Sigurdson of Arts and Dr. Lobdell who will chair the committee, and she believed that this concern would be transmitted as the committee sets up its terms of reference.

Professor Gabbert asked the President if she agreed that we do have a responsibility in that regard and that she would expect that committee to be mindful of such issues and to deal with those kinds of problems should they arise. The President responded that the reason the committee members were appointed was in part to make sure that what occurs in the foundation year of this program mimics as much as it can the kind of atmosphere and the openness that is present in university courses. She indicated that this is the responsibility of the people who bear academic oversight for the instruction that goes on there.

Professor Hultin indicated that he understood the stance of administration that this is not an academic matter and thus Senate has no jurisdiction. Professor Hultin questioned the rationale behind the case that whether Senate has allowed others to speak on campus as guest speakers and such, how this bears on a novel situation such as this and why there would be an expectation that there would be established policy procedures for something he considered to be an entirely novel case that has never arisen before. He further indicated that he would consider the terms of 34(1)(t) to be permissive rather than restrictive and put forth the thought that Senate probably should be consulted for these other cases although Senate has said that these other cases are alright. He indicated that he did not believe that it should be assumed that Senate agrees to every possible case of an outsider teaching on this campus especially when this outsider is teaching with the explicit blessing of the University.

Dr. Lobdell responded that insofar as this particular section of the Act is concerned the general advice and understanding of the university has been that this cannot reasonably apply to visiting speakers who come to lead a course from time to time. Nor can it reasonably be made to apply to visitors who come to meetings organized by UMSU or the GSA. He observed that it is almost impossible to imagine a set of policies and procedures that would govern such a wide array of programs. With respect to all of those things, Senate has been silent. He added that it is difficult to imagine what form of words Senate might devise by way of procedures and policy in respect of lecturing and teaching broadly. In the absence of policy the standard and well known principle is to follow practice and custom. The practice and custom of the University has been to welcome speakers of a variety of sorts, in a variety of circumstances advancing a variety of ideas. So, in the absence of policy and procedure the only thing left is custom and practice.

Dr. Gabbert stated his opinion that it is wrong to suppose that what Professor Hultin is concerned about is a lack of opportunity to restrict people's freedom. The issue is different. Had Senate been engaged in this matter prior to the signing of this agreement we could have made a provision that said this: "that all instructors employed by Navitas would be covered by the Board of Governors policy with respect to academic freedom and the grievance procedure that applies to members of the university community that are excluded from any bargaining unit. He felt that the University could have very easily done that and it would have enhanced the condition of instructors' colleagues at Navitas. He added that it is frankly disingenuous to

suggest that what some senators are trying to do is to figure out a way keep Navitas off campus. That has never been in fact the issue arising from section T. It has actually been emphasized as one of the things in the University Act that provides an obvious and important role for the Senate in a situation like this and he hoped it will actually be considered when the agreement for Navitas comes up for reconsideration in several years time.

Dr. Prentice requested to speak to the emailed response to a question that had been asked at the February 6 meeting of Senate. She had asked about the Senate policy under which transfer credit would be granted. The written response indicated that the admissions office decided because the university has recognized ICM as an institution. As recognition of academic matters is the purview of senate, she asked if someone could speak directly to the question about the Senate policy under which transfer credit may be granted.

Dr Szathmáry indicated that the recognition of course content as equivalent to a course that the University offers is the business of the department. Except that there is a provision whereby the admissions office is informed of what the requirements are and then makes the determination.

Mr. Dueck acknowledged that this is not a simple matter. The first business is to determine whether the institution is recognized. Accepted practice in North America and probably around the world is to compare what other similar institutions would do in that particular situation, and make a determination based on that.

In concluding the discussion on Navitas, Dr. Szathmáry noted that this was the fourth consecutive meeting at which Navitas had been discussed. She added that she wished that Senate had been consulted earlier in the process and stated that she regretted, in hindsight, that this had not been done earlier. She acknowledged that the academic authority of the University resides in Senate and that this matter ought to have been dealt with differently.

She noted that the administration intentionally did not seek affiliation status with Navitas because it did not want to confer that special status on Navitas before the relationship was tested. Dr. Szathmáry observed that some questions are still ideologically based, and the time has come for learned people to agree to disagree, and yet still work together. She added that whatever one's position on Navitas, the objective of the arrangement, namely ensuring student success for international students, was something that all members of the University community could agree on. She noted that the success of this arrangement for the University and for students depends on all members of the University working together, and encouraged members of Senate to help make this work.

## **VI      CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 6, 2008**

The University Secretary noted that, due to the confusion resulting from the sudden change in venue, a number of errors/omissions had been identified. Senators were advised to forward these to the Secretary and revised minutes for the February 6, 2008, meeting would be distributed for consideration at the April 2, 2008 Senate meeting.

## **VII     BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - none**

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

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

Page 28

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

Professor Hunter, Chair, Senate Planning and Priorities Committee reported that, since he last reported to Senate, the Committee had met on January 28 and February 25, 2008 to review the proposal for Undergraduate Reform from the Faculty of Architecture and discussions are continuing. The Committee has also dealt with proposals from the Faculty of Graduate Studies for the Master of Fine Arts and the Master of Physician Assistant Studies, and a proposal for a degree in Human Ecology (Indigenous Wellness) which would be coming to Senate. The Committee also considered Project Domino and a proposal from the Collège Universitaire de Saint-Boniface on modifications to the Bachelor of Education Program.

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

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

Professor McNicol, Chair, Senate Committee on Appeals, reported that the Committee has heard 7 appeals since its last report to Senate in September. Without compromising the confidentiality of the appellant, the hearings involved:

1. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering to deny a re-deferral of a final examination. The grounds of the appeal were medical and compassionate. Appeal denied.
2. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Science to deny retroactive authorized withdrawals. The ground of the appeal was compassionate. Committee awarded conditional authorized withdrawals.
3. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Science to deny removal of Academic suspension. The ground of the appeal was a procedural error. Appeal denied.
4. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering to deny two retroactive selective deferred examinations. The grounds of the appeal were medical and compassionate. Appeal denied.
5. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering to deny seven retroactive authorized withdrawals. The grounds of the appeal were medical and compassionate. Appeal denied.
6. Appeal by a student against a decision by University 1 to deny retroactive authorized withdrawals. The ground of the appeal was procedural. Appeal denied.
7. Appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Arts to deny lifting of academic suspension. The grounds of the appeal were procedural and compassionate. Appeal denied.



One appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering was withdrawn by the appellant. In addition one appeal by a student against a decision by the Faculty of Engineering was returned to the Faculty for further review, as the appellant provided information to the Committee which had not been previously disclosed to the Faculty.

Currently, Dr. McNicol noted, the Committee has three open files.

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

Page 29

The Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation met on January 30, 2008 to consider proposals from the Faculty of Dentistry to change the required GPA for supplemental privileges in the School of Dental Hygiene, and from the Division of Extended Education to make changes to academic assessment policy.

Ms. Heinrichs asked for clarification on the modification from Extended Education regarding whether students would no longer receive a probation or suspension "warning" prior to the imposition of probation or suspension. Dean Wallace clarified that the policy reduces the number of credit hours between assessments from 42 to 30 in order to identify at risk students earlier. In addition, the Division will be using a term GPA rather than cumulative GPA, so that a student will be able to continue as long as they maintain a term GPA of 2.0. Dean Wallace indicated that these changes are in line with current policies at University 1.

**Professor Booth MOVED, seconded by Professor Brabston THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation [dated January 30, 2008].**

**CARRIED**

3. **Proposal to Establish an Endowed Research  
Chair in Gastroenterology**

Page 34

The proposed Endowed Research Chair in Gastroenterology will provide leadership, scholarship and mentorship in gastroenterology research at the University of Manitoba. It will also promote translational research between the basic and clinical sciences in gastrointestinal disorders.

The proposed Research Chair will support an individual Clinician-Scientist by providing salary and operating funds to pursue independent research in gastrointestinal diseases. This support will allow the recipient to maximize his/her research activity and effectiveness, as well as lead research activity in the Faculty in this strategically important area.

The Research Chair will be funded from earned interest from an endowment of \$3 million. The endowment is the result of a \$1 million contribution by members of the Department of Internal Medicine combined with fund raising activities.

The initial term of appointment will be five years and may be renewed.

Dr. Cattini indicated that Gastroenterology is an area of significant recognition in Manitoba and in particular research in irritable bowel disease has earned international recognition.

**Dr. Cattini MOVED on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve, and recommend to the Board of Governors, the proposal to Establish an Endowed Chair in Gastroenterology.**

**CARRIED**

**X ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

**1. University of Manitoba – Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface Affiliation Agreement**

**Page 40**

The University and the Collège have been affiliated since the founding of the University in 1877; in fact, the Collège was one of the founding colleges of the University. The current affiliation agreement was entered into in November 1, 1972. The proposed new Affiliation Agreement seeks to update the language of the agreement and recognize changes that have happened both at the University and the Collège since the current agreement was signed.

President Gagné spoke in both French and English on the strong and long lasting relationship between the two institutions, the historic and linguistic role the Collège has to play as the oldest Canadian French-language post-secondary institution west of Québec. She indicated that the Collège has approximately 950 students with about 10% enrolled in courses at the University of Manitoba and that 2008 represents the 190<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Collège. President Gagné indicated that this new agreement had been approved by their Academic Council.

Dr. Szathmáry observed that she has been very proud that students could earn University of Manitoba degrees through their receiving all instruction in the French language at the Collège. She is very pleased that the professors at the Collège wish to maintain their affiliation with the University. Our relationship benefits both the Collège and the University.

Dean Sigurdson spoke in support of the renewed affiliation agreement, and observed that he hoped that the communication and consultation between the Collège and faculties at the University, especially as it relates to course and program changes would continue and grow. President Gagné agreed, adding two-way communication and consultation were important both for the faculties and the Collège.

Dean Sigurdson also asked that in order to facilitate a clear understanding at the University of the new agreement, that the courses offered by the Collège appear in a separate section of the *Calendar*. Dr. Szathmáry suggested that the matter be referred to the Senate Committee on the *Calendar*.

Professor Mossman highlighted the close relationship between the Asper School and the Collège and noted that the two are currently working together on accreditation. He noted that section 8 of the agreement continues to confer voting right on departmental and faculty councils at the University for faculty at

the Collège, and wondered whether this was still necessary. The President noted that both parties wanted to keep this in as she felt it to be a point of pride. Dr. Lobdell added that he saw this section of the agreement as having a lot of potential to provide opportunities for increased connections and interaction between colleagues at both institution, and that this re-commitment of the connection could serve as an opportunity to encourage such connections.

Mr. Leclerc pointed out that on the English version of the agreement (page 45 of the agenda) the year of the periodic review should be 2023 to correspond to that in the French version.

**President Gagné MOVED, seconded by Dean Doering, THAT: the University of Manitoba - Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface Affiliation Agreement [as submitted January 28, 2008], be approved by Senate and recommended to the Board of Governors for approval.**

**CARRIED**

Dr. Hultin raised the issue that the challenges faced by students of University 1 should be of great concern to Senate and asked the Senate Executive Committee to consider whether the Senate ought to investigate this and debate whether there are things that Senate could do to help facilitate the success of University 1 students. This is a matter of deep academic importance and is the sort of matter that Senate should be taking very seriously.

Dr. Szathmáry indicated she would take this under advisement and that there has been a fairly extensive review of the success and the deficiencies of the education that we provide University 1 students, not just those of international origin. Dr. Blais has already authored a paper that she has already presented so that some of this information might already be available in her report. Certainly some statistics that have been reported were taken from that report. She indicated her agreement with Dr. Hultin's concern. Cross cultural education is a difficult thing as it is not just a matter of learning how to function in another language but also how to feel comfortable in that venue represented in that other language so that one can learn. Sometimes there are more barriers than some of us might think in being able to learn even if you understand what is said to you. The issue raised by Dr. Hultin is an important one.

## **XI ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 11, combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 52 plus the report distributed to Senators for closed session, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on March 5, 2008.

/mb