

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. D. Barnard, Chair
 Prof. S. Abeysekera
 Ms. K. Adams
 Prof. S. Alward
 Prof. John Anderson
 Prof. Judy Anderson
 Prof. T. Anna
 Ms. J. Armah
 Ms. M. Artiga
 Prof. M. Ballance
 Ms. C. Bator
 Prof. T. G. Berry
 Ms. C. Bone
 Very Rev. R. Bozyk
 Prof. M. Campbell
 Ms. N. Chislett
 Dean D. Collins
 Prof. K. Coombs
 Dr. E. Cowden
 Dean D. Crooks
 Mr. R. Davidson
 Dean E. Dawe
 Dr. H. Dean
 Dean I. Diallo
 Dean J. Doering
 Ms. N. Duseigne
 Prof. M. Edwards
 Prof. J. Embree
 Prof. E. Epp
 Prof. M. Eskin
 Prof. E. Etcheverry
 Dean G. Feltham
 Dean H. Frankel
 Prof. A. Frederiksen
 Prof. M. Gabbert
 Rectrice R. Gagné
 Mrs. E. Goldie
 Prof. Y. Gong
 Ms. T. Gottschalk
 Dean N. Halden
 Prof. B. Hann
 Prof. N. Hansen
 Prof. P. Hess
 Dr. J. Hoskins

Prof. P. Hultin
 Dean A. Iacopino
 Prof. J. Irvine
 Dr. D. Jayas
 Prof. M. Joyal
 Dr. J. Keselman
 Prof. W. Kinsner
 Prof. S. Kouritzin
 Ms. M. Kuzmeniuk
 Mr. J. Lyons
 Prof. K. MacKendrick
 Prof. J. Mactavish
 Mr. C. Martel
 Mrs. D. McCallum
 Dr. R. McIlwraith
 Prof. D. McMillan
 Prof. A. McNicol
 Prof. E. Milliken
 Mr. M. Moreau
 Prof. J. Owens
 Prof. J. Page
 Ms. C. Peters
 Prof. D. Polyzois
 Prof. S. Prentice
 Prof. M. Pritchard
 Mr. R. Pudavick
 Mr. A. Sabouni
 Ms. P. Sampath
 Dean D. Sandham
 Dean G. Sevenhuysen
 Dean R. Sigurdson
 Prof. L. Simard
 Ms. M. Sitter
 Prof. A. Sloane-Seale
 Mr. D. Smith
 Mr. J. Sopotiuik
 Prof. T. Sullivan
 Dean M. Trevan
 Prof. J. Trotter
 Prof. J. Van Rees
 Mr. J. Vroom
 Dean L. Wallace
 Prof. E. Walz
 Dean M. Whitmore
 Dean J. Wiens
 Dean D. Witty

Prof. E. Worobec
 Prof. A. Wright
 Mr. C. Zhang
 Mr. J. Leclerc,
 University Secretary
 Ms. M. Brolley,
 Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Dr. C. Blais
 Mr. A. Bonar
 Dr. P. Cattini
 Mr. P. Dueck
 Mr. A. Easter
 Dr. K. Grant
 Prof. N. Hunter
 Prof. K. Jensen
 Dr. R. Lobdell
 Mr. N. Marnoch
 Mr. M. Tripple

Regrets

Prof. J. Asadoorian
 Prof. S. Barakat
 Mr. M. Bilodeau
 Prof. M. Brabston
 Rector D. Bracken
 Dr. G. Cronin
 Ms. D. Harmer
 Prof. G. Hatch
 Prof. T. Henley
 Ms. K. Holden
 Ms. J. Horner
 Prof. S. Kirby
 Prof. K. Matheos
 Prof. B. McKenzie
 Ms. H. Milan
 Dr. D. Morphy
 Mr. M. Moustafa
 Prof. P. Nickerson
 Dr. W. Norrie
 Prof. S. Pistorius
 Dr. I. Ripstein
 Ms. M. Rodrigue

Dean D. Ruth
 Prof. D. Smyth
 Dr. R. Soni
 Dr. R. Tate
 Prof. E. Troutt

Absent

Prof. W. Akinremi
 Dean C. Axworthy
 Mr. J. Barlas
 Dr. D. Burke
 Dr. G. Gerbrandt
 Mr. S. Huang
 Prof. L. Kirshenbaum
 Prof. D. Kuhn
 Dr. A. MacDiarmid
 Ms. S. Singh
 Ms. D. Sirois
 Ms. N. Umadat
 Prof. M. Vrontakis
 Dean J. Watkinson
 Dr. K. Wiebe
 Prof. A. Young

Also Present

Ms. B. Baines
 Mr. D. Barbour
 Prof. M. Britton
 Prof. S. Byrne
 Ms. S. Coyston
 Mr. J. Danakas
 Mr. S. Dorge
 Prof. J. Kehler Siebert
 Prof. D. Lenoski
 Ms. M. Martin-Strong
 Ms. K. McQuarrie Smith
 Prof. C. Morrill
 Mr. O. Outbih
 Ms. L. Reimer
 Dr. L. Smith
 Prof. L. Turnbull

Assistant and then Associate Professor in the Department of Animal Science. Her area of interest was animal welfare; in particular, the transportation and handling of piglets. Dr. Lewis was instrumental in establishing the Animal Care and Use Program in the Office of Research Services where she was appointed as its first Director in 2005. Dr. Lewis worked tirelessly for the benefit of research animals. Dr. Lewis will be sadly missed as a dedicated, knowledgeable colleague and friend to many.

V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Page 31

The President drew the attention of Senate to the written report included in the agenda. He acknowledged that the current financial situation is causing considerable concern while noting that the University does not, at this time, know what the operating budget will be. He noted that Ben Levin had been commissioned to provide advice to the government regarding tuition fees; this report is expected in about eight weeks. The pension plan has experienced a considerable drop in market value and the Staff Benefits Committee continues to meet regarding this. Budget meetings are ongoing with the Deans after which the budget proposal will be discussed at the Budget Advisory Committee; information will be shared as it becomes available.

VI QUESTION PERIOD

No questions were received prior to 10:00 a.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

**VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 7, 2009**

Dr. McIlwraith MOVED, seconded by Professor Hansen: THAT the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on January 7, 2009 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

VIII BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES – none

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

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Page 42

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

Professor Hunter reported that SPPC met on January 26, 2009 to discuss a number of proposed programs which will come forward to Senate in due course. Amongst these proposals are two from the Faculty of Graduate Studies, one for a Ph.D. in Native Studies and the other for a Master's of Physical Therapy; two proposals from the Faculty of Architecture; and a degree completion program proposal from the School of Dental Hygiene.

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

- 1. Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning
a proposal from the Faculty of Law to modify the
minimum English Language proficiency requirements **Page 43****

Mr. Dueck spoke to this proposal which seeks to increase the English proficiency for all applicants to the Faculty of Law for whom English is not their primary language. He noted that the proposal is not controversial and precedents exist at other Canadian law schools for such requirements. Mr. Dueck pointed out that other law schools in Canada have higher English language requirements and added that often the requirements for the law schools are higher as compared to the rest of the university.

A question arose as to whether there was any evidence that a higher TOEFL score correlated to a higher completion rate. Professor Turnbull, Associate Dean, Faculty of Law, responded that such evidence was not available as the English language requirement at other institutions was set rather than raised. It was noted that a correlation was found between TOEFL scores and success rates at the University 1 level in a study done about a year ago. It was also noted that the internet version of TOEFL is considered to be superior to the paper based version which is currently being phased out.

Dean Whitmore MOVED, seconded by Dean Doering: THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions concerning a proposal from the Faculty of Law to modify the minimum English Language proficiency requirements [dated December 16, 2008].

CARRIED

- 2. Report of the Senate Committee on University Research
RE: Proposal to Establish an Endowed
Chair in Renal Transplant **Page 49****

Dr. Jayas noted that \$1.5 million had been committed to the establishment of this endowed chair which will provide leadership, scholarship, and mentorship in kidney transplantation. The appointment will be offered as a five year, renewable term.

Dr. Jayas MOVED on behalf of the Senate Committee on University Research THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the establishment of an Endowed Chair in Renal Transplant.

CARRIED

3. **Report of the Senate Committee on University Research
RE: Proposal to Establish a Chair in Watershed Science** Page 57

Dr. Jayas reported that this is a term limited chair to be established with a commitment from the Province of \$1.25 million over five years. The department will be assigned on the basis of the strengths and expertise of the appointee.

Dr. Jayas MOVED on behalf of the Senate Committee on University Research THAT Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the establishment of a Chair in Watershed Science.

CARRIED

4. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of
Graduate Studies [dated October 1, 2008]** Page 60

- a) **Report of the Senate Planning &
Priorities Committee [dated November 24, 2008]** Page 66

This report includes course changes from the Departments of History and Psychology with net changes of over 9 credit hours. It was noted that the large increase in credit hours in the Department of Psychology were composed of a number of courses which were being taught as topics courses and were now being introduced as a formal course; the introductions would result in no additional workload. On the question of logistics with the Psychology courses, it was explained that this had to do with the sequencing of courses to make it clearer to students the way courses in the program were sequenced.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Dean Wiens: THAT Senate approve the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies [dated October 1, 2008].

CARRIED

5. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of
Graduate Studies [dated October 31, 2008]** Page 67

- a) **Report of the Senate Planning &
Priorities Committee [dated November 24, 2008]** Page 69

It was reported that there are no resource implications to the Microbiology proposal as there was a large decrease in graduate course offerings in this department a number of years ago. The course introductions will establish a framework and common core of courses for the Master's program.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor McMillan: THAT Senate approve the Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies [dated October 31, 2008].

CARRIED

6. **Proposal from the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies for a Joint Master's Degree in Peace & Conflict Studies**

Page 70

The Chair noted that some of the supporting material had not been distributed through the regular channels and further noted that some Senators would like this matter deferred.

Professor Prentice MOVED, seconded by Professor Owens THAT Senate defer consideration of the proposal from the Faculty Council of Graduate Studies for a Joint Master's Degree in Peace & Conflict Studies.

DEFEATED

The Chair indicated that the missing documents referred to in the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom were distributed to Senate by email and copies were available at the meeting as required; Senators were given time to consider these documents prior to the proposal being presented.

The Chair reported that this proposal had undergone extensive discussion at the committee level and, in addition to the proposal, the agenda includes three committee reports; four people will speak to this item.

Dean Doering noted that this would be the fourth joint program between the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg with joint programs in Public Administration, Religion, and History already in operation. Dean Doering indicated that this proposed Master's would complement the Ph.D. program in Peace & Conflict Studies which is housed at the University of Manitoba and currently has 19 students. This Master's will likely see up to 50 students enrolled in the M.A. in two streams: a thesis route and a comprehensive route. The proposal requires four new faculty, two to be housed at the University of Manitoba, and two to be housed at the University of Winnipeg.

Dean Doering indicated that the Statement of Intent had been forwarded from the faculty of Graduate Studies to the Provost and on to COPSE who authorized the development of a full program proposal. He noted that the full proposal was approved unanimously at the Faculty of Graduate Studies and was approved at the University of Winnipeg Senate in June 2008. He noted that the academic components of this proposal have received praise at all levels including the external reviews.

a) **Report of the Senate Planning & Priorities Committee [dated October 20, 2008]**

Page 120

Professor Hunter spoke to the SPPC report noting that this Master's program would provide a bridge between the Ph.D. program offered at the University of Manitoba and the undergraduate program offered at the University of Winnipeg through Menno Simons College.

Professor Hunter noted that the proposal required resources of \$350,000 per year to hire four tenure track professors and support staff. He further noted that St. Paul's Library resources will more than adequately provide for the needs of the joint master's program. Professor Hunter drew the attention of Senate to observation 5 of the SPPC report (which would be addressed in the SCAF report) and indicated that SPPC recommended approval of the program with implementation contingent upon sufficient space and new funding.

**b) Report of the Senate Committee on
Academic Freedom [dated December 2, 2008]**

Page 122

In the absence of the committee's chair, Dr. Judy Anderson, Professor Gabbert spoke to the SCAF report. He noted that the Senate Executive Committee had referred observation 5 of the SPPC report on this proposal to the SCAF for comment. He noted that the materials distributed today were originally attached to SCAF report.

The general issue addressed by SCAF related to academic freedom at Menno Simons College (MSC) and the Canadian Mennonite University (CMU) Having examined materials related to this matter, the committee concluded that protections for academic freedom provided at CMU/MSC are not equivalent to the unequivocal protection provided by those at the University of Manitoba (page 123 of the agenda). With respect to the issue of adjunct professors, Professor Gabbert referred to points 8 and 9 of the SCAF report (p. 124 of the agenda) and explained that the language protecting academic freedom at the University of Manitoba provides little protection to adjunct professors with a primary employer other than the University where that primary employer does not provide unequivocal protection for academic freedom.

Professor Gabbert drew Senate's attention to recommendation 2 of the SCAF report that the administration of the University of Manitoba consult with the administration at CMU with the aim of getting CMU's agreement to provide unequivocal protection for academic freedom for faculty at MSC and to establish an independent process of binding arbitration to settle disputes regarding academic freedom.

Professor Gabbert noted that the day before today's meeting, the Chair of SCAF had sent an email to SCAF pointing out that, in October 2008, CMU had been admitted to the membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and that CMU was in the process of approving a binding arbitration procedure. However, Professor Gabbert indicated that when SCAF met in December 2008, it was aware that CMU had been admitted to AUCC. He further indicated that recommendation 2 of the SCAF was double barreled, requiring both an independent arbitration procedure and modified academic freedom language and that the second part of the recommendation had not been met.

c) **Observations of Senate Executive Committee
[dated January 21, 2009]**

Page 126

Professor McNicol spoke to the observations of the Senate Executive Committee. He indicated that Senate Executive had reviewed the proposal and the SPPC report at the November 19, 2008 meeting at which time Senate Executive referred concerns raised regarding academic freedom to SCAF to report back on December 10, 2008. At the December meeting, Senate Executive requested that the President act on recommendation 2 of the SCAF report. The President reported back to Senate Executive at the January 21, 2009 meeting at which point Senate Executive decided to send the proposal forward to Senate. Senate Executive does so neither with nor without endorsement.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Dean Witty: THAT Senate approve, and recommend the Board of Governors to approve, the proposal for a Joint Master's Degree in Peace & Conflict Studies.

A question arose regarding the absence of appendices for this proposal which would identify faculty members of the University of Manitoba and publications; it was indicated that appendices are not normally distributed to Senate with program proposals. The question of reading competence in a non-English language arose regarding which languages which would inform the study of peace and conflict, Professor Sean Byrne responded that the choice of language would be specific to each student.

Professor Gabbert commented that it is rare for items to be referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and for there to be conflict between SPPC and other Senate Committees recommending on an item. He expressed concern about the academic freedom of participants in this proposed program who are not employees of the University of Winnipeg or the University of Manitoba, referring specifically to those faculty of Menno Simons College who are employees of Canadian Mennonite University (CMU) and hence subject to the academic freedom language of that institution. While this JMP is purported to be between the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg, Professor Gabbert noted that it has been clear that there would be participation in a significant way by faculty of MSC who are responsible for teaching the undergraduate program for the University of Winnipeg. Professor Gabbert drew the attention of Senate to page 76 of the agenda, noting that of the 16 faculty members of the University of Winnipeg mentioned there, seven are full time employees of CMU and not of the University of Winnipeg. He also pointed out that on page 97 it was indicated that these faculty members were to be participants in the program.

Professor Gabbert emphasized the difference between the academic freedom language of either the University of Manitoba or the University of Winnipeg and that of Canadian Mennonite University. He emphasized the unequivocal nature of the University of Manitoba language noting the guarantee of protection against institutional censorship. He quoted a passage from CMU's document entitled

“Mission, Faith and Hiring” (SCAF report, page 123) where it is made clear that a faculty member at CMU may be dismissed if his or her “outlook changes to the point where that individual is no longer able to embrace and advance the mission of the institution.” By contrast, faculty members teaching in the University of Manitoba’s programs must be allowed to pursue the unfettered search for truth. He indicated that, when the President met with the President of CMU it was perfectly clear that CMU understood the difference between our view of things and theirs, and that it was equally clear at this time that they were not going to make changes that would resolve such difficulties as laid out in the SCAF report. Professor Gabbert noted that he had prior awareness of this situation due to his being appointed as a member of the CAUT investigation committee into academic freedom matters at CMU which was, in fact, triggered by concerns expressed to the CAUT about academic freedom issues at Menno Simons College.

Professor Gabbert emphasized that the University of Manitoba’s academic freedom guarantees the integrity of the programs the University offers and that such protection cannot be assured by giving individuals adjunct status. Adjunct professors from MSC would not have full protection for their academic freedom from their principal employer. When teaching in a University of Manitoba program, an academic employed by MSC would have to take a position that is consistent with the MSC’s mission; this is clearly a form of institutional censorship and academic work should not go on under such circumstances. Professor Gabbert concluded that the SCAF recommendation on language could be met by CMU’s borrowing the academic freedom language of the University of Winnipeg.

It was noted that the administration of CMU indicated that they are in the process of establishing a binding arbitration procedure; but Professor Gabbert indicated that this does not fully address the concerns of the SCAF report since an arbitrator is only able to determine if the existing policy has been violated – hence the SCAF’s emphasis on both establishing an arbitration procedure and providing satisfactory policy language. Professor Gabbert suggested that if the proposal is approved it be approved with the proviso that all teaching be done by full time academic employees of either the University of Manitoba or the University of Winnipeg who have tenure track or tenured appointments OR that Menno Simons College faculty to be given the usual, unequivocal protections of academic freedom by their principal employer.

Professor Gabbert emphasized that it was not his purpose to exclude from the University’s programs persons of any faith, Christian or non-Christian. There is nothing unacceptable about having commitments, be they religious or otherwise that have an impact on one’s academic work. What is not acceptable is CMU’s institutional requirement to conform to a particular tradition or mission, failing which a faculty member may be subject to discipline or dismissal. Such a provision is inconsistent with the unfettered search for truth.

Professor Epp disputed that the University of Manitoba position on academic freedom must be the benchmark for all joint ventures. He noted that "we live in a pluralistic society and must readdress institutional differences as local, national and global values and imperatives are challenged." He further added that the, "Mennonite community has a long history in intervening in economic social and politically mediated aid in regional and global jurisdictions." Professor Epp noted that the notion put forward in this proposal to advance the link between practice and theory is commendable; the expertise that CMU and the Mennonite community bring to the proposed program is more than considerable having contributed significantly to advancing peace and conflict studies in Winnipeg and in many other academic institutions nationally and internationally. He added that "Their record of scholarship and related accomplishments should be embraced by us without any reservations. When one considers the matter of academic freedom in a discursive light, I believe that the Canadian Mennonite University actually has more knowledge and insight to offer than our own institution which is evidenced by the handout this afternoon."

Dean Feltham also indicated that he was "very concerned when we apply in a very strict manner our specific academic freedom standards to others. I think one can look at broader organizational structures such as AUCC membership ... [which] means that there is some general standard which has been passed." He summed up with his belief that "this is an exceptional program".

Professor Berry noted that the University currently has a large number of adjuncts with primary employers outside of the University (including industry, and provincial and federal governments); having accepted this situation for current adjuncts, he posed the question, how is this situation different? The Provost responded that there are currently will over 300 adjuncts who have the same type of protections.

Professor Prentice referred to the bottom of page 74 which refers to the participation of Menno Simons College which is the home to the University of Winnipeg's undergraduate programs. She stated that it is incumbent upon Senators to determine if this institution, which is integrally linked with CMU, is one with which we want to enter an agreement. Professor Prentice expressed the belief that the participation of MSC faculty in this program who do not have the same academic freedoms would pose a risk of compromising the academic integrity of the program due to their participation on committees that will set policies and programs and student rules and regulations, and will be creating an environment for teaching and learning for graduate students.

Professor Alward asked if it is acceptable for the University of Manitoba to enter a joint program where we know that a significant portion of the program will be delivered by faculty without the same protection that faculty members here enjoy.

Dean Iacopino asked about the freedom to develop programming and to develop excellence in one's units. He said he was more worried about the risk of someone telling him or his unit that they can't enter into an agreement to develop

a program and improve because of concerns about the fact that someone else doesn't have the same kind of entitlements in place that exist here. He went on to indicate that it was necessary to trust the people who are developing and working with programs.

Professor MacKendrick stated that there is a risk of inviting people to teach in the joint program at the University of Manitoba where their research and the conduct of their duties in the pursuit of knowledge could potentially be compromised by their findings. He further questioned how a culture committed to pacifism would address a perspective that promoted any form of violent conduct and whether faculty would put their jobs at risk for advocating alternate perspectives.

Dean Sevenhuysen stated that this is an extremely good proposal which will benefit the institution and students. He further spoke on how current procedures protect adjuncts because part of the application process includes a letter from the adjunct's primary employer agreeing that the individual will be subject to University of Manitoba policies when working for the University of Manitoba thus any arbitration would be subject to University of Manitoba policy, not that of CMU.

Professor Milliken related her experiences in teaching a social work course on feminist perspectives to classes which include students of faith based institutions. She related conflict with students using their standards of faith as a standard for assignments rather than the standards of human rights legislation, Canadian law and the social work code of professional conduct.

Dean Witty cautioned that not supporting this proposal based on the reasoning in the SCAF report puts the University on dangerous ground and that focus must be on the merit of this program indicating that, "in a day and age when interdisciplinary and inter-institutional and intercultural collaboration is essential, the notion of an interuniversity program of this type really does deserve our support." Dean Witty further reiterated that the AUCC determine membership standards and that all three institutions discussed here belong to this organization.

Mr. Tripple reported that he has had concerns expressed from students on both sides of the issue and that the Student Senate Caucus had discussed the proposal extensively and would vote on an individual basis. Mr. Tripple noted that, from the point of view of students, it is imperative that Senators ensure all programs that are introduced at the University are of the highest quality and that they respect the same standards of academic freedom that the University of Manitoba holds dear, and must ensure to not forget the objective of our University, to forward knowledge without fear of censorship.

Dean Collins stated that the proposed program is intellectually rigorous, and has a successful Ph.D. program in place, further indicating that "with respect to applying academic freedom in this place, we have to accept the fact that yes,

academic freedom guarantees the integrity of our programs but it also guarantees our faculty access to contribute to those programs”.

Dean Wiens indicated the importance of discussing academic freedom and that it should remain an open and active discussion. He did caution, however, that “what we’re talking about is a very strong belief that we have a perspective on which we think our rights and our freedoms and the search for truth rests on”. He noted that the University already has adjuncts from Menno Simons in the Ph.D. program and that the University of Winnipeg Senate had considered the proposal and, deeming it a worthwhile proposal, approved it. Dean Wiens noted that Senate needs to be fairly sensitive to what the people in a particular discipline or a particular field believe is rigor; while they need to share with Senate what they consider to be rigorous and how they make their judgment, Senate needs to accept their judgment while still being responsible for questioning those things as appropriate. Dean Wiens concluded that this proposed program is timely for the world and that the province of Manitoba is well situated to deliver this kind of program.

Mr. Lyons noted that this is a good program but expressed concern that students entering into a University of Manitoba program may have their research ideas constrained or influenced by faculty with institutional perspectives of which the student is unaware being unaware that another institution is involved in offering the program.

The Chair indicated that the 45 minute debate period regulated by Senate rules had expired and that a motion with a 2/3 majority was required to continue the debate.

Dean Wiens MOVED, seconded by Dean Feltham THAT Senate continue the discussion on this matter.

CARRIED

Dr. Blais expressed support for the diversity inherent in this proposal and emphasized that part of the responsibility of a University is to expose students to a wide diversity of different points of view so that they learn to question.

Dean Trevan expressed the opinion that sometimes we must go with the route that is good enough rather than perfect. He further noted that the CMU statement indicates that leaders and scholars are responsible to question as well as affirm the teachings and positions of the church and he stated that “our inability to recognize [that] other people start from a different position and not from where we are. If they start from that position and journey with integrity, with guidelines that encourage them to criticize, in fact tell them it is their responsibility to challenge, then I cannot see why we are having any problem with this whatsoever”.

Professor Owens reiterated that objections to the proposal had nothing to do with the Mennonite culture rather the issue was one of institutional censorship.

Dean Sandham stated that the proposal is excellent academically and germane to one of our greatest needs in our society. He stated that, "if we view complex relationships that need to be inclusive, that need to include the views of others through a very focused, single lens and apply that lens to every situation in a very focused way, I think that we put the concept at risk and make it harder to support in complex environments because we become caricatured by what is seen as its views". He expressed the caution of being seen as not being inclusive, as being judgmental, and as being too focused on our views.

Dean Halden stated that "this is a living process. The academic freedom debate is extremely important" which he further qualified as, "it is the actions and thoughts of the individual in a framework of academic responsibility, tolerance and dialogue". Dean Halden indicated that this program is significant academically and has intellectual merit in the distribution of resources in our environment.

Ms. Bone raised the question of whether this proposal could be approved and, if problems arose in the future, that changes could be made to the program at that time. The Chair responded that this does, indeed, happen on a regular basis. Dean Doering reported that academic programs are reviewed on a regular, scheduled basis.

Dean Frankel raised the point that, if we don't go forward with this proposal, there is no doubt that it will go ahead without our involvement. He asked if Senate wants that to happen.

Professor Anna expressed concern about the fragility of the program without an undergraduate department associated with this Master's program and with a small number of faculty members dedicated to the program. He also questioned the resource implications of \$350,000 per year of new money and whether COPSE would provide this. Dr. Blais raised the point that Disability Studies is a fragile program with 2 ½ faculty, 26 graduate students, a limited budget, and is doing very well.

Professor Lenoski, acting Rector of St. Paul's College, who has been very involved with this proposal for a number of years emphasized that this is an academically rigorous program. He clarified that adjunct professors are not a significant portion of this program but that there would be five permanent employees delivering the program, three at the University of Manitoba and two at the University of Winnipeg. These five would be significant and would be Faculty Association members. Referring to page 97, he agreed that a lot of professors are associated with this program but noted that they will not teach regularly. Professor Lenoski further noted that many more of the professors listed are from the University of Manitoba (29) than from the University of Winnipeg (16). He further agreed that the University of Manitoba may lose the program if we mangle any longer; it could be offered by University of Winnipeg, by CMU or together, further noting that this proposal was written mostly by Professors Byrne

and Senehi. In response to the lack of an undergraduate program, Professor Lenoski indicated that the University of Winnipeg has quite a large undergraduate program in peace studies plus there are seven other universities that teach peace studies in Canada at the undergraduate level.

The question was called.

MOTION CARRIED

The Chair noted several people have commented on how significant for us as colleagues to have this debate on such an important issue to the academe, and he thanked members of Senate for their contributions to the discussion.

XI **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS** - none

XII **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 14 combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 126 distributed earlier, plus the SCAF report attachments distributed separately comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on February 4, 2009.

/mb