

June 24, 2009

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. Abeyssekera
Ms. K. Adams
Prof. W. Akinremi
Prof. S. Alward
Prof. John Anderson
Prof. Judy Anderson
Prof. T. Anna
Prof. J. Asadoorian
Ms. C. Bone
Mr. D. Bowles
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
A/Rector C. Butterill
Dean D. Collins
Prof. E. Comack
Prof. K. Coombs
Prof. R. Cossar
Dean D. Crooks
Prof. I. Davidson-Hunt
Dean E. Dawe
Dr. H. Dean
Dean J. Doering
Mr. T. Dueck
Prof. M. Edwards
Prof. M. Eskin
Prof. E. Etcheverry
Dean G. Feltham
Dean H. Frankel
Prof. A. Frederiksen
Prof. M. Freund
Prof. M. Gabbert
Mrs. E. Goldie
Prof. Y. Gong
Ms. J. Guise
Prof. N. Hansen
Dr. J. Hoskins
Prof. P. Hultin
Dr. D. Jayas
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. W. Kinsner

Prof. S. Kouritzin
Prof. K. MacKendrick
Prof. J. Mactavish
Ms. K. Marcynuk
Mrs. D. McCallum
Mr. J. McGurran
Dr. R. McIlwraith
Prof. D. McMillan
Prof. A. McNicol
Prof. E. Milliken
Dr. D. Morphy
Dr. W. Norrie
Ms. D. Okrusko
Mr. M. Ostadrahimi
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. S. Pistorius
Prof. M. Pritchard
Mr. R. Pudavick
Mr. S. Rashid
Dean J. Ristock
Ms. N. Sajan
Prof. M. Scanlon
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Prof. L. Simard
Prof. T. Sullivan
Dr. R. Tate
Ms. K. Thompson
Dean M. Trevan
Mr. A. Vahedi
Prof. J. Van Rees
Prof. M. Vrontakis
Dean L. Wallace
Dean J. Watkinson
Dean J. Wiens
Dean D. Witty
Prof. E. Worobec
Prof. A. Wright
Prof. A. Young
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Ms. M. Brolley,
Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Dr. C. Blais
Mr. P. Dueck
Dr. K. Grant
Prof. N. Hunter
Prof. K. Jensen
Dr. R. Lobdell
Prof. C. Morrill
Mr. P. Nawrot
Dr. L. Smith
Mr. M. Tripple

Regrets

Dean C. Axworthy
Prof. T. G. Berry
Prof. M. Brabston
Rector D. Bracken
Prof. M. Campbell
Dr. P. Cattini
Dr. E. Cowden
Dr. G. Cronin
Dean I. Diallo
Prof. J. Embree
Dr. M. Enns
Rectrice R. Gagné
Dean N. Halden
Prof. G. Hatch
Dean A. Iacopino
Prof. L. Kirshenbaum
Dr. A. MacDiarmid
Prof. K. Matheos
Ms. H. Milan
Prof. P. Nickerson
Mr. O. Qureski
Dean D. Ruth
Dean D. Sandham
Dr. D. Smith
Dr. R. Soni
Dr. van Ineveld

Dean M. Whitmore
Dr. D. Wirtzfeld

Absent

Ms. N. Chislett
Prof. L. Coar
Prof. P. Hess
Mr. A. Hossein Birjandi
Prof. J. Irvine
Prof. E. Judd
Prof. S. Kirby
Prof. D. Kuhn
Mr. N. Marnoch
Mr. C. Martel
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dr. I. Ripstein
Prof. W. Simpson
Prof. D. Smyth
Prof. J. Trottier
Dr. K. Wiebe

Also Present

Mr. D. Barbour
Mr. B. Barth
Prof. J. Blatz
Ms. S. Coyston
Mr. J. Danakas
Mr. S. Dorge
Ms. M. Emery
Prof. E. Epp
Ms. S. Foster
Ms. K. McQuarrie Smith
Ms. J. Mikuska
Ms. M. Paula
Ms. P. Robertson
Ms. B. Usick

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Kevin Coombs and welcomed new senators and re-elected senators to the first meeting of their terms. The Chair noted that this is the last meeting for Dean David Witty and thanked him for his service to the faculty and to the University.

Dean Witty thanked Senate for the support given over his term. He indicated that it has been an honour and a privilege to serve with such a collegial body. He further indicated that he is very proud of his association with the University of Manitoba.

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

The Chair indicated that, in keeping with the intent of this category of the agenda, Senate Executive proposed that the items in this category be approved without debate.

1. **Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes [dated May 8, 2009]
RE: Department of Native Studies** **Page 17**

2. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes [dated May 8, 2009]** **Page 18**

3. **Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes [dated November 21, 2008]** **Page 23**

Professor Coombs MOVED on behalf of Senate Executive: THAT Senate approve the report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes [dated May 8, 2009] and the reports of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies [dated May 8, 2009 and November 21, 2008].

CARRIED

III MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards** **Page 24**

Professor Phil Hultin drew the attention of Senate to the establishment of the “*Dean David Witty Urban Design Scholarship*” (page 29) and commended Dean Witty on this sign of wonderful leadership.

2. **In Memoriam Dr. Stephen C. Stothers** **Page 33**

Dean Michael Trevan reported on the sudden passing of Steve Stothers at the age of about 79 on April 29, 2009. Dr. Stothers received his B.S.A. (Animal Husbandry) from the University of Toronto and went on to complete an M.Sc. and Ph.D. from Michigan State University. Dr. Stothers was a professor in swine nutrition and management at the

University of Manitoba from 1955 to 1994 and was intimately involved in the establishment of the Glenlea Research Station. He mentored many graduate students throughout his tenure. Dr. Stothers will be best remembered for his dedication to students (including an award created in his name upon retiring) and for his constant support and interaction with all segments of the animal feed industry and the swine industry in Manitoba.

3. Student Advocacy Annual Report (2007-2008) Page 34

Ms. Brandy Usick, Director, Student Advocacy, reported that 2007-2008 was a typical year for Student Advocacy. She highlighted the ongoing dedicated work of the staff at Student Advocacy including Advocates Brian Barth and Heather Morris. Dean John Wiens moved that Senate applaud the work of the Advocates on behalf of students.

4. Items approved by the Board of Governors on April 27, 2009 and May 19, 2009 Page 44

5. 2009-2010 List of Senate members Page 45

IV REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Page 51

V QUESTION PERIOD

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

VI CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAY 13, 2009

The Chair noted a couple of minor editorial corrections to the Report of the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes had been reported to the University Secretary and would be reflected in the minutes.

Dean Collins MOVED, seconded by Professor Hultin THAT: the minutes of the Senate meeting held on May 13, 2009 be approved as amended.

CARRIED

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 55

2. Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee

The Chair noted that this is Professor Hunter's final Senate meeting as Chair of this Committee. He noted that Professor Hunter reports to Senate at every meeting and thanked him for his work in this role. This was met with a round of applause.

a) Professor Hunter reported that SPPC met once since the last Senate meeting to consider two items which appear later in the agenda.

b) **SPPC Report on the Siting of the ART Laboratory** Page 56

Professor Hunter reported this siting is one of the pieces of the beginning phase of Project Domino. It is proposed that the ART Lab be sited on the current site of Alumni House. Professor Alward indicated that the School of Art was very happy and excited about the prospect of this facility.

Professor Hunter MOVED on behalf of the committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Planning and Priorities Committee [dated May 25, 2009] regarding the proposed site for the Art Research Technology Laboratory.

CARRIED

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

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres with Respect to Cross-Registered Courses and Instructors** Page 60

Professor Owens indicated that the English department had not approved the courses and that ENGL 1260 is not a course offered by the Department. Mr. Leclerc agreed to ensure that the departments receive the relevant information. (*Note: Confirmation was received by relevant departments after this meeting.*)

Dr. Keselman MOVED, seconded by Dean Doering THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres with Respect to Cross-Registered Courses and Instructors [dated June 10, 2009] subject to confirmation by the relevant departments.

CARRIED

2. **Proposal from the Faculty of Science for a Bachelor of Science (Major) and a Major Co-op in Biotechnology**

a) **Program Proposal** Page 62

Professor Worobec indicated that the Faculty of Science has had an honours program in biotechnology for over 20 years. In discussion with students and departmental faculty members, it was determined that the students could be better served by having an option to take biotechnology on a part-time basis. In addition, those students who do not meet the academic standards for the honours program have been unable to continue in biotechnology and must transfer to a different major program often resulting in an extra

year of study. Professor Worobec noted that most programs offered by the Faculty have both honours and majors options and that the Faculty is now in the process of revisiting those programs which do not.

**b) Report of the Senate Committee on
Curriculum and Course Changes Page 94**

Dean Frankel, Chair of SCCCC, indicated that the committee supported this program as giving more options for students.

**c) Report of the Senate Planning and
Priorities Committee Page 95**

Professor Hunter indicated that there are no resource implications to this proposal as it is more a reorganization of existing courses.

Professor Worobec MOVED, seconded by Dean Collins THAT: Senate approve and recommend that the Board of Governors approve the Proposal for a Bachelor of Science (Major) and Major Co-op in Biotechnology.

CARRIED

**3. Report of the Senate Committee on University Research
RE: Establishment of a Professorship
in Spinal Cord Research Page 97**

It was indicated that this proposal is exceptional in that it allows for the appointee to be at the Assistant Professor rank; normally the rank of Professor is required. The question arose as to how many other professorships are at this rank. (*Note: Dr. Jayas, reported after the meeting that, of the last six professorships approved, three required the appointee be at the Associate or Full Professor rank*).

Dr. Jayas MOVED on behalf of the committee: THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on University Research regarding the Establishment of a Professorship in Spinal Cord Research.

CARRIED

**4. Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and
Evaluation RE: Professional Unsuitability By-laws
From the Faculties of Education and Social Work Page 102**

a) Faculty of Education Page 103

A question arose on this document regarding the "*balance of probabilities standard*" (6.01 ii, page 107). Dean Wiens responded that this is a legal term wherein a determination is made from conflicting testimony that the incident probably occurred.

Professor Etcheverry MOVED on behalf of the Committee: THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation [dated May 20, 2009] regarding Professional Unsuitability By-laws from the Faculty of Education.

CARRIED

b) Faculty of Social Work Page 109

There was a discussion regarding the right of the accused to know the accuser and the issues attached to identifying vulnerable people. Possible alternate wording was discussed. The matter was referred back to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation for further consideration.

**5. Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies [May 21, 2009]
RE: Proposal from Department of Soil Science Page 115**

Dean Doering reported that this proposal comes to Senate in response to the Department's graduate program review wherein it was recommended that the required credit hours be reduced. The proposal is for the required credit hours for the Ph.D. program to be lowered to 9 credit hours, 3 credit hours below the Faculty of Graduate Studies' minimum. Dean Doering elaborated that this reduction in required credit hours is a trend in the bench sciences, many of which have reduced their credit hours and more of which will be coming forward in the future.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor Akinremi THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies [dated May 21, 2009] regarding the Department of Soil Science.

CARRIED

**6. Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies [May 21, 2009]
RE: General Regulation Changes: Ph.D. "Candidacy Exam"
and Master's Admission Page 119**

Dean Doering reported that the proposed changes to the General Regulation of the Ph.D. candidacy exam were to clarify that the *Thesis Proposal* and *Candidacy Exam* are two distinct events in the Ph.D. program. Upon the suggestion of Senate, the second paragraph of the document will be modified as follows, "normally ~~within the first two years after the Master's degree~~ within the first two years of the Ph.D. program".

The report also includes rewording of the current Master's Admission requirements to expand the list of Canadian institutions to all those "empowered by law to grant degrees". Dean Doering emphasized that the decision on admission would remain with the program, this modification will simply allow students who graduated from some institutions previously precluded from applying, to submit an application to the Faculty. It was clarified for Senate that the reference to "officially recognized" institutions outside of Canada referred to a list located in the Faculty containing accredited institutions in other countries. Upon the suggestion of Senate, the second bullet point of the document will be modified as follows,

- Students who have completed the pre-Master's program from the University of Manitoba or from ~~another university~~
 - a. Canadian institutions empowered by law to grant degrees; or
 - b. Colleges and universities outside Canada which are officially recognized by the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Professor McMillan THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies [dated May 21, 2009] regarding General Regulation Changes: Ph.D. "Candidacy Exam" and Master's Admission as amended.

CARRIED

7. Report of Senate Committee on Nominations Page 122

Professor Hunter indicated that for the Senate Committee on Calendar, Professor Guise's name has been withdrawn and that position will become a TBA (page 123). He noted that this leaves just three positions to fill on this year's committees. The Chair called for further nominations; no further nominations were received.

Professor Hunter MOVED on behalf of the Committee THAT: Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated June 24, 2009] as amended.

CARRIED

X ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. Strategic Framework Planning Document Page 125

The President noted that versions of this document have been reviewed by various committees of the University after which a draft was distributed to Senate on May 26 and to the larger university community on May 29 soliciting comments. He noted that he had received a great deal of input and had tried to accommodate as much as possible in the document. Dr. Barnard emphasized that this document is not a detailed operational plan; rather it is a framework to guide decision making. This document was considered and endorsed for planning purposes by the Board of Governors last week, pending Senate approval. Normally, such material is considered by Senate prior to the Board; however, as the Board will not meet again for several months, it was decided to consider it at that time.

The Chair reviewed the core of the document which proposes that some themes for academic enhancement be identified which are intended to be at the same time inclusive but are also indicative of some strengths the University can build on. These themes are not intended to be radically new departures from the current situation. There are several focal points, six in the Academic Enhancement area, one to build on strength combining research, teaching and community service and another to be consistent with what is happening in the province and the realities of where we're situated; recognizing ourselves as the University of Manitoba. In addition to Academic Enhancement, a focus on an Outstanding Student Experience, supporting Aboriginal Achievement and being an

Outstanding Employer are included. The only thing that has changed here is to try to give a little bit different definition of the text around these things and what the University can contribute.

Dr. Barnard indicated that the core of the framework was to identify themes around which the University should grow: Academic Enhancement and Innovation in Academic and Research Programs, Outstanding Student Experience, Aboriginal Achievement, and Outstanding Employer. The framework is intended to be used to make decisions about strategic directions and to provide some structure for a narrative to the larger community. It is intended to be representative of the activities of the University but not exhaustive.

Professor Owens expressed her appreciation that a lot of time and effort had gone into this document and she did understand that the document was intended to provide a broad framework rather than a plan of micro-management. It did seem to her, however, to have significant implications for micro-management that are not fully spelled out in this document and she wished to identify these implications by drawing the attention of Senate to statements on pages 126, 131 and 135. The preamble on page 126, Professor Owens reported, states in paragraph four that “the University of Manitoba’s commitment to teaching and to basic and applied research, in both traditional and professional programs, remains strong” and that what is being proposed is for the University to “take advantage of opportunities that focus specific attention on areas of particular relevance in today’s world”. The areas of relevance are referred to in section 1a-f. Further, on page 131, she noted, under Academic Enhancement, “opportunities to focus on areas of particular relevance in today’s world without abandoning the wealth of opportunities for learning and discovery that are now offered at the University of Manitoba.” Furthermore, she added, it is agreed that the new framework does not “negate the importance of a continued emphasis on basic and applied research and teaching, in both traditional and professional programs”. So the plan aims, it seemed to Professor Owens, to promote both research and teaching in what are called traditional fields and what are identified as areas of relevance in today’s world; areas which are called priorities elsewhere in the document. Professor Owens noted a directive on page 135 which reads “units can and should innovate in how they contribute to the University’s strategic priorities” which she found very pointedly directive. For instance, in relation to the statement, “will connect their internal planning efforts to the strategic planning framework and resource allocation requests and identify their progress in meeting strategic priorities in their annual reports.” Professor Owens asked the following questions: What will be the impact on individual units, of academic departments for instance, of this directive to develop unit level plans that advance the areas defined as strategic priorities for the University? Does this directive mean that decisions about hiring, for instance, or about curricula, will be made on the basis of whether or not a new hire, or a new course, or a new program fits into one of the priority areas and, if this is the case, doesn’t this mean that the importance of basic and applied research and teaching in traditional programs is, in fact, being negated, or, if not negated, certainly marginalized?

The President responded that this was a different reading of the document than he would have had. Referring to the ‘directive’ referred to by Professor Owens, he indicated

that the wording was not intended to be exclusionary, but simply to indicate that where these themes have been identified, it would be appropriate to link research and teaching in what are called traditional fields and the priorities outlined in the planning framework. The document, he explained, has tried to respond to this concern which had been articulated before by other groups.

Professor Owens requested that the phrase 'as appropriate' be added, the Chair concurred. Professor Owens expressed her concern that decisions not be made exclusively on the basis of the way in which something is connected with the priorities in this framework. The Chair agreed that these priorities would not be used exclusively in making decisions on allocating resources.

Senate had an extensive discussion on the document. Concern was expressed about the implications of the document at the unit level; such as would activities which did not fit into the themes be marginalized? How will this impact the hiring process? It was suggested that the second to last paragraph on page 135 should be modified to read as follows, "units will connect their internal planning efforts to the strategic planning framework and resource allocation requests and identify their progress in meeting strategic priorities in their annual reports as appropriate." The Chair indicated that decisions of the University would not be made solely on the basis of the themes within this document.

There was further concern expressed about the devaluing and marginalization of some researchers whose work did not fit into the themes of this document. Further concerns were raised regarding the reference to "Culture" (page 133) as not the most appropriate word as it is seen as exclusionary in some disciplines; "society" was suggested as an alternative. Concern was expressed over the way in which the document was circulated, with some colleagues of Senators indicating they had not received the email. The Chair reported that the document had been circulated widely and he had received lots of feedback on it.

Dean Collins expressed concern regarding the removal of "individual health" which was included in an earlier draft of the document. The suggestion was to modify the second to last paragraph on page 132 to include "individual and population health". The Chair reported that the challenge in drafting the health section was striking the balance between being all inclusive and focusing on a couple of projects; the challenge was to find some middle ground. He further indicated that he had received advice that the best way to balance this was to take out the wording individual health. Dr. Barnard emphasized the polarity between inclusion and focus and reported that he would take this suggestion under advisement.

Professor Hultin expressed his discomfort regarding the themes themselves and the fear that what is meant to be inclusive ends up being exclusive due to the lack of funds available for work outside of the theme areas. He further indicated that, while all of these areas are important, they are not definitive of the work at the University. He would prefer to stay away from this all together and say that the University is here to teach and discover new knowledge. Professor Hultin expressed his concern about the inevitable

pruning that will occur and expressed concern that this pruning would be done on some preconceived idea of what is important rather than on the basis of individual merit.

Professor Kouritzin expressed concern (referring to page 134) that the University should not be limited to serving the needs of Manitoba alone but should operate on a more global scale. The Chair indicated that the comments referred to were made in the context of that paragraph and that there should be no implication that the University would limit its attention only to Manitoba.

Dean Trevan commented that this document can provide a positive way forward to connect different parts of the University and will help the University to put together some groundbreaking ideas and approaches to problems and issues which impact Manitoba and the world.

Concern was expressed regarding the evaluation of academic work as important according to the discipline rather than conforming to this document's areas of concentration. The President confirmed that there would be budget cutbacks and that this document would be just one piece of information used to make those decisions. On the question of whether cutbacks would occur to work which does not fit in with these themes, the President responded that the intent is not to undermine existing work and that this framework would not change the budgeting process which has been in place for some time.

Dr. Worobec questioned how this framework will impact those programs approved in the last year or so which are falling between the last strategic framework and this one. The President responded that these programs will be considered in the budget process this year. A small amount has been allocated for Academic Enhancement and advice on these new programs has been solicited from SPPC. He emphasized that the need for resources exceeds the resources available and that judgments will have to be made.

The President indicated his attempt to be as straightforward as possible regarding inclusion and focus; the intention is not to cut people out, but rather the pragmatic reality is that the University can't do everything at the same level. This framework attempts to be responsive to the reality that we will have fewer resources going forward. He indicated that there were some opportunities and thrusts, most are already developing, and that the consultations in a number of different places had widespread support. He emphasized that it is certainly not the intention to undermine existing activities, the University wants to keep them going, but will make some marginal decisions. The decisions made this year are very much marginal because they make up less than one half of one percent of the operating budget.

Professor Young indicated that she felt some reassurance based on some of the discussions; for example, adding 'as appropriate' regarding resource allocation, but was more disturbed by some of the other discussion. She expressed concern that, in spite of reassurances, there would be some marginalization of researchers who fall outside of this framework. One of the things she asked for reassurance about was the implications for the University Research Grants fund asking if there would be any directive within that program focusing on what the strategic plan is outlining as priorities for the University.

Professor Young also indicated that she was curious about the statement that the document is meant to be inclusive but is resistant to things that make it too inclusive, as if somehow shifting the focus just a little bit might include too many so that everyone might fall under the favoured priorities. She indicated that she found it a little disturbing because it sounded like there was a kind of desire to cut people out in some way or to prune heavily in some places. She said that she didn't understand for instance why "human rights" couldn't be something like "human rights and the human condition" which would then make that category far more accessible to people in Arts, both the social sciences and the humanities. She also expressed concern about using the word "culture"; stating that it is a problematic word in the disciplines that she is concerned with as it is seen as elitist and very exclusionary. She suggested the use of the word "cultures" instead.

Dr. Jayas confirmed that the University Research Grants program would remain and would support research based on the excellence of the proposals coming from all faculty members, not for using exclusively on the areas of emphasis outlined in the planning framework.

Referring to the table on page 136, Professor John Anderson raised the question of how academic success would be measured and concern that there is no political will to move forward more specifically in the direction of measurement. The President responded that he would be open to suggestions on how to evaluate this, indicating that measures such as completion rate and number of Rhodes Scholars under-represent the complexity of the situation; this issue should form the context of further discussions. The importance of having more information and better data was emphasized.

Professor Gabbert commented that there were a lot of positive things contained in this document and referred to the commitment to the Aboriginal focus and the recognition of the University's role as a conservatory of music and art and the importance of these kinds of things being able to flourish especially at a time when the University is asked to be so deeply engaged with the economy. Professor Gabbert expressed his concerns that Senate was being asked to approve a set of priorities that, he indicated, many could not see themselves in and that, while it includes many, it does not include all. He indicated that many of his colleagues have said that if they really want to take these seriously, they would have to reinvent themselves. He noted that the comments of the Chair and Dr. Jayas (in response to Professor Young) have started to provide reassurance, but he questioned whether there would **not** be pressure on Deans to be able to show in their annual planning reports that they are doing something in their faculties to meet the priorities of the planning framework which had Senate approval. He added that, in a time when we know that we will be faced with significant financial challenges there are problems in maintaining the academic integrity of programs such as in the Department of English which hasn't had a specialist in 18th century literature for several years and the Department of History where there is only a 50% position in the history ~~in~~ **of** the Soviet Union and the post-Soviet world and the whole of east central Europe. Professor Gabbert ~~theorized~~ **was concerned** about what would happen if, pursuant to article 18 **of the University of Manitoba Faculty Association collective agreement**, we all get together and decide we want an 18th century specialist, but ~~there's~~ **there are** only a couple of positions and the Dean is occupied with **the particular**

priorities of the planning framework. ~~these particular priorities.~~ This, he indicated, is where the so-called pruning is likely to happen and **he** suggested that the **University** executive committee ~~may~~ **might** never know that these proposals went to the Dean as the executive committee would be aware of only what was submitted to them by the Dean. Professor Gabbert asked the Chair to reassure Senate that he would be mindful of this concern in an ongoing way in this environment of shrinking resources. Professor Gabbert emphasized the importance of ensuring that the President is aware of issues such as hiring needs which are outside of the priorities set out in the document. He expressed concern that the current procedure which has departments making recommendations to the Dean regarding hiring needs would be harmed in light of the priorities noted in the planning framework.

The Chair indicated that he had certainly tried in the document to be more explicit about the recognition of the existing activity and would certainly intend to be actively engaged in an ongoing way in seeing how this works out as a framework for telling the story among ourselves, with government, with other people and how it's used in various processes that Professor Gabbert described. He further said that anyone in a decision making role uses some criteria to make decisions and the intention of the framework is as our best attempt so far at the criteria that the University will use to make decisions. He indicated that it would be dishonest to say that it would be inclusive at the extreme. The President further noted that he does not want to undermine the core activities of the institution or departments but stated that, within the context of the decisions making processes Professor Gabbert described, each of us has different roles and different responsibilities in those processes and we do try to discuss them to try to understand the intent of what lies behind them, and not just run them as dry formal processes.

Dr. Keselman indicated that this document was developed out of several meetings with Deans and Directors who were asked: if you looked at all of the existing capacity and strength in your units, if you looked at your emerging areas, if you looked at areas of opportunity and looked at what's important to our Province, what would be the areas you think would/should/could be areas of opportunity for the next phase of the University's growth and development? This document provides a distillation of a lot of the plans and priorities already in place and areas of opportunity identified by faculties and schools. She emphasized that this document is not about driving the entire academic enterprise but rather illustrates areas that could differentiate us, and already differentiate us, with the intention to seize those opportunities and describe them in such a way that they bring together different faculties and schools and teaching, research, and service elements of the University.

Dr. Keselman spoke to Academic Enhancement indicating that this theme is one part of the larger planning framework. She indicated that a small percentage of the budget has been allocated to support this area. All faculties and schools have their own strategic plans and this document should be viewed as highlighting areas of opportunities. She indicated that the document is a distillation of input from all units and referred Senate to page 131 which says:

"In considering areas that could be specifically enhanced over the next few years, a number of criteria have been used:

- *The uniqueness of the activity*

- *The potential to draw on strengths from across the University*
- *The potential to exploit being a great research university and thus to combine teaching, research and public service activities; and*
- *Provincial imperatives.”*

Professor MacKendrick noted that on page 130 the principle for “*Our teaching, research and service will be in the best interests of the people of Manitoba*” could be contradictory to what occurs in some disciplines such as Religion where an individual’s perception of his/her best interest is biased. Alternate wording suggested was to critically engage and challenge people and not necessarily to serve their best interests. The Chair agreed to look at the wording.

It was indicated that the document has only been available for a short time and at a time when a lot of faculty members are engaged in research and it was suggested that the debate be deferred until September. The Chair indicated that, while a provisional approval was possible, that decisions will be made between now and September that will be guided by this document.

The Chair went on to explain that there were three options: (1) approve the document for planning purposes; (2) approve the document provisionally and have another discussion; or (3) defer the item.

It was suggested that the document be approved indicating that the document can be viewed in two contexts: firstly, the University is facing the implementation of budget cuts this year, and will engage in considerably more in the ensuing and following years, and it was felt that this document would not be helpful in making decisions about cuts; secondly, the University has to renew itself from the grassroots rather than the administrative level in spite of budgetary cuts. It was noted that this document is immensely helpful in guiding where to go next, where to find the commonalities across units and programs and to provide a more cohesive student experience. It was also felt that the framework should be dealt with today.

Professor Owens suggested that it might go part way to alleviating some of the concerns that some members of Senate have regarding the potential for marginalizing certain sectors to strengthen the claim that the plan remains committed to established areas by including a more explicit recognition of the value of undergraduate programs in the document. She observed that she went through the document a number of times and didn’t see any specific references to undergraduate students and that including references to undergraduate students might also be a way to open up an avenue to address certain ways about how we measure academic success. She also noted with respect to the theme of justifying new hires that she thinks one of the things department heads often do is to think about new hires in terms of a contribution to undergraduate programming, so would encourage a more explicit recognition of the really important role of undergraduate programming at this university. The Chair agreed that, while this was taken as a given in the document, especially with respect to the outstanding student experience, he would be amenable to making this more explicit.

Dr. Morphy indicated that the focused discussion on *Outstanding Student Experience* was a critical opportunity to focus on something very important which would address recruitment, retention, and ensuring student success. He indicated that the University needs to recognize that students are leaving as other institutions are seen to provide a better student experience. He further indicated that the University has data to measure these items including: the *Canadian University Survey Consortium*, which gives measures satisfaction and comparative data across the country, and also the *National Survey on Student Engagement*, which measures satisfaction both within and outside the classroom. He indicated that the University needs to do more with that data than it has been doing.

Mr. Rashid indicated that UMSU was concerned about the limits to engagement, advocacy and financial support and appreciated that Senate had acknowledged that these are concerns. He noted the financial threats to students including fee restrictions, but expressed appreciation for the positive focus on Student Experience and Aboriginal Achievement.

Dean Sevenhuysen MOVED, seconded by Dean Doering THAT: Senate approve the framework as a planning document.

CARRIED

XI ADJOURNMENT

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

These minutes, pages 1 to 14 combined with the agenda, pages 17 to 137 distributed earlier, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on June 24, 2009.

/mb