

February 2, 2011

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. J. Asadoorian
Prof. B. Bacon
Ms. C. Bone
Prof. T. Booth
Very Rev. R. Bozyk
Rector D. Bracken
Ms. N. Chislett
Prof. K. Coombs
Dean J. Doering
Prof. M. Edwards
Dr. B. Elias
Prof. M. Eskin
Dr. E. Etcheverry
Dean G. Feltham
Dean H. Frankel
Prof. M. Gabbert
Prof. J. Gilchrist
Prof. Y. Gong
Ms. S. Gottheil
Ms. J. Guise
Dean N. Halden
Prof. J. Hanesiak
Prof. R. Hechter
Dr. J. Hoskins
Prof. J. Irvine
Dr. D. Jayas
Prof. E. Judd
Mr. J. Kearsey
Dr. J. Keselman
Prof. W. Kinsner
Mr. B. Klassen
Prof. S. Kouritzin

Ms. H. Laube
Dr. J. Mactavish
Ms. K. Marcynuk
Mrs. D. McCallum
Prof. E. Milliken
Prof. J. Owens
Prof. S. Pistorius
Prof. K. Plaizier
Prof. M. Pritchard
Mr. S. Richardson
Ms. J. Rynar
Mr. M. Sadek
Prof. M. Scanlon
Dean G. Sevenhuysen
Mr. N. Shamanski
Dean R. Sigurdson
Dr. L. Simard
Prof. W. Simpson
Prof. H. Soliman
Dr. R. Tate
Dean M. Trevan
Prof. J. van Rees
Prof. C. Van Winkle
A/Dean L. Vercaigne
Dean J. Watkinson
Ms. M. Wetzel
Dean M. Whitmore
Prof. K. Wilson-Baptist
Dr. K. Wrogemann
Prof. A. Young
Mr. J. Leclerc,
University Secretary
Ms. M. Brolley,
Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Mr. M. Ates
Dr. C. Butterill
Dr. D. Collins

M. G. Csepregi
Mr. P. Dueck
Dr. K. Grant
Dr. B. Hann
Ms. M. Labine
Mr. N. Marnoch
Prof. C. Morrill
Dr. L. Smith

Regrets

Prof. J. Bartlett
Prof. M. Brabston
A/Dean D. Buchanan
Dr. A. Chiu
Prof. L. Coar
Prof. R. Cossar
Dr. E. Cowden
Dean D. Crooks
Dean E. Dawe
Dr. H. Dean
Ms. A. Ducas
Dr. M. Enns
Prof. M. Freund
Rectrice R. Gagné
Prof. P. Hess
Dean A. Iacopino
Dr. A. Katz
Dr. A. MacDiarmid
Prof. K. MacKendrick
Prof. K. Matheos
Prof. D. McMillan
Ms. J. Sealey
Mr. H. Secter
Dr. D. Smith
A/Dean L. Turnbull
Dr. M. Vrontakis
Dean L. Wallace
Dean J. Wiens
Dr. D. Wirtzfeld

Prof. E. Worobec

Absent

Mr. R. Chakraborty
Ms. A. Cipriano
Prof. E. Comack
Prof. I. Davidson-Hunt
Prof. J. Embree
Mr. E. Forte
Dr. G. Glavin
Mr. M. Gousseau
Mr. N. Grewal
Prof. J. Linklater
Mr. N. Ma
Mr. M. Matychuk
Dr. R. McIlwraith
Mr. J. Myskiw
Prof. D. Polyzois
Dean B. Postl
Dr. I. Ripstein
Dr. J. Ristock
Ms. E. Romeo
Ms. C. Rose
Dr. D. Smyth
Dr. R. Soni
Dean R. Stern
Dr. K. van Ineveld
Mr. B. Weedmark

Also Present

Ms. B. Baines
M. S. Dorge
Ms. T. Joundi
Ms. K. Kipper
Ms. L. Leonhardt
Mr. M. McDermid

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor Jennifer Mactavish.

**I CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES,
DIPLOMAS AND CERTIFICATES – FEBRUARY 2011**

Page 3

A complete list of candidates, provided by the Registrar, was available at the front table for perusal by Senators. Mr. Marnoch reported that the report contains 774 graduands including one degree that was recommended to be granted notwithstanding; a doctor of philosophy degree in which the student was deficient in three credit hours at the 7000 level.

Dean Doering reported on this degree notwithstanding noting that the student had successfully completed 25 credit hours (24 are required). Dean Doering noted that the requirement of the Faculty of Graduate Studies is 18 credit hours at the 7000 level; the student had 15 credit hours with the remaining 10 credit hours are at the 4000 level. He reported that the error was not caught until the student's convocation check so, while the student meets the minimum number of credit hours, the student does not meet the 7000 level requirement. Dean Doering noted that the student's graduate studies committee and department head had all recommended this student notwithstanding the administrative oversight that had occurred. The Executive Committee of Graduate Studies unanimously approved the notwithstanding and Faculty Council of Graduate Studies had approved without objection the notwithstanding.

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

CARRIED

Professor Mactavish MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT the list of graduands provided to the University Secretary by the Registrar be approved, subject to the right of Deans and Directors to initiate late changes with the Registrar up to February 4, 2011.

CARRIED

II MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

III ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVES

1. To the Senate Executive Committee

Page 4

a) From amongst faculty members:

Dean Whitmore NOMINATED Professor John Anderson, seconded by Professor Judy Anderson.

Professor Owens NOMINATED Professor Arlene Young, seconded by Professor Alward.

Dean Doering **MOVED**, seconded by Professor Judy Anderson, **THAT** nominations be closed.

CARRIED

Professor John Anderson was **ELECTED** to the Senate Executive Committee for a term ending May 31, 2013.

IV MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE - none

V MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Awards – Part A** Page 5
2. **Statement of Intent: Masters of Social Work in Indigenous Knowledge** Page 14
3. **Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Review** Page 21

Dr. Collins noted that the first round of graduate program reviews had been completed and the second round was underway. He reported that the reviews were very useful in evaluating the outcomes of graduate programs looking at resource issues that are impacting graduate programs at the University. Dr. Collins noted that there were a number of common themes that have arisen in the review and indicated that many of the recommendations which arose out of the reviews have been adopted and led to improvements in the programs. He further noted that, in those places where suggestions of the reviewers were rejected, well articulated reasons for this were provided by the program.

4. **Implementation of B.Sc. Genetics (4 year Major)** Page 28
5. **Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions RE: Blended Entry** Page 29

Ms. Gottheil reported that this report follows on the template previously approved by Senate and is being reported for information those faculties who have come forward and have met the approved template criteria for direct entry. The Faculties of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Human Ecology, and Kinesiology and Recreation Management will have a blended entry option for the fall 2012.

6. **In Memoriam: June Jackson** Page 31

Dean Sevenhuysen spoke of June Jackson who passed away. He noted that Ms. Jackson had a long association with the Faculty of Human Ecology and that her work in the 1950s and 1960s had an important influence on the Faculty and the then Department of Clothing and Textiles. Ms. Jackson, he reported, was one of a small group of academic staff who emphasized the science of textiles in the program. She helped build laboratory facilities and in that way laid the foundation for research in textile products. Dean Sevenhuysen added that Ms. Jackson also had a great impact on her students and related a conversation he had recently had with a former student who

spoke eloquently about the guidance that she had received from Ms. Jackson, an experience that was still very clear in her mind after many years. Dean Sevenhuysen concluded that June Jackson had over the decades supported the Faculty very generously and that the Faculty has lost a long supportive staff; students and staff who knew June Jackson will miss her.

VI REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Page 32

The President spoke to Senate about the unfolding of the work that members of the University are involved in around the planning framework and some other components of the work. He indicated that he would try to put this into a context of how the Executive Team has been thinking about it. Dr. Barnard noted that the presentation was a narrative of the work that he had used for a presentation to the Board on the weekend that he wanted to share with Senate and he would certainly appreciate any feedback from Senators but that the intention was to explain all the things that are going on.

Dr. Barnard noted that his thinking on this matter was in three slices: across the bottom some organizational infrastructure things, then a layer above that dealing with traditional institutional mission, vision and values, and then the strategic planning framework priorities. He indicated that a number of organizational infrastructure items really require some attention moment as we move forward.

Firstly, he indicated, is to try to do some transformation on organizational infrastructure, secondly is to provide broad support for learning, discovery and engagement, and thirdly is some marginal enhancement for the areas that are covered by this strategic planning framework's four pillars.

Dr. Barnard spoke of how he thought this fits together with respect to organizational infrastructure meaning: processes, structures, space, information technology and data, leadership, and governance. He reported that there is lots of activity underway in a number of these areas. With respect to process, there are two big projects that have been discussed at Senate and in other meetings and which involve many members of Senate: the ROSE (Resource Optimization and Service Enhancement) project and the OARs (Optimizing Academic Resources) project. He noted that both of these projects are intended to improve services and processes, reduce duplications and costs, enhance our offerings, and facilitate collaboration. He noted that there were lots of things happening in that area which are intended to support to core of the University's activities.

Dr. Barnard expressed his perception on this, and that shared by the rest of the executive team, was that by analogy with the deferred maintenance that we're all familiar with on the stock of buildings that the University has, there is recognition that deferred maintenance is needed on some of the University's organizational infrastructure. He noted that this did not apply just to the processes and referred to the rules, regulations and red tape exercise and the attempt to simplify things for ourselves and our students. He felt that this observation about deferred maintenance on organizational infrastructure applied across most of these points in the infrastructure part of the conversation. Dr. Barnard noted that the deferred investment has a significant cost just as it would if you deferred the investment on maintaining your house and decide not to repair to roof eventually you are repairing the leaks inside as well.

Dr. Barnard emphasized that it is necessary to make some investments as an institution in areas that have not received much investment in the past. Therefore, he indicated, there would be some investments this year as we move forward in a number of these areas and process would be one of the areas which would be targeted.

Dr. Barnard reported that another area targeted would be structure as the University has a relatively complex academic structure relative to other medical-doctoral universities in Canada. He reported that there are more faculties and more departments and at least as many Senate committees as any other university in the country including those that are three times larger.

Dr. Barnard indicated that there are two trends to consider: a relative underinvestment centrally so that the percentage of the overall operating budget that is invested in central administration at the University of Manitoba is among the lowest in the country for medical-doctoral universities and the overall funding level at this university is 10 to 12 percent below the average for medical-doctoral universities. This, he indicated, results in the University having a smaller amount of money on a per student basis and then a smaller percentage of it is allocated to central administrative functions as compared to other universities. On the other hand, he continued, in the academic part of the enterprise, there are more faculties and more departments as compared to other universities, with all of the articulation that is required to make that work. The deans have been asked to talk to each other in some groups that look like they might lead to some helpful collaborations. He noted that budget presentations will occur in groups and have more transparency than in previous years. He indicated that faculties have been grouped into clusters: social and human development, social sciences, natural and applied sciences, fine arts design and culture, and health sciences. He reported that the members of these clusters have been asked to discuss whether there are things that could be done that might simplify our lives.

Dr. Barnard identified the complement of space available as another matter with respect to the organizational infrastructure. He referred to Project Domino with the Taché Hall redevelopment, the construction of the student residence that is underway, the ART lab at the north east corner of Taché, and a number of other projects that affect many people in the room that were funded as part of the federal government's Knowledge Infrastructure Program. He further noted the renovations in the Wallace Building to provide additional space which has been a result of having been awarded the Canada Excellence Research Chair.

Dr. Barnard noted that a planner for capital projects would be hired and reported that the University now has possession of the Southwood lands but that the golf club will not move for a year because their new premises are not ready. He noted that the University has some very high level plans for the Southwood precinct but that there is much more work to be done. He reported that there is a plan for a learning commons in the library, the stadium project was moving ahead, and that the active living centre will be the project that will result from a collaboration around the stadium. He noted that the University was receiving some money in return for the long term lease of the land that the stadium will sit on and that money, together with other sources, will be used to build the active living centre that will provide a very significant enhancement to the quality of life on campus.

Dr. Barnard reported that another part of institutional infrastructure is the IT systems and data. He noted the recent difficulties in receiving timely delivery of email and timely web surfing and noted that the systems are not where we would like them to be so. He reported that there was a major exercise underway, some of it arising out of the ROSE discussion, to rationalize the set of

products that are being supported on campus to try to reduce costs by doing some bulk purchasing to provide some more modern facilities for help desks and to do some longer range future planning about how information technology will be used in support of the University's principal activities.

He noted that this was identified in the ROSE recommendations and there were three major implications: the need to change the nature of how information technology is used and bring it more into the mainstream of planning and enabling because so much of what we do is enabled by information technology and a number of things that different support units and different academic units are trying to do now are being held back because they don't have the IT infrastructure that they need to build what they want to build. Also, there is a search underway for a Chief Information Officer and the need to access comparative and normative data for our planning. He noted that while there were a lot of things that we know about ourselves, there were not a lot of things that could be compared very well to other universities. He noted that there was some nationally collected data, some of which was very well defined resulting in make good comparisons with other institutions but that most of the really well defined data was strictly on the administrative side and does not address performance on the management of core academic business. He noted that data was collected by Statistics Canada but some of the definitions of terms were so open to interpretation that it was not possible to do good comparative analysis of data from the different institutions in the country for any kind of planning purposes.

Dr. Barnard indicated that relevant goals in this area with respect to what we are trying to accomplish need to be identified. He indicated that there needs to be some kind of information to help understand what we are doing in a number of areas and we do not have that. He reported that the University was joining the group of 15 research universities where we could anticipate access to some better data as a result of collaboration with those other research intensive universities in the country. Dr. Barnard also reported that a formal review of the Office of Institutional Analysis was underway and that the Strategic Enrolment Management steering group was working to identify goals for enrolment, what that might look like that, that would be tied to the University institutional priorities and how it could be achieved.

Dr. Barnard reported that leadership was an important part of the institutional infrastructure and emphasized that getting strong leaders into leadership roles on both the academic and the non-academic sides of the house was critical for the University's success. He indicated that ideally not a lot of activity would be generated centrally but a lot of activity would be generated out of the units because that was where the expertise really is and that the intention would be to have ideas bubbling up out of the units towards the centre. He noted that this was a substantially important part of the institutional infrastructure.

He concluded that all of this must be supported by good governance with an appropriate involvement of the Board and Senate. He noted that some work had been done on assessment process and self assessment at the Board level. He noted that the Board would also be moving forward on other matters in the future.

Dr. Barnard noted that the executive team had realized that there were various underlying items that needed attention but did not know quite how much attention would be required. He noted that some of the ROSE projects for example have turned out to be bigger than originally expected and that there had turned out to be more projects in some areas than anticipated. For

example, he noted, in the finance area there are about nine streams underway; some of which will not be very visible to individual faculty members but a lot of them will be very visible to all of the folks involved in the administration of the academic enterprise. He noted that this had turned out to be a much bigger piece of work and noted that it is being done enthusiastically. Dr. Barnard indicated that this has resulted in a delay in getting to engagement on some of the other issues.

With respect to the academic enterprise more broadly, Dr. Barnard noted, we are trying to be inclusive of lots of the good things that are happening at the University with the continued commitment to core activities of learning and discovery and engagement, and honour the commitment to research and teaching excellence across all disciplines consistent with the values that have been articulated in the past for this University and its previous strategic plan and being carried forward into the current strategic planning framework.

Dr. Barnard noted that there are a number of ways that it would serve the University well to be more visibly engaged in the community. He noted that many good things are happening that our students are involved in and that a lot of things are coming out of very many academic departments there are lots of interesting programs that have students involved in the community in many ways and faculty members involved in a wide variety of ways on a number of very interesting and important projects. He indicated that it seems fairly clear that the community as a whole or at least its eyes and ears as represented by the media are not as aware of those good things as it would be of benefit to have them aware. So he indicated the need to do a better job of being engaged and talking about engagement and why it is important to the people of the Province that the University of Manitoba does what it does.

Dr. Barnard noted that the last couple of budget years have led to financial pressure and that this would continue again this year. He noted that all are aware as citizens what the overall financial situation in the economy looks like and what governments at all levels are saying about the availability of money for public spending. He noted that the University will need to be very careful about how money is allocated moving forward and that some marginal adjustments to the areas in the strategic planning framework might be required. He reminded Senate of the four pillars of the strategic planning framework: academic enhancement, Aboriginal achievement, having an outstanding student experience and employer of choice.

Dr. Barnard indicated that, with respect to academic enhancement, some resources have been targeted to priorities within the framework. Currently, he indicated, about two thirds of one percent had been directed to some new programs, the Master of Fine Arts, Jazz Studies, Peace and Conflict Studies, PhD in Native Studies. He noted that some seed money had been targeted to other areas and provided some support for international development. He noted that graduate student support had been enhanced with GETS which provides a central top up to money provided for graduate student support through the graduate student enhancement tri-council graduate enhancement for tri-council scholarships student support.

He noted that the University was working with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Canadian Museum of Human Rights and noted that there were of other projects underway in that area.

Dr. Barnard noted that, with respect to enhancing research capacity, last year the University was successful in being awarded a Canada Excellence in Research Chair, there have been

several NSERC industrial chairs, other Canada Research Chairs are moving ahead, the Watershed Systems Research Chair and the Babs Asper Professorship in Jazz Performance. He added that there is a very exciting proposal in front of Genome Canada and some other proposals that are in development for other Canada Research Chairs.

Dr. Barnard noted that the second pillar in the strategic planning framework, Aboriginal achievement, had a lot of activity and noted that part of the challenge was to take all of the activities and synthesize it into a whole that somehow realizes the value of all the parts. He noted the challenge to have a strategic vision for improving programs services and outcomes. He indicated that some work had been done by Dr. Kiera Ladner about a year ago and that some funding was targeted to hire a senior person to help develop the strategy and implement it inside the University. He reported that a search committee was currently active and would be interviewing people soon. He expected that the person hired for that role would be able to take the mass of information that had been collected and provide some kind of a roadmap forward in order to increase the University's impact in this area.

Dr. Barnard indicated a number of things were underway in the third pillar of the strategic planning framework, student experience. He noted that Strategic Enrolment Management was the next phase of the OARs project which has divided into two things: strategic enrolment management which was a fairly large enterprise and the collaborative conversations that the deans are having in groups. He noted that this was the identification of our efforts to improve the student experience focusing on how to get students here and how to help them be successful. Dr. Barnard reported on some infrastructure improvements which would directly address the student experience including library space, learning commons, the potential in Southwood for additional residential space within a few years, the active living centre, and the automation of some of services which are not entirely automated at the moment.

Dr. Barnard reported that on the fourth pillar in the strategic planning framework, an outstanding employer, there are a couple of things that have happened to move this along. He noted the establishment of the Office of Fair Practices and Legal Affairs as an administrative change, the hiring of Stan Amaladas who has been around campus working with focus groups and talking with people about how to characterize an outstanding workplace. He noted that some of the themes that have been coming out of are strong leadership and management, the opportunity to make a contribution, a sense of community with the people you work with, people want to be recognized for what they do and appreciation for the overall 'package' working in this environment. He noted that over the next few months Rosalind Howard and Stan Amaladas and others will be working on identifying a set of priorities and then making some proposals on how to move forward.

Dr. Barnard concluded that in the 'good' column, the University is making some changes that will make the environment better, there is a focus on organizational transformation, there is the recognition that a University like this is always in the process of renewing leadership especially when you've got as many faculties and kind of term appointments as we do, that the University was trying to build some relationships in the broader community and looking for collaborations inside, and that it would continue to increase its national prominence.

In the bad column, he noted chronic underfunding, a deficit in some of the areas referred to as organizational infrastructure. He thought that a lot of universities in Canada with respect to physical infrastructure responded by saying that they will spend less money on buildings and more money to protect the core of academic programs which is good in the short term with bad

consequences. After a while, he noted, this was not a sustainable trajectory because these things do need attention. He felt that the same thing is true of this deficit in organizational infrastructures where IT can be squeezed and the money continues to flow into the academic programs until such time as the IT infrastructures start to break as has happened around here in recent months. He noted that there is some difficulty in really understanding some of the things that we do in getting good information that helps us inform our decisions and there is lots going on and at the same time we have some things happening that may cause us some concern about our reputation nationally and in the local community so, he concluded, there are some good things, some bad things and he thought it is possible that together we can get done the things that we've committed to do and make a substantial contribution to achieving the vision of the University that has been articulated in the past.

Dr. Barnard said he wanted to convey how for him and for the executive team, they see a number of these things fitting together into a narrative structure and to reflect on the amount of activity that has been created in some of those fundamental layers: OARs, ROSE, other parts of the organizational infrastructure and development. He noted that this meant that many areas are quite stretched in terms of capacity to do some of the larger issues at the higher levels so it is essential that some of these things get finished before starting on much more that is new. The President then invited comments while noting that he would be even more interested off line to get advice, criticism, comments.

Professor Owens had a question that she had before the presentation, she noted that she thought that her question would be related to the outstanding workplace initiative mentioned on page 32 of the agenda. Professor Owens indicated that teaching schedule and timetabling are obviously important in the establishment of good workplace and makes the University of Manitoba an employer of choice; she asked the President to provide some information on the proposal to centralize timetabling, what would be involved in that centralization and what specializations might be written into the program to accommodate special needs of students and faculty.

Ms. Gottheil responded that the project that is underway is not centralized scheduling it is centralizing the assignment of space noting that there are issues for people finding space for meetings or classroom space. She indicated that this software would help identify what space we have and better assign space. She noted that there would be a policy committee formed that will have representation from a number of faculties, not every faculty she noted due to the sheer numbers involved. That policy will replace a policy that already exists but has not been revised since 1980. Ms. Gottheil noted that there would be a lot of opportunity even before it gets to Senate to discuss what goes into that policy. In addition, she foresaw that there would be an ongoing committee that would discuss issues that come up with space and space allocation. She noted that within the new policy items to be discussed could include constraints for faculty, constraints for students and that ultimately what would result is a way of optimizing space. She also thought that the process could be quite student centred and optimize student timetables. She also assured Senate that the University would not be constrained by the software package which would help in the allocation of space but it will respond to the constraints that the University dictates. The President noted that there may be some constraints that already exist that should be addressed and will probably cost some money such as the stock of rooms that is actually available for teaching. He noted that anecdotally from talking to faculty members and to department heads and deans, that there are some size ranges that we do not comfortably have so sometimes there are small groups meeting in large rooms because the faculty member did

not have access to a room of a size that he or she wanted for the time and that just leads to underutilization.

Professor Edwards asked about what the President anticipated the clusters would accomplish. The President indicated openness to whatever the deans who are involved decides was of value. He indicated that there was no expectation imposed on the deans other than the movement towards a more transparent budget process where rather than one-on-one meetings with deans, the executive team would meet with the deans with other members of the cluster present.

Dr. Keselman added that through some of the executive retreats with Deans and Directors over the past few years regarding the university planning framework, there was discussion about some of the impediments to advancing on the academic front. She noted that one of the things that came up over and over again was the potential of a large number of academic units to have a fairly siloed approach to things and not working more horizontally and more collaboratively across the university and accessing the university's resources. Dr. Keselman reported that this cluster idea was an initiative of Provost Council, which is essentially composed of the deans and directors, as a more formal way of asking deans to come together. She noted that these clusters could be any number of groupings and that the deans had been asked to keep University planning framework in mind.

Dr. Keselman noted that some of the challenges identified that the deans were asked to explore the opportunities within those clusters and also by working with other clusters included joint academic program development and delivery of both teaching and research. She noted that this arose from the work of the rules, regulations and red tape committee. The deans were asked to consider ways within the clusters and between the clusters things can be streamlined and harmonized to make it easier for students to move across the clusters or within the clusters and for faculty to share their expertise. She noted that there are there opportunities for sharing administrative resources, for example in health sciences where all of the health sciences faculty are talking about inter-professional education (IPE) and putting in administrative supports to develop IPE programs. The question was being asked as to whether there was a way in which that cluster might actually use its resources more effectively to develop IPE.

Dr. Keselman indicated that the deans had been asked to look at joint resource planning and utilization noting that the deans will be presenting their budget submissions individually but in a group format and talking about collaborative opportunities.

In addition, she noted the deans were asked to take a look at the units that comprise their cluster and identify if there was any advice that they might provide on ways in which the University could structure itself in a way that would be more effective of academic enhancement. She noted that any of those recommendations would go to departments and faculties prior to consideration at Senate.

Dr. Keselman noted that these are early days and, while there are preliminary reports, she thought that many of the deans felt that they could come up with some interesting opportunities. She indicated that the natural science cluster, for example, was looking at potential new undergraduate programs in material science as an attempt to more formally deal with the issue of having a very large complicated academic structure and identify the need to work more collaboratively together.

The President indicated that he would take the structure of the presentation and turn it into a document with some supporting information to use as a framework for discussion about the number of the things that are going on. He reiterated that he would be happy to discuss or receive emails on any comments on this matter. He concluded that the framework bundles together a huge amount of activities going on in all of the parts of the University in all administrative and academic units. He felt that it was a challenge to move so many things forward at the same time and indicated that part of the thinking has to be what are the most critical things to do. He noted that this may mean that things need to be slowed down a pace or two in some things and caution needed to be used about starting more new things because of capacity to handle all this much activity.

Professor Judy Anderson thanked the President and Vice-Presidents for providing a detailed President's Report as she felt that this contributed to the understanding of what goes on across campus. She felt that this was especially important for Senate that is supposed to be aware of the broad university picture. She noted that the University community received a lot of emails and recognized that a lot of care was taken in writing the emails but, she indicated, that having the opportunity to hear it from President and the Vice-Presidents and to have the opportunity to discuss and ask questions, not on a confrontational basis but for information, was very useful. Professor Anderson then asked about the access copyright program which, she noted she had downloaded and read. She thought that it would be useful to have a broader discussion at some point on that issue as it links together with the patent and copyright bylaw and policy of the University and has an impact on undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty and staff involved with many processes that go on in every academic unit for teaching and research.

The President expressed appreciation for both observations. After two years of submitting a written President's Report, he felt that there was a better way to use the President's Report slot and the presentation was the first example of a different way to use the slot. He noted that he wanted to have some conversation about some serious issues with Senate every month and indicated that copyright may be one. While he was not sure that Senate was the right place to talk about copyright, he committed to creating a venue where this conversation could occur as it was certainly is an important issue.

VII QUESTION PERIOD

Senators were 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 following question was submitted by Professor Wrogemann, Faculty of Medicine.

Re: Impact of Stadium Construction and Operation on the Normal Function of the University as a 24/7 Academic Institution.

The Construction of the Stadium has been fully resumed. However, the University Community is uninformed of what is being built and how it will affect the normal operation of the University and surrounding parts of the City. Initially the plan was to build a stadium with a playing surface 25 feet below ground level and a sound muffling Teflon roof. A special bus terminal on Chancellor Matheson and no bus traffic on University Crescent were planned, and a traffic impact study was requested.

Due to the enormous cost overruns of the project, numerous aspects of the project were changed to save money. These were discussed in the press and hinted to at public open houses. With the resumption of construction under new management it is unclear what actually is being built and how it will affect the operation of the University and surroundings. An objective traffic impact study and analysis has not been published. Has it been done?

Is the University as one of the underwriters of the stadium project exerting its full influence and responsibility to ensure that the operation of its academic functions is not impaired and the South of Winnipeg is not paralyzed during stadium events? Would it be possible to receive updates on the current plans?

Mrs. McCallum reported that the design of the stadium had not been significantly altered since the original design that appeared on the renderings both on the site and as seen in the newspaper. One change that had been made, she noted, was the depth of the bowl which was originally 25 feet but had been changed to 23 feet, not as a budget cut, but rather due to a water table issue. She noted that the project was still a bowl design and that the playing surface would still be 23 feet below grade. She reported that there would still be a canopy over the stadium and that had not changed from the original design. She noted that a full roof had never been in the plan but that it was canopy that would cover 80 percent of the seats. Mrs. McCallum noted that, in terms of containing the sound and the light, there had not been any significant changes from the original design.

Mrs. McCallum noted that there was a traffic management plan that was commissioned by Stantec on behalf of Creswin when Creswin was involved in this project. Creswin was no longer involved in the project, she noted, and the traffic plan was recently revised at the request of the City of Winnipeg. She noted that the University had just received a copy of the revised plan that week and reported that there would be a meeting on February 16 with the City to review the traffic plan. She also noted that an event day plan was being developed which would be the plan of how the campus would be managed during the Bomber games or during any major event at the stadium in order to ensure that staff and students who have a need to get onto the campus can still access the campus and will still have a place to park. She noted that there was a lot of work involved in developing this event day plan but the intention was that, once the plan was developed, an open house would be held on the campus for the benefit of students and staff, probably in the spring. Mrs. McCallum noted that even with the plan, when the first event was held at the stadium there would likely be some issues that would require action. She noted that the University would try to anticipate those issues as much as possible in advance to try and minimize the impact on the campus and ensure that the University community can still do whatever they need to do. She noted that the event day plan may required modifications during or after the first few events but assured Senate that as soon as details were worked out there would be an open house event and that the information would be put up on the website.

Professor Wrogeman indicated that initial information indicated that all the bus traffic (and there would be several hundred buses required to bring the people here that do not come by cars) would come down Chancellor Matheson because there would be a bus terminal there. He noted that he had later learned at other open houses that cost cutting measures were being introduced that would have the traffic go down University Crescent and he assumed that this was probably because the bus terminal was cancelled. Secondly, regarding the traffic impact

studies, Professor Wrogeman noted that the City had made this condition before issuing a building permit for the final structure of the stadium. He felt that traffic was one of the biggest problems that would be faced and indicated that this was one thing that could be studied in advance. He asked if a traffic evaluation of this situation had been objectively analyzed by experts noting that there were experts at the University that could do this and wondering why this resource would not be used. Professor Wrogeman noted that he appreciated that once things start out problems will arise but felt that some of the problems could be anticipated.

Mrs. McCallum confirmed that there was currently still a plan to have a bus terminus on Chancellor Matheson Road so the buses would stack up in front of the current University stadium. She indicated that she was not sure that it was ever the plan to stop buses coming down University Crescent but there was a plan to not allow vehicular traffic beyond Dysart Road so people wanting to access the campus could do so via Dysart Road but if people were travelling from Pembina Highway to Fort Richmond, they would be required to go around using Pembina Highway rather than University Crescent. She noted that was the original plan but noted that Stantec did the original traffic study and the City was now involved and was reviewing it. She noted that the City has traffic experts on staff so they have done a review, made some revisions to the original plan and that would be reviewed at the meeting on February 16.

VIII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 5, 2011

Professor Owens MOVED, seconded by Professor Simpson, THAT the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on January 5, 2011 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

IX BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES – none

X REPORTS OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
AND THE SENATE PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee Page 47

Professor Mactavish noted that Senate Executive met on January 19 and in addition to their regular course of business reviewed the report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Procedures that had been deferred from the meeting in November 2010. She noted that an ad hoc committee had been established which would be chaired by Professor Emeritus Archie Cooper to consider the issues at hand. She indicated that these issues would include looking specifically at ways of accommodating students with diverse learning and evaluation needs, looking at issues surrounding degrees notwithstanding a deficiency and a better understanding of decanal authorities among other issues. Professor Mactavish noted that those three principle topics will be handled by a single ad hoc committee which would be pulled together and its official focus and terms of reference will be a matter of consideration.

Professor Judy Anderson asked whether the terms of reference of the committee would be available to Senate and whether the committee would include the matter related to the opportunity for academics to have a chance to debate/appeal academic decisions on

a student's progress. Dr. Barnard confirmed that the terms of reference would be available to Senate once they were finalized. Mr. Leclerc noted that he was meeting with Professor Cooper the next day having shared the draft terms of reference that Senate Executive approved and noted that there might be some revisions to the terms at that point. He indicated that, once the terms were finalized and the committee set, they would be distributed. Mr. Leclerc he noted that it was an identified issue in the draft terms of reference as faculty members raising concerns and looking at best practices elsewhere. Professor Anderson noted that since the minutes were so exhaustive from that meeting as were the senators, that the minutes of that meeting of Senate would be useful to Professor Cooper. Mr. Leclerc confirmed that Professor Cooper had been supplied with those minutes

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

In Ms. Ducas' absence, Dr. Barnard noted that the Committee is currently considering a proposal for a Ph.D. in Nursing.

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

**1. Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies RE: School of
Medical Rehabilitation, Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation
Management and the Department of Computer Science
[dated December 6, 2010]** Page 48

Dean Doering reported a proposed reduction in credit hours for the School of Medical Rehabilitation from 15 to 12 for those entering with a Bachelor degree and for those entering with a Master's degree a reduction from 12 to as low as six to be negotiated on a case by case basis. He noted that the Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management current has an M.A. in Recreation Studies and an M.Sc. in Kinesiology; the proposal would have both the M.A. and the M.Sc. with the designation of 'Kinesiology and Recreation'. In the Department of Computer Science, COMP 7220, a zero credit hour course, would be replaced by COMP 7210, a three credit hour course and result in an increase in the credit hours of an M.Sc. thesis based program from 12 to 15. In the same department, the proposal was for a revival of the course based M.Sc. which was initiated from the graduate program review; this program would require 24 credit hours, 18 at the 7000 level and the balance at the 4000 level and a deletion of the comprehensive examination.

Dean Doering MOVED, seconded by Dr. Etcheverry, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies RE: School of Medical Rehabilitation, Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management and the Department of Computer Science [dated December 6, 2010].

CARRIED

