

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
 Ms. K. Adams
 Prof. John Anderson
 Prof. Judy Anderson
 Prof. J. Asadoorian
 Prof. B. Bacon
 A/Dean D. Buchanan
 Prof. T. Chen
 Prof. L. Coar
 Dean D. Crooks
 Dean E. Dawe
 Prof. R. Desai
 Prof. M. Edwards
 Ms. S. Enns
 Dr. E. Etcheverry
 Mr. A. Fazaluddin
 Mr. L. Ford
 Prof. M. Gabbert
 Mr. O. Gagne
 Prof. J. Gilchrist
 Ms. S. Gottheil
 Ms. J. Guise
 Dean N. Halden
 Prof. P. Hess
 Prof. J. Hughes
 Prof. P. Hultin
 Dean T. Iacopino
 Dr. D. Jayas
 Prof. E. Judd
 Mr. A. Kassum
 Mr. P. Karari
 Dr. A. Katz
 Mr. J. Kearsey
 Ms. J. Krahn
 Ms. C. Laforge
 Prof. J. Linklater
 Mr. R. Lucenkiw
 Prof. D. Mann

Mrs. D. McCallum
 Prof. D. McMillan
 Mr. R. McQuire
 Prof. B. McIlwraith
 Prof. A. McIntosh
 Prof. J. Morrill
 A/Dean C. Mossman
 Prof. S. Palahicky
 Prof. S. Pistorius
 Prof. T. Podolsky
 Dean B. Postl
 Prof. M. Pritchard
 Ms. D. Salem
 Prof. M. Scanlon
 Dean G. Sevenhuysen
 Prof. W. Simpson
 Prof. D. Smyth
 Prof. L. Strachan
 Ms. C. Tapp
 Dr. R. Tate
 Dean L. Turnbull
 Prof. J. Van Rees
 Prof. C. Van Winkle
 A/Dean L. Vercaigne
 Dean L. Wallace
 Dean J. Watkinson
 Ms. M. Wayne
 Dean J. Wiens
 Prof. K. Wilson-Baptist
 Prof. K. Wrogemann
 Prof. A. Young
 Mr. J. Leclerc,
 University Secretary
 Mrs. L. Leonhardt,
 Recording Secretary

Assessors Present

Dr. C. Butterill
 Ms. J. Chen
 Dr. D. Collins

M. G. Csepregi
 Ms. A. Ducas
 Dr. K. Grant
 Dr. C. Kristjanson
 Prof. C. Morrill
 Ms. N. Rashid
 Dr. J. Ristock

Regrets

Prof. S. Alward
 Prof. T. Booth
 Very Rev. R. Bozyk
 Prof. M. Brabston
 Rector D. Bracken
 Prof. K. Coombs
 Prof. I. Davidson-Hunt
 Dr. H. Dean
 Dean J. Doering
 Mr. P. Dueck
 Dr. M. Enns
 Prof. M. Eskin
 Dean H. Frankel
 Rectrice R. Gagné
 Prof. J. Hanesiak
 Dr. B. Hann
 Dr. J. Hoskins
 Dr. J. Keselman
 Prof. W. Kinsner
 Prof. S. Kouritzin
 Dr. K. Matheos
 Prof. S. Prentice
 Dr. I. Ripstein
 Mr. H. Secter
 Dean R. Sigurdson
 Prof. L. Simard
 Dr. L. Smith
 Prof. H. Soliman
 Dean R. Stern
 Dean M. Trevan
 Prof. J. Trottier

Dean M. Whitmore
 Prof. E. Worobec

Absent

Mr. R. Akther
 Ms. C. Bone
 Prof. E. Comack
 Prof. E. Cowden
 Prof. B. Elias
 Prof. M. Freund

 Prof. J. Guard
 Dr. G. Glavin
 Prof. R. Hechter
 Prof. J. Irvine
 Mr. W. Liang
 Mr. N. Marnoch
 Mr. P. Panchhi
 Prof. K. Plaizier
 Prof. K. Polyzois
 Ms. J. Sealey
 Dr. D. Smith
 Prof. K. van Ineveld
 Dr. D. Wirtzfeld

Also Present

Prof. J. Embree
 Ms. M. Matthews
 Ms. B. Baines
 Ms. S. Coyston
 Prof. D. Mandzuk
 Dr. B. Martin
 Ms. M. Mayes-Wiebe
 Prof. G. Toles
 Prof. D. Watt

The Chair informed Senate that the speaker of the Senate Executive Committee was Professor John Anderson.

I MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION - none

II ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVES

1. To the Senate Executive Committee Page 3

The Chair noted that a faculty representative was required for a one year term to replace Professor Mactavish (Kinesiology & Recreation Management) whose term on Senate expired May 31, 2011.

Professor McMillan was nominated by Dr. Etcheverry, seconded by Dean Crooks. There were no further nominations.

Professor McMillan was **ELECTED** to a one-year term ending May 31, 2012.

2. Election of a Student Member to the Senate Executive Committee Page 4

Ms. Tapp MOVED, seconded by Ms. Enns, THAT Senate approve Mr. Ryan Lucenkiw as the student member of the Senate Executive Committee.

CARRIED

Ms. Rashid reported that Ms. Sara Enns as the student assessor member for the Senate Executive Committee.

III MATTERS RECOMMENDED FOR CONCURRENCE WITHOUT DEBATE

1. Report of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres Page 5

2. Report of the Executive Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes RE: Department of Human Anatomy & Cell Science Page 7

3. Report of the Senate Committee on Medical Qualifications RE: Dr. Eberhard Renner Page 9

Professor Anderson MOVED, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, THAT Senate approve the reports of the Senate Committee on Approved Teaching Centres, the Faculty of Graduate Studies on Course and Curriculum Changes regarding the Department of Human Anatomy & Cell Science, and the Report of the Senate Committee on Medical Qualifications regarding Dr. Renner.

CARRIED

IV MATTERS FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | <u>Senate Membership 2011-2012</u> | Page 11 |
| 2. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [May 11, 2011]</u> | Page 15 |
| 3. | <u>Report of the Senate Committee on Awards [May 25, 2011]</u> | Page 20 |

V REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT Page 25

The President drew attention to the written material provided in the agenda and noted that the University was coming to the end of a celebration season with students graduating, convocations, recognition of long service by a number of faculties and recognition of awards of various sorts. He noted that it had been a busy period and expressed the hope that Senators would get some personal time and refreshment over the summer while also recognizing that a number of people have things that they look to accomplish in their research programs during this time.

VI QUESTION PERIOD

Two questions were received by the University Secretary.

The first question was submitted by the UMFA Assessor.

1. *At the March 2nd session of Senate, David Collins reported that negotiations were underway between the Faculty of Extended Education and an agency of the Peoples' Republic of China that could potentially lead to the establishment of a Confucius Institute at the University of Manitoba. Have there been any developments in these negotiations since March 2nd?*

Dr. Collins indicated that discussions were ongoing and that no proposal had been received. Professor Morrill asked for confirmation that the matter had been resolved; Dr. Collins reiterated that no proposal had been submitted.

The following questions were submitted by Professor Radhika Desai, Faculty of Arts Senator.

2. *In the recently concluded selection process for the Duff Roblin Professor of Government, Dr. Richard Sigurdson, the Dean of Arts, whose term as Dean ends on 30 June 2011 and who is on leave July 2011 and June 2012, was the successful candidate for a term starting July 2012. The process was not made public to members of the Department of Political Studies where the Duff Roblin Chair is housed. Dr. Sigurdson himself designated a member of the selection committee that ultimately awarded him the position, a fact confirmed by Committee Chair, Dr. Karen Grant and University President, Dr. Barnard.*

In a response to my letter dated 15 April 2011 raising the concern that this process and its result could constitute at least the appearance of a conflict of interest under the terms of the university's own policies, Dr. Barnard stated that he

could see 'no way that any member of the committee could stand to benefit from the appointment of Dr. Sigurdson'. In light of these facts, I would like to raise the following questions for the University President and Chair of the Duff Roblin Selection Committee:

- i. Was it not a conflict of interest and procedurally unfair to permit a candidate to designate a member of the selection committee member?*
- ii. Was the opportunity to designate a member of the selection committee given to any other candidate for the Duff Roblin Professorship?*
- ii. Why was there no public hiring process as per the regular practice of the university for appointments, one which included public presentations by all candidates, provision of their CVs for department members to review and solicitation of letters of support from members of the Department and Faculty even though this was compatible with the terms of reference of the Duff Roblin Chair?*

The Chair responded that he felt that the questions posed by Dr. Desai were technically out of order as the appointment of chairs and professors and other selection processes do not fall within the purview of Senate. He further noted that he did not intend to set a precedent for considering matters that are out of order or for correcting misconstrued interpretations of his previous communications. He was, however, prepared to provide some information of a general nature noting that some of this information had previously been provided to Dr. Desai.

The Chair noted that the terms of reference of the Duff Roblin Professorship set out the membership of the selection committee and its process; those terms of reference had not in the past contemplated, nor would they presently contemplate, processes in line with the provisions of article 18 of the collective agreement. He indicated that, consequently, candidates were not interviewed in a public process, nor were CVs circulated; nominations and applications for the position were invited, and letters of reference were obtained in connection with the nomination/application process. The Chair noted that University policy explicitly states that, notwithstanding the provisions of the policy on Appointment of Academic Staff, in cases where it was proposed that a member of the University's full time, including GFT, academic staff be appointed to a chair or professorship, such an appointment may be made without a search with the approval of the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost normally on the recommendation of the unit head and, where appropriate, the Dean or Director. Dr. Barnard indicated that this answered question iii and then called on Dr. Karen Grant, Vice-Provost (Academic Affairs), who served as his designate in this process, and chaired the selection committee to address questions i and ii.

Dr. Grant noted that the terms of reference of the Duff Roblin Professorship stipulate the composition of the committee and that this was communicated to Dr. Desai. The membership of the committee was: the President or designate (as chair), the Chancellor of the University, the Dean of Arts, and two faculty members. Dr. Grant indicated that she was designated as chair of the committee by Dr. Barnard, and in consultation with the President, two faculty members were asked to serve on the committee, both having expertise in Canadian and Manitoba politics. Dr. Grant noted that, when she learned that the Dean was going to be a candidate for the position, she suggested to the Dean that

the Department Head of Political Studies which houses the Duff Roblin Professorship be designated as his appointee on the committee. She indicated that her suggestion was based on the fact that the Head of the department had previously served on a review committee of the Duff Roblin Professorship. Dr. Grant emphasized that she made this suggestion to the Dean who assented to it.

Dr. Grant concluded that, in essence, Dr. Sigurdson did not choose his designate, he assented to a recommendation that she had made to him. Dr. Grant indicated that she did not believe that there was a conflict of interest, much less bias, and that the President had already indicated in correspondence to Dr. Desai that there was "no way that any member of the committee could stand to benefit from the appointment of Dr. Sigurdson." In this case, and in every other case, no candidate chose or chooses the members of the selection committee.

**VII CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF MAY 18, 2011**

Professor McMillan MOVED, seconded by Dean Postl, THAT the minutes of the Senate meeting held on May 18, 2011 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

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

1. Report of the Senate Executive Committee Page 37

Professor Anderson noted that he was acting as speaker as Professor Brabston was unable to attend the Senate meeting. He noted that Professor Arlene Young was appointed as Vice-Chair of the Senate Committee on Appeals.

Professor Anderson MOVED, on behalf of Senate Executive, THAT the following nomination to the Senate Committee on Nominations be approved for a one-year term ending May 31, 2012: Ms. Nour Rashid (Student).

CARRIED

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

Ms. Ducas reported that the committee is currently considering a proposal for a Community Recreation and Active Living Diploma which will come forward to Senate in due course.

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

1. **Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation** Page 39
RE: Elimination of Undergraduate Spanned Courses

Dr. Grant noted that the committee had been working on this item over the last year and that members of Senate would recall that a report was previously submitted to Senate as part of the OARs project last year which outlined the rationale for the elimination of spanned courses. Dr. Grant summarized some of the key points that were raised in the OARs report that were reviewed by the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation. She noted that concern was expressed that spanned courses reduced the amount of flexibility in program offerings which made it harder for Deans and Directors and Department Heads to manage the allocation of teaching responsibilities, particularly when individuals went on research study leaves or other kinds of leaves.

She also noted difficulties for students who dropped one course from a full set of courses in the fall term and, with a limited number of courses available that were one term courses in the winter term, may not be able to have a full time registration which, for some students, could have financial implications related to loans or scholarships which require a full course load. Furthermore, she added, students who were admitted or who entered the University in January may have limited access to courses if courses are term spanning courses that began in September.

Dr. Grant indicated administrative reasons for which term-spanned courses were deemed to be problematic due to the manner in which student progress was assessed; if students took a term-spanning course, no grade would be reported in the fall term meaning that staff must manually recalculate GPAs and other associated difficulties related to assessing student progress.

Dr. Grant noted that the recommendation of the 3Rs committee of OARs came to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation for consideration. SCIE assessed that information and discussed it extensively. The committee recognized that there were different reasons across the University for the use of term-spanned courses; for example, in some faculties where programs are lock step and a student must complete courses in a particular order, there may be good justifications for retaining a term spanned course. Dr. Grant noted that there was a lengthy discussion of pedagogical factors and the understanding that, in some cases, retention could be justified; but overall the committee was of the view that the recommendation to Senate should be to approve the elimination of spanned courses and that faculties, schools and departments undertake a review of their undergraduate courses to be compliant with this recommendation for the 2012-2013 academic session with implementation planned for no later than 2013-2014. The committee recommended that applications for retention of term-spanning courses should be made to the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes with a rationale provided.

Dr. Grant MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation on Elimination of Undergraduate Spanned Courses.

Professor Chen indicated that she would address the report according to three main issues: first the assumptions it made about student needs and preferences, second the pedagogical considerations that would be appropriate for an educational institution, and third the process and methodology undergirding the report and its recommendations.

Professor Chen firstly felt that there was no evidence provided to support the claims made about student needs nor was there description explaining the methodology and research conducted for the report. She felt that it was appropriate for her to provide some concrete evidence that would bring into question the assumptions about students that were used to support the recommendations. Professor Chen first addressed the questions of student choice and flexibility. She noted that, in each year, the History Department generally offers equal numbers of sections of full-year and half-year courses, a practice she stated which had been in place for at least two decades. She stated that, for example, in 2011-12, the department would offer 22 sections of six credit hour courses and 47 sections of three credit hour courses. Professor Chen stated that this meant that 48% of the full credit equivalents in the History Department would be delivered as full-year courses. She indicated that this would allow students and faculty to make informed decisions about courses based on pedagogy, classroom experience, and personal and program needs, while providing adequate choice and flexibility. Professor Chen further noted that, in 2010-11, the department taught just under 10,000 undergraduate credit hours and 50% of those were students in full-year courses. Professor Chen expressed the opinion that this would indicate that there was strong student support for these full year courses and noted that summer session had similar statistics.

Professor Chen further noted that the Department of History offers a number of core courses at the introductory level in both three credit hour and six credit hour variations that were part of the regular offerings including: Canadian History, Western Civilization, and World History. Professor Chen gave the following example to illustrate how this works: Western Civilization is offered as a full year course that goes through the entire time span plus a half year course To 1500, and a half year course From 1500 to the present. She stated that, given that the History Department offered at the introductory level three credit hour and six credit hour courses with similar topics in the same academic year, she felt that this provided important comparative data about student needs and enrolment patterns. Professor Chen further noted that she, as associate head, had tracked the data for these courses for at least the last five years. She indicated that she felt that her careful review of the enrolment patterns demonstrated that the existence of six credit hour courses increased the flexibility for students and their ability to choose the type of courses that best suited their needs and interests. Professor Chen stated that she felt that three credit hour and six credit hour courses appealed to different students for different reasons. She concluded that, based on this evidence, it was her opinion that when a course such as World History, Western Civilization, or Canadian History was available in different formats, equal numbers of students chose the different courses, that these

courses enrolled at the same rate and generally to full capacity, and that it was clear to her that students were making choices that suited them based on their own assessment of their needs and interests. Professor Chen felt that the kind of evidence she had presented should be at the basis of any recommendations that takes as its basic format the needs and assertions about what students need.

Professor Chen further stated that she felt that the evidence she had given from the History Department would suggest that students were not limited by when they started courses as six credit hour and three credit hour courses were available during both the regular session and summer session. Professor Chen indicated that it seemed to her that any report and Senate recommendations that make a basic premise that student needs required certain kinds of changes, those who teach them in the classroom and the students who are taking these courses should be consulted.

Professor Chen stated that, secondly, she had very serious concerns about pedagogical considerations which she felt seemed to be largely absent from the report. She said that it appeared to her that the committee did not undertake consultation about pedagogical issues with those very departments offering spanned courses. Professor Chen stated that she felt that an educational institution should make pedagogical considerations the primary consideration for course delivery, not an afterthought; she felt that bureaucratic efficiency was a necessary support for the educational mission of the University not its driving force.

Professor Chen reported that, as part of the History Department's strategic planning process over the last eight years, there had been considerable discussion about the different types of courses, the distinct pedagogical opportunities provided through six credit hour courses for specific areas, fields, and courses as part of the program. She indicated that the assortment of course offerings were the result of ongoing assessment and engagement with pedagogical considerations relevant to the discipline not, she stated, as an afterthought nor as a relic of previous forms.

Professor Chen continued by asserting that the History Department was not alone at the University of Manitoba in reaching these conclusions. She reported that she had surveyed 26 history departments in Canada and found that 50% of these departments offered a substantial number of full-year courses. She noted that, among schools who offer full-year courses, that the following universities at the 1000-level offer only full-year courses: the University of Toronto, York University, Queen's University, University of Western Ontario, Lakehead University, University of Winnipeg. She noted that her survey showed that other schools offered a mix which she felt was to increase student offerings, flexibility and the allocation of resources.

Professor Chen indicated that her final point was about process and methodology. She stated that she felt that if the University was indeed serious about being an Outstanding Workplace, that respectful consultation with units offering spanned courses should be a minimal requirement for any recommendation. She felt that the issues that she had raised regarding resource implications for units were best raised with those units themselves. Moreover, she added, that in her mind it was

unacceptable for a committee to choose to put forward recommendations without consulting faculties and departments whose considerable expertise was at the root of decisions about undergraduate curriculum and programs. Professor Chen felt that disempowerment of faculty and students on issues related to pedagogy and classroom experience was a very serious issue at an educational institution; she said that it seemed to her that the recommendations signaled to the academic community, to the students, and to the general public that the University simply did not have time to engage in real discussion about quality undergraduate education. Professor Chen stated that her opinion that this did not make for an outstanding workplace, nor for a student-centered university, nor did it allow for engagement in the whole mission of delivering quality education to students and for faculty to engage in what they would like to do and that was to teach according to what they feel was best in the classroom.

Dr. Grant responded that the subject of spanned courses had been under discussion for close to two years. She noted that the 3Rs committee that referred the matter was composed of faculty members and administrative staff from across the faculties and student representatives. She noted that after considerable discussion of this issue at the 3Rs committee, the item was referred to the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation which consists of faculty members who have expertise and are in the classroom as well as student representation and the Director of University Teaching Services. Dr. Grant reported that this item had been on the SCIE agenda for at least five or six meetings over this past year where the merits of it were debated and discussed. She noted that there was an acknowledgement at the committee level that, in different places and in different units, there were very strong and compelling reasons for the retention of term-spanning courses but in other cases there were not. She added that, in fact, a number of term-spanning courses could easily be broken up into two one term courses without very much lost and would provide students with greater options. Dr. Grant referred to the example of Introductory Economics which had recently been changed from a six credit hour course to two three credit hour courses and indicated that the committee believed that it would be a good idea for departments and faculties to look at their curriculum and consider whether or not the way things had always been should be retained.

Dr. Grant noted that information had been received from students and that it was not hard to know that students who have student loans and scholarships that require them to have a full slate of courses could have a problem if they are required to maintain a full course load if they do not have the option of picking up a half course in the January term. She noted that SCIE looked at this and there was discussion of these issues about students over the last two years and that she was satisfied that the committee gave that due consideration. Dr. Grant also pointed out that the discussion of pedagogical issues was also hotly discussed and included those courses that are developmental in nature. After must debate and discussion of these issues in a very careful and conscientious way, she continued, the consensus of opinion was that this was a good idea and should be brought forward to Senate.

Dr. Grant assured Senate that pedagogical considerations were taken into account and that SCIE recognized that there were cases which would require a spanned course such as the development of a particular type of expertise in

music where there is an evolution of expertise in performance that really does require a lengthy period of time. The contrast between that kind of scenario and others, she noted, where it is just the way it has always been taught was really what the committee wanted units to look at and where there were compelling reasons for retention of a term spanned course, to present them to the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes.

Dr. Grant concluded that student need was just one consideration for the recommendation. She noted that the elimination of term spanned courses would increase student choice, ensure that students come into the University in January also have the option of taking courses that will allow them to advance in their degrees, allow flexibility in the deployment of faculty and other instructors by department heads, deans and directors, and not require administrative staff to manually calculate grades because the grades for term spanned courses are not available.

Dean Buchanan expressed concern about what he perceived as the broad brush approach of the report and the mechanism requiring those with courses that span more than one term to fight back to get it to be the way it has been. He asked how many courses this affected. He noted that, in Engineering, there is a final year capstone project that in at least one department spans two years which, due to the nature of the project, there was no way that it could be divided. He agreed that term spanned courses should be looked at but did not think that administrative reasons such as the manual calculation of GPAs because course grades are absent was a reason to change a whole system. Dean Buchanan indicated that he would like to see a lot more data to understand what the effect of this would be because he felt this change could be an incredible burden for departments such as History to undertake.

Ms. Gottheil noted that she has only been at the University for a year but had experience at four or five institutions over the course of her career and she would like to speak to this from a student point of view and the retention and progression of students through their programs. She noted that this was an issue that had been addressed by many institutions across the country. She indicated that this was not an issue of Aurora calculating GPA, it was not a system issue, but was a matter of calculating GPAs for students at two points: one was calculating GPAs for financial aid, for loans, for maintaining loans, for band funding and keeping scholarships and the second was calculating GPAs for students applying to professional schools and graduate schools.

Ms. Gottheil noted that the issue of retention and progression was one for students who were at the beginning of their programs where there are many spanned, full year courses. She indicated that for a student in introductory courses who was transitioning from either work or from high school into university it can be a difficult transition; if the student falters, and many students do falter in their first term or the first year, in the first term in a one term course they are able to pick up the course again in the winter and they have only missed or have to make up one course. If, on the other hand, it is a full year course then it becomes a matter of picking up six credit hours which is harder financially on the student and it can certainly be harder if it is a prerequisite course for second or third year courses. Ms. Gottheil noted that in such situations the student may actually fall

behind and not progress so she did not think that the proposal was about a one size fits all but that it was clear that the committee has said was that there would be a number of exceptions which could be brought forward with a rationale. Ms. Gottheil concluded that term spanned courses were a consideration for students' progression and retention and keeping them in our programs.

Professor Blunden reported that, about ten years ago, the Department of Physics eliminated most of their six credit hour courses and divided them into two three credit hour courses. He noted that this change had no effect on required courses; however, he noted that the department found that for optional courses, students would take the first half of the course and not take the second half resulting in a large impact on enrolment for the second half of those courses. Professor Blunden felt that there were courses where the first half of the course builds toward the intellectual meat of the course which happens in the second half; if students were only taking the first half, he continued, they do not get that higher level of learning. He expressed concern that student who only take introductory courses will never reach that higher intellectual level. Professor Blunden noted that this concern does not apply to every course but that there were courses in his department that, in retrospect, he would have preferred remain as six credit hour courses. Additionally, Professor Blunden echoed Dean Buchanan's comments regarding the capstone course and indicated that honours thesis courses in the senior year were unique courses which clearly could not be completed in one term.

Professor Cameron Morrill expressed his concern about what circumstances there should be in which Senate or any Senate or administrative agency would try to dictate how a particular University department should deliver its courses. He indicated that, at UMFA, they were big believers in collegiality mostly because he felt that collegiality leads to better decisions. Professor Morrill said that it seemed to make sense to him that the best way to deliver a history course was something that a history professor should decide on and not somebody like him. He noted that his daughter attended Queen's University and found that in her first year, sixty percent of her thirty credit hours were in spanned courses. He noted that, of course, Queen's has a lot of spanned courses. Professor Morrill stated that there were some things about Queen's that the University of Manitoba does not want to emulate, their success with undergraduate students, he thought, was something that the University would want to emulate if possible. Professor Morrill noted that, in his department of Accounting, in contrast, there are no spanned courses and that had been the case for many years. He indicated that the introductory financial accounting course is a three credit hour course which has a forty percent voluntary withdrawal rate; this meant that in the fall there are 200-300 students who drop out. He indicated that many instructors in the course believed that many of the students simply have trouble adjusting to university in their first year so that the first real feedback that they have got about their old high school approach came with the first midterm exam which, in that course was worth 30-40 percent which, he indicated, meant that if the student blows the midterm exam that there would really be no way back and all the student could do would be to drop the course. Professor Morrill indicated that if it were a spanned course, however, he felt then the first midterm would be worth 20 percent or something like that and a student could fail that midterm exam but still have lots of time and lots of marks to catch up. That, he stated, does not happen in a single term course. Professor

Morrill noted that this, of course, was a complicated issue and to say it was simply a matter of spanned courses versus single term courses but he thought that, because it was complicated, he would prefer to leave it to individual departments to make those decisions.

Professor Morrill made a final point that maybe the reasons that this committee offered to abandon spanned courses were good reasons for departments, observations 2, 5 and 6 at least, and he expressed his understanding and appreciation of all of them, but he thought that those items could be considered at the department level to move in the right direction and that some departments had already abandoned spanned courses so he did not think that Senate needed to outlaw spanned courses altogether if all we were trying to do was convince departments that they should look at spanned courses.

Professor Gabbert indicated that he just wanted to say that he agreed with Professor Blunden as he thought most of his colleagues did that spanned courses (which he noted used to just be called yearlong courses and that they used to be the only courses there were) had a lot more potential for developing student skills and intellectual work than the half courses did. He expressed the opinion that he would see their abolition as a major deterioration of his pedagogical range of options and he indicated that he was just put in mind of one of the major concerns that arose when Aurora was actually installed which was the question of whether, in fact, spanned courses would be manageable by the system and he felt that he was assured that the University could have spanned courses.

Professor Gabbert then stated that, years later, the proposal claims in a dozen places that spanned courses are inefficient and are wasteful of resources. He noted that the History Department had tried to develop a combination of half courses and full courses that work for the students, the faculty and the department. He said that to simply between now and whenever the deadline was in 2013 or whatever to get rid of all these full courses and then apply back to a Senate committee to rebuild the curriculum that has been built over all these years, he stated that the committee may have had intense discussions on pedagogy but the committee never talked to his department, they did not, he stated, and they did not talk to any of the units as far as he could tell that have over time evolved a balance of these things or have maintained year long courses for reasons that they are the best to decide. He indicated that he would have thought that a change this drastic, which was considerable for those who were used to this mix of things, that these people should have been notified that this was under discussion and should have been invited to make submissions Professor Gabbert stated that this was a much more serious thing than just something a committee can make however well founded the committee was.

Professor Gabbert then stated that his question to Dr. Grant was that in her last intervention she suggested that the committee was recommending that units take a look at things and see if some of these yearlong courses could be eliminated but, he stated, that was not what was before Senate. What was before Senate, he stated, was the abolition of these courses and a deadline by which it must be done. Professor Gabbert indicated that some people might feel quite differently about this if the proposal gave more flexibility to think about this and did not require units to come, he felt, hat in hand to some Senate committee and make an

argument to “goodness knows who” about why we should keep our curriculum in one piece. He stated that he was not quite sure what Dr. Grant was trying to say but indicated that what was in the proposal was not exactly the same as what he thought that Dr. Grant was suggesting she wanted units to do.

Professor Gabbert expressed the opinion that if Senate passed this proposal it would mean the dismantling of these courses and insofar as units get them back then, he stated that it sounded to him that units would get them back one at a time on the basis of some kind of appeal. Professor Gabbert indicated that, as far as he was concerned that it was a terribly destructive situation and a hideous waste of time.

Professor Young indicated that she wanted to pull some of the conversation in to the proposal itself noting that while Professor Grant claimed that there was conversation about this proposal, the departments were not really included in this conversation, History was not consulted, and English was not consulted. Professor Young noted that a conversation about this issue took place in Arts Faculty Council and, just so that Senate understood the unanimity in a broad range of disciplines within Arts to this idea, she indicated that a motion was passed at the April 13, 2011 Arts Faculty Council meeting after a discussion that she indicated included the observation that departments should not have to ask for permission to offer courses that best serve their students and disciplines. Professor Young reported the motion was: *That there are important pedagogical reasons why 6 credit, full academic year, courses should be retained. Most notably they provide an opportunity for the instructor to work with students to improve their writing skills by means of two or more major essay assignments and giving students a chance to respond to the instructor's comments in a subsequent essay, something that it is not realistically possible to do in the time allotted to a 3 credit half course. Arts Council therefore moves that each individual department or program should be able to decide to retain 6 credit courses if they are deemed to offer significant pedagogical advantages for that discipline.* Professor Young indicated that this motion was carried unanimously by Arts Faculty Council.

Professor Young then indicated that she would like to point out that this move to say we were really just being asked to re-jig our curriculum, to not do things the way we have always done them, was making a completely unfounded assumption that departments do not regularly review their curriculum and indicated that the English department does a serious re-assessment every four years. She noted that the department had tried three credit hour courses about 15 years ago and felt that it did not work so the department switched back to spanned courses. She also pointed out that the department has a range of courses including term spanned courses and three credit hour courses. Professor Young indicated the department felt that the mix of courses worked very well for the department, for the students and for the faculty. She felt that the mix of courses worked very well in terms of planning teaching schedules and assignments and that it worked very well for working out timetables for leaves. She indicated that the department had no problems and was working very well with this and that there was quite enough flexibility. Professor Young added that, in fact, because the department has the flexibility of both kinds of courses it also has the flexibility to teach most effectively the things that it needs to teach so in those courses where there are six credit

hours, there was the flexibility to work with different kinds of assignments and to work with students intensely when they need that kind of work.

Professor Young spoke on the issue with first year students regarding progression and retention and pointed out what happens when the first assignment goes so badly. She indicated that this certainly happens a lot in the English department where students do very badly in their first assignment and they work hard to improve and they do improve. She related personal experiences where students had improved from D to B over the course of the year noting that they could not do that in a one term course. Professor Young noted that, on the subject of progression and retention, if the student dropped a course in the fall term intending to pick it up in January there is nothing to say that that same course would be offered in January and certainly with a mix of courses there would still be courses that could be picked up in January.

Professor Young concluded that she did not see the problems with spanned courses being well founded and that the assumption that departments have not thought about what they are doing and whether or not they need to have full year courses for certain topics and the assumption that they do not discuss this and have not thought about it was also erroneous. She added that it was her opinion that the effect of the proposal would be to infringe on the academic freedom and sound pedagogical practices of instructors teaching in the humanities, certainly History and English and she felt sure the other humanities departments as well. Professor Young asserted that academic freedom was not just a matter of research but that it was also teaching as the two could not really be separated in the humanities. She summarized her position by indicating that the argument for three credit hour versus six credit hours courses should not be based on notions of flexibility of scheduling, although certainly the department of English has accommodated that, really the only argument for length of course should be pedagogy and to presume that departments should have to ask permission will, as Professor Gabbert had pointed out, create an onerous burden of work. Professor Young indicated that about 50 percent of the courses in the English department are term spanning courses and to have to make an argument for every single one of them, to have to go hat in hand begging for permission to teach the courses the way that the instructors believe that they should be taught, would be a make work project that may have the effect of eliminating some of the term spanning courses simply because it would break down the will to work as conscientiously in the teaching of our students as we would like to. In conclusion, Professor Young indicated that she felt that a one size fits all policy was an unsound one.

Dr. Grant responded that neither she nor anyone else on the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation thought that academic units were not regularly reviewing their curriculum and that there was never any intent to suggest that. She did reiterate that the committee did suggest that units should consider whether or not the retention of term-spanning courses was indicated. Dr. Grant reviewed the recommendations that Senate committee believed on the evidence reviewed that term spanning-courses should be eliminated and where there was a justification for their retention that they should be considered by the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes for retention. She added that the Senate Committee on Curriculum and Course Changes is composed of fellow faculty

members and they may not be English professors or historians or sociologists but they are a mixture of individuals representing the academic community who regularly make an evaluation of all proposals with respect to courses, the introduction, the removal and the modification of courses and that SCIE believed that it would be appropriate where for academic units apply to SCCCC with rationale for the retention of term-spanning courses as appropriate. The committee recognized that this process would involve a lot of work for academic units and SCCC and the lengthy discussions considered this factor.

Senate voted on Dr. Grant's motion and the motion was defeated.

2. Report from the Faculty of Graduate Studies Page 41
RE: the Department of Medical Microbiology and the
Department of Psychology

Professor McMillan questioned the requirement of 60 credit hours plus a thesis for the M.A. stream School Psychology program which appeared to be burdensome; she asked if this course load was representative of other programs in this field. Professor Mactavish indicated that this program was approved by COPSE and came on stream in 2005 and that the requirements met the certification accreditation requirement for school psychologists which is standard across the country. Professor Mactavish added that there was, therefore, no flexibility on these requirements for school psychologists to be licensed.

Dean Mossman noted his puzzlement with a Ph.D. program moving from 12 to 6 credit hours and a master's program with 60 credit hours. He indicated, while he was not opposed to either proposal as he thought that the faculties and departments should have an opportunity to do what they think was best, that he felt that this was a move towards the lower end on the Ph.D. side regarding the number of credit hours. Dean Mossman asked whether a cut in credit hours from 12 to 6 would result in the course fees being cut in half because he felt that there was a certain minimum that people should have to pay in fees for a Ph.D. regardless of whether they were at the bench or in the classroom. The Chair confirmed that fees were not an issue for these programs and that there was a program fee for Ph.D. programs.

Dr. Mactavish MOVED, seconded by Dean Postl, THAT Senate approve the Report from the Faculty of Graduate Studies regarding the Department of Medical Microbiology and the Department of Psychology as amended.

CARRIED

3. Proposal to Establish an Endowed Chair in Cardiology Page 45

Dr. Jayas reported on the proposal to establish an endowed chair in cardiology. He noted that the proposal had been reviewed by the Vice-President (Academic) and Provost. He noted that the interest from a \$3 million endowment would support the chair and noted that \$2.5 million had already been raised and that the candidate would have an M.D. and the term of the chair would be five years and renewable.

Dr. Jayas MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve, and recommend that the Board of Governors approve, the establishment of an Endowed Chair in Cardiology.

CARRIED

4. Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations

The Chair indicated that this report had been handed out at the door. Professor Edwards noted that this report almost completed the task of filling committees noting two remaining vacancies for faculty members and two vacancies for students; she indicated that the committee continues to work to fill these positions.

Professor Edwards MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the report of the Senate Committee on Nominations [dated June 22, 2011].

The Chair asked if there were further nominations; no further nominations were made.

CARRIED

5. Reports of the Senate Committee on Admissions

a) **RE: Faculty of Education – recognition of degrees from Booth College and Providence College** Page 53

Ms. Gottheil noted that the report arose from a joint ad hoc committee of the Faculty of Education and SCADM. She noted that the professional certification unit of Manitoba Education was directed by the Minister responsible for that department to recognize degrees from both Booth College and Providence College for the purpose of making teacher certification decisions. Ms. Gottheil further noted that, in June 2009, Senate approved a proposal from the Faculty of Graduate Studies to allow the faculty to consider, and she emphasized to consider, applications from students with undergraduate degrees from all Canadian institutions empowered by law to grant degrees. Ms. Gottheil noted that the Faculty of Education currently works with the Canadian Mennonite University and that this arrangement had been used as a template for the proposal. She noted that the review team in the Faculty of Education was recommending a selective rather than a wholesale approach to the recognition of degrees for admission from these two institutions under consideration.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions regarding the Faculty of Education, recognition of degrees from Booth College and Providence College [dated April 15, 2011].

Professor Gabbert began by indicating that he would make some specific comments about the report and then some more general comments about the issue. He felt that the report left several important issues unaddressed which he said that he thought that Senate had the need to hear about. First, he asked exactly which programs at each institution would be considered for acceptance by the Faculty of Education and which would not. Second, on what grounds exactly,

he asked, were these programs placed on the list in question. Third, Professor Gabbert asked, to what extent were courses from those degree programs not recommended for acceptance going to be accepted for credit as electives? Fourth, he asked to what extent did each institution make being a Christian a condition of employment for faculty or enrolment for students. And fifth, Professor Gabbert asked to what extent and how did each institution protect the academic freedom of its academic staff. Professor Gabbert stated that he believed that all of these questions related to the validity of programs at any institution and that such questions had to be addressed if Senate was to make an informed decision about the proposal.

Professor Gabbert continued by saying that more generally, he was of the opinion that this was an important and difficult matter and he felt that it should be clear at the outset that the issue was not whether faith based institutions should exist or what they contribute to their various constituencies nor was it an issue of whether Christians or those of other deeply held faiths or commitments can or should be academics because he knew that this was the case all the time. He continued that he felt that it was certainly not the case that this was an issue of whether the government wanted the University to take a particular stand on this matter. He stated that it had been left to the University to decide what stance to take on it and he stated that that was why it was being discussed at Senate. Professor Gabbert stated that the issue was certainly not what other institutions like the University of Winnipeg had decided to do. Professor Gabbert stated his opinion that the question was really whether programs in these two institutions were so fundamentally the same as those of the University of Manitoba that students who received degrees from them should be admitted to the post degree program in Education at the University of Manitoba. He declared that the report itself recognized that this was the issue.

Professor Gabbert stated that the report recommended that certain select degrees or secular degrees be accepted but degrees in faith based or applied programs not be accepted although, he noted, the list of degrees had not been provided.

But the problem with this approach, Professor Gabbert felt, was that each of these institutions professes to uphold an institution wide religious position that was meant to effect the entire curriculum not just the degrees like theology that the committee had singled out as not acceptable as a basis for admission to the Faculty of Education.

Professor Gabbert then cited Providence College as an example stating that it was admirably clear and frank about its position which, he indicated, was laid out on the institution's website in uncompromising terms in a declaration of traditional fundamentalist Christian belief as central to the college's work. He said quoting from the website: 'Providence University College and Seminary holds and teaches the essential doctrines of the Christian faith embraced by evangelicals'. Professor Gabbert continued by indicating that this included a claim that scripture was 'divinely inspired, complete, entirely trustworthy and authoritative for faith and life'. He went on to state that, in a list of questions elsewhere on the website which were frequently asked by prospective students, Providence responded about the difference between its education and education in places like the University of Manitoba and he noted that he was quoting again from the website 'while every

higher education institution aims to graduate students who are proficient, independent and who think carefully and with moral conviction, a Christian institution has the advantage of a foundational belief and value system. Although diverse views of each issue are fairly presented, there is an ultimate reference point against which all issues can be measured. Good and truth are defined in accordance with Christian and biblical teaching rather than individually by personal preference. For a Christian institution the Christian God sets the measure of what is true right and good'. Professor Gabbert indicated that these general positions were applied to what the College says about particular programs including ones, he presumed, recommended for acceptance by the committee.

Professor Gabbert stated that, in the area of humanities for example, one of the goals of academic work was stated by Providence as the ability to 'summarize and evaluate important human ideas events and issues from an informed Christian world view'. He further declared that this very same attention was found amongst the six purposes given for studying history, one of which he noted was 'to be able to summarize and evaluate important human events ideas and issues of the past from an informed Christian world view'. Professor Gabbert indicated that the point that he was trying to make was that there was a specific institutional commitment to doing what he referred to as, so-called secular academic work from the perspective of the specific institution wide religious position. In effect, Professor Gabbert felt, such institutions proceeded on the basis of prescribed doctrine. He continued stating his belief that, whatever the subject matter, be it theology or history, the clear understanding was that, and this he thought was critically important, the institution's religious position must be affirmed and respected. Professor Gabbert then referred to Harry Crowe having mistakenly referred to religion as a coercive factor in United College and got himself fired as a reminder of the importance of these issues.

Professor Gabbert observed that, as Providence College itself pointed out, this was fundamentally a different approach from that taken at the University of Manitoba and other public institutions because here at the University of Manitoba prescribed doctrine and institutional censorship do not have a place. He observed that, in the faith based approach, there were implicit limits to skepticism and critical thinking and to the range of acceptable conclusions that can be drawn and to the range of acceptable positions that can be taken by students and teachers alike. He argued that these apply not just to theological programs but to the entire curriculum. He then submitted that this was not university education as he understood it and degrees produced in the context governed by institutionally imposed prescribed doctrine should not be acceptable for entry into the Faculty of Education. Professor Gabbert felt that, if the committee could not revise its report or elaborate in its report in a way that reassured him on these matters then he urged Senate to think again about it but, he stated, there was nothing in the report that addressed most of the issues he raised. He further stated that it struck him that the distinction made in the report between secular and faith based teaching and so on was in fact undercut by the very claims that the institutions themselves made. Professor Gabbert felt that if these two institutions do not want to leave the University of Manitoba with this difficulty then he declared that there was an easy solution, either they do not ask for their students to be admitted to a place which apparently had no fundamental values or they abandon their insistence on a particular prescribed doctrine being the basis upon which everything from history

to English to theology had to be taught. He said that he did not see that you can have it both ways.

Dean Wiens sought permission for Professor David Mandzuk, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, to speak to this matter. No objections were expressed. Professor Mandzuk indicated that the comments made included some of the same arguments considered over the course of a year in the deliberations of the working group. Professor Mandzuk provided Senate with some background indicating that the Faculty receives regular visits from representatives of Providence and Booth and that these visits had occurred over a number of years. He noted that, in each of those visits, these kinds of discussions occurred including the faith statements that have to be signed. Professor Mandzuk noted that the Christian worldviews that students were expected to adopt when in the programs and the seemingly increasingly blurred distinction between secular and faith based courses were also discussed at these meetings. Professor Mandzuk noted that, having said that, the Faculty had admitted students who have first degrees from both Providence and Booth and the Faculty's general conclusion and observation was that even though their first degree is faith based these students had adopted a very general broad worldview, could think for themselves and could function very well. He also noted that these students come to the Faculty with generally more community oriented and service oriented experience than many of the Faculty's other students and that was certainly what the Faculty was looking for in terms of future teachers. Professor Mandzuk noted that, while the other two competing institutions in this province had already moved in the direction of recognizing degrees from these institutions, that it did not necessarily mean that the University of Manitoba must do the same. He indicated, however, that the University needed to recognize the fact that institutions were changing, or should be changing, and that the University of Manitoba was seen as not as accessible as we would like it to be.

Dean Wiens noted that he shared a lot of the concerns expressed by Professor Gabbert. He reported that the Faculty at one point took the position that it should not have to accept students from CMU and was basically told by the Province that it should, that CMU had a different kind of charter than Providence and Booth and therefore the University had to consider them. Dean Wiens reported that, for ten years the Faculty had dealt with this issue by not admitting students who could not be certified at the end of their program. The Minister of Education, he noted, had changed that by allowing these students to be eligible for certification and recommending that the University consider them for admission into the program. Dean Wiens also indicated that they had visited Providence and Booth over the last 8 -10 years and expressed the very concerns that Professor Gabbert expressed. He noted that the Faculty had been assured on one hand that students who do not profess to be Christians can, in fact, attend these institutions but that they must participate in certain of the activities and follow the structural activities of each of the colleges.

Dean Wiens noted that Manitoba was at the end of a country-wide movement and may be the only holdout in faculties of education for accepting students from faith based colleges. He stated that the Faculty had been very vigorous about this proposal and had done due diligence around these programs. Dean Wiens noted that the Faculty had very carefully created a list as referred to by Professor

Gabbert and has a very careful screening process which contains a general screening and a specific screening for different streams. He noted also that the Faculty has a professional unsuitability policy which allows and in fact has been used upon occasion for people who have taken particular stances such as religion, gender issues and other things to say that the individual was professionally unsuitable to become a teacher in Manitoba.

Dean Wiens concluded that there were safeguards built into the admission process and the Faculty was asking Senate to allow it to monitor these and do due diligence around and then proceed and use the structures in place to ensure that there would not be indoctrination and proselytization taking place. He noted that the Faculty does not foresee large numbers of applicants from these institutions.

Professor Young indicated that she wanted to express the same kinds of concerns that Professor Gabbert had already expressed and indicated that on the Providence College website, in the English literature program, two of its four objectives were to have students demonstrate knowledge of different approaches to the integration of Christian perspectives in English literature and skill in its practice and summarizing and evaluating important human ideas and issues from the Christian worldview. She felt that, from what goes on in an English department, that the statement does not suggest the development of a kind of critical skepticism that those in an English department believed to be essential to the study of literature. Professor Young said that she could not judge their degree as equivalent to the University of Manitoba and thus not really suitable for postgraduate training.

Dean Iacopino indicated that he was troubled by the dichotomy he saw where the arguments raised during the issue of term-spanned courses were based on departments and faculties having sound mechanisms in place to run their programs, to administrate their programs, to decide their pedagogy and how they were going to teach their programs and that the motion was defeated on that basis. Now, he indicated, there was a proposal from a Faculty that was seeking to do something and had mechanisms in place for evaluating who they would like to take into their program and administrate but the members of Senate seemed to be talking about restricting the Faculty's ability to do that. Dean Iacopino indicated that he thought that in the first case where there was a broad consensus from different parts of the University that perhaps a one size fits all proposal could best be handled at the department and faculty level for people to do their due diligence was pretty reasonable. But now, he stated, Senate is on a slippery slope going the other direction where Senators are asking to have Senate tell departments and faculties what they cannot do with their own programs based on their own expertise. Dean Iacopino stated that he thought that this was not as reasonable an action to take.

Professor Gabbert indicated that he took that point but thought that the fact was that Dean Wiens had now had a chance to respond about a set of serious concerns that were been raised and Professor Gabbert declared that he was not reassured at all by what Dean Wiens had said. Professor Gabbert indicated that Dean Wiens said that there had been endless discussions but really nothing had changed even though the discussions go on and on with the institution itself.

Professor Gabbert felt it incumbent to point out to his fellow Senators that, in the old days when Booth College was an approved teaching centre of the University that one of the pre-conditions for being an approved teaching centre was that there had to be an arbitration procedure in place for cases where there were academic freedom questions. He indicated that departments who taught courses at Booth College approved the instructors for those courses and Booth College actually had in place in those days anyway, he did not know whether it still does, a procedure which people could have access to if they considered that their academic freedom had been undercut. Professor Gabbert stated that it did not seem to him, and he did not know if it still existed anymore at Booth which has now become Booth University College, and there was no indication that any such thing takes place at Providence. Professor Gabbert reiterated that nobody had been able to reassure him at all about any idea of the academic freedom of his colleagues at these two institutions. He felt that it was a matter of concern for Senate and for the University and that this was a matter of quite a different order than how somebody organizes the structure of their courses.

Professor Gabbert continued by saying that he was not indifferent to what Dean Wiens said about what the Faculty of Education was doing to assess these particular candidates although it was not exactly clear to him what they do and in addition to not having anything in the report about the academic freedom situation of colleagues in these places. He stated that, frankly he thought that having academic freedom was pretty well fundamental to a satisfactory degree program. He asked whether in addition to the courses from programs that are supposed to be acceptable for admission there was also going to be the acceptance of electives which come out of courses that are in degree programs that are not accepted for admission purposes. He asked how Education would assess these students on an individual basis and indicated that his assumption would be that the relevant University department would be looking at the courses and would have to decide after reviewing course descriptions and a lot of other things whether credit could be given but, he continued, he did not know exactly what Education would be doing and he felt that Education had not really said what they would be doing.

Dean Wiens responded that it was incorrect for Professor Gabbert to claim that nothing had been done as the situation had moved from the request to accept the degrees carte blanche to a place where the Faculty, through long and difficult discussions, had reduced the list of acceptable degrees for admission because the Faculty had some serious concerns about them and, he noted, the concerns were very much what have been referred to in Senate's discussion. Dean Wiens spoke on the issue of academic freedom at Booth and others institutions such as CMU who hire people to teach who do not profess a religious belief and that, for him, at least part of the argument was that politically the University, by not accepting degrees from faith based institutions, was left in an isolated situation in relation to other provinces and countries.

Professor Mandzuk spoke to admissions indicating that the current admission process included a written expression exercise where applicants are expected to write on a current educational issue. He noted that process will likely be replaced soon by another admissions process that will specifically be a question on equity and diversity issues and the advantaged and disadvantaged in society; the

Faculty hoped that the new process would allow identification of any particular students who may not be predisposed to dealing positively with diversity and equity issues during their teaching career. In terms of assessing courses, the Faculty has worked closely for over a year with Enrolment Services to develop a more holistic rather than a course by course evaluation process to be more in keeping with ROSE and OARs initiatives.

Dean Mossman, speaking as one of the members of the Senate Committee on Admissions, noted that the committee had discussed many of the questions raised at Senate and decided that Education had developed a good proposal which included a lot of work to try to figure out what they would accept and what they would not accept. He recognized that one of the issues not detailed in the report was that there was not a list of all of the programs acceptable, or not acceptable, for admission; the Faculty would need to do that kind of due diligence to ensure that there are at least 60 credit hours out of the 90 that would be generally acceptable for credit at the University. Dean Mossman noted that he could not say that some of those courses are not taught with an ideological slant but of course no courses at the University of Manitoba are taught with an ideological slant. He suggested that an individual who some might think has been brainwashed in a certain way of thinking was allowed into the Faculty of Education because they met the admission criteria was now exposed to quite a different community who had all taken those arts and science courses that have been broadening; this individual would now have a chance to be broadened. From an ideological point of view, he felt that there was a chance to broaden an individual's education and that the University community should be welcoming these individuals.

Dean Mossman also noted that SCADM also looked at what the Province looked like and that about 80 percent of the cost of the courses were subsidized by taxpayers. He noted that many universities west of Winnipeg had decided to modify what were formerly community colleges into universities namely because the universities refused to actually accept the college courses for transfer credit. He thought that this was an issue that needed to be discussed from an overall point of view.

Dean Mossman concluded by saying that, whether one thinks an individual is brainwashed or not, one should not be aiming at that individual and rejecting them because one thinks their institution might not have academic freedom. He reiterated that it was the individual that was being considered, not the institution, and indicated that it should be viewed from that perspective and noted that SCADM viewed it that way and felt that Education proposed a reasonable way of looking at it.

Professor John Anderson asked for clarification as to whether the degrees referred to in the recommendation as approved or select degrees by the Faculty of Education were same set as the Province of Manitoba does or does not recognize or whether Education would be picking from a subset of what was acceptable and what was acceptable to the Province. Professor Mandzuk responded that the list of programs referred to was programs that the Education program review committee deemed to be acceptable or unacceptable and that the Province had no restrictions other than by the end of the B.Ed. program students must have 60 credit hours of education courses and 24 weeks of mandated practicum.

Professor Mandzuk indicated that, in terms of admission to the B.Ed. program, all entrance requirements would remain the same and, in some cases they would have to make up additional coursework as they do now. Professor Anderson asked if the recommendation referred to approved or select degrees based on a master list that the Faculty of Education has. Professor Mandzuk agreed that it referred to the list of degrees developed by the Faculty over a period of a year. Professor Anderson suggested a friendly amendment to the recommendation to clarify that the 'select' degree refers to the Faculty's list rather than a degree recognized by the Province of Manitoba.

Professor Cameron Morrill expressed concern about the accessibility item that was raised and he indicated that he did not think that it was an issue about whether or not we are accessible to students as many students seem to come to the University who meet the current criteria. Professor Morrill indicated that in his mind the question was does the University accept these courses and that was what he found troubling. It seemed to him, and he was not sure if it was true or not, that if an individual in the Faculty of Education was taking a three year degree with two years at the University of Manitoba and then took one year for example in biblical studies from Booth College, he asked whether the University would accept the courses from Booth College as transfer courses and then say that that is an education degree or would the University say that there was something wrong with those courses and that the individual would not be able to transfer the courses in. Professor Mandzuk responded that sometimes those courses are evaluated and accepted by Enrolment Services.

Professor Judy Anderson asked what was included in the programs from which those students could be accepted under the proposal because, she said, if there was a science course that was required which did not include evolution then the people coming in would have a very large challenge in getting towards a place where they could prospectively teach science in a public school system. Dean Wiens responded that as far as he knew every student in Manitoba studies evolution whether as a fact or as a theory that exists so he felt that there was no question about coverage of material here even in English literature which was absolutely full of Christian references he felt that there was no question of coverage; it was, he noted, a question of orientation and where you are intended to end up. Dean Wiens confirmed that, once in the Faculty of Education students would learn how to teach evolution as part of the program.

Professor Gabbert indicated that he wanted to make it clear that he never said brainwashing and he did not mean brainwashing. He indicated that he said that there were certain limits to positions one can take and so on given the assumptions behind this particular kind of arrangement. He indicated that he did not think it was right to characterize his position in some kind of an ad hominem fashion. Professor Gabbert said that, with respect to ideology, there was no institutional ideology at the University; there were many commitments, there were many positions, there were many ideologies but he felt that the University did not require anyone to have a particular one. Professor Gabbert indicated that he thought that it was all very well to make a throw away remark about oh well we're not ideological around here and noted that of course we are, of course we are. He felt that he expected to be able to be ideological and that was the point. Professor Gabbert then indicated that his question about elective courses had finally been

answered which he indicated was that yes, elective courses in degree programs that are not acceptable to the Faculty of Education as degree programs were nevertheless going to be acceptable in that body of courses that would be part of what was assessed for a student's application for the post degree program in the Faculty of Education. He concluded that he felt that there would be whatever the Faculty of Education said was secular or sufficiently non faith based along with a mishmash of things some of which will be presumably be faith based to the point where a degree in such a program could not be accepted as the basis for admission. He indicated that he intended to vote against the proposal. Dean Wiens responded that there were course admission restrictions related to teachable subjects which were set out by the Province.

Dr. Collins, Acting Provost, took the Chair to allow Dr. Barnard to speak to this matter.

Dr. Barnard, speaking as a member of the faculty, expressed his resonance with Professor Gabbert's comments at the beginning on the difficulty of trying to distinguish between those courses that are secular and those courses that are ideological. He thought that was difficult for everyone not only in this context but everywhere, he noted his agreement with Professor Gabbert's statement that the University was open to people taking all kinds of positions and he thought most would be hard pressed to say what positions were represented by the several dozen Senators in the room and noted that participants had not been filtered out on that basis. Dr. Barnard indicated that it was a bit incongruous to him to say that if someone declared where they stood they become unacceptable but if they did not declare where they stood then it was okay to join the community. He noted that it seemed to him that often in situations like this the University is very paternalistic. He felt that it was appropriate to say to students that the University thinks that they are not sufficiently well prepared and would not be admitted as the university was not just trying to grab their money to take them into classes knowing they would fail. Dr. Barnard indicated that the people referred to are adults who come with some views and if it is made clear to them what they will face, he thought that, as an institution, the University should be more open to accepting students from lots of different backgrounds as a general preparation to come here and study whether it was for graduate degrees or other degrees. He noted he would like to say to graduate students who have an undergraduate degree from another institution and undergraduate students who transfer that although they may not have exactly the same preparation as students who have been studying here, they will have to go through here what everyone else goes through here and they will need to be ready for that. Dr. Barnard expressed the wish that universities in general be a little less paternalistic and perhaps a little less ideologically narrow regarding this. He noted that the University already accepted students from lots of places knowing that the mindset and the context from which they came was not the same mindset expected on this campus, the University accepts graduate students from universities around the world from a number of countries where academic freedom is not practiced in the same way as at this institution. He concluded that, recognizing that this was a very strongly held conviction, he was concerned about a slippery slope if the institution was questioning on the basis of religion what would the next step be politics, certain kinds of orientations? Dr. Barnard stated that the University is looking for students who have reasonable preparedness to come here and do what we do here.

Mr. Kaffum spoke as a representative of the student body of the Faculty of Education indicating that he believed that students would accept applicants from these colleges with the understanding that they had been screened appropriately through administration because there already exist students with those value systems and with those religious backgrounds in the Faculty. Mr. Kaffum noted that these students were not viewed as such, that the student body did not see them as less educated or differently educated but rather as individuals with good and strong value systems. Mr. Kaffum also indicated that Senate had demonstrated a principle in the discussion on spanned courses that departments should be granted autonomy and that it would follow that the Faculty of Education should be trusted in its decisions and screening processes given that it has gone through discussions and understands the concerns that have been raised. He also noted that the screening did not stop at the Faculty of Education as students from these colleges, once being certified as teachers, still need to apply for employment or seek employment and these employers would see their history and would see where they have been schooled and may also take these things into account and if they see that the individual had graduated from Booth or Providence, might change their opinion of the student. He concluded that he thought that these individuals should be accepted into the Faculty given that they are screened properly and ensuring that they satisfy the requirements; they should then be offered equity and equality in the Faculty.

Professor Desai indicated that she wanted to address this because she thought that Mr. Kaffum and Dr. Barnard made very good points but she also indicated that she wanted to note that this was not just a question of discriminating on the basis of religion and whether that would lead to discrimination in the future on the basis of other types of approaches. She stated that there was a difference, that as an educational institution that uses knowledge, she thought that the University should not have any truck with institutions that explicitly fence off a certain belief and say that it was above questioning. Professor Desai felt that was the problem with the institutions she thought would be granted credibility to by accepting their students as though it was alright. She felt that this was the difference between a secular approach in which science or social science seeks to attain proof, not beyond doubt as there was always a lot of doubt. She stated that there was a difference between the clashing of different views because of the existence of scientific thought and any institution which purports to provide education which then fences off certain beliefs from ever being questioned. Professor Desai concluded that she thought that this was a more serious matter than had been presented.

Professor Blunden noted that the University accepts students at the graduate level from all over the world including students that come from countries where the whole idea of academic, political or intellectual freedom was a completely foreign concept. These students, he noted, were accepted on the basis of assessing what they had done at the undergraduate level and he thought that this was the only issue that was relevant. Professor Hultin endorsed Professor Blunden's comments noting that he was going to make exactly the same point.

MOTION CARRIED

Dr. Barnard resumed the Chair.

b) **RE: Faculty of Medicine**

Page 56

Ms. Gottheil noted that report contained numerous changes to admission requirements some minor some a bit more significant. First was a clarification of the definition of Manitoba applicant, secondly a clarification to ensure consistency with Canadian Forces members to ensure the definition was the same as was used in other provinces, the third related to Aboriginal applicants and the documentation that required for students to declare themselves as being Aboriginal which SCADM recommended be more inclusive to align with the definitions from other provinces.

Ms. Gottheil reported that the next proposals had to do with learners with blood borne pathogens which enlarged the definition from just HIV/AIDS. She noted that this proposal did not discriminate against those applicants but rather asked that they self declare. The third set of recommendations, she reported, were two proposed applicant pools for admission to the Faculty of Medicine: a bilingual, French-English, applicant pool to address the need for more doctors to serve in the Province's francophone communities that would operate much the same as the pool for Aboriginal applicants does today, and the second pool would be for MD/PhD program applicants.

Ms. Gottheil MOVED, on behalf of the committee, THAT Senate approve the Report of the Senate Committee on Admissions regarding the Faculty of Medicine [dated April 15, 2011].

Regarding the clause about blood borne clinical diseases, Professor Edwards asked what would happen after an applicant had disclosed this to the office of student affairs. Ms. Gottheil directed the question to Dr. Bruce Martin, Associate Dean (Student Affairs), Faculty of Medicine who indicated that there was a policy in place that governs students who are in the program with chronic disease, chronic communicable blood borne pathogens. He noted that the first component would be the assessment of risk to the applicant as well as to patients he or she may attend would be evaluated within the Faculty and if there was a risk to either party, the curriculum may be modified in a manner that does not restrict the student's ability to meet the objectives of the program. The second component would involve appropriate counsel to the student in all regards related to the undergraduate as well as postgraduate program and future career aspirations to ensure that it is aligned with the condition that they may have. The third component, Dr. Martin noted, was the requirement under existing legislation through the Medical Act, to refer the matter to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba for their review of the student and his or her illness and recommendations under the Medical Act regarding the nature of their practice.

Dr. Collins commented that this was his second meeting that day which had discussed the definition of a Manitoban and suggested that this was a University rather than a faculty matter; he foreshadowed to the chair of SCADM that the 3Rs

committee would be having some discussions on looking at a more uniform definition on what a Manitoban is for the purpose of admission.

MOTION CARRIED

XI ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. Proposal to introduce a Citation in Internationalization

Page 62

Dr. Grant clarified that, when this proposal went to Senate Executive, it was called International Scholar; following discussions at Senate Executive it was revised to be referred to as a citation in internationalization. Dr. Grant reported that this proposal had originated in the Faculty of Arts, was endorsed by Arts Faculty Council last year, and was brought to the attention of the Senate Committee on Instruction and Evaluation who believed that this ought to be available to all undergraduate students so referred the matter to Provost Council which consists of all Deans and Directors and other members of senior administration. The proposal presented comes from the Provost.

Dr. Grant noted that, following a discussion at Provost Council, the Provost constituted a working group which consisted of Tony Rogge the Director of the International Centre for Students and Dr. Grant as co-chairs and a number of other individuals representing Provost Council to consider the proposal and to work out the architecture to make it available to all students, both undergraduate and graduate. Dr. Grant noted that the model for the proposal was based upon models developed at other universities including York University and Thompson Rivers University who have something similar. She reported that the proposal would provide students with an opportunity to get this citation on their transcript upon graduation. The intention would be to allow students to internationalize their experience as undergraduates and as graduate students. She noted that the intention would be for the process to roll out over the next many months with a lot of publicity about this in the fall and work with the International Centre for Students and the Registrar's Office to ensure a seamless way of administering this and making it as automated as possible. Students would apply for this citation in the term prior to their graduation.

Dr. Grant noted that the proposal called for student to earn points in two of three categories: through course work, by studying on a student visa, and/or other activities which would have to be approved in advance at the faculty level. Dr. Grant indicated that the first intake would be scheduled for February 1, 2012 so that graduating students in May 2012 would be able to take advantage of the citation.

Dr. Grant MOVED, seconded by Ms. Gottheil, THAT Senate approve the introduction of a Citation in Internationalization.

Professor Hultin asked how this citation would impact a student's future job success and whether there was any evidence that future employers would value this. Dr. Grant responded that the intention was around the various competencies referred to in the proposal and she supposed that for a student who wanted to work in an international context or with an NGO that had international reach there

were many ways in which a student might actually use this to their advantage to profile their experience and to demonstrate that they have developed certain competencies. Professor Hultin asked how this particular statement on the transcript would be different than a student drawing attention to their education and competencies in a cover letter. He questioned the value of the citation if the University was going to give the citation only on the basis of information already contained in the transcript.

Ms. Gottheil responded that the International Student Centre and the Career Centre both reported that many employers were looking in a globalized economy for students who had a wide knowledge of the world. She noted that this could be acquired in many different ways such as language and courses but also through co-curricular activities which include volunteer and service learning opportunities. This citation, she noted, by combining a number of different types of activities both in class and out of class, could tell an employer that the student had a competency and that it had been intentional. Ms. Gottheil further noted that students want this as demonstrated through student satisfaction surveys and that employers were also saying that this was what they were looking for.

Professor Chen indicated that Ms. Gottheil had summed up the issues discussed at the Faculty of Arts Council and noted that a student cannot accrue enough points on courses alone to get this citation, that it was actually built upon extracurricular and other international experiences and recognized that many of these activities which were tied to the University or were volunteer work which could not get recognition on their own. She noted that this proposal pulls these experiences into a broader educational set of experiences and folds in class learning into a broader set of experiences.

Professor Hultin, while noting the importance of internationalization, expressed concern about the minimum amount of effort that would be put into assessing students' claims by automating the process as much as possible and asked what part of the process would not be automated. He noted that, if the citation was to have value, it must be because the University of Manitoba stood behind a certain set of experiences and he asked how the students' experiences would be assessed. Dr. Grant responded that only two areas which could be easily automated: points awarded to courses (keeping in mind that students cannot get all the points they need on courses) and the points given on the basis of being a visa student.

Professor Hultin asked how a service learning experience would be assessed and indicated that a clear mechanism should exist to ensure that the student had achieved this. Ms. Gottheil responded that a co-curricular record working group had been working on this over the past year and, over the next month or six weeks, there would be communication going out on the co-curricular record with very clear criteria, application forms and assessment. The working group, she noted has worked to ensure that there are not multiple definitions of things like service learning and volunteerism. Ms. Gottheil noted that, as the citation would be on the academic transcript, it was essential to ensure that it was credible.

Professor Blunden asked what student groups and clubs with an international focus would be included and whether a student from Timbuktu would receive

points for joining the Timbuktu student association. Ms. Tapp responded that there were a diverse range of student groups available that are run through the University of Manitoba Student Union including the Indian students association, the Hong Kong students association; she noted that there was a wide variety, there were executive positions within each group and students could also be a registered member of each group.

Professor Blunden expressed concern that the proposal seemed to be well thought out for Canadian students but questioned what it offered to international students who come to the University above and beyond what they would normally do as an international student. He noted that the proposal required Canadian students to step outside the box, to engage in a program or a course of study that would be beyond what you would normally do. For international students, Professor Blunden asked what the proposal wanted them to take away at the end of this process; he felt that it should be more than studying on a visa and joining their local student association. He suggested that there were experiences offered at the University of Manitoba that could enhance that experience such as the Native Studies and Faculty of Environment, Earth and Resources course on Baffin Island where students spend six weeks living and working among the Inuit of Pangnirtung. This course, he indicated, is not eligible under the criteria proposed but it could provide a transformative experience for international students and asked why experiences such as that could not be included. He also noted that work with the Franco-Manitoban Cultural Centre or the Métis Friendship Centre could also give international students opportunities that would be valuable.

Dr. Grant commented that the working group had a lengthy conversation about this including what happens if a student comes to the University of Manitoba from North Dakota who would be considered an international student. Such a student could decide that they want to get that citation and would be eligible for the points awarded as an international student. She noted that it would be too difficult to deal with countries differently noting that even though the United States was right next door that it was different from Canada and that there were ways in which international students bring that experience to the classroom and that they may have the influence to increase the dialogue about the differences and the similarities between their experience, whatever country they come from.

Mr. Karari indicated expressed concern with some of the concepts in the proposal about how to measure or assess these. He indicated that some students are already involved in community service out of passion and self determination and was concerned that there would be students who participated in the process just as a means to get credit. Mr. Karari asked if the intention was to look at the issues of passion and the intentionality of the students, how can it be measured and how can justice be ensured. Dr. Barnard recognized the point and noted that it was very difficult to measure; he noted that we all want students to be passionate about their subject but at the end of the day the only measure that can be applied was what the student had learned.

Dr. Barnard noted that there was still some work to be done on the details and asked if Senate would be content to vote on this in principle recognizing that an elaboration of the details taking into account the conversation would be brought back to Senate. Professor Hultin asked for clarification on what that does and

does not empower. Dr. Barnard indicated that the motion could be approved knowing that work still needs to be done and would be communicated back to Senate.

MOTION CARRIED

XII ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

These minutes, pages 1 to 30 combined with the agenda, pages 1 to 69, and the Report of the Senate Committee on Nominations handed out at the meeting, comprise the minutes of the meeting of Senate held on June 22, 2011.